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Joanna de Silva, a native of Bengal, the faithful and affectionate Nurse of the Children of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Deane.
Painted by Will. Wood 1782.
In 2020, The Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired a portrait from the estate of the art historian John Richardson (fig. 1). The portrait has no known publication or exhibition history, but an inscription identifies its sitter as “Joanna de Silva, a native / of Bengal, the faithful / and affectionate Nurse / of the Children of / Lieutenant Colonel Charles Deare,” and records that she sat for the artist William Wood in 1792. These bare facts establish that the painting is something extraordinary: an independent portrait of a female Indian servant by an eighteenth-century British artist, and moreover one whose name was preserved for posterity. Although ayahs—Indian nurses or lady’s maids—frequently figure within Anglo-Indian family portraits, no other independent likeness of an ayah is known to survive before the
nineteenth century. \(^2\) Recent archival discoveries about Joanna de Silva’s life clarify much about the circumstances and anomalous composition of her portrait. Painted in the wake of warfare between the British East India Company and indigenous Indian rulers, the painting attests to the complex and uneasy intimacies of Anglo-Indian domestic life in the early colonial period. An account of Joanna de Silva’s employment and her journey to London can shed light on the seeming contradiction between Wood’s autonomous depiction of his sitter and the inscription’s insistent placement of her in a relationship of servitude to a British family. In this account, the portrait emerges as one among several traces of de Silva’s life in the archive of Anglo-Indian colonialism, inflected, like all of these, by complex relations of power and subordination. \(^3\)

"A NATIVE OF BENGAL"

Three names feature in the inscription on Joanna de Silva’s portrait: the sitter’s, her employer’s, and that of the artist who painted her in 1792. Each name provides an essential clue to the origins of the portrait and its possible significance. But the most informative name is that of de Silva herself, a household servant documented in the India Office archives now in the British Library. Alongside these archival traces, de Silva’s first and last names identify her as a member of the Catholic Indo-Portuguese community. In India, Portuguese names do not necessarily entail Portuguese descent; in many instances, enslaved people of various geographic origins adopted Lusophone names upon their manumission and conversion to Catholicism. \(^4\) Joanna de Silva’s exact ancestry may never be established, but it is not surprising to find a woman with a Portuguese name employed as a nurse within an eighteenth-century Anglo-Indian household. As noted by the English traveler Jemima Kindersley, who visited Calcutta in 1768, “The servants who attend in a lady’s apartment are generally slave girls, or Portuguese women; and the nurses for children are Portuguese.” \(^5\)

In her portrait by William Wood, Joanna de Silva’s clothing and jewelry express her hybrid Indo-European identity. \(^6\) Her hair uncovered, she wears a white chemise with ruffled collar and cuffs under a fringed and lightly patterned shawl that is pinned together at the chest. Strands of gold beads are looped around her

---

\(^2\) Johan Zoffany (German, 1733–1810). *Group Portrait of Sir Elijah and Lady Impey with Their Children and Household*, ca. 1783–84. Oil on canvas, 36 × 48 in. (91.5 × 122 cm). Madrid, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid (inv. 445 [1986.11])
neck, along with a thin gold chain bearing a scapular, or Catholic devotional pendant, made of pink silk. Propping herself on an upholstered armrest, she displays three rings, including one with a prominent rose-colored gem. Her hair ornaments and earring are of complex workmanship and in a style associated with the Indo-Portuguese community.

While the armrest in the lower right-hand corner anchors de Silva in space, the background of drifting clouds dislocates her from any specific setting, either English or Indian. Only the inscription gives her a geographic point of origin as “a native of Bengal.” Against the hybridity of de Silva’s attire, the inscription clarifies her racial status for a British (and English-speaking) audience. De Silva’s distant gaze, conveyed in three-quarter profile, renders her a more comfortable object of contemplation, one who does not return the viewer’s scrutiny. The inscription’s characterization of the sitter as “faithful and affectionate” mitigates the relative emotional blankness of her portrayal.

The singularity of Joanna de Silva’s portrait becomes clear in comparison with other contemporary representations of Indian women who worked for British families. In one typical example, an ayah sits on the ground on the far right of Johan Zoffany’s portrait of the family of Sir Elijah Impey, first chief justice of the Supreme Court of Calcutta (fig. 2). Zoffany depicted the Impeys listening to a group of Indian musicians, with their daughter Marian, in Indian clothing, striking a dancer’s pose. The youngest child, Hastings, sits on the lap of his ayah; another woman wields a fly whisk above them. The ayah’s hand rests on the stomach of her towheaded charge, his fingers clasping hers in a detail that conveys bodily intimacy at the same time as it stages racial difference. Zoffany’s painting explores themes of hybridity and cross-cultural emulation through the central figure of Marian, whose costume and dancing suggest an emergent Anglo-Indian identity among the family’s youngest members. Simultaneously, it mobilizes the ayah as a foil whose attire (with prominent nose hoop) and lowly positioning reinforce the white British femininity of the children’s biological mother, seated at far left.

In contrast to the pose of the ayah in Zoffany’s conversation piece, nothing in Joanna de Silva’s portrait, apart from the inscription, explicitly places her in a position of servitude. Indeed, as suggested above, the tension between the autonomy of her representation and the inscription’s emphasis on her relationship to the Deare family is one of the most pressing questions raised by the portrait. Why, if she was intended to figure as “the faithful and affectionate Nurse” of the Deare children, does Joanna de Silva appear without them, breaking with the conventions of Anglo-Indian portraiture? Like her jewelry and hybridized dress, the fact that de Silva was the subject of an independent portrait hints at an exceptional status compared to other servants in late eighteenth-century Bengal. Recent archival discoveries reinforce this supposition.

Perhaps the most intriguing of these documents is a will drawn up on October 18, 1809, by one “Johanna De Silva of the town of Calcutta in Bengal.” The will records the testator’s assets as well as her devotional practices, with the second clause stipulating that “after my decease my body . . . be Interred in the Roman Church at Calcutta as near to the Holy Altar as circumstances may admit,” and setting aside five hundred rupees “for the ground and five hundred Rupees for all other charges incident to my funeral.” De Silva further specified that her remaining one thousand rupees be bequeathed “to the confraternity of the Lady Monte de Carmo Roman Catholic Church.” Affidavits preserved with the will record that de Silva died on January 7, 1810, that she was “a Portuguese Christian and Inhabitant of Calcutta,” and that “she understood English.” Illiterate, at least in English, she signed her will with an X (fig. 3).
The Johanna De Silva who dictated this will owned a “house and ground . . . at Chowringhee,” a prosperous and largely European section of Calcutta. Her property was to “be held in durance” by her executor, Mr. João de Abrue, on the condition that he arrange a series of bequests and annuities to her dependents, godchildren, and gardener, Emomdy. Apart from the gardener, all of the legatees in the will have Portuguese or English names. For example, a “Mrs. Rose” was to receive a ring, perhaps a significant detail in light of the prominent ring in William Wood’s portrait.

But was the “Johanna De Silva” who made these bequests in 1809 the same “Joanna de Silva” who sat for her portrait in 1792? The appearance of status and wealth conveyed by the portrait would seem to support this conclusion, while the sitter’s identification as a servant might at first glance undermine it. Establishing a possible link between the portrait and the will requires a closer look at Joanna de Silva’s role within the household of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Russel Deare.14 As will be seen, the death of Joanna de Silva’s employer directly precipitated the painting of her portrait.

"IRREPARABLE LOSS"

In November 1790, the Calcutta Monthly Register published its first issue. Much of the magazine was devoted to the progress of the Third Anglo-Mysore War, fought between the British East India Company and the Kingdom of Mysore in southern India. The Monthly Register’s account of the war interweaves imperial and domestic tragedy, with the author particularly struck by one “irreparable loss, which a respectable family experienced in the present contest”: the deaths, within a week of one another, of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Russel Deare, who had commanded the corps of artillery at Sittimungulum, and of his wife, Catherine, who had remained behind at Calcutta.15 Lieutenant Colonel Deare died on September 13, killed by cannon shot from the troops of Tipu Sultan, ruler of Mysore.16 The writer for the Calcutta Monthly Register declared that Mrs. Deare’s death, seven days before her husband’s, was “an instance of conjugal affection, not more uncommon, than extraordinary.”17 Indeed, it was believed that her “apprehension for [her husband’s] safety, and strong prepossession, that she should never see him more, occasioned her death.”18 Dying of anxiety for her soldier husband, Mrs. Deare came to figure as a tragic heroine of the imperial home front.

Lieutenant Colonel and Mrs. Deare died more than three decades after the British East India Company had achieved control of Bengal, a vast and wealthy region in the east of India, following the Battle of Plassey in 1757. Rule over Bengal marked a decisive step in the company’s evolution from a trading corporation into a quasi-governmental entity with its own standing army and rapacious territorial ambitions. Charles Russel Deare died in the course of one of the wars fought by the company against Indian rulers as the British pursued ever greater economic exploitation of the subcontinent. The short life spans of many East India Company soldiers, officials, and their dependents prompted a culture of commemoration that has left numerous physical traces in both India and the United Kingdom to this day.19

Alongside the newspaper tribute discussed above, the deaths of Lieutenant Colonel and Mrs. Deare inspired a large memorial obelisk, commissioned by Charles’s brother and co-executor George, that still stands in South Park Street Cemetery in the city now known as Kolkata (fig. 4).20 The Deares also left behind three young daughters and a complex estate for their executors to unravel. Charles Russel Deare’s probate inventory, drawn up at Fort William in Calcutta in August 1791 and signed by his brother George, documents the arrangements taken to dissolve the Deare household and to provide for its surviving members.21

These included multiple auctions, the first of which alone brought in some 28,452 rupees. The executors were also responsible for paying the wages of household servants. Among their expenses can be found forty-eight rupees, “By Cash paid Johannah De Silva nurse attending Miss Sophia Deare her wages for September October & November [1790].”22 These records show that de Silva was a relatively well-paid member of the Deare household, although her salary was far below that of the Englishmen listed in the inventory. While “Mr. Thompson Superintendent [sic] of the Gun Carriage Yard” made fifty-eight rupees in one month, the “derwanah,” or porter, made just eight rupees for two months’ work. Moreover, de Silva’s wage of sixteen rupees per month compares favorably with the average salary of between five and twelve rupees for an ayah in nineteenth-century Bengal, when more comparative data is available.22

Two more payments to de Silva appear in the probate inventory. The first is for one hundred rupees paid to her “to purchase Cloaths for Miss Deares Passage to Europe.” The second records a payment of six hundred rupees to “Johannah De Silva Servant for Attending on Miss Sophia Deare on her Passage to England.” This last payment is particularly important as the primary piece of evidence, beyond the portrait itself, that Joanna
de Silva traveled to London and sat for William Wood there. The payment of six hundred rupees for the journey appears to have been unusually substantial. When, for example, the executors of Edward Close, a British merchant who died at Rangamati in 1790, arranged for his daughter Marrianne Windsor to travel to England, they paid an unnamed ayah only two hundred fifty rupees to accompany her.23 Beyond establishing de Silva’s wages and the fact that she made a well-remunerated voyage to England, the probate inventory gives greater precision to her work for the Deare family. As the inventory makes clear, de Silva was the nurse of Sophia Deare, who was born on May 26, 1786, and thus was just over four years old at the time she lost her parents.24 Although her portrait’s inscription refers to de Silva as “Nurse of the Children of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Deare” (emphasis added), the inventory makes no reference to her taking care of either of the couple’s two other surviving daughters, Helen, born in 1780, or Mary Anne, born in 1789.25 Nor does it mention payments for Helen’s and Mary Anne’s passages to Europe, indicating that they traveled separately from their sister Sophia.26

Lieutenant Colonel Deare’s last will was proved at London on July 8, 1791, suggesting that Sophia Deare and Joanna de Silva may have arrived in England with the will by that date.27 Corroboration for this thesis appears in a series of entries from both the probate inventory and the ship’s journal of the Rodney, an East Indiaman that docked at Diamond Harbour (the port for Calcutta) on August 6, 1790.28 On November 22, thirteen days after Joanna de Silva received funds to purchase clothing for Sophia Deare’s journey, the executors recorded a payment of fifteen hundred rupees to Captain Chatfield of the Rodney “for the Passage of Miss Sophia Deare to Europe.” In the meantime, the Rodney had moved downriver to Sagar Island, where, on December 22, it received onboard “Col: Elliot a Passenger for Europe.” This is almost certainly the same Colonel Elliot who on December 10 had received from the executors “100 Spanish dollars . . . to pay Washing and other Charges for Miss Sophia Deare on her Passage to England.” Although they are not listed in the ship’s journal (perhaps because their passage represented private income for the captain), Joanna de Silva and Sophia Deare presumably boarded the Rodney in the company of Colonel Elliot.29 On June 11, 1791, the St. James’s Chronicle in London announced a “Miss Deare” among the passengers from Bengal imminently expected aboard the Rodney.30 The ship reached moorings in England on June 15, 1791, allowing plenty of time for Charles Russel Deare’s will to be proved at London on July 8.

For all their apparent dryness, these archival documents establish a crucial timeline for Joanna de Silva’s journey to London. The deaths of Charles Russel and Catherine Deare in mid-September 1790 necessitated the rapid dissolution of their household and the placement of their orphaned children with relatives. At least one of these, Sophia Deare, was en route to England three months after her parents’ deaths, accompanied by her nurse, Joanna de Silva. The pair arrived in England in the summer of 1791, and de Silva sat for William Wood the following year. The portrait’s inscribed mention of de Silva’s “faithful and affectionate” service to the Deare children can now be given greater precision as a testimony to her guardianship of the four-year-old Sophia Deare during the perilous six-month sea voyage from Bengal to England.

Ayahs and Nabobs

By the time of Joanna de Silva’s arrival in London, the presence of ayahs there had become a matter of considerable controversy. It was common for British women returning from India to bring ayahs with them for the lengthy journey home; and ayahs also might be employed to travel with otherwise unaccompanied children, as Joanna de Silva was hired to accompany Sophia Deare. But despite the East India Company’s
requirement that employers post bonds guaranteeing their servants’ return passage to India, many ayahs faced abuse, exploitation, or abandonment upon their arrival in England. In public discourse, the figure of the abandoned ayah came to stand in for the cruelty of the “nabobs,” or wealthy British returnees from India. At the same time, the presence of indigent women of color on the streets of London stoked alarm in some observers about interracial mixing among the capital’s ever more globalized residents. In one representative protest, a writer signing himself “Truth” published a letter in the *Public Advertiser* in 1786 in which he decried “the number of those poor wretches who are daily begging for a passage back” to India. He declared himself “not such a fool . . . as to expect much humanity from a female adventurer to Bengal; but the nation has a right to demand common justice from their husbands.”

Characteristically, the author expressed particular hostility to the female members of nabob families. At the same time that they experienced extreme economic and physical vulnerability, ayahs came to be sentimentalized within imperial discourse. Satya Shikha Chakraborty has described ayahs in literature and the visual arts “as a distinct signifier of elite Anglo-Indian domestic morality,” a desexualized and wage-earning counterweight for the repressed history of concubines and enslaved workers in earlier East India Company households. In the eighteenth century, Indian wives or concubines of East India Company officers were sometimes the subject of independent portraits, as was the case with Amber Kaur, *bibi* or concubine of the British resident at Poona, Sir Charles Malet (fig. 5). James Wales painted Amber Kaur in the same year that Joanna de Silva sat for William Wood, in a portrait that conveys both the sitter’s beauty and her high rank. But the closing years of the eighteenth century, when both of these women had their portraits painted by British artists, saw dramatic shifts in the sexual politics of the East India Company. Long accepted practices of interracial marriage and concubinage became taboo, especially for elite men, as colonial officials embraced newly rigid ideals of sexual and racial purity. As a result, many Indian wives and concubines, including Amber Kaur, were abandoned, while some mixed-race children were separated from their mothers and sent to relatives in England in an attempt to disguise their Indian heritage.

Within this climate, the emphatically desexualized ayah came to supplant the *bibi* or concubine as the emblematic image of Indian womanhood within imperial discourse. The ayah furthermore served as an essential foil to the white memsahib, the idealized colonial matron who replaced, in the British popular imagination, the “female adventurer to Bengal.” We can see this process already at work in Zoffany’s *Impey* portrait, described above, where an ayah appears on the floor with one of the children while Lady Impey (in fact a highly engaged patron of Indian artists) sits demurely on the periphery, seemingly oblivious to the concert of Indian music. As two paradigmatic female identities in British India, the ayah and the memsahib came to define one another. This dynamic also inflected the texts and images that responded to the deaths of Charles Russel and Catherine Deare. While newspaper accounts and a funerary monument celebrated Catherine Deare’s tragic devotion to her fallen husband, William Wood’s portrait enshrined Joanna de Silva’s “faithful and affectionate” service to the orphaned Deare children; the tributes to ayah and memsahib both reinforced the family’s narrative of self-sacrificing imperial service.

To this date, no documentation for the commission of Joanna de Silva’s portrait or its provenance prior to its acquisition by John Richardson has come to light.
most likely patron for the portrait, however, was Philip Deare, Charles Russel Deare’s brother and the co-executor of his estate, with whom his daughters lived after their arrival in London.41 Of course, we should not rule out the possibility that de Silva might have commissioned her own portrait. However, the inscription’s emphasis on her service to the Deare family makes this less likely.42 As one of his late brother’s executors and the guardian of his children, Philip Deare had a strong sentimental investment in preserving Charles Russel Deare’s memory. In his own will, for example, written in 1807, he bequeathed a “gold stopwatch” to his eldest son, “it having been the watch of . . . my brother Lieutenant Colonel Charles Russel Deare and in his pocket when he fell at the battle of Sattamugalum [sic] in the East Indies on the 13th of September 1790.” With this bequest came “an injunction that it may be carefully preserved as I have hitherto preserved it.”43

East India Company officers and their relatives, maintaining kinship ties across vast geographic distances, had a particular investment in the preservation of family memory and the sentimental circulation of heirlooms.44 As Charles Russel Deare’s executors, George and Philip undertook both to fulfill the material provisions of their brother’s will and to honor his memory. In Calcutta, George Deare not only organized auctions of household effects and arranged Sophia Deare’s passage to England with her ayah but also commissioned the obelisk in the South Park Street Cemetery that commemorated his brother and sister-in-law. In London, meanwhile, Philip Deare provided a home to his orphaned nieces, administered their inheritances, and preserved his brother’s watch as a cherished family relic. He also very likely commissioned Joanna de Silva’s portrait. In the wake of the Third Anglo-Mysore War—a conflict that had claimed Charles Russel Deare’s life—Joanna de Silva provided a reassuring image of “faithful and affectionate” Indian servitude to a newly bereft East India Company family.

As a commemorative object, the portrait could have spoken to both an intimate and a national audience. Lieutenant Colonel Deare’s death was a much-publicized tragedy, reported in newspapers in both Calcutta and London. For example, on August 16, 1791, the London Public Advertiser printed an extract from the Calcutta Gazette Extraordinary, in which Deare was described as a man “who, from his rank, situation, and abilities, must be considered as an irreparable loss to the army he served with; and who, from his personal good qualities, and acknowledged worth, must be universally lamented.”45 His name and fate could have been familiar to a metropolitan public reading the inscription on Joanna de Silva’s portrait, whether they saw it in the artist’s studio, the Deare family home, or some other space of display.

In commissioning the portrait, Philip Deare would have paid tribute to an honored family retainer who had done a great service to his orphaned niece, a practice with some precedent in British portraiture.46 But why, then, did he not have William Wood depict Joanna de Silva together with Sophia Deare, visualizing the bond between ayah and charge in accordance with a long tradition in East India Company portraiture? His decision may reflect the rapid transition, discussed above, in Anglo-Indian domestic morality of the 1790s, with new taboos placed on established practices of interracial concubinage, and new pressures brought to bear on the depiction of Anglo-Indian intimacies.47 Such a shift was particularly pertinent to the Deare family, since a young woman of mixed British and Indian parentage was already living in Philip Deare’s household at the time that Joanna de Silva and Sophia Deare arrived there, namely Sophia’s older half sister, Elizabeth.

The second clause of Charles Russel Deare’s will, drawn up on February 15, 1790, makes a bequest of “one thousand five hundred pounds Sterling” to “my natural daughter Elizabeth now in London under the care of my Brother Philip Deare.”48 Baptismal records show that Elizabeth Deare was christened in Calcutta on August 17, 1780—the same day as her half sister Helen. But whereas Helen is listed as the “Daughter of Capt. Charles Russel Deare . . . and Anne Catherine his Wife,” Elizabeth is listed as the “natural Daughter of the above Capt. Deare,” leading to the supposition that he had a child with an Indian woman.49 Charles Russel and Catherine Deare had married on June 5, 1779; Elizabeth may already have been born by this date but had her baptism deferred until that of her half sister Helen. As recorded in Charles Russel Deare’s will, Elizabeth was living in London by the time of her father’s death, and she remained in England for the rest of her life, eventually marrying the clergyman Philip Wynell Mayow in 1806.50

The private history of the Deare family, in which a mixed-race daughter born out of wedlock shared a home (and a substantial inheritance) with the legitimate daughters of Charles Russel and Catherine Deare, provides another crucial piece of context for the painting of Joanna de Silva’s portrait. As an heiress born in India, or so-called nabobina, Sophia Deare would have had a tenuous claim to social respectability.51 British people who returned from India frequently brought
with them enviable wealth, nonwhite servants, and foreign modes of living that all made them objects of popular fascination and suspicion. Much of this suspicion focused on children, like Elizabeth Deare, who were the product of relationships between British men and Indian women. With mixed-race children facing increasing pressure to “pass” as white (indeed, they were officially banned from traveling to England in 1786), their mothers occasionally posed as ayahs in order to accompany them abroad without exposing their true racial identities.52

In the face of sparse evidence, it is tempting to imagine an even more intimate link between Joanna de Silva and the Deare family than the archival sources reveal. In fact, nearly every reader of this essay in manuscript has raised the possibility that Joanna de Silva was the mother of either Elizabeth or Sophia Deare. Yet, to this date, I have uncovered no indication that Sophia Deare was anything but the daughter of Charles Russel and Catherine Deare, or that Joanna de Silva had any relationship to Charles Russel Deare other than that of nurse to his children. The desire to speculate otherwise, to imagine a more salacious history, would also not have been lost on Philip Deare, the guardian of Sophia Deare, who received her into his home alongside her ayah in 1791. As a young and wealthy orphan who had lost her mother in Calcutta, traveled in the company of an Indo-Portuguese woman, and occupied the same London household as her mixed-race half sister, Sophia Deare would have been subject to heightened levels of scrutiny and suspicion. Philip Deare’s desire to commemorate Joanna de Silva’s service to the family through a portrait might have conflicted with the need to shore up his niece’s social standing and racial identity—and to establish her difference from her half sister, Elizabeth. A depiction of Sophia Deare and Joanna de Silva together may simply have been too suggestive, too easily mistaken for the portrait of a mother and daughter. Wood’s independent portrait of de Silva, which conveys her intimacy to the Deare children verbally but not visually, effectively quarantines her likeness from the complex attachments of earlier Anglo-Indian family portraits.

Philip Deare’s efforts to introduce Helen, Sophia, and Mary Anne in London society, and to distinguish them from Elizabeth, also extended to publicizing philanthropy carried out in their names. On April 2, 1793, the sisters were all listed as contributors, at a rate of five pounds and five shillings, to a “Ladies’ Subscription for the Relief of the Widows and Children of Soldiers and Seamen.”53 The naming of the three girls in the subscription advertised their status as charitable “ladies,” who, like the objects of their generosity, were also war orphans. No mention is made of their half sister, Elizabeth.

Sophia Deare grew up to make an excellent marriage, in 1810, to Sir Frederick Leman Rogers, 7th Baronet Rogers of Blachford House, near Plymouth. Their son, Frederick, 1st Baron Blachford, continued the family’s tradition of imperial service as permanent under-secretary of state for the colonies, from 1860 to 1871.54 Lord Blachford died childless; his estate eventually passed to the granddaughters of Helen Deare. In the extensive surviving Deare and Rogers family papers now in the Plymouth archives, I have been unable to find any record of Joanna de Silva’s portrait.55 Perhaps in a climate of Victorian imperialism, the portrait became an embarrassment, like the Deare family’s own history of colonial intimacies. Following its acquisition by The Met, conservation treatment revealed extensive punctures to the sitter’s eyes and mouth.56 Were these the result of darts flying in a nursery, a fit of derangement, or mere household neglect? The damage to the canvas is a chilling physical trace of the two centuries when Joanna de Silva’s portrait was kept out of sight.

**THE MINIATURIST**

One key proper name from the inscription on Joanna de Silva’s portrait remains to be considered, that of its painter, the twenty-two- or twenty-three-year-old William Wood. Known today almost exclusively as a miniaturist, Wood was born in 1769 and entered the Royal Academy Schools in 1785.57 Wood kept meticulous records of the miniature portraits he painted, as well as of the materials and techniques he used, in ledger books now at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.58 From this source, it is clear that much of his clientele consisted of returnees from the British East and West Indies, including, for example, a “Miss Smith,” the “demi-dark daughter of Mr. Alexander, of Calcutta.”59 The Deare family likely came to know Wood through shared Anglo-Indian circles. In 1799, Wood painted two miniatures, one a copy of the other, of a “Mrs. Deare.” This may have been Helen Deare, the eldest daughter of Charles Russel and Catherine Deare, who had married her first cousin (and Philip Deare’s son), the Reverend James Russell Deare, one year before.

Unlike the rest of Wood’s surviving body of work, Joanna de Silva is an oil painting on canvas, not a miniature portrait, and as such is not recorded in his memorandum books. It was a statement of ambition on the
part of a young painter who had already exhibited six miniature portraits at the Royal Academy in 1791. In his ledger, Wood wrote that the "first miniature I ever painted" was a copy after the work of Sir Joshua Reynolds. In painting Joanna de Silva, he also drew upon the precedent of the Royal Academy’s founding father, specifically the unfinished portrait of a Black man, sometimes identified as Samuel Johnson’s servant Francis Barber, now in the Menil Collection (fig. 6). Like Reynolds’s portrait, Wood’s painting depicts a figure of color at bust length, with an upward, averted gaze, against a cloud-streaked sky. The many surviving copies of Reynolds’s portrait suggest that it was made available to Royal Academy students as an aid to instruction. Indeed, Wood’s estate sale listed as one lot, “A small Portrait of Sir Joshua Reynolds, ditto of a Negro, unfinished.”

Wood found in Reynolds an authoritative precedent for the depiction of a servant of color, and such sitters can be said to have become a subspecialty for him in subsequent years. In 1798, for example, he exhibited at the Royal Academy a portrait of “Shaich Emanum Bux, Consumat to Lord Mornington.” A khansamah was a house steward or butler, and Lord Mornington was Richard Wellesley, the future Marquess of Wellesley, who served as governor-general of India from 1798 to 1805. In his ledger, Wood records that Bux wore “white muslin with a scarlet turban” in this untraced portrait. In 1800, the group of miniatures Wood sent to the academy included the portrait of a man the exhibition catalogue termed “a Chinese” (fig. 7). Wood’s ledger gives the further information that his sitter was “A Servant of Mr Hotson’s,” identifiable as John Hotson, a purser of the East India Company, who also sat for his portrait by Wood. These two portraits, like that of Joanna de Silva, suggest complex relationships of affection and subordination between British imperialists and their Asian servants. At the same time, in exhibiting portraits of these servants, Wood capitalized on a contemporary taste that reduced his sitters to exotic types. In the case of John Hotson’s servant, Wood did not even record the sitter’s name.

In the absence of any documentation, the possibility remains that William Wood painted Joanna de Silva not on a commission from the Deare family or the sitter herself, but rather on his own initiative. As the portrait of an individual that a white British public would have considered “exotic,” made in clear emulation of Reynolds, the painting would have lent itself to display at the Royal Academy, where portraiture had begun to occupy an increasingly central position as the object of public fascination and commentary. But there is no record of the painting being exhibited at the academy, and Wood never seems to have succeeded as an exhibitor of oil paintings. Wood’s posthumous studio inventory contained a number of unsold (and now untraced)
works by the artist “in oil,” including a portrait of “a Paphian [courtesan]” and a “Portrait of a Female in a Gold frame.” But it is difficult to imagine a record of Joanna de Silva’s portrait, with its distinctive sitter and prominent identifying text, hiding beneath these vague descriptions.

POSTSCRIPT
William Wood died in 1809, the same year that “Johanna De Silva of the town of Calcutta” dictated her last will. But was this woman, with her house and gardener, her bequest to her confraternity, and her desire to be buried near the altar of Calcutta’s Catholic church, the same Joanna de Silva who sat for her portrait in London in 1792? Keyword searches through the digitized records of the India Office indicate that while “de Silva” was a very common name, “Jo[h]anna de Silva” was not. Yet, against the record of the prosperous and pious Johanna De Silva’s last will, we must posit another possible fate for the sitter of Wood’s portrait: the parish registers of the Presidency of Bengal list the burial, on February 11, 1833, in Calcutta, of the one-hundred-year-old “Pauper,” Johanna D’Silva.69

Through the archival research described above, I have outlined de Silva’s relationship to the Deare family and shown how her ocean voyage could have helped her obtain substantial personal assets. I have also traced circumstances, both domestic and historical, that might have prompted Philip Deare to commission a portrait of his niece’s ayah that alluded verbally, but not visually, to her close relationship to the orphaned Deare children. At this stage of research, however, I have not yet been able to establish a conclusive link between the sitter of the portrait and the testator of the will, or, for that matter, the centenarian pauper buried at Fort William in 1833. Nor have I uncovered any further evidence for de Silva’s return to India or her subsequent life there. Her voice and her agency in such matters as her voyage to London and the making of her portrait remain beyond the frame.

Of course, one foundational assumption within postcolonial studies is that imperial archives, such as those I have relied upon here, are built upon the erasure of the subaltern, and particularly the female subaltern, as a speaking subject.70 Against this pessimism, other scholars have attempted acts of archival retrieval, salvage, or bold speculation, “listening for the unsaid, translating misconstrued words, and refashioning disfigured lives.”71 In this article, I have attempted my own admittedly cautious reconstruction of the “effaced itinerary” of Joanna de Silva.72 Working at a time of surging nationalism, pandemic illness, and closed borders, I have been repeatedly reminded that archives remain physical spaces, often difficult to access. The question of which archives transcend these limitations through digitization is directly linked to the question of whose history is valued. It is no coincidence that a monthly subscription provides access, for anyone with an internet connection, to the probate inventory of Lieutenant Colonel Charles Russel Deare, while the archives of the Catholic community of Kolkata remain, for the moment, out of reach.73

After the bulk of this article was written, I was able to make my own journey to Kolkata, traversing half the globe in less than twenty-four hours. With permission from the Indian army, I toured Fort William, where Joanna de Silva and the Deare family lived together centuries ago, where Catherine Deare died, and where her husband’s probate inventory was drawn up. At the South Park Street Cemetery, I located the Deares’ obelisk, its inscription browned but still legible. And one morning, I took a car to the Cathedral of the Most Holy Rosary—still, as in the early nineteenth century, the center of Catholic worship in the city. I presented the parish priest, Father Franklin Menezes, with a photograph of Joanna de Silva’s portrait, and together we went looking for her grave.

In her will, de Silva asked to “be Interred . . . as near to the Holy Altar as circumstances may admit.” Father Franklin told me he believed that only clergymen had been buried on the high altar, but he generously asked the custodian to pull up the worn burgundy carpet covering the floor. There, we discovered richly carved eighteenth-century grave markers, ornamented with flowers and skulls. Some did record the names of women—Sebastiana Shau, Maria Tench—but not Joanna de Silva. In fact, all of the stones predated the construction of the church itself in 1799, indicating they must have been transported there at a later date. A cursory examination indicated extensive architectural interventions on the high altar, with some grave markers sliced in two. If Jo[h]anna de Silva’s final wish was honored, no evidence of her last resting place remains.

Following its conservation treatment, William Wood’s portrait of Joanna de Silva has been installed on public view at The Met in a gallery of other British portraits, including Thomas Lawrence’s 1823 portrait of Emily and Laura Anne Calmady (fig. 8).74 These two young girls, aged five and three, romp across Lawrence’s canvas in a whirl of dimpled limbs, rosy cheeks, and rumpled chemises. Described by Lawrence
as “my best picture,” it is a consummate image of unfettered and winsome childhood, one that leaves the entire apparatus and labor of child-rearing decidedly out of sight. Hung next to this painting, William Wood’s Joanna de Silva makes domestic labor visible. As the only figure of color in the gallery, she provides an intervention that brings it one step closer to representing the globalized and multiracial population of London at the close of the eighteenth century.

Against this optimistic account of the painting’s current work within the Museum, I have attempted to show that Joanna de Silva cannot be understood outside the context of Anglo-Indian imperial politics, including the sentimentalized politics of family life. It is a painting of an Indian woman by a British man, almost certainly painted at the behest of a British family. Likewise, every archival record of Joanna de Silva’s life recovered so far—her salary, her sea voyage, her possible last will—stems from an encounter with British authority. The autonomy of de Silva’s likeness exists in permanent tension with the deference conveyed by her portrait’s inscription. Nonetheless, placed on public view after more than two centuries of apparent neglect, Joanna de Silva emerges as the embodied trace of a woman’s life, far more than the sum of the words that circumscribed her.
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NOTES


2 For one late Victorian portrait of an ayah, see Gertrude Ellen Burrard’s Nussibian, Our Ayah (1895), now in the National Army Museum, London (inv. NAM. 1951-11-8). I am grateful to Farhanah Mamoojee of the Ayahs’ Home Project for bringing this work to my attention and confirming the uniqueness of Joanna de Silva’s depiction.

3 My thinking about colonial archives is particularly indebted to Hartman 2008 and Odumoso 2020, as well as exchanges with Meredith Gamer.

4 For an overview of Indo-Portuguese domestic workers in early modern Bengal, see T. Chakraborty 2019.

5 Thompson 2020, 114.

6 I am grateful to Usha Balakrishnan; Navina Haider, Nasser Sabah al-Ahmad al-Sabah Curator in Charge, Department of Islamic Art, MMA; Sylvia Houghteling: Amin Jaffer; Romita Ray; and Holly Shaffer, who all discussed Joanna de Silva’s clothing and jewelry with me.

7 I thank Deepthi Sasidaran, who first identified the scapular in our correspondence.

8 For an overview of the representation of servants in Anglo-Indian family portraits, see Tobin 1999, 110–38.

9 For the painting, see Gillian Forrester’s entry in Postle 2011, 265, no. 81.

10 For theorizations of cultural hybridity and exchange under East India Company rule, see Eaton 2013, de Silva 2018, 77–80, and Shaffer 2022.

11 Zoffany’s painting provides a visual analogue to what Satya Shikha Chakraborty has written of ayahs in general: “By cleaning and folding the mistress’s clothes, by making the mistress’s bed, by bringing the mistress’s breakfast and by taking care of British children, ayahs enabled the creation of memsahibs as a new racially elite feminine social class in empire. The domestic labours of South Asian ayahs allowed memsahibs to become companionate imperial wives.” S. Chakraborty 2019, 54–55.

12 Conservation treatment has indicated that the inscription is contemporary with the rest of the portrait; moreover, the signature conforms with Wood’s usual manner of signing his paintings. I am grateful to Michael Gallagher, Sherman Farrchild Chair of Paintings Conservation, MMA, and to Alan Derbyshire for discussing these matters with me.


14 Confusingly, the lieutenant colonel appears to have preferred the spelling “Russel” while other family members adopted “Russell.”


16 For a detailed account of the battle and Lieutenant Colonel Deare’s death, see Buckle 1852, 128–31.

17 “Monthly Chronicle,” 105.

18 Ibid., 111.

19 See Travers 2007.


22 Banerjee 2004, 50. I am grateful to Swapna Banerjee for discussing Joanna de Silva’s wages with me.


25 Helen’s baptism is recorded on August 17, 1780; see “Baptisms in Calcutta: 1778 to 1782,” Bengal Past and Present 26, pt. 1, no. 51 (1923): 142–68, listed on p. 148; for Mary Anne Deare’s birth on November 28, 1789, see “Parish Register Transcripts from the Presidency of Bengal,” IOR/N/1/4, fol. 87, India Office Births & Baptisms, The British Library, London.

26 The probate inventory lists payments through 1792 of wages to “Servants” attending “Miss A Deare,” presumably the infant Mary Anne, who was still in the care of a wet nurse and must have remained in Calcutta beyond Sophia’s departure. The fact that there is no mention of Helen Deare in the probate records of her father’s estate suggests that she had already left Calcutta by the time of his death. A “Miss A. Deare” is listed among the passengers “hourly expected” to arrive aboard The Ganges in The Morning Chronicle (London), February 15, 1793, 2.


29 The ship’s journal records that “42 invalids” also came aboard the same day.

30 The St. James’s Chronicle; or, British Evening-Post, June 9–11, 1791, 1.

31 S. Chakraborty 2020. The records of these bonds appear in the L/MAR/1/” Minutes of the Committee of Shipping series, now at the British Library, but are incomplete, and I have found no record of a bond for Joanna de Silva’s travel. I am grateful to Michael Fisher for discussing these bonds with me and reviewing his records for a mention of Joanna de Silva.

32 For responses from a later period, see Datta 2021.


34 S. Chakraborty 2019, 41–42.

35 For more on the portrait and its context, see Barlow and Gilpin 2005, 83–84. I am grateful to Holly Shaffer for bringing this portrait to my attention.

36 On this shift, see S. Chakraborty 2019; for relationships between British men and Indian women in the early colonial period, see D. Ghosh 2006.

37 For one detailed case study, see Dalrymple 2002.

38 S. Chakraborty 2019.

39 For Lady Impey’s patronage, see Toppfield 2019.

40 The executors of Richardson’s estate had no record of the portrait’s acquisition, nor have interviews with his associates shed any
light. I have not been able to trace the painting in any databases of auction records from the nineteenth or twentieth century.

41 The Account of Philip Deare as Executor to Lieutenant Colonel Charles R. Deare, from 20th April 1792 sold at Forum Auctions, London, on March 16, 2017, lot 27; I have been unable to trace its current whereabouts.

42 Another possibility, that the portrait was painted at the instigation of the artist, will be discussed below.


44 On this topic, see Finn 2019. The commemorative practices of the Deare brothers complement Finn’s account of the practices of East India Company women.

45 The Public Advertiser (London), Tuesday, August 16, 1791, 2.

46 For the tradition of British servants’ portraits, see Waterfield and French 2003. There is a brief discussion of Indian servants’ portraits in ibid., 146–51.

47 On the representation of mixed-race families during this transitional period, see de Silva 2018, 32–82.


49 For Elizabeth and Helen’s baptisms, see “Parish Register Transcripts from the Presidency of Bengal,” IOR/N/1/1/2, fol. 300, India Office Births & Baptisms, The British Library, London. The dual baptisms are discussed, along with the assumption that Elizabeth’s mother was “an Indian consort,” in S. Ghosh 1970, 74.

50 “Proposals for marriage settlement, P.W. Mayow and Miss Elizabeth Deare,” BRA1737/75, Archives and Cornish Studies Service, Redruth. Confusingly, Philip Deare also had a daughter named Elizabeth who married in 1806. That the Calcutta-born Elizabeth married Philip Wynell Mayow is established by the fact that a copy of Charles Russel Deare’s will is housed with her marriage settlement.

51 See Nechtman 2010, 189.

52 S. Chakraborty 2019.

53 Morning Post (London), April 2, 1793, 1.


55 I am deeply grateful to Deborah Watson, who conducted a thorough review of these papers for me.

56 I thank Michael Gallagher, Sherman Fairchild Chair of Paintings Conservation, MMA, for discussing his treatment of the painting with me.

57 The most extensive account of Wood’s life and career remains Williamson 1921, 156–73. I thank Richard Hark for sharing his forthcoming research with me, which establishes William Wood’s correct date and place of birth. I am grateful to Mark Pomeroy, archivist of the Royal Academy, for discussing the documentation of Wood’s career and exhibiting practices with me. The William Wood (1769–1810) who painted Joanna de Silva’s portrait should not be confused with the other William Wood (1774–1857) who published a series of panoramic views of Calcutta in 1833.


59 Cited in Williamson 1921, 291.

60 Ibid., 158.


62 Wood sale 1810, lot 96.

63 The Exhibition of the Royal Academy, MDCCXCIX. The Thirtieth (London: J. Cooper, 1798); 29, no. 851.

64 Williamson 1921, 166.


67 On this development, see Pointon 2001.

68 Wood sale 1810, 11, lots 93 and 95.


70 Spivak 1988; for archival projects that nuance Spivak’s famous formulation, see Datta 2021 and S. Chakraborty 2020.


72 For the phrase, “effaced itinerary,” see Spivak 1988, 287.

73 I am deeply grateful to Romita Ray for drawing on her family connections in Kolkata to make initial introductions for me to the Catholic community there; to Swapna Banerjee for her connections in Kolkata to make initial introductions for me to Archivist of the Royal Academy for discussing the documentations of Wood’s career and exhibiting practices with me. The William Wood (1769–1810) who painted Joanna de Silva’s portrait should not be confused with the other William Wood (1774–1857) who published a series of panoramic views of Calcutta in 1833.

74 For the painting, see Baetjer 2009, 215–17, no. 106.
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The pervasive influence of maritime industries, events, and working-class sailor culture on life in the United States is gaining long overdue attention by social and art historians. The exhibition and book *In American Waters: The Sea in American Painting*, co-organized by the Peabody Essex Museum and the Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art, examined more than three hundred years of American painting in order to foreground the extensive, yet underacknowledged, impact of the sea and maritime affairs on the nation’s cultural identity.¹ Through the survey accomplished by that project, it became clear that the painting *After a Long Cruise* by John Carlin in The Metropolitan Museum of Art is a crystalized expression of the political and social upheaval of the pre–Civil War years, as well as the role mariners played as
disrupters of traditional mores of the time (fig. 1). This article investigates the painting in greater depth than could be accomplished within the context of the larger project. In an examination of the painting within the milieu of mid-nineteenth-century American maritime history and culture, the work is transformed from a genre scene with general, satirical references to working-class life into an incisive, complex, and multivalent social commentary reflecting specific events of the day and their relationship to broader civil unrest occurring in the city and across the nation at the moment of its creation. The article also frames the painting in terms of how New Yorkers, including Carlin, received episodes of topical interest as they unfolded in newspapers of the time, and how their interpretations of the subjects were imbued with deeply held stereotypes. In paint, as in life, sailors ashore were regarded as a potentially rebellious working-class subculture, with habits that fostered group solidarity among mariners and a self-protective posture borne out of oppressive labor conditions and resistance to the hierarchical structure of shipboard life.

Carlin primarily painted portrait miniatures, works of exacting detail and intimate scale meant for private viewing, and often commissioned for those who had personal relationships with the sitters. His larger-scale genre scenes such as this one were intended for public venues. Today, After a Long Cruise is probably Carlin’s most recognized painting. Much of what is known about Carlin’s life as an artist survives in an account book that he kept between 1835 and 1856. It documents approximately two thousand paintings, mostly miniature portraits, that he executed during these years. The record ends only months before he created the painting discussed here.

Beyond his career as an artist, Carlin was well known as a proponent of education for people with hearing impairments. He was born in Philadelphia in 1813 and presented profound deafness from infancy. A brief education in sign language and painting until age twelve prepared him to launch his career as an artist shortly thereafter. Leveraging the connections he established through his portrait business, he raised substantial funds toward the construction of Saint...
Ann’s Church for the Deaf in New York, the first such church in the United States. Carlin also helped erect a monument to Thomas Gallaudet, cofounder in 1817 of the earliest permanent school in the United States for educating deaf people (known today as the American School for the Deaf, located in West Hartford, Connecticut) and originator of American Sign Language. The monument was designed by deaf artist Albert Newsam and decorated with bas-relief panels by Carlin. In 1854, he successfully lobbied the Hartford and New-York Steamboat Company to offer reduced fares for deaf people from the “middle and southern states” to travel on the City of Hartford to celebrate the dedication of the monument.

Although the large format and complex composition of *After a Long Cruise* (1857) are unusual in Carlin’s oeuvre, his choice of subject was an extension of associations he established with the maritime community early in his career. The aforementioned account book notes that in 1837 he painted a miniature portrait of the recently deceased naval hero Commodore Bainbridge, as well as “another copy” and one of “Mrs. Bainbridge.” He also received a commission for a full-length portrait of a certain Captain Drinkwater “in the costume of a sailor,” one of the “race boat Cleopatra,” and “a view of the Famous Regatta.”

He left Philadelphia for Liverpool in May 1838 on the packet ship *Monongahela*, settling in London for “academician studies” while supporting himself by painting miniatures four days a week. In London and then Paris, his training focused on history and genre painting, at first copying works by Rembrandt and other old masters, but eventually creating his own compositions, such as *The Petition of the Greek Peasants to the God of Medicine Especius (Asclepius)* in 1839, and *The First Lesson in Dancing*, which he sold for forty dollars at the American Art Union in 1840.

Back in the United States in 1841, Carlin moved to New York and embraced portraiture almost exclusively, mostly in miniature. His work included many babies and children, and occasional mourning subjects such as postmortem images and funeral monuments. But he quickly established connections with the city’s commercial maritime community. In 1844 he painted numerous miniatures of the powerful and wealthy Minturn, Grinnell, and Fish families, who jointly owned a firm that dominated New York’s maritime commerce for most of the nineteenth century (fig. 2). In 1851 he produced ten identical miniatures from a portrait of “Capt Vanderbilt,” likely Cornelius Vanderbilt (known as the “Commodore”), whose early career included work as a steamship captain. The year before creating *After a Long Cruise*, Carlin obtained a commission to paint a portrait “in the full length large as life” of Captain Oliver P. Brown, who commanded the ship on which he had traveled to Europe eighteen years prior. This return to work in larger scale may have inspired him to tackle a painting that could attract more public attention and situate mariners centrally within the cultural conversation of the moment.

Carlin created *After a Long Cruise* in 1857, and it was likely first exhibited at the National Academy of Design in New York in 1859. It is usually read as a scene of social satire in the tradition of William Hogarth and Thomas Rowlandson. At least since the painting’s appearance in the Whitney Museum of American Art’s exhibition and book *Seascape and the American Imagination* of 1975, and likely since it was acquired by The Met in 1949, the work has been interpreted through a lens of social commentary focused on New York’s most multiethnic community, the working-class waterfront. Such bawdy scenes were meant to be humorous and gave figures exaggerated gestures and facial expressions. Viewers could find amusement in the foibles of human nature as well as in visual and behavioral stereotypes associated with certain social and ethnic groups. Sailors, with their distinctive dress and manner of walking as if on a rocking ship, were easily identified within the shoreside community. Their customary habit of celebrating a brief time on leave with rambunctious and often drunken behavior made them

---

Carlin’s painting features all of these clichéd elements of sailor life, with three red-faced mariners swaggering brashly off a pier and into a busy commercial area. Their postures suggest what poet James Russell Lowell called “that unsteady roll in the gait with which the ocean proclaims itself quite as much in the moral as in the physical habit of a man.” The sailor to the right knocks over a vendor’s table, scattering fruit and peanuts to the ground, while another grabs at a woman in formal attire, who pulls away while a merchant looks on and laughs. Behind them, a police officer watches their behavior warily, yet seemingly unwilling to get involved. The sailors each display aspects of disreputable behavior, reinforcing the notion of the painting as an evocation of the general cacophony of a modern urban waterfront.

Carlin undoubtedly chose his subject with the intention of creating unease among viewers. The world of working sailors has been interpreted alternately by historians as a quasi-organized proletariat with anti-authoritarian tendencies defending itself from oppressive labor tactics through collective action, and as a disjointed and motley working-class rabble with pent-up desires to be satisfied by brief stints ashore. Either way, waterfront society was an undeniable threat to bourgeois values in mid-century New York, and three drunken sailors represented the impending prospect of random mob violence.

The ship to the far right from which the sailors appear to be departing carries a quarter board identifying its name as New-York. Indeed, the large white buildings across the waterway that are partially obscured by the ship’s bowsprit are enormous covered drydocks called shiphouses that sheltered naval vessels during construction or overhaul (fig. 3). In the 1850s they were standard features in American Navy shipyards. The Brooklyn Navy Yard was distinguished by having two shiphouses that stood side by side, suggesting that the waterway in the painting is the East River and the action in the foreground is taking place along South Street in lower Manhattan. Carlin’s image of South Street diverged significantly from urban waterfront views of prior generations, such as that of William James Bennett, whose watercolor presented an organized commercial environment that was a suitable place for respectable women and children to walk and play (fig. 4).
But when the painting was first exhibited it likely bore specific associations with a confluence of events that was reinforcing New Yorkers’ notions about the dangers associated with the sea, and more specifically with international shipping and mass immigration. The very name of the ship undoubtedly also resonated explicitly with the population of New York City and vicinity, changing the tenor of the scene from that of amusement to one more menacing. By identifying the central figures as sailors from a ship named *New-York*, Carlin was alluding to a sequence of events that was playing out in the news at the time Carlin was conceiving and perhaps even executing his painting in 1857.

In the early hours of Saturday, December 20, 1856, following an arduous Atlantic winter crossing, a packet ship named *New-York* ran aground on a sandbar three miles off Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, while on its approach into New York Harbor. The packet had been built for the Black Ball Line, a company that ran ships on a regular schedule between Liverpool and New York City. Although the barrier islands and beaches along the New Jersey coast are heavily developed today, they were mostly uninhabited at that time. Information about the wrecking and its aftermath appeared episodically in newspapers across the country and in Europe over many days, at first because wind and swells prevented the approach by rescue vessels for more than a day and later because thirty miles of beach and barren ground lay between where the incident occurred and the nearest telegraph office. The horrifying yet gripping narrative unfolded in a serialized fashion over many days, as the newspapers delivered new details and different perspectives on the wrecking, its causes, and the subsequent acts of bravery, cowardice, and outright treachery of those involved.

The first account of the tragedy reached New York City on Monday, December 22. With the ship’s hull breached and waves washing completely over the deck, hauling it off the sandbar was a lost cause, and 27 crew along with 307 passengers, mostly Irish and German immigrants, needed to be transferred to the beach. The ship held four small boats but the surf was hazardous, and the first boat to be launched was smashed before anyone was able to board it. The second mate volunteered to row a second boat ashore with several passengers and a rope that they hoped would establish a line of direct connection with the shore. That rope got caught up in the surf and eventually broke. The first mate then volunteered to row several more passengers ashore, and when the storm began to abate, Captain Alexander McKennon transported an additional group of passengers ashore. They reached...
the keeper of a lifesaving station several miles away, who brought a covered metal lifesaving car in an oxcart, but operating it required a stout cable running from ship to shore and a mortar capable of firing a lifesaving line over the ship’s deck. With the surf too high to permit returning to the ship, the majority of passengers were then left on board overnight with no form of nautical command in place.15

When Captain McKennon and mates were able to return on Sunday morning, a group of the crewmen refused their duty, claiming that since the captain had gone ashore he was no longer in command. The captain described them as “men I picked up in Liverpool, and rather hard cases. They were altogether a lawless set, during the whole voyage.”16 In the captain’s absence overnight, some were reported to have behaved riotously, rifling the between decks, breaking into the storeroom and seizing the liquor and robbing passengers while ransacking their belongings. An altercation took place over the ownership of possessions, and a crewman nicknamed Dublin Jack attempted to strike the captain with a belaying pin. Another crewman struck the captain several times with an iron pot, causing serious injury.17 The captain drew his pistol and fired at the sailor, but it misfired. He drew a second pistol, which also misfired, whereupon he was beaten by some of the crew so severely that for several days it was reported that he was not expected to live. From there, the insubordinate sailors rowed ashore in the captain’s boat with their stolen goods and headed up the beach on foot.18

Meanwhile, the seas had calmed enough and passengers were carried off the ship in groups of four or five in the lifesaving car. From there, they were left on the beach without food or protection from the elements. Some passengers were able to huddle in a shanty overnight, and the next day, Monday, December 22, they walked northward up the barrier beach toward Point Pleasant and New York City, while the insurers of the ship sent carts down to transport passengers they had encountered.19 One of the rebellious sailors was discovered frozen to death on the beach and was buried in the sand where he had been found. By Tuesday morning, several others had been tracked down by the sheriff of Freehold, arrested, and charged with assault and mutiny.20 On Friday, it was reported that seventeen of the ship’s crew were in custody.21 Four would ultimately be charged for their direct involvement in violence against the captain.22

In his written statement that was distributed to newspapers, the captain described the events that led up to the wrecking, setting the stage for charging his assailants with a reprehensible crime. He asserted that while he was on shore, “the crew had planned a mutiny, which they endeavored to carry out on Sunday, while we were landing the passengers.”23 For a ship master, the word mutiny carries sinister associations beyond the menace of a localized upheaval, but with a larger rejection of established authority that threatens the entire maritime system.24 Historically, mutiny in the naval service is a rare event, and those that have occurred, such as on HMS Bounty in 1789, Royal Navy ships at the Nore in 1797, the USS Brig Somers in 1842, and the Russian battleship Potemkin in 1905, become etched in history as moments with important political overtones that reached well beyond issues of shipboard hierarchy. The threat of mutiny was an ongoing concern to masters of merchant ships, however, and shipboard insurrections were not uncommon. In January 1857, as the four sailors waited in jail for their trial, the crew of another American ship, the J. L. Bogart, attacked the officers while in Liverpool. The captain declared it a mutiny, while the sailors, who were “nearly all black or colored men,” claimed that they had signed articles for a voyage to New York, but they found they were actually headed to Mobile, Alabama, where they would have been “retained in slavery.”25 During court proceedings, the word mutiny was stricken and the sixteen men were charged with assault.

Differing perspectives on the events and their significance began to play out in the daily newspaper reports. On board the New-York, what was an assault against the captain and his authority if the ship was aground and would never float again? Was the crew mutinous, or was the captain overstepping his authority? Testimony supplied by the lifesaving crew and insurers supported the captain’s point of view, but several passengers told reporters that the captain was overbearing and shorted passengers on the food and water that were included in their passage ticket.

The living situation on the New-York prior to the wreck was fairly typical for transatlantic packets. Journalists expounded upon the hard life of the sailor and the rigors of working on such ships for both crewmen and officers and discussed “cruelties, which are beginning to give the American merchant service a very bad name,” but debated where the fault lay.26 One stated, “Scarcely two out of every hundred seamen in New York are natives of the soil, the rest being principally English and Irish, with a strong infusion of Scandinavians.” The belief was that the American seamen, who possessed the necessary skills, could make
more money on steamers, clippers, and in the Navy. In Liverpool, European sailors were being abducted, shipped aboard while drunk, and given tasks that they may well be unqualified to perform.27 Another pointed out that “it very often turns out that the mutiny was not without cause other than the mere wickedness of the sailors, having been provoked by gross misbehavior on the part of the officers.”28

National allegiance also figured into the varying perspectives regarding events on the New-York. Upon arrival at Castle Garden, reporters interviewed German passengers who claimed that members of the mostly Irish crew stole money and clothing from their chests while in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, long before the wreck occurred, and that following the wreck, passengers of one nationality were stealing from those of another. Irish passengers, on the other hand, reported that they were well treated by the crew, but felt abused by the captain.29

Legal proceedings for the four sailors began swiftly, with a grand jury hearing testimony from Captain McKennon and several witnesses on January 22, 1857, and the newspapers identifying the accused as mutineers.30 The case was postponed, however, since the second mate, a key witness, had become ill and had left town.31 When proceedings continued on March 17, the defense attorney argued for dismissal of those charges that involved intent to mutiny on the grounds that the court only held jurisdiction over offenses that were made crimes by an act of Congress. The crewmen may have been guilty of assault, but assault did not necessarily imply intent to mutiny.32 Within four days the jury came back with a verdict of guilty: one sailor was sentenced to three years’ imprisonment, and the other three were sentenced to two years each.33

More direct than his allusion to mutiny, Carlin’s painting casts a critical eye upon the behavior and values of seamen, whose experiences exposed them to ways of life in other lands. One sailor lunges lustily at a Black woman, perhaps a sex worker, who is walking alone and wearing what appears to be inappropriately extravagant apparel for the busy commercial street.34 This may be an indiscriminate sexual advance made to the first woman he sees “after a long cruise” but beyond the apparent violence of the act, Carlin’s reference to interracial sex was intended as an affront to the sensibilities of his viewers and its association with immigrants, the poor, and transients, including mariners.35 The urban waterfront was a place where itinerants encountered the poor and hungry, the lonely, the widowed or orphaned, the displaced, and the opportunistic, and as such it was inextricably linked to sex work. Sailors in particular were seen as more accepting of interracial sex work, because, as Paul Gilje points out, “in every port there was some mixing of races—black women sleeping with white men and black men sleeping with white women” and “wherever a sailor went, he sought out practitioners of the world’s oldest profession.”36 In general, the prevalence of interracial sex in such circumstances was interpreted as a confrontational flouting of the social norms of middle- and upper-class New Yorkers. Complicating the scene, however, is the sailor at center who, though also visibly intoxicated, may be attempting to hold his colleague back from his abrupt advance, suggesting that Carlin’s view of working-class mariners is not universally contemptuous. A sailor’s life may have been filled with vital urgency, but not at the cost of all semblance of morality.

The painting also engages with biases against Jewish and Irish people. The merchant on the left, who appears entertained by the scene, is depicted with an elongated nose and dark beard, features that at the time were coded as stereotypical of European Jews.37 The sailors from the New-York were known to be mostly Irish as, perhaps, is the policeman behind them, who chooses not to intervene. Thieving street urchins emphasize that the dangers of South Street run across generations.

Beyond the specific incident of the packet ship New-York, the scene alludes to tensions that made 1857 one of the most difficult and dangerous years for working-class New Yorkers. The city’s government, including its Municipal Police, had become notorious for corruption. To counter it, the state legislature formed a competing Metropolitan Police force and ordered the previous agency to disband. One of the instructions of the new force was to arrest Mayor Fernando Wood. The two groups fought one another in a brawl in the streets around City Hall, and competed for authority until the court ordered the Municipals to disband in early July. A massive gang riot immediately followed, and for twenty-four hours pedestrians were mugged, shops looted, and homes ransacked. It became known as the Dead Rabbits Riot for the instigators who may or may not have been a gang of Irish immigrants that went by this name.38

In visual contrast to Carlin’s work, George Henry Hall created a three-quarter-length painting of an Irish gang member in 1858. Despite reports of the viciousness of the events, he presented the street fighter as a heroic nude martyr, employing traditional iconography of such figures as Saint Sebastian. Ross Barrett’s analysis of A Dead Rabbit (Study of the Nude or Study of an
Irishman (fig. 6) explores how this ennobling image of the rowdy gang member evoked a mixed emotional response that combined a revulsion for the violence with a sense of allure for a vision of social disorder, all of which helped to define the distinction between genteel society and the “lower-class” rabble. Some urbanites became so fascinated by street violence in the slums that they took tours of the Five Points and other neighborhoods with protection of the police. For such an audience, Carlin’s painting provided a voyeuristic peek into a world that offered a form of excitement not accessible within their circumscribed daily routines.

In a further, although subtle, reference to the violence, the policeman in After a Long Cruise wears a star-shaped badge of the soon-to-be-defunct Municipal Police force on the left side of his jacket (fig. 5). The Metropolitan Police replaced it with their order’s shield-shaped badge that year. At the time of Carlin’s painting, a star badge would have indicated political affiliation with the city’s embattled mayor, and a police force more interested in protecting the status quo than engaging with thugs to protect residents on the city streets.

Street violence was a by-product of larger social, political, and economic upheavals of the 1850s. The rise of the Know-Nothing Party was a powerful catalyst for increased religious divisiveness. The nation had been in a recession for several years, which culminated in a financial panic in late 1857 and a run on the banks. Bankruptcies and increasing unemployment lasted until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. The war further polarized political discord, heightened working-class resentment, and ultimately led to the Draft Riots and openly racist violence and murder on the streets of New York in July 1863, when white rioters killed more than one hundred Black people.

After Long Cruise possesses potent cultural allusions for city residents of Carlin’s day and captures threads of important societal issues under the guise of a humorous genre scene. Yet Carlin refrains from placing too much significance upon the actions of his protagonists, and his messaging remains ambiguous. He had considerable exposure to shoreside maritime culture and likely some firsthand experience with the ways of the sailor at sea. His sailors are rowdy and violent, but their threat is limited to the few figures surrounding them, who are poor and marginalized. He withholds from passing direct judgment about the larger causes of social friction in cosmopolitan New York, and his seeming ambivalence about the effect of seamen as instigators of social tension and outright confrontation in the street suggests conflicting emotions. For one, the long-standing association with his maritime elite clientele likely generated a sense of condemnation for the seamen’s open transgressions of social mores as hazards to a profitable business. However, Carlin may have...
viewed sailors as a population similarly sequestered from society at large as the deaf, whom he was working so arduously to support. If so, he undoubtedly embraced at least a modicum of sympathy for their lot. In its day, Carlin’s painting was a potent visual appraisal of the social discord wrought by working-class rebellion, large-scale population movements, and racial and economic crises. Consideration of these factors that were in play when the painting was created sheds new light on period imaginings of nineteenth-century maritime life in the United States.

DANIEL FINAMORE
Russell W. Knight Curator of Maritime Art and History, Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Massachusetts

NOTES

2 I am grateful for the assistance of Elizabeth Kornhauser, Sylvia Yount, George Schwartz, Austen Barron Bailly, and Craig Bruns for insights and assistance with various aspects of this research.
5 “New York City,” New York Daily Times, September 16, 1854, 3. When the campus of the American School for the Deaf moved several miles away in 1919, the monument was disassembled and placed in storage. It was re-erected in April 2022. https://we-ha.com/restored-gallaudet-monument-unveiled-at-american-school-for-the-deaf-in-west-hartford/.
6 This was likely the rowing regatta held on the Schuylkill River in November 1833, when Cleopatra won the eight-oared boat category. Excitement around this regatta inspired the formation of rowing clubs in many cities throughout the country. See Crowther and Ruhl 1905, 6–7.
7 Caldwell, Rodriguez Roque, and Johnson 1994, 588.
8 Stein 1975, 66, 69, fig. 67.
10 Lowell 1892, 38.
13 More than one packet ship named New-York operated for the Black Ball Line. This one was built by George Webb of New York in 1839–40, measuring 862 tons burthen. By the time of the wreck, the ship had been sold by the Black Ball Line, perhaps because of its size or age.
25 “Serious Row and Deck Fight on Board the American Ship J. L. Bogart,” New York Herald, February 6, 1857, 2. The Dred Scott Decision of the U.S. Supreme Court was released on March 6, 1857, declaring that a person who had been enslaved in one state but who resided where slavery was prohibited was not entitled to freedom and could never be a citizen of the United States.
37 Corson 2000, 104.
39 Barrett 2014.
40 Ibid., 100.
41 The party was known more formally as the “Native American Party” and then the “American Party,” and embraced a generally xenophobic and specifically anti-Catholic platform.
42 Cook 1974.
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Two German drinking vessels in The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s collection were found in Regensburg in 1869 as part of a cache of early modern artifacts that had been hidden in the seventeenth century (figs. 1, 2). If such a discovery were made today, its contents would most likely be kept together in a local institution, where interpretive emphasis would be placed on the treasure as a collection of objects with a precise context of concealment.¹ However, the so-called Regensburger Silberfund came to light in an era less concerned with the hoard as a subject of archaeological analysis and with heavy financial pressures on objects to be sold or moved from their original findspots. Dispersed by the end of the nineteenth century, the trove is likely impossible to recover as a complete set of objects and, in some cases, individual
fig. 1 Abraham Riederer the Elder (German, ca. 1546/47–1625). Tankard, ca. 1580–85. Gilt silver, H. 4 in. (10.2 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1911 (11.93.16)

fig. 2 Simon Pissinger (German, act. 1582–1609). Double cup, ca. 1600. Gilt silver, H. 11¼ in. (29.5 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1911 (11.93.15a, b)
artifacts have been severed from their association with the treasure. It was only later in the twentieth century, for example, that The Met’s two vessels acquired in 1911, a double cup now attributed to the Regensburg smith Simon Pissinger and the small tankard given to Abraham Riederer the Elder, of Augsburg, were linked back to the Silberfund, making them the only known survivors from an original group of twenty gilt-silver cups and tankards. While the Regensburg discovery is mentioned in recent catalogue entries on the two objects, the formal provenance information does not include this earlier history. Yet information about the vessels’ owners extending back through the nineteenth century to the home in which they were found, and perhaps even to some of the people who may have hidden them in the 1630s, is available.

It was a group of Regensburg historians who were best placed to record and report on these circumstances, down to the specifics of the hoard’s archaeological provenience, its findspot. This article reconstructs the finding of the Regensburg silver and the media event that followed in its wake using their sketches, photographs, newspaper articles, and a detailed inventory of the find made within days of its discovery. It traces the process by which historical information was associated with the treasure’s objects by means of circulated text and image and how those details slowly fell away as the silver was dispersed into the art market in the late nineteenth century. By attending to the lost local context of the Regensburg Silberfund, much of that information can be connected anew to its surviving objects, whose journeys are traced here by means of the original inventory. This research yields not only the unbroken provenance of The Met’s two vessels, including their complete exhibition history in the nineteenth century, but also the reidentification of two additional cups from the original hoard, one of them in The Met’s own collection.

In addition to revealing more extensive provenance for several early modern silver artifacts, re-creating the treasure’s discovery brings us closer to two distinct moments of material emergency: the upheaval of the Thirty Years’ War in the 1630s and the destruction and displacement of cultural heritage in the 1860s. While the seventeenth-century component must await further archival investigation, the battle over historical preservation in nineteenth-century Germany is here thrown into stark relief by the fate of the Regensburg Silberfund. For amateur historians struggling to save local material histories in the face of modernization campaigns and an intensifying art market,
the late thirteenth century. Erich quickly set to demolishing the structure and its medieval foundations, with plans to install shops and apartments in the new building. On February 26, workers taking down the staircase between the third and fourth floors found a wooden chest under the treads. Inside, packed carefully in paper, were twenty silver drinking vessels, sixty-six spoons of silver, wood, and bone, knives contained in leather cases, two silver girdles and other adornments, a personal seal with ivory handle, and thirteen documents, some on parchment. Just two days after the discovery, a writer for a local newspaper was able to report on specific details of the chest and its contents. He enthused that the silver objects “had remained so fine and sparkling it was as if they had come directly out of the workshop of a jeweler.” This surprising state of preservation would become a trope as the find was discussed subsequently in newspapers in and beyond Regensburg. The unnamed writer continued:

I hear the metal value itself has been estimated to be around 2000 florins and the value of the find is increased because individual pieces are especially finely worked. . . . Because of the years engraved on some of the pieces, this chest could have been hidden around the time of the Swedish War. . . .

Thus the find had been evaluated immediately by persons with expertise in historical metalwork and early modern history, with enough knowledge of Regensburg in the seventeenth century to identify the likely moment the hoard was hidden during the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48), when the threat posed by conquering or quartering armies was high. The descriptions alluded to here betray a distinct and serious interest in the silver’s seventeenth-century context, including the objects’ connection to local families and the events that shaped the city’s passage through tumultuous times.

Using information found in the documents, eventually a more specific hypothesis emerged connecting the stockpile of silver plate to Georg Hoffmann, one of the house’s previous owners, an assertion supported by the seal and one spoon in the chest that bore his initials. Hoffmann was a wealthy merchant and while many of the circumstances of his life and the hoard’s storage remain unclarified, a deposit date between 1632 and 1634 is likely. In this period, Regensburg experienced the alternating presence of both Bavarian and Swedish forces and was besieged. The decision to hide valuables stemmed from fears not just of loss through battle damage and plunder but also the Brandschatzung, a citywide ransom payment, as well as forced contribution, a system in which citizens were required to pay quartering armies. More recent discoveries of caches hidden during the Thirty Years’ War show the actions people took to protect everything from iron pots and pewter plates to currency, and the most sentimentally and financially valuable objects they owned.

Regardless of the precise historical context of the Silberfund as it was understood in 1869, the find had caused huge excitement, particularly in the area in front of Erich’s construction site. The Regensburger Tagblatt reported on March 10:

Our historians and gossips now have the opportunity to grab fresh material on a daily basis. In fact, the square in front of the . . . [Bärbinger House] is never empty and people suspect to see a pot or chest full of ancient talers or silver plate rolling out of every hole in the walls or floorboards.

To satisfy, and philanthropically capitalize on, the public’s curiosity, the find was put on display in glass cases in Regensburg’s town hall, which was only a two-minute walk from the site of the Bärbinger House. Viewing hours ran from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on March 7 to 17. An entrance fee of six kreuzers was charged, with all profits going to the poor, with the exception of Sunday the 14th, when entrance fees went to the men working on Erich’s building site. All in all, the hastily arranged exhibition earned more than four hundred gulden profit for Regensburg’s poor, a sum that likely reflects about 5,400 visitors, or close to 500 per day. Publicly disclosed costs included advertising the event but also the “Autographie” (transfer lithograph) of the find’s description. This line item refers to a handwritten inventory of the finds, reproduced through the process of transfer lithography, that was circulated to newspapers (fig. 4). In addition to obvious interest from publications engaged with historical and artistic topics, the popular press also devoted column inches to the Silberfund; some newspapers even chose to typeset and print the inventory in full.

We might pause here to consider why the Regensburg find caused enough excitement to create raucous crowds, a five-thousand-visitor-strong exhibition, and daily newspaper coverage with detailed descriptions of early modern metalwork. Beyond the fascination that treasure hoards hold in general, there was the specific context of an ancient and once powerful city forging a new identity in relationship to its past.
For centuries Regensburg had been a strategic site for trade and political rule. A free imperial city from the thirteenth century, it became a favored location for diplomatic meetings and later played a central role in the governance of the Holy Roman Empire. The presence of emperors, bishops, princes, and visiting dignitaries, along with the city’s three monasteries, made Regensburg a cultural center. But by the mid-nineteenth century, Regensburg’s importance had declined significantly. In 1803 the city lost its free imperial status and was later incorporated into the Kingdom of Bavaria. The resurfacing of the seventeenth-century treasure in the mid-nineteenth century provided an arresting visual testament to the glories and dramas of the city’s early modern history and made Regensburg newsworthy again.

The secular precious metal vessels found in the Bäringer House were particularly evocative of Regensburg’s historical past. From the Middle Ages onward, gold and silver covered standing cups were important signifiers of honor, reward, and political rule. Noble and patrician families bought such vessels to commemorate births, weddings, and deaths; guilds commissioned cups for drinking ceremonies; cities built up collections of Ratssilber (council silver), with cups that were used on civic occasions but could also be given as gifts to esteemed visitors with whom advantageous political relationships were desired. This market for secular metalwork fostered the development of talented goldsmiths. Although the hoard contained many examples from the renowned metalsmithing cities of Augsburg and Nuremberg, there were also objects from Regensburg craftsmen, attesting to the existence of an impressive local goldsmithing tradition. By 1869 the social position and professional requirements of goldsmiths had changed radically, a reality confirmed by the fact that the centuries-old register of Regensburg’s goldsmiths’ guild received its final entry in 1864. Beyond the erosion of a craft tradition that had historically signaled a city’s financial, political, and cultural might, Regensburg also lacked enduring evidence of that lost tradition in the form of surviving examples. The Bäringer House trove thus made accessible again a sliver of Regensburg’s lost cultural patrimony and with it a glimpse back toward its earlier status.

The Silberfund may also have resonated with the German public more broadly because of the recent uncovering of another treasure hoard. Less than six months prior, in October 1868, a massive collection of first-century Roman silver—likely war booty or a military commander’s personal plate—was unearthed in Hildesheim. The find caused an absolute sensation and the popular desire to experience the objects spurred campaigns to reproduce them in both two and three dimensions. The Hildesheim discovery perhaps prepared the public for yet another find of primarily silver objects, which also came to be known by the same term, Silberfund. But if Hildesheim evoked Germany’s distant Roman past, the Regensburg find spoke to a closer historical moment, not only the Thirty Years’ War, which remained meaningful to the shaping of German identity in the nineteenth century, but also the longer period in which silver vessels formed by renowned South German smiths were ubiquitous and constituted a store of material wealth and resonant symbolism.
**DESCRIPTION AND DOCUMENTATION**

As the first textual document of the Regensburg find, and the means by which it was communicated to the press, the lithographed inventory is a key primary source. It still provides the most direct means of discussing and tracking the hoard in full, given that so many objects are lost, and its numbering offers a useful shorthand for discussing individual pieces. The inventory’s medium conveys a proximity to the find’s discovery and speaks to the urgency to circulate details about it. *Autographie* was a form of lithography in which special ink and paper were used to transfer a manuscript page to the lithographic stone for replication. This direct-to-matrix method had the advantage of speed—it was much faster than typesetting or wood engraving, for example—and accuracy. Because it could reproduce handwriting, moreover, it delivered an authenticity that, in the case of the Regensburg treasure, meant bringing the reader near to the moment of the find’s sensational discovery and the experience of its first handlers.

The writer of the inventory was not identified, but a later oral tradition held that a pair of goldsmiths had been brought in to examine the contents of the chest. Proceeding by object type from vessels, to spoons and cutlery, to adornments and finally documents, the inventory follows an obvious order. The measuring, weighing, and notation of ornament and marks on the plate suggest a familiarity with metalwork and specifically the forms of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century South German vessels, but the descriptions are by no means systematic; they vary in the notation of measurements, marks, and other features. *Autographie* could be an extremely finicky process that was not conducive to making corrections. While the Silberfund inventory certainly represented a finished final draft organized from what must have been more fragmentary notes taken during the process of evaluation, its medium—and the pressing need to advertise the find’s exhibition—may have hindered further amendment, which perhaps explains some inconsistencies across its entries. A fair amount of historical knowledge is on display in the inventory: coats of arms, inscriptions, and inset coins are identified, and the thirteen documents are set into the context of early modern Regensburg. But it also reflects moments of misapprehension, as when the small wreath of silver wire, silk, and pearls (R42) was described as a *Serviettenband* (napkin ring), a form that came into use only in the eighteenth century.

Members of the Historischer Verein für Oberpfalz und Regensburg (local historical society) played central roles in documenting, analyzing, and disseminating news of the find, and it is possible that they were closely involved in producing the inventory. Their interest in the Bäringer House stemmed from an acute awareness of what was being lost in its erasure and a desire to salvage what they could from this example of medieval Regensburg architecture. The society’s secretary was Hans Weininger, a retired army officer who was an amateur artist and researcher who published extensively in local historical periodicals. Just before demolition work began, Weininger produced several drawings of the old Bäringer House, depicting features of the exterior and interior (see fig. 3). His captions to two drawings of stonework and vaulting in the house—“recorded at the time of demolition” (“aufgenommen beim Abriss”; “Aufgenommen zur Zeit des Abbruches”)—express the urgency of preserving in visual form the soon-to-be-destroyed historic building. Though Christoph Erich remains a somewhat obscured character in this story—he is exclusively referred to in all available reports only as Needle-Manufacturer Erich or Needle-Master Erich; his first name is never given—he certainly seems to have been cooperative, not only consenting to Weininger’s sketches but also donating to the historical society fragments of architectural sculpture that had appeared in those sketches. After the hoard was discovered, he also agreed to exhibit it for a charitable cause and to have its detailed inventory copied and disseminated, efforts that also, of course, produced free publicity for his newfound collection.

Weininger’s sketch of the house’s ground-floor vaulting places him at the site on February 19 (fig. 5).
Seven days later the chest filled with silver was found beneath the stairs in the upper floors. It would not have been lost on him or fellow local historians that it was only through the house’s destruction that this rich time capsule of the seventeenth century came to be uncovered. Later that winter, as the society noted in its summary reflection on the year, the demolition of the Bäringer House would also reveal a section of Roman wall and drainage pipe, an even deeper cut into Regensburg’s history. Weininger may have been behind some of the early newspaper reporting on the find; echoes of his obvious concern for the house can be heard quite distinctly in some. But it was only in May that an article on the Silberfund under his initials appeared, in the *Illustrirte Zeitung*, accompanied by a two-page spread of images (fig. 6). This text, which was foundational to most later discussions of the Silberfund, shows Weininger’s attention to the find’s historical context and its specific provenience. It included the details of the Bäringer House he had recorded and a rare description of the chest in which the silver was found—it was apparently decorated with two arches supported by three columns. Weininger added more details and interpretive framing to the descriptions of the objects, suggesting that he and perhaps others had undertaken further research after the inventory was produced. This commitment to preservation undergirded by a belief in the significance of material evidence of the past was entirely in keeping with the ethos of nineteenth-century amateur historical associations in Germany, as Peter Miller has shown.

Published in Leipzig, the *Illustrirte Zeitung* was a weekly news magazine modeled on the *Illustrated London News*. Images of the Regensburg find appeared in the typical form of wood engravings, which were quickly copied by other outlets. The German art monthly *Gewerbehalle* printed them over one spread with brief captions; its American edition, *The Workshop*, put out the same set of images with descriptions translated into English. The selection and arrangement of vessels varied, appearing in differing groupings and sometimes depicted as if they sat on a supporting surface or shelf. *Kunst und Gewerbe* placed one half of the Regensburg Doppelpokal (R8 and R9) between two Augsburg lidded tankards (R14 and R19), inadvertently pairing the vessels that would come together, decades later, to The Met.

The *Illustrirte Zeitung* and others cited the original source for their illustrations: a series of photographs by Peter Schindler of Regensburg (fig. 7). This project of photographic documentation had been reported locally on March 22, as were plans to make the prints available for purchase. By May 1, Weininger could inform readers that individual images mounted on card were available for thirty kreuzers apiece. Two weeks later, a more professionally formulated notice appeared in the *Illustrirte Zeitung* advertising seventeen photographs in large folio format, at forty-five kreuzers apiece, distributed through J. G. Bössenecker’s publishing house in Regensburg: “These fine photographs are of great interest for historical societies, antiquities researchers, art collections, schools of art and industry, gold- and silversmiths, etc.” (The fine print called the previously quoted price an oversight.)

These glimpses into Schindler’s and Bössenecker’s publishing endeavor suggest it was formulated quickly, in response to the huge amount of popular interest in the Regensburg find, and shifted as the true cost of producing luxurious folio format images emerged. The idea for the series must have been informed by the many efforts being made in the 1860s to record historically significant works of art and architectural monuments and make them accessible to cultural institutions and to the wider public. In this case, perhaps the photographs were not originally created with an audience of art...
students and connoisseurs in mind, but the clamor for images made such a venture viable. Schindler likely took the photographs as preparatory material for illustrations in the *Illustrirte Zeitung*. Or they were a record of the objects that had been put on display in the town hall. Or it might simply have been an attempt to capture the objects in the first light of discovery, before anything happened to them, like the lithographed inventory and like Weininger’s sketches designed to “record” (aufnehmen—a verb used later specifically for film and photography) the architectural features of the Bärbinger House before it was demolished.

Bössenecker operated a multipronged publishing business and bookstore in Regensburg that by 1869 had expanded to include the sale of photographs of local monuments, some of them by Schindler. One of six photographers in the city in 1868, Schindler had pioneered the trade a decade earlier by opening an atelier where he produced both hand-colored and monochrome portraits. Schindler’s interest in historical preservation and local monuments is evidenced by his appearance in the membership rolls of the historical society and by the Visitenkarte (carte de visite) he produced that captured the changing face of the developing city, including the cathedral under construction. Endeavors to utilize photography to record historical sites and objects in Regensburg resonated with similar projects elsewhere in these decades.

Comparing Schindler’s photographs of the Regensburg find against the wood engravings that derive from them, the eye is drawn to elements that the latter erase—the details of context, scale, and the ephemeral reflection of the image maker’s immediate surroundings as they were captured in the “fresh” surfaces of centuries-old silver vessels. While the location of photography is not known, it was likely to have been in Schindler’s light-filled studio, located only a ten-minute walk from the Bärbinger House, on the poetically named Straße zur schönen Gelegenheit. Evidence revealing the makeshift approach to capturing these newly found objects for posterity abounds, from the edges of tables that seem casually caught at the borders of the silhouetted albumen prints, to the coin peeping from below one cup, where it seems to have been placed to steady the foot.

The final plate organizes objects in such a way that they cannot be extricated singly into white space—the *Illustrirte Zeitung* captures the dense rectangle of the gathered objects as a single unit. The form of the cut oval competes for visual dominance with the wooden rectangle of what was presumably one of the display cases used to exhibit the find in the town hall (fig. 8).
Against the moiré pattern of a paper or textile background hang carefully tied sets of spoons, girdles spread and framing the leather purses, and three sets of cutlery in their heavily ornamented cases. (Other leather cases without applied silver ornament were apparently not included in the display.) The arrangement of vast quantities of discovered treasure in decorative trophy-like form was an approach employed for other hoards unearthed in the nineteenth century. But Schindler’s photograph recalled a much more immediate local context, the set of seventeenth-century paintings of unexplained function that hung in the Regensburg town hall and appear to show the city’s accumulated treasure, including precisely the types of objects—double cups, saltcellars, spoons, girdles—found in 1869 (fig. 9).

Though produced in the modern medium of the albumen print, and regardless of their original intended purpose, Schindler’s photographic series participates in a similar tradition as the town hall paintings, that of the practically wordless visual inventory.

Full sets of Schindler’s albumen prints currently reside in five collections in Germany and Austria. The set in Berlin’s art library bears an acquisition number from 1870, suggesting that, by appealing directly to connoisseurs, artists, and art historians, Bößenecker’s advertisement may have had its intended effect, prompting almost immediate purchase by major art research collections in German-speaking Europe. Each of the five versions varies in ways that highlight the hand labor required to produce this photographic series, as well as differing choices in the reception and archiving of the prints. How they were packaged for purchase is not clear, but they seem always to have been accompanied by the “autographiert” version of the inventory, whether to save on the cost of a typeset and printed pamphlet, or because it conveyed an immediacy in keeping with Schindler’s photographs. The prints are often numbered by later hands in an order roughly following that of the inventory, which underscores its significance to the study and analysis of the images.

The inventory serves as a kind of extended set of captions, as Schindler’s mounts gave no other information. The Regensburg set bears captions in elegant script copied directly from the inventory. In Weimar, the prints have been removed from their original substrates and pasted onto plain paper, then bound.

It was presumably in Schindler’s atelier that the prints were made, cut down, and then carefully mounted onto the card stock preprinted with the photographer’s name and the assertion of copyright. A pale green rectangle framed in a simple line offered a blank oval onto which the prints were glued. Spots where the white of the interior oval peeps out highlight the often uneven edge of the hand-cut print. Comparison between the same plates across the five known sets of Schindler’s photographic series reveals the variation with which the oval template for cutting was placed, thereby shifting the edges of the visible image and the angle at which each vessel appears to stand. In one case entirely different photographs were printed, which switch the positions of the Museum’s Augsburg tankard (R19) and the barrel-shaped double cup (R15 and R16),
perhaps to better catch light on the angel’s face, an adjustment that hints tantalizingly at Schindler’s process and the intention of the photographs—clearly the securing of detail was important.61

Later on, when the Regensburg silver appeared in collection and exhibition catalogues, it was almost always photographed in groups, sometimes even with unrelated objects.62 What is extraordinary about Schindler’s images is the space and the time devoted to individual vessels and carefully chosen pairs, the actual time in front of the camera, and the time spent developing, printing, retouching, and then cutting and pasting each one of these large-format images onto its card (fig. 10).63 Plate 17 offers an image of bounty, highlighting the impressive number of spoons (though fewer than half of the original sixty-six are pictured) and a diversity of forms. But the plates that depict the vessels singly convey the cups’ individuality—even the Regensburg Doppelpokal (R8 and R9) gets two images, so both sets of the repoussé faces on its surface can each be viewed right side up. The close crop of the oval, a shape often used in the 1850s and 1860s for portraiture, gives the vessel, no matter its size, personality and monumentality. Thus the figure in the Augsburg maiden cup, a form of Scherzgefäß (trick vessel) (R17; see fig. 14), is not some quaint silver doll but a sculpture with arms thrown powerfully upward, raising her lace collar (fig. 11).64
These single-sheet photographic portrayals of individual silver vessels find visual counterparts in early modern German prints that utilized the then-new representational media of engraving and etching to engage with the ascendant craft of the goldsmith. In the 1520s, Regensburg’s own Albrecht Altdorfer depicted covered standing cups and double cups in etchings that captured them often against dark backgrounds, cropped tightly to the vessels’ contours, or indicating the form of a niche. In general silhouette and function they were probably similar to the many cups, stored in various boxes and sacks, recorded among the artist’s possessions upon his death in 1538. They certainly bear details of the vessels and spoons in the Regensburger Silberfund, hidden almost a century later: bulbous lobes, graduated feet, scrolled engraved ornament, grotesque heads, inscribed initials, even top ornaments of warriors standing contrapposto and holding shields and lances (fig. 12). Though often depicted singly, Altdorfer’s cups and double cups were later taken up by other printmakers, copied, resized, and grouped together, much like the wood engravings made after Schindler’s single photographs, which similarly took on a new, recombinatory existence in the pages of art periodicals in 1869.

His vessel etchings are now understood to be designs ostensibly destined for use in the goldsmith’s workshop, thus positioned on the opposite end of production from Schindler’s documentary project. But Altdorfer is never far from discussions of Regensburg’s historical goldsmithing tradition because in the face of a vastly depleted archive, his etchings stand in to represent the now poorly preserved accomplishments of Regensburg’s smiths. Altdorfer also shared with Weininger and Schindler a similar urge to record for posterity the endangered material fabric of their city. In February 1519 he famously etched two views of the interior of the Regensburg synagogue before it was demolished after the city’s Jewish community had been exiled. Although on a social and political level the synagogue’s destruction was orders of magnitude more catastrophic than the tearing down of the Bärbinger House almost exactly three hundred and fifty years later, Altdorfer’s and Weininger’s portrayals of these still, empty medieval vaulted spaces both have the weighty finality of having been “aufgenommen beim Abriss” (recorded at demolition). Produced in the fresh flush of an unexpected recovery of Regensburg’s past, Schindler’s photographs would nevertheless also come to serve an elegiac purpose.

**DISPERAL**

Weininger closed his article on the Silberfund by warning of the “pity if these things were to be scattered all over the world.” That is, however, what eventually came to pass. A year after the Bärbinger House was razed, the new structure built in its place was finished and Erich was advertising shops and apartments for rent; a shoemaker and stationer opened there in 1870. In June the collector Eugen Felix of Leipzig visited the needle-manufacturer and his family and soon left with the hoard in tow, having paid Erich 4,600 talers in cash. From a twenty-first-century perspective interested in archaeological documentation, a purchase keeping the find together seems ahead of its time. But for Felix, who amassed a magnificent art trove partly by buying up already formed collections, it may have been a matter of an astute business deal. Certain crucially important components of the find seem to have been separated out and some were never carefully documented, including the wooden chest and the material in which the objects were packed. Items appearing

---

*fig. 12* Albrecht Altdorfer (German, ca. 1480–1538). *Covered Goblet with a Knight on the Lid*. Etching, sheet 7 × 4 ¼ in. (178 × 10.3 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1924 (24.82.2)
in the original inventory that were not photographed by Schindler—the non-silver components of the Silberfund—also seem to have gone missing, including a small pendant of amber beads, the thirteen documents, and the seal linking the documents to the posited original owner of the chest and its contents, Georg Hoffmann (R44–48). Of the additional silver objects reportedly found on the same site in March, only the pocket watch later appeared in Felix’s collection.74 It was a farsighted purchase in other ways, anticipating a desire for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century silver that would increase as old collections and treasuries were dispersed into developing museums and the art hoards of wealthy robber barons. A successful purveyor of silk fabrics, Felix collected European prints, paintings, decorative art, and numismatic material. The Met owns several items formerly in Felix’s collection, including ivories, painted glass beakers, German stoneware, fifteenth- and sixteenth-century jewels, and paintings, such as Albrecht Dürer’s *Salvator Mundi*.75 It was through Felix that the Regensburger Silberfund was for the most part comprehensively catalogued and published, recording information on rarer and more ephemeral objects that had received less detail in Schindler’s photographs and in contemporaneous newspaper reports, like the leather purses ornamented with silver buttons (R37–39), or the goose feather decked in pearls and gold wire (R41). Marc Rosenberg, the compiler of German goldsmiths’ marks, used the information in Felix’s catalogues to make attributions for his indispensable handbooks.76 Felix exposed many of the vessels, spoons, and cutlery to a wider public by loaning them to a major exhibition in 1875, for which they were photographed in a more stable, professional, yet less revelatory manner than Schindler had achieved in the medium of albumen print a few years earlier (fig. 13).77 The phrase “Regensburger Fund” (Regensburger Find) appears conspicuously in almost all descriptions and captions of these objects while in Felix’s possession. This provenance mattered not only for the association with the hoard and its sensational discovery, but also because it lent an irrefutable authenticity at a time when copies, replicas, forgeries, aggressively restored originals, and historicist fantasies were common.78

In 1880, likely as a means to build interest toward an eventual sale, Felix published a lavish catalogue of his collection with a pendant atlas of 35 collotypes, an early form of photolithography, including some of the Regensburg silver.79 In the end his prints were sold in 1885, and the bulk of his remaining collection was auctioned by J. M. Heberle (H. Lempertz) in Cologne, beginning on October 25, 1886, and lasting five days.80 The hefty accompanying catalogue includes photographs that, along with the 1880 collotypes, may be the only documented close-up images of some of the find’s spoons and cutlery. Object descriptions correspond for the most part with those written in 1880, though with some variation in the identification of makers’ marks. Much more extensive than the brief lines of the lithograph descriptive inventory of 1869, these entries reflect more consistent recording of measurements and marks, and were undoubtedly informed by the increasing sophistication, and scientific documentation standards, of connoisseurship for sixteenth- and seventeenth-century silver in the intervening years.81 But in some cases they strangely overlook important identifications made by the local compilers of the original inventory, like the coat of arms on one set of silver spoons (R30).82 Such oversights emphasize the enduring significance of the inventory and the local knowledge on which it was based.
The Felix sale became a public spectacle and prompted extensive discussion in the art press, which took a critical view of the astronomical prices reached by some of the top objects (the Silberfund pieces alone came to more than 55,000 marks). With little quality Renaissance German silver on the market, the authenticity of the Regensburg vessels and utensils was thought to have driven up the prices. In reality not everything in the 1886 sale went to buyers. Observers had already speculated in the month before the sale that Felix would have trouble breaking even on many of his best pieces. It was later revealed that he purchased back several items, including a few that had appeared to go to the dealers Bourgeois Frères in Cologne. These pieces stayed with the family and passed upon Eugen Felix’s death in 1888 to his son, Hans E. C. Felix. In 1894 Hans was said to be shipping the remains of the collection to New York, where he lived, to achieve higher prices than possible in Europe. He later made an agreement with the dealer Julius D. Ichenhauser to put these pieces up for private sale, receiving an advance that would be deducted from the final proceeds. They were on view at the Anglo-American Fine Art Company at 523 Fifth Avenue in October 1909. When Ichenhauser died the following year, his widow went forward with a public auction in order to settle her husband’s estate, which Hans Felix attempted to stop by means of a temporary injunction. These legal issues gave a notably uncomfortable atmosphere to the auction in May 1911, which appeared to spook potential buyers and keep prices down. The Met was able to purchase several items of European decorative art, including stoneware, glass, and ivories, in addition to the Augsburg tankard and the Regensburg Doppelpokal.

Forty-two years after their discovery under a Bavarian staircase, the two German vessels finally had found a permanent home in The Met. Notably neither the detailed sale report by curator Wilhelm Valentiner nor the acquisition notes in The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin mentioned the vessels’ origins in the Regensburg hoard. That provenance, which Eugen Felix had vigilantly maintained in all publications of his collection because it remained crucial to the cultural and monetary value of the surviving objects, apparently had begun to slip during Hans Felix’s stewardship. When he lent some of the remaining Regensburg vessels to a Leipzig decorative arts exhibition in 1897, they appeared with his name, but no mention of the Silberfund. Perhaps the association no longer conjured the thrill it had decades earlier, or seemed crucial to the reception of these artifacts. The interpretive shift away from the vessels’ specific provenance placed renewed focus on the objects themselves, their physical features, ornament, and the Augsburg and Regensburg smiths to whom they were now attributed, but it also severed them from the first stage of documentation that had been undertaken within days of their discovery, and thus from later research that grew out of it.

One small example of this dissociation, in this case literally an obscuring of knowledge about social relations, pertains to The Met’s small Augsburg tankard, which bears on its base a coat of arms and the inscription “Ursula der gotl Kandl,” a line of text that has remained undeciphered. But when Weininger wrote about the tankard in 1869, he offered a translation for Gotl, the South German dialect term for godmother (Taufpathin), which suggests the vessel may have served as a christening gift. Christening gifts in gold and silver have a long tradition in this region and inscriptions often followed the pattern of naming the child, then the godmother or godfather, who had likely given the gift. The inscription may be identifying the tankard (Kandl, South German dialect for Kanne) as having belonged to, or a gift from, Godmother Ursula, a further data point that, along with the currently unidentified coat of arms, could lead to more definitive identification and recovery of information about the social relationship to which the tankard attested.

In addition to the obstacles it posed to tracking surviving objects, the lost association with the Regensburg hoard and its documentation also obscured an important section of the vessels’ lengthy itineraries, bookended by their careful protection in the 1630s and their impactful revelation two and a half centuries later. Both moments have important lessons to teach about the shifting meaning of these sixteenth-century objects, as well as their shifting value. Knowing that an object has come from a hoard brings awareness to the great lengths that were taken to preserve it at a specific historical moment. The act of preservation speaks not only to the way it was valued, but also to the extremity of the crisis at hand. The wartime necessity that had caused the Silberfund’s deposition in the early 1630s was met in 1869 by a different material emergency, the threat of destruction that Regensburg’s historians responded to with a similar intention to protect and preserve.
Regensburg town hall, which included extended discussion of its civic plate and an appendix on the city’s historical goldsmiths.99 A kind of pall hangs over his recounting of the city’s lost treasures, as he explains that not a single example of Regensburg’s once extensive and dynamically changing collection of civic plate survives.100 Though undocumented, these losses likely occurred over centuries and stem from the general vulnerability of precious metalwork.101 Nor were they uncommon for German cities that had experienced war, financial crisis, and the destructive effects of changing fashion and mores. But the removal of precious metalwork testifying to local histories had taken a different turn in the nineteenth century as the desirability of early modern silver grew and the dispersal of long-standing collections sped up. Regensburg’s local historians witnessed this firsthand, lamenting what, in the eventful year of 1869, had begun to seem like a pattern of alienation. In addition to the discovery and swift sale of the Silberfund, they noted the loss of a Regensburg vessel that had been in use by the local shooting club for more than three centuries. It went, along with an archive of associated documents, to a Munich antiques dealer.102 “In addition to these old Regensburg treasures,” they wrote of the Silberfund, “we had to see yet another magnificent cup disappear from the city.”103 By the time Hupp was attempting to reconstruct the history of Regensburg’s goldsmiths, little local secular silver survived in its city of origin.

Against this backdrop, the Silberfund offered crucial additional data. Hupp reconstructed the find with help from a set of manuscript documents borrowed from the son-in-law of Christoph Erich, the landlord of the demolished house and thus by law the hoard’s first modern owner. These included an eyewitness recollection of its sale to Eugen Felix.104 An opportunity had been missed, Hupp asserted, when no attempt was made in 1886 to buy back some of the pieces in the Felix sale and return them to Regensburg.105 He noted that the sale catalogue’s illustrations did not capture the objects known to have been produced in the former free imperial city. For that, he had to turn to the “old photographs,” by which he meant the albumen prints Schindler had made immediately after the find’s discovery, which Hupp included as tightly cropped details that in his text on the town hall stood in for Regensburg’s lost civic plate.106

The reliance on photographs to gain traction on lost metalwork leads us to the rhetoric that was used by Schindler and others to describe the nature of his photographic work. In the first mention of his studio, Schindler advertised services for producing portraits, but also for copying artworks of all types (“Copiren von Kunstgegenstände jeder Art”).107 When it came to the Regensburg find, the assertion that Schindler’s photographs “copied” the original objects was made more than once.108 Bössenecker worded the advertisement for the series of prints in such a way that the silver vessels came before acknowledgment of their representational medium: “obtainable through all book and art dealers: The Silver Plate Found in Regensburg. . . . 17 Sheets of exquisitely executed photographs in large folio format.”109

The implication of this language of copying and the silver plate made “obtainable” in shops was that photographs could substitute for the objects themselves, facilitating possession, admiration, and study. That the majority of Schindler’s prints were devoted to a single vessel made possible an intimate, focused gaze that heightened the sense of direct access. The production of substitutional facsimiles by means of photography resonates with other contemporary replication technologies, notably transfer lithography, which reproduced the manuscript pages of the original inventory for dissemination, and electrotyping (known in German as galvanoplastische Kopiren), which used modern chemical-electrical technology to reproduce metalwork for private pleasure, public display, and professional artistic and industrial ends.110 The stupendous silver finds at Hildesheim were electrotyped and later appeared in international exhibitions, eventually making their way into far-flung museums.111

There was another use for electrotypes in the nineteenth century, which we might think of as compensatory copies: replicas—whether copied by hand or with the aid of industrial processes—standing in for works that had been alienated, usually in a context of financial pressure. The most famous example is the Lüneburger Ratssilber, a large collection of late medieval and early modern silver vessels once owned by the northern German city of Lüneburg.112 In 1874 the city finally agreed to sell its historic civic plate to the Prussian State for the sum of 220,000 talers. Electrotype replicas took the place of the originals in the town hall, allowing Lüneburg to retain these symbols of civic pride and history while also capitalizing on the historical and artistic value of their carefully preserved plate. Similarly, the city of Basel had been forced to auction off its medieval cathedral treasury in 1836, but subsequently welcomed back copies of its lost artifacts in many forms, including plaster casts, electrotypes, and hand-formed silver copies.113 The use of nineteenth-century replication
technologies in these contexts brought complication to the traditional notion of financial extraction in regard to precious metalwork. During the Thirty Years’ War, as it had been for centuries, plate was confiscated and melted down to win its melt value, signaling a definitive end to a vessel’s existence. In the nineteenth century, the extraction of historical plate might mean instead the exchange of the vessel for hard cash, with the possibility of substitution in a different material or medium.

**Photography Facilitating Reidentification**

Schindler’s photographs, and the accompanying lithographed inventory, now reside in Berlin, Braunschweig, Regensburg, Vienna, Weimar, and perhaps in other collections not yet identified. Through digitization and the access made possible by the internet, the same images can be viewed now from almost anywhere and compared against contemporary photographs of surviving metalwork. It was through such digital comparisons that, in the course of research for this article, two more Silberfund vessels were located.

The first is the silver ship with enameled sea monsters on its base and a teeming crew of miniature figures (R5) (see fig. 13). Although Schindler did not intentionally capture detailed marks on the vessels he photographed, in the albumen print of this nef the Nuremberg mark and the maker’s mark of the smith Tobias Wolff are clearly visible. The placement of these marks and the accompanying assay bite on the ship’s hull are identical to that of the marks on the Wolff nef, now missing its mast flag, recently sold at auction. When exhibited in 1992, no mention was made of this vessel’s origins in the Regensburg hoard, suggesting that this special provenance had, sometime after 1886, become dissociated. Now in a private collection in Germany, the nef can be contextualized not only against Wolff’s many other tabletop ships, but also against another cache of silver plate deposited in the same region. Found in 1912 in a town about 175 kilometers north of Regensburg, the Pörbitsch Schatz remains intact and can be linked through archival documentation to a local merchant family that buried their plate for safekeeping probably in 1632. It includes many forms similar to those found in Regensburg, such as silver spoons, gilt-silver standing cups, and female adornments, as well as a nef with the figure of Fortuna produced by none other than Tobias Wolff of Nuremberg.

The second object reidentified thanks to Peter Schindler’s albumen prints is perhaps more surprising, for it turns out also to reside in The Met. Received as part of J. Pierpont Morgan’s gift in 1917, the vessel was made by the Augsburg smith Hieronymus Imhof between 1620 and 1630. Known as a Jungfrauenbecher (maiden cup), it consists of one larger cup in the form of a woman in Venetian dress with a voluminous embossed skirt who holds above her head another, smaller cup able to swing on pins (fig. 14). A specialty of Nuremberg and Augsburg smiths from the mid-sixteenth through the mid-seventeenth century, this type of cup is associated with drinking games and wagers, such as whether two drinkers can manage simultaneously to sip from both beakers. They have also been connected to drinking rituals around marriage and in that context reflect a gendered differential in the amount considered appropriate for men and women to imbibe in early modern Germany.

With its ornamented skirt and attention to the details of elite, exotic dress, The Met’s maiden cup finds several comparanda, but the face and décolletage painted in pink flesh tones are more unusual. Other examples by Imhof have small beakers decorated with embossed ornament to match the female figure’s skirt, and their faces are bare. The Jungfrauenbecher that came from the Regensburg treasure was notably polychromed: “the upper part of the figure is painted and enamelled; the wide ruff is cut out of silver; the upper beaker is smooth.” A note in the curatorial file for The Met’s “wager cup” had raised but then dismissed a connection to the Felix collection based on a discrepancy between the cup’s measured height and the published measurements of the cup in Felix’s possession, as well as the fact that Imhof had created multiple similar vessels.

Documentation in Morgan’s correspondence suggests, however, that the Felix and Morgan cups were one and the same. In 1902, Morgan had bought a large collection of silver plate including the Augsburg maiden cup from the German banker Eugen Gutmann. Soon after, this acquisition was published in a luxurious catalogue, and Morgan loaned the German plate to exhibitions and museums in England and Scotland. These catalogues do not mention where Gutmann had acquired the cup. Felix’s Jungfrauenbecher was still in his son Hans’s possession in 1897, when it was exhibited in Leipzig. But in the short period between this loan exhibition and Morgan’s acquisition of Gutmann’s collection, Hans Felix must have sold the cup to Gutmann. A printed inventory drawn up in the course of sale to Morgan includes a marginal notation in ink asserting that the “Frauenbecher” with enameled face carrying a small cup in her outstretched arms derived from Felix’s collection.
Nowhere in this series of private and published records is the Regensburg Silberfund mentioned. It is possible that Gutmann was unaware of the connection. The most convincing evidence that The Met’s Augsburg maiden cup derived from the hoard in the Bärbinger House comes once again from Schindler’s photography. The albumen print captures all the minute detail of the ornamented skirt, which matches in each scroll and flourish that of The Met’s Jungfrauenbecher (compare figs. 11 and 14). Inspired by contemporary ornament prints but embossed by hand, these elements could not have been replicated perfectly across vessels. Even if Imhof had produced a cup of the same form, including the same cast details of the head and upraised arms, the tool marks on the skirt’s repoussé surface would have varied. A small inconsistency at the base of the figure’s bodice, which lops off the point of its V shape, provides further confirmation that the vessel photographed by Schindler in 1869 and by the Museum’s Imaging department in 2023 is the same.

What can locating Imhof’s maiden cup in the Regensburg Silberfund add to its future study and interpretation? The early newspaper reports of the find emphasized the silver’s “freshness,” meaning its remarkably undamaged condition. Painted components remained intact, rather than severely abraded or lost over the centuries, as was common. Although in monochrome, Schindler’s albumen print records the
The Regensburg treasure also gives The Met’s Jungfrauenbecher potentially illuminating historical context, including connections to a series of additional objects that might begin to explain its social significance and function. Although research into the hoard’s seventeenth-century owners is just beginning, comparisons with other depositions of silver plate from the Thirty Years’ War suggest that the objects hidden under the stairs did not represent the possessions of a single person, but were more likely the gathered valuables of a family or larger social group, perhaps even including the dowries of married women.229 Did this particular maiden cup, along with the silver girdles and silver-buttoned purses, form part of the possessions of the women, as yet unidentified, who lived in the Bärbinger House in the 1630s? Could it have commemorated a marriage as such cups are sometimes thought to have done?230 What can be known without a shadow of a doubt is that it and its dozens of silver companions in the concealed chest were deemed worthy of protection in a moment of enormous uncertainty. As stores of financial value, social identity, and individual memory, they were placed in a temporary estrangement from their owners that became, for reasons still unclear, permanent.

CONCLUSION
After having remained still and undiscovered for more than two centuries, the speed at which the Silberfund circulated in the art press in spring 1869, and the rapidity with which the artifacts themselves left Regensburg for Leipzig, was staggering. Despite defying detection by the military plunderers of the seventeenth century, the Silberfund faced a new threat from the rapacious seekers of the nineteenth century, who wore the guise of the wealthy art connoisseur. What went unacknowledged among those lamenting its removal from Regensburg was the role that careful documentation of the hoard likely played in precipitating Eugen Felix’s purchase. After all, it was through the detailed inventory circulated to the press, the widely advertised exhibition, the diligent reporting of local journalists, and Peter Schindler’s photographs in particular that the Silberfund entered the awareness of a collector like Felix, who happened to live in Leipzig, where the Illustrierte Zeitung published the first images of the find in May 1869.

Schindler’s photographs contributed to the alienation of the silver treasure from Regensburg, but they also offered a form of compensation for that loss. By multiplying the silver vessels, girdles, and spoons, they made these historical artifacts accessible in many places, no matter the fate of individual works. Even after the dispersal of Felix’s collection in 1886, Schindler’s photographs and the lithographed inventory thus continue to allow narratives of the hoard to be written, facilitating research that opens up for examination the historical contexts of these objects, not only in 1869 but also in the periods of their production, use, and possession beginning in the sixteenth century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
The research for this article was facilitated through the generous aid of many colleagues. I thank the following in The Met’s Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts: Elizabeth Cleland, Curator; Ana Matisse Donefer-Hickie, Research Associate; and Wolfram Koepppe, Marina Kellen French Senior Curator. I am further grateful to Kevin Tierney, Sotheby’s New York; Doris Gerstl, Karin Geiger, and Michael Preischl, Museen der Stadt Regensburg; Martin Dallmeier and Manfred Knedlik, Historischer Verein für Oberpfalz und Regensburg; Nina Schipkowski, Stiftung Landschaftsmuseum Obermain; Thomas Rudi, GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig; Lena Hoppe, Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Cologne; Annette Schommers, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich; and Klaus Edel in Cologne. For sharing their expertise in nineteenth-century photographic practices, I thank Emily Doucet and, in particular, Nicholas Robbins, who also kindly read and gave incisive comments on an earlier version of this text. I am additionally grateful for feedback from the Past Imperfect seminar in the History of Art Department at University College London and for the tireless research support of Stuart Moss. The text was much improved thanks to the suggestions of Adam Eaker, Associate Curator, Department of European Paintings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

ALLISON STIELAU
Lecturer, History of Art Department, University College London
NOTES
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3 Angerer 1887, 76.
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23 Meixner 2012.
26 Hupp 1912.
27 Boetzkes and Stein 1997.
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Inventory of the Regensburger Silberfund, 1869

A transcription of the lithographed inventory circulated with Peter Schindler’s photographs appears below. Endnotes correlate individual objects to later catalogue entries and further literature.1 Heights were measured in Zoll, a unit of length close to the modern inch. Weights were given in Mark and Loth (1 Mark = 16 Loth). In Bavaria the Loth equated to 17.6 grams.


1) Ein silberner Pokal, vergoldet, 16½″ hoch, auf seiner ganzen Oberfläche mit reicher Renaissance-Ornamentik getrieben, mit einem Deckel, auf dem ein Ritter, der einen Schild hält, und auf welchem die Buchstaben M.B. mit einem Wappen, an welchem die Buchstaben M.B. sitzen, angebleicht sind. Gewicht 50 ½ Loth. 2 [R1]


3) Eine silberne Kanne von 12″ Höhe; auf derselben befindet sich das Wappen des Wilhelm Acker und die Jahreszahl 1597. Der flache Deckel zeigt einen sog. Ferdinand-Thaler eingemessen vom Jahre 1541. 3 [R3]

4) Ein silbervergoldeter Pokal; auf der Schale getrieben und geziert mit einem silberfarbenen Münzen, auf einem silberfarbenen Schild, welches in Landsknechte endet und deren Streicher. Die silberne Ornamentik der Lederscheide weist auf ventianischen Ursprung. 29 [R33]

5) Eine silbervergoldete Kanne, 8″ hoch. Die einfach getriebenen Ornamente weisen das Gefäß ins 17. Jahrhundert. Das Silberzeichen ist M.S. 4 [R7]


7) Eine silbervergoldete Kanne, 8″ hoch. Die einfach getriebenen Ornamente weisen das Gefäß ins 17. Jahrhundert. Das Silberzeichen ist M.S. 6 [R7]


13) Eine ähnliche Kanne von einfacher Form, silbervergoldet. Das Gepräge zeigt die Buchstaben M.B. 13 [R13]


15) Ein kleiner Doppelpokal in Form von Kuchen. Silbervergoldet und in Augsburg gefertigt. 15 [R15 und R16]

16) Ein Kredenzbecher; eine Dame hält mit erhobenen Armen das kleinere bewegliche Becherchen, der größere Trinkbecher selbst zeigt in seinen Ornamenten auf die Zeit des späten 16. Jahrhunderts, das Gepräge zeigt auf Augsburg. 16 [R17]

17) Ein Salzfässchen in Dreieckform, angeblich 11 Loth. Gepräge zeigt das Regensburger Wappen, die Handhabe bildet ein silbernes Figürchen, in dessen rechte Hand jedoch die Standarte fällt. 17 [R18]


20) Zwei halbe Dutzend silberne Löfelf ohne Ornamentik. 20 [R21 und R22]


22) Zwei silberne Löffel mit silbernen Stielen, welche in Landsknechte enden und deren Schildchen die Buchstaben A.W. zeigen. 22 [R26 und R27]

23) Sechs Löffel von Buxbaumholz mit silbern in gothische Fialen endenden Stielen. 23 [R28]

24) Drei beinerne Löffel mit einfach silbernen Handhaben. 24 [R29]


31) Ein silbervergoldeter Pokal mit Regensburger Gepräge, mit stemmen-weisem Gravirungen und den Buchstaben G.H. 31 [R31]


33) Ein damascirtes Doppelmesser in ledergepresßer Scheide. Die Ornamentik weist auf venetianischen Ursprung. 33 [R33]

34) Ein silbernes Eßgehänge, bestehend in Gabel, Messer und Streicher. Die silberne Ornamentik der Lederscheide weist auf den Anfang des 17. Jahrhunderts. 34 [R34]

36 Eines detto mit zwei Messern. Die Fassung der Lederutsche gehört in’s 17. Jahrhundert und hat ihren Ursprung in Regensburg.32 [R36]
37 38) und 39) Drei Gürteltaschen von Leder mit silbernen Kettchen und besetzt mit silberdurchbrochenen Knöpfen – dazu der lederne mit Silber verzierte Gürtel.33 [R37, R38, and R39]
40 Ein Silbergürtel mit schön gearbeiteten Ketten und gepreßtem Schließstück. Regensburger Arbeit.34 [R40]
41 Eine Zierfeder mit Golddraht und kleinen Perlen.35 [R41]
42 Ein Serviettenband in Silberdraht und Seide in Form eines Blumenkranzes.36 [R42]
43 Sechs silberne Löffelstielchen mit Monogramen.37 [R43]
44 Ein kleines Gehänge von fünf Bernsteinkugeln.38 [R44]
45 Siegelstückschen von Silber mit elfenbeinernem Griff und den Buchstaben G.H.39 [R45]
46 Zwei Schuld-Urkunden der churpfälzischen Landschafts-Commissionaire von 1611 und 1616, auf den Namen Caspar Stögberer lautend. (Auf Pergament mit Siegeln in Holzkapseln.)40 [R46]
48 Vier Kaufbriefe auf Pergament über das Eckhaus D 72. am Römling in Regensburg aus dem 16. Jahrhundert.42 [R48]

NOTES TO APPENDIX

1 Key: R = numbering from the original Regensburg inventory; S = Schindler 1869 (plate number according to the Technische Universität Braunschweig copy; a = left, b = right); F = Felix inventory number; FC (Felix Catalogue) = Von Eye and Börner 1880a; FS number = Felix Sale 1886. Sale prices are recorded in the copy of the Felix sale catalogue in the Thomas J. Watson Library, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, which is digitized and available online.
2 S 1; F 141; FC, pp. 10–11; FS 420 (17,100 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 29. Later attributed to Nicolaus Schmidt of Nuremberg. Rosenberg 1926, 137. In 1891 this cup was in the collection of Baron Geyr von Schweppenburg in Haus Caen, Straelen (Landkreis Geldern). Clemen 1891, 77–78, no. 420.
3 S 2; F 137; FC, p. 12; FS 424 (1,005 marks).
4 S 3; F 145; FC, p. 13; FS 429 (5,200 marks; bought back via Bourgeois Frères). Dresden 1875, pl. 29 and 95; Leipzig 1897, 16, no. 68.
5 S 4; F 139; FC, p. 11; FS 422 (2,500 marks). In the Felix sale catalogue, this lid is associated with R10 rather than R4 (see FS, p. 79, lots 421 and 422). But this appears to be a mistake because the two are together not only in Schindler's photograph but also in Dresden 1875, pl. 29.
6 S 5; F 138; FC, p. 14; FS 426 (2,310 marks). Later attributed to Tobias Wolff of Nuremberg. Based on photography of the marks and other details, this vessel appears to be the nef later in the collection of Alexis Gregory and sold after his death in 2021, now in a German private collection; a French import stamp indicates its presence in a French collection sometime after 1886. Dresden 1875, pl. 45; Rosenberg 1922, 176; Pechstein 1992, 171–72, no. 39; Sotheby’s sale 2021, lot 41.
7 S 6; F 131; FC, p. 11; FS 423 (365 marks). Attributed to the Regensburg smith Hannß Kurtz. Hupp 1912, 180; Rosenberg 1925, 293.
8 S 7; F 133; FC, p. 14; FS 430 (670 marks).
9 S 8 and S 9; F 143; FC, pp. 11–12; FS 417 (10,000 marks; bought back via Bourgeois Frères). Dresden 1875, pl. 45; Leipzig 1897, 15, no. 67; Rosenberg 1925, 291. Acquired by MMA in May 1911 (2,040 marks). Accession number 11.93.15a, b. Valentiner 1911, 476; MMA 1911a; MMA 1911b.
10 S 10; F 140; FC, p. 11; FS 421 (3,000 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 105.
11 S 11; F 134; FC, p. 11; FS 425 (1,550 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 45.
12 S 12; F 144; FC, p. 14; FS 433 (810 marks).
13 S 16b; F 133; FC, p. 14; FS 434 (250 marks).
14 S 15a; F 132; FC, p. 14; FS 432 (950 marks).
15 S 13a; F 136; FC, p. 12; FS 437 (145 marks).
16 S 14; F 146; FC, p. 12; FS 418 (6,000 marks; bought back via Bourgeois Frères). Probably acquired by Eugen Gutmann from Hans Felix after 1897, sold with Gutmann’s collection of plate to J. Pierpont Morgan in 1902, then came via Morgan’s gift to MMA in 1917. Accession number 17.190.579. Dresden 1875, pl. 105; Leipzig 1897, 15, no. 64; Gardner 1903, pl. XIII, fig. 1; Jones 1907, 16, pl. XVII; Rosenberg 1922, 78; Hackenbroch 1968, 383; Hackenbroch 1977, 35–36; Seiling 1980, 3:160.
17 S 15b; F 142; FC, p. 15; FS F445 (2,830 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 45.
18 S 13b; F 148; FC, p. 13. Not included in the 1886 Felix sale. Leipzig 1897, 16, no. 69. Acquired by MMA in May 1911 (1,040 marks). Accession number 11.93.16. Valentiner 1911, 476; MMA 1911a; MMA 1911b.
19 S 16a; F 135; FC, p. 13; FS 436 (190 marks).
20 S 17. Possibly F 150; FC, p. 32; FS 856 (20 marks).
21 S 17; F 152 (2 spoons); FC, p. 18; FS 854 (85 marks). Rosenberg 1925, 292. Later attributed to Peter Praunsmennl (or Braunsmandl) of Regensburg. One of these spoons is now in the GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V153). The other, which had apparently been given to another collector by Felix before the 1886 sale, was acquired by Wolfgang Baumann, an antiques dealer in Regensburg, who details the object and its provenance on his website (Baumann n.d.). Its itinerary illustrates some of the complications of identifying and tracking the spoons from the Silberfond, which were not described or photographed completely or in detail. The spoons inventoried in 1869 do not match the number of spoons listed in Felix’s catalogue. It is possible that, given their great numbers, some stayed in Regensburg or Felix kept or used some as gifts.
22 S 17; F 158 (8 spoons); FC, p. 19; FS 811–17 (400 apiece). Six of these spoons are now in the collection of the GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V151–V157).
23 S 17; F 157 (2 spoons); FC, p. 19; FS 808 (300 marks); and FS 809 (300 marks). GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V152a, b; two spoons). Museum für Angewandte Kunst
24 S 17; F 156 (2 spoons); FC, p. 18; FS 806 (300 marks); and FS 807 (360 marks). Sauerlandt 1926, 34–35.
25 S 17; F 155 (2 spoons); FC, p. 18; FS 819 (25 marks) and 820 (25 marks).
26 S 17; F 151 (2 spoons); FC, p. 18; FS 853 (120 marks). Rosenberg 1925, 293. Museum der Stadt Regensburg (inv. K 2011/64; 1 spoon), acquired from Lempertz Cologne in November 2011. GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V171-174; 4 spoons). Further research is necessary to understand the relationship between these four and the two listed in Felix’s collection in 1880, one of which was sold in 1886. Lempertz sale 2011, 16, lot 285.
28 S 17; F 161; FC, p. 16; FS 830 (450 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 103 (the fork only). GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V180a, V180b, and V209). The fork, V180b, is now missing, as is the leather case with which the set had been sold in 1886.
29 S 17; F 160; FC, p. 42; FS 795 (720 marks).
30 S 17; F 162; FC, p. 16; FS 788 (240 marks). Dresden 1875, pl. 45.
31 S 17; F 163; FC, p. 16. This is probably item 787 in FS (sold for 1,300 marks), though it is not associated with the Silberfund there.
32 S 17; F 164; FC, p. 16; FS 789 (460 marks).
33 S 17; F 165–67, FC, p. 7; FS 492 (30 marks), 493 (130 marks), and 494 (30 marks). The silver-decorated leather girdle: S 17; F 165b; FC, p. 7; FS 497 (75 marks). One purse (probably F 166 / FS 494) is now in the GRASSI Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Leipzig (inv. V175).
34 S 17; F 168; FC, pp. 6–7; FS 495 (60 marks).
35 S 17; F 169; FC, p. 107; FS 1052 (36 marks).
36 S 17; F 170; FC, p. 107; FS 1051 (36 marks).
37 Likely because of their incomplete nature, these were not photographed by Schindler and may have been left out of the Rathaus exhibition. FS 821–24 (25 marks apiece).
38 Not photographed, not mentioned in Felix’s collection.
39 Not photographed, not mentioned in Felix’s collection.
40 Not photographed, not mentioned in Felix’s collection.
41 Not photographed, not mentioned in Felix’s collection.
42 Not photographed, not mentioned in Felix’s collection.
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Although Joseph Cornell never owned a camera, the artist avidly amassed photography manuals. About 1941, he subscribed to The Complete Photographer, a serialized field guide replete with stylistic tips and technical advice. Exhaustive as the magazine was on matters creative and chemical, Cornell remained a resolutely incomplete photographer, whose artistic practice engaged every aspect of camera work except for the thing itself. He fabricated photographic constructions from found materials (fig. 1), and his diaries reveal a roving camera-eye, registering images everywhere.

To sift through his notes is to assemble an ad hoc album of these images in absentia: there are the passersby and pigeons, the piece of plastic in the street. There—in the window—the teenager, the turkey sandwich, and
Characteristically choosing the most esoteric possible path, Cornell had, by 1941, come into his own as a cameraless “photographer.” That year, as in all previous years, he photographed nothing. Working instead with scissors, sequins, glass, and glue, he transformed an interchangeable scrap of ephemera into a unique photographic object, designed to mediate between photography’s past and present. This object, evoked on the Complete Photographer envelope, engages the daguerreotype as a type of time machine with which to resolve the existential anachronisms of the artist’s life and work.

Beneath the rose-tinted glass of this rare Cornell creation, Tamara’s face flashes (see fig. 1). With head turned and eyes downcast, she accentuates an elegant profile. At her shoulder, embellishments twinkle along the trim of her dress. And around her likeness, ambient light bounces off a silver mirror, in a masterful illusion orchestrated by Cornell. The artist glazed and inset her photographic portrait in a leatherette specimen box, enshrining her in one of his so-called daguerreotype-objects. An enchanting, understudied work from 1941, Tamara Toumanova (Daguerreotype-object) was recently promised to the Photographs collection of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, where it was carefully disassembled, conserved, and exhibited in 2020. Not a daguerreotype in any traditional sense, the work synthesizes an entire history of photography, using a modern photographic reproduction to simulate a much older process.
Tamara’s image tricks the eye—though photographed in 1932 and appropriated nine years later by Cornell, it effectively evokes a nineteenth-century portrait by Matthew Brady or Southworth and Hawes. With her demure coiffure and expression, one might mistake her for a Victorian ingénue. Of course, viewers in 1941 were unlikely to have been so daft. She was the great ballerina Tamara Toumanova, then famous enough to insist a reporter call her “just Toumanova,” the very month this work was made (during a season when there were “too many Tamaras in New York”). But she appears in the portrait as an obscure Tamara on the cusp of fame, just after joining the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo. She is twelve or thirteen years old, posing for one of her first professional headshots. The photograph was made at Studio Iris in Paris, where Toumanova was living in exile with her parents. Born on a trans-Siberian cargo train as her family fled the Russian Civil War, she had only been dancing for a few years when, at age six, Anna Pavlova plucked her out of ballet class to perform in a concert. She made her Paris Opera debut four years later, and in 1931 she caught the eye of George Balanchine. He recruited her for a new Ballet Russe company, where she and two young colleagues were lauded as the “Baby Ballerinas.” Toumanova’s star turns with the company won her an international following of fervent admirers, of whom Joseph Cornell was perhaps the least likely and most devoted.

Cornell first met Toumanova in December 1940, at the Fifty-First Street Theatre in New York. After haunting the backstage and raising the suspicions of the ballerina’s mother (a formidable chaperone), he finally won an introduction courtesy of his friend Pavel Tchelitchew, a painter and designer who had collaborated with Serge Diaghilev’s original Ballets Russes company and continued to work with Balanchine. Cornell and Toumanova began a tentative friendship, built on a shared love of ballet history. As touring Russian companies like hers began to cultivate a popular American audience for ballet, new scholarship on the art form emerged, fueling in Cornell a consuming fascination.

Toumanova and her colleagues had first come to New York years earlier, in winter 1933. Dance motifs began to appear in Cornell’s work that very season, though their inspiration originated elsewhere. In November, the artist visited an exhibition of costumes and set designs from Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes. The show was mounted by Julien Levy, whose uptown gallery had become a gathering place for avant-garde émigrés and a proving ground for an American strain of Surrealism that Cornell would help to shape. His own work debuted there the previous year, alongside montages by Max Ernst and photographs by Man Ray and László Moholy-Nagy. In this experimental milieu, Cornell found fresh angles to his antiquated interests, like a historian with spectacles recalibrated to the New Vision. Thus, the mode of modern ballet promulgated by Levy’s show, and by Balanchine and Tchelitchew, interested him primarily as a conduit to its Romantic precursor—that period begun in the 1830s, when choreographers started to reject neoclassical themes in favor of folktales and love stories, evoking otherworldly spirits in a sensuous style danced en pointe.

Nineteenth-century cults of celebrity arose around Romantic ballet stars like Marie Taglioni, Fanny Cerrito, and Carlotta Grisi—women whose carte-de-visite portraits Cornell rescued from thrift shops, and whose legacies live on in his series of boxed Homage(s) to the Romantic Ballet. Such dancers were darlings of the picture press, illustrated, and eventually photographed, ad nauseam. That Cornell could find them, a century later, in the stalls of Manhattan booksellers was a happy accident of the antiquarian economy, but one that reflected the impressive scope of their earlier circulation.

Toumanova was the first living dancer to so captivate Cornell, seeming to him to embody this Romantic tradition. Years after the artist’s death, she recalled in an interview, “He saw me not as a living creature but as a dream; a spiritual creature beyond flesh and blood. I felt that Cerrito, Taglioni, and Grisi all seemed to come alive to him when I danced.” As if to foster this association in her work, Cornell brought photographic evidence to her dressing room; visiting backstage in 1941, he recalled “showing her some cartes de visite of old time Russian ballet.”

To his trove of historic dance souvenirs, Cornell added contemporary evidence of Toumanova’s triumphs, filling a folder with her photographs and programs. He scoured the city’s bookshops for this ephemera, but the most precious to him were objects bequeathed by the ballerina herself: letters, cards, and even cuttings from her costumes. In exchange, he offered her artworks and imagined mementos of dancers past; among them, a necklace and a sewing kit that he told her were Taglioni’s. By adorning Toumanova in symbolic relics of the Romantic ballet, and incorporating her likeness into his archive, Cornell ushered her into an alternate plane of living history. Of his many works inspired by the dancer, only the Daguerreotype-object activates this temporal transference in form as well as content.
By the time of Toumanova’s birth in 1919, the daguerreotype process was long out of use, replaced by faster, cheaper forms of picture making. Critically for dance publishers and promoters, modern photographs—printed on commercially manufactured papers coated in light-sensitive emulsion—were also much easier to copy, thanks to advances in halftone photolithography.24 Photographed often and endlessly reproduced in print, Toumanova’s countenance graced newspapers, programs, and the pages of *Vogue*.25 (Cornell was far from her only admirer—even dance critic Edwin Denby, an avowed Toumanova skeptic, could not help but marvel at her “large, handsome, and deadly face.”)26 For his *Daguerreotype-object*, then, Cornell had no shortage of images from which to choose. His pick, the Studio Iris portrait of Toumanova, shows the dancer in her adolescence, months before her New York debut, and years before her acquaintance with Cornell. This selection, like so much else about the daguerreotype project, seems self-consciously arcane—especially at a time when artist and muse were actively trading pictures. Though Toumanova sent Cornell a number of her headshots, this is one photograph he likely never saw firsthand.27 Instead, he and many others encountered it in reproduction, as it circulated around the world in the 1930s and beyond.

An obscure portrait in a minor key, the Studio Iris picture nevertheless traveled widely. The same could hardly be said of Cornell himself, who rarely left New York except in his art.24 To the extent he knew of the portrait’s international reach, it may have roused his interest. It is illuminating to recapitulate a bit of its itinerary, tracing a trail of reproductive prints across several countries in the period before one of them found its way into the *Daguerreotype-object*.

The Studio Iris portrait reached its widest audience not on any broadside or ballet program, but inside a package of cigarettes. It appeared on a German cigarette card that was issued by the Eckstein-Halpaus firm in Dresden in 1933, as part of a collectible series illustrating the faces of dancers around the world (fig. 3).29 Had he smoked, one can imagine Cornell’s delight at opening a pack of Ecksteins to discover a tiny Toumanova inside.30 More plausibly, he could have encountered the card within a commemorative volume. In the early 1930s, albums of these ballerina cards were published annually in Germany and quickly became collectors’ items on the international dance circuit. Even if Cornell never found a Toumanova card for his own collection, he could have come across one at the Museum of Modern Art, New York (MoMA). The albums were likely part of the museum’s Dance Archive—a collection of ballet books and ephemera, where Cornell made frequent visits.31

An analogous set of cigarette cards exists in Cornell’s own archive, though it is tricky to say when it was acquired.32 Dating to the 1890s, the set was published stateside by Admiral Cigarettes and presents photo-portraits of American stage actresses in all manner of costume. It is little surprise that such cards appealed to Cornell, but their format merits momentary attention for its affinity with the daguerreotype and the carte de visite. Setting aside material and technological differences—of which there are, admittedly, many—one might claim the cigarette card as a mass-market heir to these earlier portraits. Like cased photographs and later cartes, the boxed cards were collectible and closely held, small enough to slip into a pocket or cradle in a palm. In the right hands, either could become precious. As Toumanova’s portrait charted a course across the globe, it entered the collections of

![Fig. 3 “Tamara Toumanowa, No. 98” from Tanzbühnen der Welt 1932. Photomechanical reproduction on cigarette card, after a photograph by Studio Iris, Paris. Private collection](image-url)

**fig. 5** Portrait of Tamara Toumanova by Studio Iris, Paris, as it appears in a souvenir program for "Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo" at the St. James Theatre, New York, 1933–34 (fig. 4). Photomechanical reproduction, image 4½ × 3½ in. (11.4 × 8.9 cm). Irina Baronova Papers, Jerome Robbins Dance Division, The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, New York
countless fans—some, chain-smoking Germans, and others, American balletomanes. Eventually snatching this image from public circulation, Cornell alters it almost beyond recognition, investing it with personal significance.

About the same time that the Studio Iris portrait peered out of cigarette boxes, being crumpled, trashed, and traded by turns, it was reproduced on at least one poster and two ballet programs. One of these, a British playbill, allotted an entire page to the portrait, cropping into the image and printing it in a wash of dreamy blue ink. The second of the two was more significant to Cornell, as it would supply the actual print for his project. This was a souvenir program for the Ballet Russe’s first American season, which debuted at New York’s St. James Theatre on December 22, 1933. Eagerly awaited and warmly received, the company treated its audience to a lavish playbook wrapped in gilt covers and replete with original art. Alongside full-color production designs by André Derain and Raoul Dufy are more than a dozen pages of cast portraits. Among them appears the telltale Toumanova, sharing a page with fellow “Ballerina” Tatiana Riabouchinska (figs. 4, 5). Here, Toumanova’s shoulder and décolleté are dodged out, in a gesture of modesty that handily makes space for a Studio Iris image credit.

The New York reproduction is, in truth, rather banal, lacking the lustrous tone of the British program or the dynamism inherent in the German card. Yet this is the version on which Cornell’s project depends, and his treatment of the work is so transportive that, seen in retrospect, the source material’s simplicity comes as a surprise. The portrait appeared to Cornell as it does to us: on a page of the St. James souvenir program—a page he found, trimmed, and transformed into his Daguerreotype-object. After assembling the work, he sliced off the lower edge of the page and pasted it to the back of the leatherette case, where it becomes a title card (fig. 6). To its identifying caption, Cornell added two flourishes: a typewritten subhead that approximates the printed slab serif of the program text, and beneath this, his signature.

The ephemera in this assemblage is original—at least, insofar as any mass-produced paper print can reasonably be described as such. Despite a sentimental tendency and a strong preservationist impulse, Cornell could be unsparing with scissors, slicing apart a prized portrait or postcard for purposes of collage. But at times, to maintain the integrity of his archive, or simply to adjust the size of an image, he supplemented his found material with photostatic reproductions, which he commissioned from a local camera shop. An early reproductive device, the photostat machine was essentially an oversize camera with a built-in lab, which yielded silver prints of desired documents. (The results were negatives of their source material, but could be ‘statted a second time to produce a positive copy.) In effect, it could make any scrap of paper into a photograph. By this process, Cornell replicated sheaves of ephemera, from bookplates of Renaissance paintings to cabinet cards from the Romantic ballet. Exchanging authenticity for convenience, the resulting photostats would institute one or two steps of additional removal between Cornell and a historical subject. Lost in these reproductions was the texture of immediacy that Cornell so relentlessly pursued in his collecting.

By contrast the Daguerreotype-object case contains a genuine article: the original page of a ballet souvenir. In 2020, treatment was undertaken by The Met’s Photograph Conservation Department to clean and consolidate the work’s case, as well as to clean its two layers of glass, allowing for better visibility of the image below. During the process, those two panes of glass were temporarily removed, exposing the paper surface of the portrait for what may have been the first time since the assembly of the object in 1941 (figs. 7, 8). Visual analysis of the print suggests that it was sourced directly from a page of the 1933 ballet program, and it is not the result of photostatic reproduction. While Cornell’s decision to use the “original” print necessitated the sacrifice of
fig. 7 Tamara Toumanova (Daguerreotype-object) (fig. 1) during treatment, with case lid and glass layers removed, revealing a photographic reproduction with mirror overlay and applied rhinestones. Photograph Conservation Department, The Metropolitan Museum of Art
one souvenir program, he managed to keep its contents close at hand; he never parted with the *Daguerreotype-object*, which remained with his family until after his death.45

By preserving this print beneath glass, Cornell elevates its status and symbolically halts its circulation. Though mechanically reproduced and not, at the time, especially rare, it appears in his 1941 *Daguerreotype-object* as a readymade relic. In essence, the work reverses the course of photography’s history, retrofitting a modern, mass-produced picture into the outmoded format of the medium’s first years. Cornell’s choice of image is also retrospective, insofar as it shows Toumanova younger than he ever knew her, before her face was recognized on the street or published in the paper. The daguerreotype—photography’s least reproducible format, yielding an edition of one—here halts the course of her fame. The artist fixes her there, in his sealed specimen case, as if to ward off the future and keep her to himself.46

Accentuating the flash of metal and glass, Cornell added embellishments to heighten the *Daguerreotype-object*’s verisimilitude. Around the image of Toumanova, Cornell overlaid a silvery surface (figs. 7, 8). This was not the sensitized silver of an actual daguerreotype but a contemporary dupe: a thin mirror, cut to contour the dancer’s head in an inverted silhouette. Silhouetting—that extractive tactic adopted with equal enthusiasm by Victorian scrapbookers and modernist *monteurs*—was by 1941 key to Cornell’s practice, deployed as often to impart meaning as to eliminate context. Thus, in a pair of 1939 works he made from cut-up cabinet cards, Cornell staged little contretemps between silhouetted subjects and the scenic voids from which they had been snipped. With such meta-silhouettes, he probed the tension between photography’s “negative” and “positive” poles.47

Here, however, Cornell operates in a more conventional mode. The mirror silhouette gestures to nineteenth-century portraiture and to conventions of ballet publishing, wherein the silhouetted heads and bodies of dancers distilled the shapes of their choreography.48 Cornell often worked within this idiom, creating and collaging ballerina silhouettes. Of these, the closest analogue to the *Daguerreotype-object* is an unfinished fragment, found in a sheaf of the artist’s so-called Toumanova dossier (fig. 9).49 It is a magazine reproduction of a photograph by Renato Toppo—New York portraitist to the stars—that Cornell cut into a silhouette and set aside for some unknown future use. As in the Studio Iris portrait, Toumanova here turns her head in profile, her sleek hair coiled to reveal the taut tendons of an elegant and powerful neck. The dating of this object is ambiguous. Photographed after 1933 and reproduced in a 1937 issue of *Dance* magazine, the image could have been cut out by Cornell anytime thereafter. The shape of the silhouette rhymes with that of the earlier Studio Iris portrait, and he may have considered it as a possible alternative for his *Daguerreotype-object*. But, larger and sharper than the St. James reproduction, the magazine print is crisply contemporary—as is its subject. Toppo’s Toumanova is not a “Baby Ballerina” but a modern dancer, casting a diffident gaze from beneath darkly lined brows. She bares a plunging neckline with confident carriage. Try as Cornell might to snip her from her stylish studio portrait, this Toumanova would never fit into his anachronistic image-world of the Romantic ballet and is instead consigned to an archive of unused clippings.

In the finished *Object*, silhouetting obscures as much as it reveals. Cornell’s silver overlay slices along the dancer’s sinuous profile, but departs, below her shoulders, from a faithful outline (fig. 7). Covering her chest with the mirrored glass, it obscures the studio mark so prominently featured in the St. James program (fig. 5). Returning to form along her right shoulder, it diverges again—just briefly—to soften the curve of the dancer’s neck. This edit adds an increment of grace, evoking the avian gestures of Odette and
Odile, the famous double roles Toumanova danced in *Swan Lake*. Viewers of the work are likewise doubled in this mirror, their faces briefly reflected into its closed world.

The mirror introduces a kinetic element to Cornell’s *Daguerreotype-object*, befitting both the dancer and her photo-historical frame. A nineteenth-century daguerreotype was designed to be held, requiring manual adjustments of angle and case opening to yield a clear view across its silvered surface. Such luminous dynamism—the flashing mirror, the dissolving subject—likewise suited Cornell’s interactive impulse; in his other boxes, objects roll and swing. If he could make a cigar box into a carnival game, why not invent a funhouse mirror in daguerreotype form? Cornell scholar Sandra Leonard Starr hits upon a similar note in her discussion of the *Daguerreotype-object*, reading in its reflective surface the performative spirit of the early, illusionistic panoramas and designs that Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre made for the Parisian stage. Her point, though apt, is as applicable to genuine daguerreotypes as to Cornell’s fictive *Daguerreotype-object*. Instead, to the extent that he convincingly replicates a nineteenth-century image, Cornell engages the theatrical enchantments to which all photography is heir.

To perform on Cornell’s silvered stage, a reflective costume was evidently required. He added rhinestones to the surface of the Studio Iris print, atop Toumanova’s left sleeve (fig. 8). There is reason to suspect that these were snipped from the dancer’s own attire; at least once, in 1940, Cornell slyly assembled trimmings from her outfits, then returned them to her in a bespoke box. She willingly granted such treasures from time to time, and the prospect preoccupied Cornell. One senses his disappointment in an episode from his diary when, after spotting Toumanova backstage “in wings in streetclothes,” she “promised to bring the costume pieces [to the] gallery. Nothing happened.” She would eventually make good on this promise, sending him labeled scraps of silk and velvet by mail in 1942.

Either freely given or furtively gotten, costume pieces and their provenance became the ostensible subject of an intervening Cornell box, constructed in 1941 (fig. 10). In his *Little Mysteries of the Ballet: Homage to the Romantic Ballet*, a note inscribed inside the lid (and thus obscured in the reproduction here) itemizes some of the box’s contents: “pink slipper-lace, silver hairpin, white rose—actual pieces from the ballet costume of Tamara Toumanova …” from her performance in *Le Spectre de la Rose*. Additional objects, including a rhinestone ornament and three pearls, go unmentioned there. But a second inscription on the box’s exterior wonders how those other items got inside:

Into a souvenir-case guarding its sealed treasure of fragments from “La Spectre de la Rose”—how explain the intrusion of jeweled and faded tokens of a ballerina of an earlier day, accented with a renegade blonde hairpin loosed from the chevelure of some Cinderella in her midnight haste……Reward.

The riddle, to which Cornell requests an answer and proffers a prize, proposes the existence of two ballerinas: Toumanova and a historic, blonde-haired double, who appears from the past and leaves baubles behind. But, as any Hitchcock fan could guess, the woman and her double are one and the same, at least in the collapsing space of Cornell’s construction. Toumanova appeared to the artist as a Romantic ballerina reincarnate—“in wings in streetclothes”—and, eager to bridge the gap between historic dance and its modern counterpart, Cornell here puzzles over an appropriate mechanism. The trinkets he collects are charged with meaning, but their container is insufficiently neutral, tied to no specific time. Enter then, the
work’s true subjects. Rimbaud’s likeness is incidental by comparison, though Cornell may have intended this effect (perhaps to evoke the poet’s experimental verse, or the pandemonium of his personal life). The arrangement of the glass fragments highlights negative space in the cased enclosure, which more readily resembles a shadow box than a daguerreotype. Absent a silvered image surface or a smooth-paned frontispiece, the work tests the elasticity of its namesake form.

Stranger still is Cornell’s 1938 daguerreotype-object of the painter and poet Mina Loy, which takes as its source a photograph by Man Ray (fig. 12). Cornell had first encountered Loy’s work at the Julien Levy Gallery, where a 1933 show of her atmospheric blue canvases preoccupied him in years to come, as the two artists developed an abiding friendship. Alluding, perhaps, to those paintings, he outfitted his object with blue-tinted glass, which shades Loy’s likeness a deep sapphire. At a glance, the choice better approximates a true daguerreotype; even the color evokes the early years of the process, when overexposed plates ran the risk of blotching blue. Peering from beneath this blue glass, Loy assumes a classic three-quarter pose. She is silhouetted, like Toumanova, though the ground around her is a hybrid expanse of mirrored silver and shimmering stars—an allusion to the astrological motifs in her poetry. But any semblance to a historical daguerreotype would disappear once the object was handled, as its surface started to move. Sliced into tiles, glass pieces were designed to slide across the object’s

---


*Daguerreotype-object*, in which this problem finds its solution. Fixed in history and roughly coincidental with the period of the Romantic ballet, the daguerreotype offers a perfect case for Cornell’s conundrum. Into its recognizably nineteenth-century setting, new characters can be introduced. Slipping Toumanova’s face into a Daguerrean frame, he draws her backward into the era of their favorite dancers. The *Daguerreotype-object* itself is Cornell’s reward.

This work is arguably Cornell’s most successful daguerreotype-object, but it was not his first. He started experimenting with this format about 1935, revisiting it intermittently in the years to follow. Although Cornell’s engagement with photography was by that time well established, the Daguerrean constructions mark a shift in his practice. For the first time in these works, Cornell endeavors not only to collect photography or to mine it for source material but to fabricate photographic objects of his own. Those early “daguerreotypes” adopt an experimental approach to the form; each secured a photographic image inside a specimen-box enclosure, but the format was otherwise flexible. In what seems to be the earliest published example, Cornell appropriates a famous portrait of a teenage Arthur Rimbaud, which the artist likely cut from a cabinet card (fig. 11). The photograph appears behind fragments of broken glass, the snagged shards of which transgress the picture plane in a crude overbite, asserting themselves as the
face, distorting Loy’s features into a shape-shifting mask. Part kinetic experiment, part game of chance, the work evokes its subject’s avant-garde affiliations. Cornell constructs a vivid portrait of Loy but, in so doing, explodes the already loose parameters of his DIY daguerreotypy.

If, as these experiments suggest, the daguerreotype format offered Cornell a productive playground, it also fueled a brisk business: curator Diane Waldman describes him building daguerreotypes as “objects to order, as Christmas gifts.” By 1940, Cornell’s friends were pestering him with requests: his collaborator Charles Henry Ford wanted a daguerreotype with his sister, and his dealer Julien Levy later wrote on behalf of someone who “would pay a reasonable price” to have one made. This mercenary enterprise finds Cornell at cross-purposes in 1941, by turns debasing his daguerreotype practice for income and adapting it to increasingly sophisticated ends. Contradictory as this may seem for Cornell—a habitually unemployed dreamer, underfoot in his office job and unreliable with commissions—it is typical of daguerreotypy, a practice whose meteoric ascent was inextricable from capitalist enterprise. Like an art photographer with a commercial trade, Cornell here divides his efforts between personal and professional projects, effectively playing (for once) the role of the “Complete Photographer.”

The 1941 Daguerreotype-object marks a break from these early experiments and pictures for hire. The previous year, in Cornell’s Exhibition of Objects at Julien Levy Gallery, he presented an entire group of “daguerreotypes.” When Toumanova attended the opening that December, mere weeks after meeting the artist, she would have seen these works firsthand. But if she remarked on them, Cornell—consummate archivist of their every interaction—seems not to have remembered it. Instead, he recalled her gravitating toward one of his boxed devotions to the Romantic ballet. Lifting a piece of glass from the box, “she said she needed the ‘unworldly’ quality of it in her work.” Memorialized in Cornell’s diary, this observation may
have served as an artistic prompt. Soon thereafter, he would fix Toumanova’s likeness beneath its own piece of glass. Hazier than his early experiments in blue, the pink pane he selected acts as a filter for her photomechanical portrait, softening its sharp details, obscuring its halftone matrix, and thus blurring out evidence of its modernity.

Completely the next fall, this Tamara Toumanova (Daguerreotype-object) was Cornell’s first construction to authentically simulate a nineteenth-century photograph. If, in earlier “daguerreotypes,” the format was a container against which to rebel, the 1941 work finds Cornell embracing his glass box. With fewer explicit physical interventions, he locates drama in the photographic image itself. This work, which trades glass shards for tinted panes and reflective mirrors, still facilitates an active experience of looking, just one more typical of the historical form. Focusing his backward glance, Cornell selected as his source image a multi-valent view of the young Toumanova and, in a gesture of reverse animation, enshrined her in the “unworldly” realm of the Romantic ballet.

Where Cornell’s earlier daguerreotypes traded on surprising disjunctions of form and subject, his 1941 work effectively transports its sitter back a century. Cornell chose for this mission a resolutely modern image, mechanically reproduced and widely circulated. Transforming Toumanova’s mass-printed portrait into something particular and precious, he cycles backward in time, taking his audience with him. After all, in the mirrored surface of the Daguerreotype-object, it is impossible to avoid one’s own reflection. Entirely convinced of Toumanova’s charms, Cornell persuades viewers in turn; captivating us in her enchanted image, he keeps us there until the curtain falls.
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NOTES

1 Prepaid postage on a subscription envelope points to this date. Joseph Cornell Papers, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution (hereafter Cornell Papers), box 10, folder 31; U.S. Camera & Travel and Photography Annual are among the other publications he collected. Cornell Papers, box 16, folder 30.
2 Solomon 1997, 76.
3 Winking at Dziga Vertov, Cornell would periodically use this anglicized version of the Soviet director’s term for the autonomous and increasingly omniscient perspective of the modern camera, which transcended the capability of the human eye. In Cornell’s lexicon, the expression referred to a cinematic mode of stream-of-consciousness observation, as in Caws 1993, 171, 193, 223.
4 Ibid., 193, 232.
5 Though this inscription is open to interpretation, and could reasonably seem to describe several different artworks, it illustrates the extent to which Cornell’s thoughts of Toumanova coincided with photographic concerns. Cornell Papers, box 10, folder 31.
6 These mostly vernacular photographs are held in the Joseph Cornell Study Center at the Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, DC. Before it was sold, Cornell’s collection of fine photographs included works by Julia Margaret Cameron, Eugène Atget, Berenice Abbott, and Brassaï. Hartigan 2007, 44, 89.
7 GalleryJulien Levy recalls meeting Cornell in 1931, when he began making visits to Levy’s inaugural exhibition of nineteenth-century American photographs. His first impression of the artist—whom he would later represent—was that of “a gray young man . . . with some knowledge of the history of photography.” Cornell had by then already begun to build a modest collection of photographs, in which daguerreotypes and their cases were well-represented. Levy 1977, 76.
8 A promised gift of Ann Tenenbaum and Thomas H. Lee, the work was exhibited at The Met from March 10 to November 30, 2020, in Photography’s Last Century: The Ann Tenenbaum and Thomas H. Lee Collection (Rosenheim 2020).
9 Reporter Elliott Arnold did not comply with her wishes when he published “Tamara Yearns for a Steak, or a Dance” in the
October 3, 1941, issue of the *New York World-Telegram*. Cornell Papers, box 26, folder 5.

10 This dance company's official name changed often in the course of Toumanova's tenure, as a consequence of internal politics, periodic schisms, and the formation of splinter groups. Most iterations of the company hewed as closely to the “Ballet Russe” brand as they could legally manage, seedling deliberate confusion among audiences and advertisers. In the interest of clarity in this article, I refer consistently to the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo, or simply the “Ballet Russe.” Except for her 1933 season in Paris with Balanchine's short-lived Les Ballets 1933, Toumanova was consistently affiliated with the original Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo company, rather than its offshoots.

11 Located on Rue La Boétie, in the eighth arrondissement of Paris, Studio Iris catered to stage performers in the 1930s and produced portraits of many of Toumanova's Ballet Russe colleagues. An original print from Studio Iris, showing Toumanova with Roman Jasinski in Mozartiana, was collected by Cornell and remains among his papers. Cornell Papers, box 26, folder 5.

12 Cornell also had a formative early encounter with Anna Pavlova, watching her dance *The Dying Swan* at the Metropolitan Opera House in 1923 or 1924. Hartigan 2007, 21.

13 The Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo was conceived as a successor to Serge Diaghilev's Ballets Russes, the dance group that became an international phenomenon in the 1910s and 1920s for its radical synthesis of modern choreography, art, and design. The new company's teenage “Baby Ballerinas,” Toumanova, Irina Baronova, and Tatiana Riabouchinska, were lauded at the time of their New York debut as the company's “chief attractions” (Martin 1940, 32). Publicity for the Ballet Russe played upon the dual innocence and sophistication of these young women, juxtaposing evidence of their beauty with amusing accounts of their youth. It is not surprising, then, that headshots like Toumanova's accentuate the adolescent girl's maturity, such that she seems considerably older than her twelve or thirteen years.

14 The theater was located a block from Cornell's day job at the Traphagen Commercial Textile Studio, and he reportedly watched rehearsals there on his lunch hour (Solomon 1997, 116). Known today as the Mark Hellingier Theatre and leased to the Times Square Church, the venue at 237 West 51st Street was originally built in 1929 to serve as a movie palace. Cornell, an avid filmgoer, may have seen movies there in the 1930s, before returning the next decade to see Toumanova perform.


16 Hennessey 1983, 8.

17 The exhibition, *Twenty-five Years of Russian Ballet*, was drawn from the collection of dancer and choreographer Serge Lifar, and presented at Julien Levy Gallery between November 2 and 18, 1933. See Lifar 1933.

18 Schaffner and Jacobs 1998, 21.

19 Hennessey 1983, 8.


21 Cornell Papers, box 10, folder 75.

22 Ibid., box 26, folder 5.


25 See, for example, Kirstein 1933, 29–30, and “Paris Panorama” 1933, 44–45.

26 Denby 1944, 135.

27 Original prints of this portrait do not exist in Cornell's collections, nor in any New York collections to which Cornell would likely have had access.

28 Though the idea of travel, across continents and centuries, preoccupied Cornell and became a recurring motif in his work, the artist spent his entire adult life in New York. Obligations to his mother and his disabled brother restricted his movement, as did an intensely shy, reclusive nature.

29 The Toumanova card appears in a 1932 album titled *Die Tanzbühnen der Welt* (The Dance Stages of the World), published by Eckstein-Halpaus. It is collected in a section devoted to “The Dance Stages of Foreign Countries.”

30 The cards were distributed inside boxes of the popular Eckstein no. 5 cigarettes. Text on the back identifies Toumanova as a young ballerina trained in the Russian style of ballet, who emigrated after the Bolshevik Revolution.

31 Established at MoMA by dance impresario Lincoln Kirstein, this collection of research materials opened to the public in 1939, but closed within the next decade. In 1946, Kirstein's founding gift of bound volumes was transferred to Harvard University. Two copies of the album in question, *Die Tanzbühnen der Welt*, are today held in the Harvard Theatre Collection, Houghton Library, Cambridge, MA, and at least one of them could plausibly have come from MoMA.

32 Further research is needed to determine when Cornell began collecting the cards. Joseph Cornell Study Center Collection, 1930–1980, bulk 1930–1972, Research and Scholars Center, Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, DC (hereafter Cornell Study Center), box 106, folder 2.

33 In a photograph from the late 1940s or early 1950s, collected by the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Toumanova poses with an array of photographs and ephemera from past performances heaped around her in piles. In one such pile, a poster printed with the Studio Iris portrait is visible, though identifying details about the production are obscured. This is the only trace I have found of the poster, which Sandra Leonard Starr mentions in *Joseph Cornell and the Ballet* (1983, 61) and which likely promoted Les Ballets 1933.

34 Little else is known about this program. It was probably made for a London production of either Les Ballets 1933 or the Ballet Russe.

35 Martin 1933, X4.


37 Even so, if the collections of others are any indication, Cornell was not alone in attaching significance to the print; it turned up, torn from an identical 1933 program page, in an auction of historic autographs (Freeman's Auctions sale 2015, lot 403). That version of the print is dedicated in the dancer's hand as a “Souvenir of Tamara Toumanova,” but the stains across its rumpled surface read incongruously with the precious inscription.

38 We cannot be sure how the program reached Cornell, whether as a gift from Toumanova, or a bookshop find.

39 These appear throughout his papers, including in his Toumanova file at the Archives of American Art, where a set of photostats enlarges a studio photograph of the dancer to different sizes; Cornell Papers, box 25, folder 5. A comparable file at the Smithsonian Institution contains Cornell's printing
instructions for another Toumanova photostat; Cornell Study Center, box 21, folder 40.
40 Photostat Corporation 1936, 3.
42 In his diary, Cornell reflected on the aesthetic effect of the photostat process, comparing it to the "tabloid" look of photographs by Henri Cartier-Bresson. Caws 1993, 171.
43 This treatment was carried out with the full support and formal approval of the work's present owners.
44 Exhibiting none of the sheen seen in Cornell's photostats, the matte surface of the portrait, the scale of the image, and the quality of its printing all align with the corresponding page in a reference copy of the program. Though it was not possible to conduct a side-by-side comparison of the unglazed portrait against a Cornell photostat, I have examined other photostats used by the artist and found few similarities with the printed portrait. It is nevertheless worth noting that these findings are, as yet, unsubstantiated by scientific analysis. The 2020 treatment of the work was deliberately narrow in scope, designed to address the work's case and glazing but not its image layer. Once the work joins The Met's permanent collection, further research will be possible.
45 Another page of the St. James program, which features a different picture of Toumanova with dancer David Lichine, is preserved in his collection. Cornell Study Center, box 21, folder 41. PerFraenkel Gallery (in conversation, October 2022), the artist's sister, Elizabeth Cornell Benton, sold the work in the late 1970s to Castelli, Feigen, Corcoran Gallery, from whom Fraenkel purchased the work and later sold it to Ann Tenenbaum and Thomas H. Lee.
46 Toumanova recalled Cornell's alarm at her growing fame. "He was afraid of losing me," she told Starr (1983, 68).
47 These are Post No Bills: Object (Défense d'Afficher), in the Robert Lehman Art Trust, Washington, DC, and Variétés de Minéralogie: Object, in a private collection. See Hartigan 2007, nos. 40 and 41. Silhouetting would go on to figure prominently in Cornell's cover and layout designs for Dance Index, the journal founded by Lincoln Kirstein in 1942.
48 For example, pages from a disbound nineteenth-century album, preserved among Cornell's papers, show photographic reproductions of silhouetted dancers in a variety of poses. Riffing on this motif a century later, photographer Alexander "Sasha" Stewart made shadow portraits of the Les Ballets 1933 company (of which Toumanova was a member) for a photo story in The Sketch. Cornell Study Center, box 88, folder 6; Stewart 1933, 81.
49 Cornell cut this portrait from page 8 of the July 1937 issue of Dance, where it illustrated Anatole Chujoy's article "Will Toumanova Desert the Ballet?"; Cornell Study Center, box 21, folder 40.
50 In July 1941, several months before Cornell made the Daguerréotype-object, Toumanova sent him tickets to Swan Lake: "Have never seen it before," he noted in his diary, "but she tells me that it is one of her favorites." Cornell Papers, box 6, folder 2.
51 Commenting on Cornell's use of mirrors in his pseudo-photographic objects, one reviewer suggested that "the reflections which do not have the aid of quick-silver are images drawn from the unconscious." Art News, December 23, 1939, quoted in Waldman 1967, 14–15.
53 He evidently imagined them as earrings for the dancer, and titled the work Boucle d'oreille (Pour Tamara Toumanova). Starr 1983, 60, pl. 32.
54 Cornell Papers, box 4, folder 1.
55 These are, in all likelihood, pieces that Toumanova actually bequeathed to Cornell after a July 1941 performance of Le Spectre de la rose at the Lewisohn Stadium in New York. Starr 1983, 66.
56 To the extent that this work conjures a specific Romantic ballerina, her identity is in dispute. The text invokes Cornell's other boxed homages to Marie Taglioni, but Starr (ibid., 68) proposes a plausible connection to Pierina Legnani, whose performance of Cinderella featured a record-breaking number of fouettés—a challenging pirouette technique that Toumanova had likewise mastered.
57 Introduced in 1839, the Daguerréotype reigned until the mid-1850s, when paper photography began to take its place. The period of the Romantic ballet stretched from the 1830s into the 1860s.
58 Rimbaud's portrait was photographed by Étiénné Carjat in 1871. The work was exhibited with the title "Object Daguerréotype" in MoMA's 1980 Cornell retrospective (McShine 1980, pl. 32), where it was credited to a private collection. It appears to remain in private hands.
59 Man Ray made this portrait of her in or before 1920; an alternate view from the same sitting illustrates an issue of The Little Review (7, no. 3) published that year.
60 By 1938, Mina Loy was also Levy's mother-in-law, and an agent for his gallery. Cornell made two other blue-tinted daguerreotype-object portraits of Levy about this same time. Schaffner and Jacobs 1998, 67–71.
61 This solarization effect was most apparent on the lightest part of a daguerreotype. Because, in portraits, the inadvertent tint would often appear on the white front of sitter's shirt, some hack photographers practicing in the United States were ignominiously dubbed "blue bosom operators." Newhall 1961, 63–64, 104.
62 The work also takes its title, "Imperious Jewelry of the Universe" (Lunar Baedeker): Portrait of Mina Loy, Daguerréotype-Object, from Loy's poetry.
64 Waldman 1967, 15.
65 Cornell Papers, box 3, folder 5.
67 An exhibition announcement for the show, which ran from December 10 to 26, 1940, identifies this group and other categories of work to be presented, including "Miniature Glass Bells" and "Miniatiae," Julien Levy Gallery Records, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Library and Archives, box 35, folder 3.
68 The box in question is Taglioni's Jewel Casket, constructed in 1940 and now in MoMA's collection (474.1953).
69 Cornell Papers, box 10, folder 31.
70 The pink glass may also allude to Le Spectre de la rose, a Michel Fokine ballet about an indisputably Cornelian subject: the souvenir rose from a young girl's first ball. The ballet was in Toumanova's repertoire, and is referenced in Little Mysteries of the Ballet: Homage to the Romantic Ballet.
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A small cast copper alloy object in The Metropolitan Museum of Art displays a figure in relief with hands upraised in an orant gesture (fig. 1). The figure is inscribed ΜΡ ΘΥ, the Greek abbreviation for “Mother of God,” which was the standard epithet for the Virgin Mary in the icons of the Eastern Roman, or Byzantine, Empire. Before it was acquired by The Met in 1999, the piece was dated to the eleventh or twelfth century and described as the “handle of a wide and low cup for some liturgical use, perhaps a paten.” Helen Evans, Mary and Michael Jaharis Curator of Byzantine Art Emerita, more recently assigned this object to the thirteenth to fourteenth century and identified it as the handle of what was once a Byzantine katzion censer. Although the censer survives in a fragmentary state, comparisons with
similar censers and depictions of *katzia* enable us to propose a reconstruction of the censer’s original form and functions, and to argue that The Met’s *katzion* juxtaposed burning coals with the icon of the Virgin to evoke metaphors of the Virgin’s childbearing as fire.

The use of incense was already well established in Byzantium when the *katzion* censer was fashioned, although Byzantine censers often took a different form. Christians began incorporating incense into religious rituals from the fourth or fifth century. The Byzantines deployed incense in church services, public ceremonies, funerary contexts, and domestic spaces. Hanging censers were common throughout much of Byzantine history, combining a bowl-like receptacle suspended from chains and a ring or hook that served as a handle. Hanging censers were often made from silver or copper alloy, as seen in examples preserved at The Met, including a silver censer with six holy figures dated to about 582–602, a sixth-century copper alloy censer with non-figural ornament, and three silver censers displaying holy figures from the Syrian village of Attarouthi.

The *katzion* emerged as a new type of censer in the Middle Byzantine period. The term appears in lists of equipment for the invasion of Crete in 949 in the tenth-century *Book of Ceremonies*. The *diataxis* of Michael Attaleiates from March 1077 is among the earliest ecclesiastical inventories to mention *katzia*, referencing a censer that was made of silver and apparently decorated with a figure on horseback, perhaps a military saint. Sources indicate that *katzia*, like hanging censers, were commonly made of silver and bronze. *Katzia* differed in form from hanging censers by combining a censer bowl with a horizontal handle and sometimes incorporating a lid or a foot. The oldest surviving *katzia* are copper alloy and date from the eleventh or twelfth century. Like hanging censers, *katzia* often bear figural decoration or non-figural ornament.

A well-preserved copper alloy *katzion* in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford dated to the fourteenth century can help reconstruct The Met’s *katzion* (fig. 2). The Ashmolean *katzion* preserves a bowl-like receptacle for coals and incense, a flat openwork element with a griffin motif that extends horizontally from the bowl, and a long handle affixed to the underside of the openwork element. The Met’s fragment corresponds with the openwork element on the Ashmolean *katzion* and still preserves a curved edge beneath the icon of the Virgin where a bowl was previously affixed. Two small holes above and below the Virgin show where a long handle was also once attached. Metal censers became hot when coals were placed inside them, so long handles helped distance the user from the heat source to avoid being burned. Many surviving *katzia* preserve similar holes for attaching long handles. So, although The Met’s *katzion* has been identified as a “censer handle,” it is unlikely that the *katzion* was actually held by this fragment.

Byzantine sources say little about how *katzia* were used, but artistic depictions of *katzia* from as early as the thirteenth century offer clues. A panel icon of the Dormition of the Virgin from Novgorod dated to about the beginning of the thirteenth century shows a bishop holding a golden *katzion* with red coals
Fig. 3a, b  Icon with the Dormition of the Virgin, and detail. Novgorod, early 13th century. Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow

Fig. 4  Dormition of the Virgin wall painting, 1260s. Sopočani Monastery, Doljani, Serbia
over the Virgin’s head (fig. 3a, b). The bishop holds the *katzion* by a long handle that recalls the Ashmolean censer. A *katzion* similarly appears in the large wall painting of the Dormition at Sopočani Monastery in Serbia from the 1260s (fig. 4). Here, a bishop is shown holding the long handle of another *katzion*, this time with a lid that has been flipped open, toward the Virgin’s midsection. The presence of *katzia* censers in such images of the Dormition have led scholars to speculate that *katzia* censers were used at funeral services. The discovery of a *katzion* in a burial at Mistra has lent further support to this hypothesis.

Wall paintings from about 1380 in the Church of Saint Demetrius, Markov Monastery, near Skopje suggest that *katzia* may have been used in other settings as well. An image of a public procession with an icon of the Virgin, which is part of a larger cycle illustrating the Akathistos hymn, includes a deacon with a *katzion*. Another *katzion* appears in a wall painting in the prothesis niche to the north of the altar in the same church, where the clergy prepared the bread and wine before the celebration of the Eucharist (fig. 5). This painting depicts the dead Christ as the Eucharistic offering with liturgical implements. Saint Stephen appears on the right vested as a deacon and offers incense over Christ with a *katzion*. This painting of Stephen with the dead Christ may again point to a funerary function for *katzia*. But since the clergy also offered incense during the preparation of the Eucharistic bread and wine, this painting indicates that *katzia* may have been used in the prothesis rite as well.

The presence of religious iconography on some *katzia* may signal that they were used for such church services. *Katzia* with zoomorphic and other non-figural motifs may likewise indicate nonecclesiastical functions. However, religious iconography often adorned personal objects in Byzantium, and nonreligious ornament could also be found in churches. So, decorative motifs should not necessarily be taken as an indicator of religious or nonreligious use. However, an inscription on another *katzion* fragment, preserved at the Benaki Museum in Athens and dated to about 1300, may indeed refer to an ecclesiastical context (fig. 6). Decorated with an icon of the Virgin and Child, the Benaki *katzion* offers the closest comparison with The Met’s *katzion* in terms of iconography. The Virgin is identified as the Mother of God “Therapiotissa,” which likely refers to the Church of the Virgin Therapiotissa in Constantinople, where this censer was probably used. It is possible that The Met’s *katzion* similarly served an ecclesiastical function.
In addition to the *katzia* at The Met and Benaki with their icons of the Virgin, other *katzia* dating from the eleventh to fourteenth century display icons of Christ and saints. All of them feature decoration on similar flat surfaces that were affixed to the incense bowl like The Met’s fragment. In all cases, the icons are oriented outward, away from the handle, implying that the images were meant to be viewed by an audience. The fact that *katzia* were held in front of the user rather than swinging on chains would have made their decoration more perceptible than images on hanging censers. In the prothesis rite before the Liturgy, *katzia* would have been seen by the clergy who performed this service, and in funerals and processions, *katzia* would have been visible to a broad audience of clergy and laypeople.

On The Met’s and the Benaki’s *katzia*, the juxtaposition of the Virgin with the incense bowl is suggestive. On both censers, the bottom of the icon terminates immediately above the censer bowl, whereas *katzia* decorated with icons of Christ and saints do not closely juxtapose these figures with the incense bowl. When coals and incense were placed in the censer bowl of The Met’s and the Benaki’s *katzia*, their position would have corresponded...
with the implied location of the Virgin’s lower torso or pelvis, in other words, her womb. As such, the censers would have evoked widespread metaphors from patristic texts, homilies, and hymnography that interpreted the Virgin’s conception and childbearing in terms of fire.

Associations of fire with divinity predate Christianity, appearing in several passages of the Hebrew Bible. Moses encounters God in the burning bush, God leads the people of Israel through the wilderness as a pillar of fire, and a seraph touches the lips of the prophet Isaiah with a burning coal, to name just a few well-known examples. Later, Christian writers interpreted many of these episodes as prefigurations, or “types,” of Christ. For Clement of Alexandria writing about the turn of the third century, it was Christ as the Word of God who spoke through the burning bush to Moses and led the Israelites as the pillar of fire. For the eighth-century John of Damascus and other Byzantine writers, the burning coal of Isaiah evoked Christ in his divine and human natures, as well as the Eucharistic bread as Christ’s body.

Byzantine writers extended such fire imagery to describe the Virgin Mary as well. Objects containing fire were apt metaphors for the Virgin who contained the Son of God in her womb. For the fourth-century Gregory of Nyssa, the burning bush was not only an image of Christ but also an image of Mary’s virginity, since the bush burned but was not consumed. And since Isaiah’s coal was commonly interpreted as an image of Christ, several Byzantine writers interpreted the tongs that held the coal as an image of the Virgin. Such metaphors also manifested themselves visually in Byzantine art, as with icons of the Virgin as the burning bush, which became popular in Sinai and the Holy Land in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and depictions of the tongs and coals in two manuscripts containing homilies on the Virgin by the monk Iakobos of Kokkinobaphos from the twelfth century.

The incense altar of the Jewish temple described in Exodus 30 offered another potent image for Christian interpreters. Exodus 30 states: “You shall make an altar on which to offer incense; you shall make it of acacia wood . . . You shall overlay it with pure gold.” A canon (hymn) for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin attributed to the eighth-century Andrew of Crete says of the Virgin: “You have become a gold censer, because the Word under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit planted fire in your womb, and became visible in human form, O pure Mother of God.” As a sacred object that contained fire, the altar of incense in the Jewish temple offered Byzantine hymnographers and preachers another poignant image for describing the incarnation of the Son of God through the Virgin.

Byzantine commentators also deployed this typological approach for interpreting Christian ritual, describing censers in church services as symbols of Christ and his mother. A commentary traditionally attributed to Germanos of Constantinople, more recently attributed to an anonymous author of the seventh or eighth century, states: “The censer demonstrates the humanity of Christ, and the fire, His divinity.” A ninth-century Latin interpolation of this same text elaborates: “The interior of the censer is understood as the [sanctified] womb of the [holy] virgin [and Theotokos] who bore the divine coal, Christ, in whom ‘the whole fullness of the deity dwells bodily’ (Colossians 2:9).” Maria Evangelatou has argued that depictions of censers in Middle and Late Byzantine images of the Dormition carried these same associations. For example, a wall painting at the church of the Panagia tou Araka in Lagoudera in Cyprus from about 1192 features a bishop pointing toward a censer that he dangles above the Virgin’s abdomen. The aforementioned bishop who stretches his katzion toward the Virgin’s midsection in the Dormition at Sopoćani likely carried the same incarnational symbolism.

Such textual and visual associations of censers with Christ and the Virgin reveal that juxtaposition of the icon of the Virgin with the incense bowl was meant to conjure similar meanings in The Met’s katzion. We can now imagine the reconstructed object, with its lost incense bowl and long handle reattached, held by a cleric in a funeral service, procession, or in the prothesis rite. The censer bowl would be filled with burning coals and incense, from which wisps of fragrant smoke would rise, giving the impression that the Virgin’s womb was swollen with divine fire. The censer and the icon of the Virgin are conflated. The censer and its contents became an extension of the image, of the Virgin’s body: a multimodal actualization of the Virgin’s miraculous conception of Christ as divine fire.

The form and decoration of The Met’s katzion also suggest parallels with contemporary depictions of the burning bush. In the twelfth-century Kokkinobaphos manuscripts, the ogival form of the burning bush is remarkably similar to the outline of The Met’s katzion fragment. In several works of art that depict the Virgin and Child within the burning bush, such as the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century triptych at the Monastery of Saint Catherine at Sinai (fig. 7a, b), the Virgin raises her hands in an orant gesture while the
Christ Child appears over her torso in a manner that is analogous to the image of the Virgin and the position of the censer bowl on The Met’s *katzion*. Such images of the burning bush may well have inspired the form and decoration of The Met’s *katzion*.

If The Met’s *katzion* was used in the prothesis rite, its decoration would have further resonated with the symbolism of the prothesis, which interpreted the Eucharistic bread and wine in terms of the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ. In this setting, The Met’s *katzion* likely evoked Byzantine descriptions of the Virgin’s womb as an oven.33 In the first kontakion (hymn) on the Annunciation attributed to the sixth-century Romanos the Melodist, Joseph addresses the Virgin: “O Radiant One, I see a flame and burning coals around you; hence, Mary, I am shaking; protect me, and do not consume me! Your faultless womb has suddenly become an oven full of fire.”34 Elsewhere, Mary’s womb-oven is described eucharistically as a bread oven. In his ninth-century homily on the Annunciation, Photios I of Constantinople states: “Hail, because thou hast brought to all of us the ambrosia of the life-giving bread, baked in thy flaming womb as in an oven.”35 Byzantine writers continued to employ such imagery for centuries, sometimes mixing the metaphors of censers and ovens to present Christ as a coal, incense, and baked flesh all at once, as in the twelfth-century homily of John Phournes: “For you are truly the gold censer, in which the coal of divinity was placed, and when it had burnt the proffered flesh of Christ in the form of incense it filled the world with the fragrance from his body.”36 In the prothesis, The Met’s *katzion* would have visually evoked such richly layered metaphors for the incarnation.

Surviving in a fragmentary state, the significance of The Met’s *katzion* is obscured to the modern viewer, but by reconstructing its original form and function, we encounter an object with decoration that was carefully integrated to generate rich meanings. By combining object, image, and ritual substances such as coals and incense, The Met’s *katzion* actualized metaphors of the Virgin’s childbearing as fire.
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NOTES

1 Gómez-Moreno 1968, no. 87.
3 Harvey 2006, 75–83; Caseau 2007.
4 MMA 1985.123.
5 MMA 1999.519.10.
6 MMA 1986.3.11, 1986.3.12, and 1986.3.13.
9 "κατζίαν ἀργυροῦν ἱστῶν"; Gautier 1981, 91. Additional early references to katzia appear in wills and inventories from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. For example, a private will dated to 1098 mentions a large silver katzion with a cover ("τὸ δὲ γε κατζίαν που τὸ μέγα τὸ σκεπαστὸν τὸ ἀργυρίον"); Lefort, Oikonomídès, and Papachryssanthou 1990, 179. An inventory of the Monastery of Saint Panteleimon, Mount Athos, from December 14, 1142, mentions a bronze katzion ("κατζήν χαλκὸν ἔν") and a silver katzion ("κατζὴν αργυρὸν"); Lemeler, Dagron, and Čirković 1982, 74–75. An inventory of the Monastery of Saint John the Theologian on Patmos from September 1200 mentions a silver katzion ("κατζην αργυρον εν"); Astruc 1981, 21.
10 A bronze katzion dated between the eleventh and twelfth century is preserved at the State Museum-Preserve "Khersones Tavriysky" in Sevastopol, Crimea; Frings and Willinghöfer 2010, 304, no. 378. A copper katzon dated to the second half of the twelfth century is preserved at the Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg; Piatnitsky et al. 2000, 115–16, no. B94.
12 Lazarev 1997, 35–36, pl. 7.
16 Djuric 2014, 123–25.
17 A ninth-century Latin interpolation of the Historia ekklesiastike attributed to Germanos I of Constantinople describes the use of incense during the prothesis; Meyendorff 1984, 72–73. See also the recent discussion of the redactions and dating of this commentary in Zheltov 2021.
18 Xynogopoulos 1930; Barmparitsa 2010, 228, 230.
19 See catalogue entries by Anastasia Drandaki in Vassilaki 2000, 362–63, no. 42; Cormack and Vassilaki 2008, 235, 432, no. 207; and Drandaki, Papanikola-Bakirtzi, and Tourta 2013, 155, no. 73.
20 For example, the katzia mentioned in note 10 above. See also the copper katzion with military saints at the Benaki Museum; Drandaki, Papanikola-Bakirtzi, and Tourta 2013, 154, no. 72.
21 Note, however, that the large size of the Virgen Therapiotissa katzion at the Benaki has led Drandaki (in Vassilaki 2000, 362) to conclude that this censer was rarely moved.
23 For example, Clement of Alexandria, Protrepticus 1.8, in Marcovich 1995, 14.
26 Evangelatou 2019, 84–85.
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Although the literature contains several contributions regarding Ciro Ferri’s artistic production and his position as agent and director of the Medici Academy in Rome, several episodes are yet to be reconstructed so that we may better understand this artist’s role in serving the grand ducal court.¹ This article sheds light on the preparation of the parade carriages Ferri designed for the cavalcade of Prince Francesco Maria de’ Medici (1660–1711), brother of Grand Duke Cosimo III, who visited Rome in spring 1687 to receive the cardinal’s hat from Pope Innocent XI.²

Correspondence found at the Archivio di Stato in Florence between the future young cardinal and his artistic contacts in Rome elucidates some of the episodes pertaining to Ferri’s assignment. The letters,
written from autumn 1686 to May 1687, are used here to trace the production of the vehicles by analyzing the dialogue between the patron and Abbot Angelo Doni, a man of great culture who was the artistic agent of the grand ducal family in the eternal city. Another source provides critical information: the booklet titled *Breve ragguaglio della promozione alla porpora* (Brief Account of the Elevation to the Cardinalate), written in 1687 by Giovanni Andrea Lorenzani, a Roman chronicler. Given the lack of illustrated plates accompanying the text, Lorenzani’s exacting descriptions of the event provide invaluable insights about the final appearances of the carriages. Together, the two sources provide a visual impression of the carriages. This article focuses on three drawings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art that contain decorative ideas for carriages intended for the Roman school. They are catalogued among work by anonymous late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Italian artists. The sheets under examination come from a disassembled album, previously owned by a Piedmontese collection, then sold on the antiquarian market, and partly acquired by the Museum in 1952 from the János Scholz collection. All the sheets bear a Gothic “A” stamped in purple ink.

The solemn procession to receive the cardinalate held great relevance. For any designated figure in...
diplomatic, political, and religious terms it was an occasion to flaunt the power of lineage. According to the Roman ceremonial, the future cardinal was expected to prepare two processions: the first for his entrance into the city from the Porta del Popolo and the second for his arrival at the apostolic palace to receive the cardinal’s biretta. The first of the two processions always drew a crowd of onlookers; however, the latter demanded the highest financial outlay as it required a considerable contingent of noblemen and clerics to lead the parade of the cardinal’s carriages that were the true centerpiece of the event. The carriages were divided between the richly decorated ones for the nobility and the plainer ones for the retinue. The outer structure of a noble carriage might feature one or more gilded wood carvings positioned on the front and back, designed to extol the person’s virtues through allegories and the family’s coat of arms. The carriage interior, door panels, upholstered seats, and ceiling would be lined in finely embroidered velvet.

The task of creating an image to match the ambitions of the Medici family was conferred on Ferri, who began working on drawings and models in October 1686. The artist was a major authority on carriage design: in 1686 he gained favorable recognition for the carriages of the ambassador of England, Lord Palmer Castlemaine, and soon after he also received a commission for those of Rinaldo II d’Este (1655–1737). The latter had been appointed cardinal at the same time as Francesco Maria de’ Medici reported that the designs he had seen the day before he arrived in Florence; the former was immensely pleased with the carriage, which appeared in January 1687, featured a large group of almost life-size statues, as can be seen in the print commemorating the occasion (fig. 1). The assemblage of sculptures was a celebration of England’s power over land and sea, which was represented by Cybele and Neptune raising a crown. Behind them, two tritons alluded to the sea, while the lower part contained a unicorn and lion, emblems of the Crown, advancing.

The grand ducal court then received Ferri’s preliminary ideas for the cardinal’s procession: a drawing for the first noble carriage with figures of the Arno and Tiber Rivers and a second drawing of a carriage with simple carvings for the retinue. Doni notes that the subject of the first carriage was executed “secondo il pensiero da me suggerito al Signor Ciro (following the idea I had suggested to Lord Ciro),” thereby proving his skill as an iconographic designer and his firsthand relationship with the artist in creating the carriages. This design matches Ferri’s well-known sheet in the Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe of the Gallerie degli Uffizi, Florence, portraying two imposing male deities wearing laurel crowns and holding oars. They represent the Arno River at right, sitting on a lion, and the Tiber River at left, while the she-wolf suckles Romulus and Remus (fig. 2). The sculptural energy and expressive vibrancy of the sheet are reminiscent of work by Ferri’s master, Pietro da Cortona. The smooth, mellow red pencil strokes are complemented by watercolor brushstrokes that highlight the central group, leaving part of the upright at left and wheels in the background.

Francesco Maria’s comments were not long in coming, and on October 25 he wrote to the secretary that he preferred there be no figures on the carriage because they did not meet his taste, and that the weight of so many figures would make it difficult for the horses to draw the coach. The monumental ceremonial carriages in the Roman style, as already observed for the English ambassador’s first carriage, seemed overly lavish in the eyes of a Florentine accustomed to more unassuming vehicles. His request troubled Abbot Doni, and his subsequent lengthy letter pointed out that the front carriages of all the cardinals presented the figure of an angel or animal in addition to ornamental foliage. He further reported that the designs he had seen prepared for other cardinals and princes were adorned with numerous sculptures. Even greater opulence and larger statues were reserved for those of the ambassadors, drawn by six horses. To preempt his patron’s recurring objection about weight, Doni reassured him
that all sculptures would be medium-sized, carved from lightweight wood and hollowed out inside.¹⁸

Doni then discussed the second parade coach, suggesting that the prince should select a design based on foliage only, to which a lion or other figure evoking the Medici coat of arms could eventually be added.¹⁹

No reply to this suggestion has been found; however, it seems to have been accepted, as Lorenzani’s account states that the third vehicle portrayed the crowning of the Marzocco, the symbol of Florence.²⁰ Notably, a design in The Met shows the rear train of a chariot with a putto crowning a lion that rests its paw on a ball with three fleurs-de-lis (fig. 3). Writing on the verso of the sheet identifies the design as the “Disegno della 3ª Carrozza nobile del servito nero” (Drawing of the 3rd black carriage). The lion and the putto are enclosed by the leafy ornamentation of the uprights; the wheels are barely outlined, and a light brushstroke marks the vehicle’s shadow to provide greater depth to the drawing. The firm strokes used to outline the shapes and the areas in blue-gray ink bear little resemblance to Ferri’s fluid style, but it remains possible that the drawing was executed by someone associated with his workshop. The drawing could be a copy of a compositional
proposal based on Ferri’s model for the carriage, or even a copy from the master’s original to be used to execute the carvings. The artisan appointed to execute the wooden parts may have been Giorgetti, a member of a family of Roman carvers extending back more than two generations. He could be identifiable as the little-known Giovanni Giuseppe, son of Giovanni Maria and brother of Antonio, both of whom had died by the time of this commission. Giorgetti undoubtedly possessed skills ranging from drawing to modeling. However, there is not enough evidence to attribute The Met’s drawing to this still elusive figure.

The technique and draftsmanship of the project in The Met match that of another sheet in the Museum that depicts the rear of a vehicle, the uprights of which are solely embellished with decorative foliage (fig. 4). Comparison with the Marzocco carriage design reveals similar strokes and watercoloring and the same ornamental language with acanthus leaves and large flowers. The resemblances suggest that the sheet can be
identified as a copy from an original by Ferri or one of the artists who worked closely with him. The inscription *Disegno della 2a Carrozza nera* (Drawing of the 2nd black carriage) in the lower margin of the drawing in figure 4 is identical to the inscription on the sheet with the Marzocco carriage, linking the two sheets to the same project. However, the description in Lorenzani’s *Breve ragguglio* explains that the carriage was decorated not only with foliage but also with two cherubs frolicking among the leaves.24 Regrettably, the correspondence does not disclose any other details related to Francesco Maria’s selected iconography, but the sheet in The Met (fig. 3) was likely a preliminary design idea, which was then modified in keeping with the prince’s frequently stated preferences for a subdued and lightweight carriage. Here again, Abbot Doni recommended this compositional solution, as reflected in a letter in which he refers to a drawing that had been sent to Florence and from which inspiration could be taken. The sheet depicted the first noble carriage adorned with three cherubs that was being made for the Neapolitan Cardinal Fortunato Ilario Carafa della Spina, who had also been appointed cardinal by Innocent XI.25 Carriages portraying angels frolicking among acanthus fronds were common in those years, and some idea of their appearance can be gleaned from a study contained in the same album from the János Scholz collection in The Met (fig. 5). The sheet is rendered with a well-defined pen stroke, which was intended to express shapes in a sculpted manner. Unlike the others, the drawing bears no inscription that traces it to its intended recipient.26 Once again, the graphic style and handling of this sheet may be a copy from a design similar to those devised by Ferri in the late 1680s and attributable to a Roman artist.

By the second week of November, the designs for Francesco Maria’s noble carriages had been approved, and Abbot Doni had commenced production.27 He also attempted to restrict visitor access to the workshop, wanting to retain an element of surprise during the procession. Despite these precautions, Camillo Affarosi, an agent of the future Cardinal Rinaldo II d’Este, succeeded in intercepting two drawings of the first and second Medici carriages and dispatched them to Modena. Although we have no information about the origin of these drawings, their existence further proves how lively the circulation of reproductions of the original models must have been at the time.28 Ferri presented the compositional design of the two rivers to Affarosi again a few months later as a proposal for one of the carriages of the Este prince’s procession. Affarosi then wrote to Rinaldo II that he liked the design, especially the lower part, but he doubted that it would be executed, since it closely resembled the Florentine’s first carriage with the rivers. Affarosi, however, insisted that should the carriage be to the prince’s liking, some alterations could be made to give it a distinctive appearance.29

The custom of replicating a successful innovation, changing no more than a few details, was a well-established practice that appears not to have raised any significant concerns about the vehicle’s originality. Thus, it is unsurprising to find similar iconography for a carriage designed by Giovanni Battista Foggini for the wedding coach of Violante Beatrice of Bavaria for her marriage to Ferdinando de’ Medici, nephew of Cardinal Francesco Maria, celebrated in Florence on January 9, 1689. Anton Francesco Marmi’s chronicle of the wedding reports that the chariot was carved by a famous sculptor who designed the front with figures that are slightly less in relief than life-size ones. At the back he portrayed two pairs of figures, the first of which
represented the allegories of Peace and Abundance holding a royal crown, and the second two rivers, the Arno and the Danube. Between the two figures is a lion in the act of drinking. The description is similar to that of a drawing in the Museum der Bildenden Künste in Leipzig, in which a lion about to advance is portrayed in the same pose as that of the third Medici carriage. The only differences are the half-moon attribute on which the animal treads and the two virtues on each side, identifiable as Prudence and Abundance.

The correspondence in Florence and Modena has proven to be a valuable documentary tool containing a wealth of new information regarding the circumstances surrounding the production of the Medici cardinal’s three parade carriages. These extraordinary vehicles resulted from a combination of the patron’s needs, his appointed agents’ ambitions, and the creativity of the artists and their collaborators. The stylistic variety of the sheets in The Met exposes the complex issues involved in analyzing carriage designs, especially the identification of the artists and their individual roles. The study of graphic works alongside documentary sources is an essential starting point for understanding these extraordinary ephemeral vehicles that no longer exist yet fascinated Roman spectators in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
I am grateful to Giulia Fusconi for her generous assistance, and to Daniele Sanguineti and Cristiano Giometti for their continuous support.

ROMINA ORIGLIA
PhD Candidate, DIRAAS: Dipartimento di romanistica, antichistica, arti e spettacolo, Università di Genova

NOTES

1. The topic is explored extensively in my doctoral thesis, which is being completed at the University of Genoa under the supervision of Professor Daniele Sanguineti. On Ciro Ferri as a designer, see Davis 1986 and Prosperi Valenti Rodinò 2015.

2. On this ceremony, see Fusconi 1984 and Fagiolo dell’Arco 1997.

3. Although the name of the agent Angelo Doni is familiar to scholars of art collecting between Florence and Rome in the late seventeenth century, his biography is unknown. Gualandi 1844–56, 3:213–49.

4. The lack of prints in the Ragguaglio limits our knowledge of the event. The entrances of the English envoy and of Cardinal Rinaldo II d’Este, both of which feature a series of engravings of vehicles, are better known. For Castlemaine’s entrance, see Wright 1867 and Fagiolo dell’Arco 1997, 528–31; for Rinaldo II d’Este’s entrance, see Lorenzani 1868; Fusconi 1984, 82–84; Fagiolo dell’Arco 1997, 543–45; and Curci 1999, 234–36.

5. This letter “A” was described by Frits Lugt (Lugt S 47a) “as an unidentified mark on a collection of drawings which, he reported, may have belonged to the Savoia-Aosta family”; Myers 1975, 6, 8 (quote). See also Scholz 1976, ix, and Tordella 1996, 25–26n66.

6. Angelo Doni, letter to Francesco Maria de’ Medici, October 8, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 43: “Stò dietro a disegni, e non mi porta altro di preciso et che mi obbliga ad altra risposta.”

7. For a description of the carriage, see Wright 1687, 45.

8. On Bernini’s invention of carriages, see Petrucci 2017, with previous bibliography.


10. On carriage production in Rome in the second half of the seventeenth century, see Fusconi 1984; Sanguineti 2013, 24–25; and Fusconi 2016, 122–23.

11. Francesco Maria de’ Medici, letter to Angelo Doni, October 12, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 101: “Le soggiun-ugo, che avrei caro, ch’ella mi mandasse il disegno della carrozza nobile fatta far costi dal S.r Amb.re d’Inghilterra.”

12. Angelo Doni, letter to Francesco Maria de’ Medici, October 19, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 46: “I disegni della Carrozza prima d’Inghilterra si mandano questa sera, e martedì prossimo s’invierranno quelli delle carrozze di V.A”; Francesco Maria de’ Medici, letter to Angelo Doni, October 22, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 106: “Ho visto i disegni della carrozza d’Inghilterra à tirar la quale credo che ci voglion ele-fanti, e non cavalli!”

13. The carvings of Lord Castlemaine’s carriages were awarded to Arnold van Westerhout based on graphic models developed by the Roman artist Giovanni Battista Leinardi; see Fagiolo dell’Arco 1997, 528–31.

14. For a description of the carriage, see Wright 1687, 45.

15. Angelo Doni, letter to Francesco Maria de’ Medici, October 22, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 47: “Qui annessi riceverà V.A. Rev.ma due disegni delle Carrozze, uno figurato per la Prima Carrozza di ricamo, il quale rappresenta i due fiumi Arno, e Tevere secondo il pensiero da me suggerito al Sign.r Ciro, e l’altro semplicemente intagliato il quale servirà per le dieci carrozze di seguito.”

16. Francesco Maria de’ Medici, letter to Angelo Doni, October 25, 1686, ASFI, Principato Mediceo, doc. 5818, p. 49: “Sig. Abbate non mi porta altro di preciso et che mi obbliga ad altra risposta che i disegni della prima carrozza qualcheduno si fosse possibile et non fosse giudicato costà baronata non vorrei in nessuno
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Amid the growing scholarship on pigments and colorants in China, orange is a color that has so far received little attention. Perhaps it was not as culturally salient as the five colors that formed an important cosmological system and were understood as “primary colors” in classical texts, namely red (chi, 赤), blue-green (qing, 青), white (bai, 白), black (hei, 黑), and yellow (huang, 黃).¹ Sunzi (孫子; 544–496 BCE), in The Art of War, claimed, “There are no more than five primary colors, yet in combination they produce more hues than can ever be seen.”² The terminology for the color we now associate with orange was in flux during most of China’s history, crystallizing only as chengse (橙色) or juse (橘色), after oranges and mandarins, in the modern period.³ But the material culture produced during the Qing dynasty (1644–1911)
shows several shades of what we would now recognize and call “orange,” which are also named in archival records—for instance, we find textiles dyed in “apricot yellow” (xinghuang, 雄黃), or painting pigments obtained from minerals such as realgar (xionghuang, 雄黃) or red lead (huangdan, 黃丹). Importantly, orange colors are also found in silicate pyrotechnologies such as glass and enamels.

In 1680, the Kangxi emperor (r. 1662–1722) created a system of imperial workshops specializing in a variety of mediums and object types, from tablewares to weapons. Catering to the material needs of the court, the workshops were overseen by skilled technocrats, and production was controlled by the emperor himself (and later by his successors), who reviewed most of the objects and artworks created in the workshops. A close study of these can illuminate the experimental nature of imperial production, as well as the degree to which this production integrated European materials and techniques brought to China by Jesuit missionaries working at the Qing court. In the early decades of the eighteenth century, the number of colors available to glass and enamel workers increased dramatically, largely due to the Kangxi emperor’s insistence on acquiring foreign colorants and expertise, as well as his determination to match—and surpass—these technical achievements at the imperial workshops. The efforts expended to create such a range of colors can be partly explained by Qing emperors’ eagerness to outshine their cultural rivals in this artistic arena, and the colorful objects produced at the imperial workshops evinced the technical advances cultivated within the Qing empire, where raw materials were extracted and transformed into highly sophisticated products.

As part of ongoing research for the Met’s exhibition Embracing Color: Enamel in Chinese Decorative Arts, 1300–1900, enameled porcelain and glass objects from The Metropolitan Museum of Art were selected for scientific analysis. This study focuses on three objects: two opaque orange glass wares—a small bottle from the Yongzheng period (1723–35) and a tripod censer made during the Qianlong reign (1736–95)—as well as a porcelain bowl with overglaze enamelled decoration of yellow and orange peonies, also dating to the Yongzheng period (figs. 1, 2, 5). A historical investigation uses archival records and connoisseurial literature to situate these objects within their contexts of production and reception, while scientific analysis considers not only the chemical composition of the glasses, but also how the colors might have been produced. This two-pronged approach helps illuminate the processes of production at the Qing imperial workshops, where experiments with colorants and new materials were actively encouraged, arguing that new orange colors were the product of these experimental approaches. But before delving into these production processes, this article explores the origins of the now commonly used term “realgar glass” to denote opaque orange glass and proposes an alternative, more historically accurate, appellation.

FROM REALGAR TO PERSIMMON

Although scholarly attention to Chinese glass has been growing in recent years, the type of opaque, orange-toned glass commonly known as “realgar glass” rarely benefits from more than a passing mention, and therefore we know very little about how it was made or how it came to acquire this association with the mineral realgar. This category comprises opaque glass colors ranging from yellow to reddish brown, generally with a marbled or mottled patterning, or in rare cases, pictorial surface effects. In the most substantial study of this type of glass, Shelly Xue examined the earliest pieces of “realgar glass” to have entered European collections. Xue reveals records of a bowl and two hexagonal vases collected by Sir Hans Sloane in the 1720s, now in the British Museum, London, and twelve cups that entered the Royal Danish Collection in 1732. Interestingly, these records do not associate the pieces with realgar. Instead, the bowl is described as “A China bason yellow & red made of flints,” while the cups are considered “made of prepared agate in China.” These descriptions beg the question of whether the term “realgar glass” was used when these pieces were produced, or even when they were collected in the West.

Although a glasshouse was first established in Beijing in 1696 by the Kangxi emperor, workshop archives were only systematically compiled starting in 1723 under his successor, the Yongzheng emperor. These archives are organized by date and workshop, with straightforward descriptions of each commission, as well as production notes chronicling the results. Given the ubiquitous mentions of color or decoration, it is surprising to find not a single mention of realgar in conjunction with glass. While it is possible that the orange-colored glass pieces were simply described as “yellow” or “red,” another term is a possible match: “persimmon glass” (shihuang boli, 柿黃玻 lí), after the bright orange Chinese persimmon ( Diospyros kaki). The earliest record of this term dates to November 25, 1726, as part of an imperial order for bronze spoons to be paired with glass water containers in red, blue, “persimmon,” “clear-sky-after-rain,” and white (clear) colors.
as well as snuff bottles of all colors. A subsequent order for a persimmon glass bowl was filed in September 1733. During the following Qianlong period, production of persimmon glass increased substantially, with commissions recorded throughout the reign, but with a clear concentration in the 1740s. Among these, a series of orders for persimmon glass bottles for holding incense tools (as part of sets also comprising an incense burner and box) appears to correspond to the small orange bottle in the collection of The Met (fig. 1). This type of diminutive work continued to be produced in the imperial glass workshops during the Qianlong period, as is the case for the incense burner, also in the collection (fig. 2).

Early discussions of Chinese glass in the literature of Western connoisseurship similarly contain no references to realgar. The term is absent from Maurice Paléologue’s chapter on Chinese glass in L’art chinois (1887), as well as from Stephen W. Bushell’s seminal Chinese Art (1904–6). In the latter, Bushell provides an illustration of a snuff bottle that would now unequivocally be labeled as “realgar glass,” instead describing it as “variegated in colour to simulate tortoiseshell . . . made of red and yellow mottled opaque glass.” The association of this mottled opaque glass with realgar might have formed during the following two decades, as the catalogue of the International Exhibition of Chinese Art, which took place at the Royal Academy of Arts in London in 1935–36, contains a mention of a “Bowl; glass, imitating realgar” having been exhibited in the Large South Room of the galleries. It is clear from the above discussion that the term “realgar glass” was used neither in China nor in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but rather is the result of an association that likely emerged among early twentieth-century collectors. While these connoisseurial designations may be difficult to fully dispense with, we propose the term “persimmon glass” for discussing pieces that were produced in an imperial context.

Two objects made of opaque persimmon glass, a Yongzheng-period small bottle and a Qianlong-period tripod censer, were analyzed by noninvasive qualitative X-ray fluorescence (XRF) spectroscopy to determine their chemical compositions and investigate the colorants and opacifying agents used in their creation (figs. 1, 2). It should be noted that the adopted methodology does not allow for an unambiguous identification of all the glass constituents, as some chemical elements could not be detected (such as boron, fluorine, sodium, and magnesium), or can be associated
to several colorants, opacifiers, and fluxing agents in the same object (such as arsenic, tin, and lead). Despite these limitations, it was possible to propose glass typologies, colorants, and opacifiers, and to offer clues as to how persimmon glass was produced.

Analysis of the small bottle suggests a composition of lead silicate glass with an arsenic-based opacifier, and with a copper-based colorant. Iron, zinc, and tin X-ray K-lines of low intensity were also detected. Results for the tripod censer have been interpreted as a sodium borosilicate glass with an arsenic-based opacifier and a copper-based colorant. In this case, in addition to traces of iron and tin, the analysis detected traces of lead and antimony, indicating that small amounts of other opaque colorants might also be present, in addition to reducing additives. The different hues of orange present in both objects, from light orange to dark orange, are almost identical in composition, suggesting that the glass used for each object was created from the same batch and that copper was the main coloring agent. Similar results were obtained in recent analyses of Qing-dynasty persimmon glass objects from the Bristol Museum & Art Gallery and the Corning Museum of Glass.

Observation of the cut and polished rim of the tripod censer appears to confirm that the range of warm colors on the objects was indeed not created by mixing distinct colorants, but rather by casing the basic shape with successive layers from the same glass batch (fig. 3). Each cased layer exhibits a color gradation from red at the interior edge to yellow at the outside edge, with a hard distinction between the yellow and red with each new layer. This could likely be explained by the glass being worked in a furnace with a reducing atmosphere. Between each casing, the object was likely exposed to air outside the furnace, resulting in a lighter color, while the interior of each layer remained dark orange. Obtaining the opaque red with a copper colorant requires a strictly controlled and highly reducing system. In oxidized form, copper normally confers a turquoise or green color to glass, depending on the composition of the matrix in which it is mixed. Reduction, through a reducing agent added to the glass, or by a firing atmosphere devoid of oxygen—or both—will reduce the cupric (Cu$^{2+}$) ions either to cuprous ions (Cu$^+$), which could precipitate as crystals of cuprite (Cu$_2$O) imparting yellow to brick red colors depending on their size, or to nanoparticles of metallic copper (Cu$^0$) with high red coloring power, or both. When the hot glass is being worked, even momentary exposure to oxygen might cause the color to change to orange, yellow, or green. Incidentally, small green specks and thin lines are observable on both of the glass objects in this study, supporting the findings that the colors were created through dispersed metallic copper and, possibly, cuprous oxide particles, resulting from different degrees of exposure to air.

Previous analyses of red and orange opaque glasses from the Ancient Near East have also revealed the common presence of lead and tin in the glass, additives that were detected in the two persimmon glass samples.
Additionally, iron, also present in the samples, could have acted as a reducing agent within the glass, together with tin, arsenic, and antimony. Recent attempts to recreate rosichiero glass, a transparent red glass described by seventeenth-century Italian and German glassmakers, have shown that the addition of iron oxide (Fe₂O₃) was essential to the reduction of the copper particles.²² The researchers experimented with several recipes for this ingredient, and they found that the color of the final result was not only affected by the recipe for producing the iron oxide, but also by the order in which the glass components were mixed, as well as by complex firing conditions.²³ In light of these studies, it is possible that iron oxide lead stannate, and other arsenic- and antimony-containing compounds contributed to the orange coloration of the samples, although more investigation is required to fully understand the role of each element in the final result.

The few pieces of persimmon glass that bear pictorial patterns provide important clues as to how the mottled effects characteristic of this type of glass were achieved. For instance, a small vase in the Toledo Museum of Art shows a floral pattern in a mid-orange color against a darker, orange-red background (fig. 4). This reddish area appears divided into two sections, with seams running vertically and horizontally near the foot and neck of the piece, suggesting the use of a mold. It is possible that the lighter lines making up the floral pattern were created in relief within the mold, thus impressing an intaglio depression into the glass object. Exposed to air, these cavities (and the surrounding surface) would have turned into a lighter shade of yellow-orange. The darker areas could have been obtained by polishing down the surface of the object until flush with the depressions, thus exposing the darker orange tones of the interior of the glass and retaining the lighter yellow-orange of the pattern. It is conceivable that this technique was also used to create abstract mottling, possibly by polishing unevenly applied (or molded) glass layers briefly exposed to air. The production of persimmon glass at the Qing court workshops shows the active development of new glassworking techniques, an experimental approach to silicate pyrotechnologies that was also deployed at the enameling workshops.

**ORANGE-ENAMELED PEONIES**

Although present in a handful of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century enameled porcelain,²⁴ orange enamels from this period have not been the subject of scientific analysis to date.²⁵ A small porcelain bowl with painted enamel decoration of two peonies and a pink daisy (fig. 5) provided a unique opportunity to study these colors, and complement the information obtained from the persimmon glass. The two peonies feature orange petals painted in a gradient, with a darker color near the pistil that lightens to yellow near the edges of the petals, which are outlined in brown. Darker ruby-red spots between some
of the lower petals lend depth and three-dimensionality to the overall depiction of the flowers.

The palette of the overglaze enamels was studied by a combination of XRF and Raman spectroscopy, with specific attention to the making of the orange peonies. Analyses indicate that the lead arsenate-opacified yellow enamels are colored with a mixture of lead-tin yellow type II and likely lead-tin-antimony triple oxide yellow colorants in different proportions. Ruby red is obtained from colloidal gold, the dark brown used in the contour lines from coarse hematite pigment particles, the green from a copper-based colorant containing traces of zinc, and the blue from a cobalt-containing colorant. The orange grading hues were obtained by using yellow and ruby-red colorants in layers, in different proportions and producing a characteristic final texture (fig. 6a, b), while the light and dark pink hues were obtained by mixing lead arsenate opacifier together with colloidal-gold ruby red in different proportions. Most of the decorations are realized by combining several pigments. For instance, traces of green and brown are often found in small amounts in yellow and ruby red enamels (fig. 6c); blue is often mixed with green to render the leaves (fig. 6d), stems, and sepals; and green is applied over yellow in the pink flower’s stamen. Similarly, based on XRF analysis, the amount of lead-tin yellow type II varies, and could prevail over the antimony-containing yellow in some decorations.

Tracing the origins of the new colorants that make up what is commonly known as the famille rose palette is a complex and ongoing endeavor. Lending its name to these expanded possibilities in polychrome enameling, the ruby-red enamel was created by the precipitation of colloidal gold, and often opacified with lead arsenate white to create a soft, milky pink color. There is evidence that an enameler from South China introduced the technique for producing ruby-red enamels to the court in 1716, and intensive experiments to create this color were already underway at the imperial workshops before the end of the Kangxi period in 1722. Although ruby-red enamels have been the subject of several scientific studies over the past forty years, their mixing with colored enamels other than opaque white has been largely overlooked. A handful of studies have shown that Chinese enamlers integrated this new ruby red into a cobalt-blue enamel matrix, producing deep purples. And, as noted above, ruby red was often mixed with lead-arsenate to create an opaque pink color. But to the authors’ knowledge, the mixing of colloidal-gold ruby red with yellow colorants, resulting in orange-colored enamels, has not been studied to date.

Yellow enamels created by compounding lead, tin, and antimony also appeared in painted enamels on porcelain in early eighteenth-century China. For instance, lead-tin-antimony triple oxide was detected in the yellow background of an imperial piece dating to the
Kangxi period, while an enameled dish fragment attributable to the Yongzheng imperial workshops contained the triple oxide in a yellow flower, and lead-tin yellow type II in its opaque yellow background. Although it is tempting to attribute these new yellow colorants to the adoption of European enameling materials and techniques, it is worth noting that they were used in cloisonné enamels in China prior to European contact. A study of seventeenth-century cloisonné objects from the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, has revealed the presence of lead-stannate as a yellow colorant. In 2010, lead-tin yellow type II was detected in the yellow sections of a cloisonné pitch-pot vase dating to the turn of the sixteenth century in the Musée des Arts décoratifs, Paris. The same study found lead-tin-antimony triple oxide as well as lead antimoniate in the yellow sections of cloisonné objects dating from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. Given their presence in Ming dynasty cloisonné enamels, these yellow colorants were likely available to enamelers in the subsequent Qing dynasty. During the Yongzheng period, artisans working in both cloisonné and painted enamels operated in the same physical location (the enameling workshop: falang zuo, 法琅作), making it likely that they shared raw materials whenever possible, rather than rely on infrequent shipments from Europe.

The process of layering enamel colors has been documented in two studies of enameled porcelain fragments excavated at the Forbidden City, Beijing. However, these studies only report the layering of colored enamels on top of an opaque arsenic-white enamel base, rather than the successive layering of colors to obtain secondary hues. In the example at hand, it appears that the ruby-red enamel was applied in a light-colored wash over the opaque yellow enamel to create orange gradients and shading. In the Yongzheng period, the ruby-red and yellow enamels were recent additions to the overglaze enameling palette, and finding ways to mix them together was but one of the experimental projects of the Qing court workshops. Although more comparative research is required, it is possible that the method of layering was adapted from European watch enameling of the second half of the seventeenth century, which involved building up color by superimposing enamel layers in a manner akin to oil or tempera painting. Given that European missionaries with enameling and painting abilities worked alongside Chinese artisans at the enameling workshops, it is likely that painting techniques were exchanged and developed collaboratively.

Over the first half of the eighteenth century, new approaches to silicate pyrotechnologies led to unprecedented developments in glass and enamels in China, and focusing on the color orange has provided a productive entry point into these experimental practices. The warm hues of persimmon glass were likely obtained by manipulating reducing conditions to create color variations using a single colorant; meanwhile, superimposing two newly available enamel colors created the bright orange peonies on the porcelain bowl. The reduction and oxidation sequencing needed to achieve persimmon glass, and the formation of colloidal gold needed to produce the ruby-red enamel, are both complex systems. It is perhaps not surprising that producing orange colors was different for glass and enamels, since the working processes and temperatures are quite different for forming a glass object than for decorating porcelain with multiple colors of enamel. The development of two different ways of achieving orange colors—one in glass, the other in enamels—illustrates the degree of experimentation in glass technologies at the Qing court workshops in the eighteenth century. Although colorants frequently transited between the glass factory and the enameling workshop, the archival and scientific evidence presented in this paper shows that Qing-dynasty artisans had a sophisticated understanding of the affordances of each medium. The research and fine-tuning that undoubtedly went into developing these new hues was a direct result of increased attention to glass and enamels in the Kangxi, Yongzheng, and Qianlong periods, contributing to the dramatic expansion of the color palette in Qing imperial art and material culture.
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NOTES

1 An early system found in the Zhouli (周禮; Rites of Zhou) added a sixth color: dark (xuan, 玄), sometimes interpreted as dark red. “Dongguan Kaogong ji,” n.d., section 60.

2 Sunzi 1910, 36.

3 Bogushevskaya 2018.

4 Han 2016, 234, 297; Yu Feian 1988.

5 Siebert, Chen, and Ko 2021, 28.

6 Shih 2013.

7 Bellemare 2023.

8 Xue 2021.

9 Ibid., 99–100.

10 On the establishment of the imperial workshop archives, see Chen 2013.

11 Realgar (xionghuang, 雄黃) is only mentioned as a mineral. In some instances, it was used as a painting pigment, while in others, as a decorative stone for display. QNZ 4:372, 5:381.

12 ONZ 2:94.

13 ONZ 5:781.

14 ONZ 11:62, 85, 733.

15 Bushell 1904–6, 2:67, fig. 78.

16 Royal Academy of Arts 1935, 238.

17 X-ray fluorescence analysis was performed with a Bruker Artax instrument using unfiltered Rh radiation, a 1 mm collimator, and a live-time acquisition of 120 seconds. Two different conditions were used depending on the elements to detect: for the detection of low atomic number elements (Z≤17) the analysis was realized at 20 kV and 800 μA under a flush of helium. For the detection of elements with atomic number >17 the analysis was realized in air at 50 kV and 700 μA. This noninvasive analytical approach was deemed necessary because of the impossibility of collecting samples from intact glass objects.

18 This assumption is based on the scantiness of elements associated to other components, such as potassium, calcium, and lead, and by comparison with published comparable glass. See Xue and Maxwell 2022, 144–45.

19 See, for instance, sample CH7 in Ma et al. 2020, 29–30, and samples 19 and 20 in Xue and Maxwell 2022, 148–49.

20 The thorough characterization of the copper-containing phases would require the combination of analytical techniques such as Raman spectroscopy, UV-visible absorption spectroscopy, micro-X-ray diffraction, and transmission electron microscopy, possibly on a small sample of glass. See, for instance, Brill and Cahill 1988, 17; Freestone and Barber 1992; Colomban 2009; and Sciau, Noé, and Colomban 2016.

21 Brill and Cahill 1988, 19–23. Lead is thought to keep the cuprous copper from becoming oxidized, while tin might have been derived from the use of bronze rather than pure copper in the glass melt. A Roman glass fragment with orange bands also contained copper and lead; see Basso et al. 2014, 244–45 and sample H3.

22 Hagendijk, Vilarigues, and Dupré 2020, 331.

23 Ibid., 337.

24 See, for instance, a covered box with “hundred boys” motif dating to 1650–70 from the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (inv. EA1978.1067).

25 Dana Norris (2021, 229–31) has analyzed orange-colored enamels on objects dating from the nineteenth to twenty-first century, finding that most of them were created by iron oxide, sometimes mixed with yellow colorants such as antimony or tin.

26 X-ray fluorescence analysis was performed with a Bruker Artax instrument using unfiltered Rh radiation at 50 kV, 700 μA, a 0.6 mm collimator, and a live-time acquisition of 120 seconds. Raman spectra were acquired with a Bruker Senterra Raman microscope using a 785 nm laser line with integration times of 15 seconds and three co-additions. The Raman measurements were obtained using a ×50 objective. Powers at the sample were set between 1 and 10 mW using neutral density filters.

27 Lead-tin yellow type II was identified by Raman spectroscopy (Raman bands at 139 cm⁻¹ and 326 cm⁻¹), while the presence of lead-tin-antimony triple oxides is suggested from the detection of antimony by XRF analysis of the yellow decorations. Although Raman spectroscopy did not find any trace of lead antimonate, it is not possible to exclude its presence in the yellow enamels based on the available data.

28 Identified by the presence of characteristic X-ray La-lines of gold of small intensity.

29 Hematite was positively identified by the Raman bands at 227, 245, 293, 411, 494, 610 cm⁻¹, and by the dominant Ka-lines of iron in the XRF spectra.

30 The cobalt-containing colorant is characterized by the presence of potassium; nickel; traces of copper, zinc, and manganese; and by the absence of detectable bismuth, suggesting a possible Western provenance of the raw materials. See Colomban, Kirmizi, and Simsek Franci 2021.

31 The relative proportions of these two colorants were derived from the ratios of the intensities of tin and antimony Ka-lines in yellow decorations.

32 For a summary of recently published scientific analyses of pink, blue, yellow, and white enamels, see Bellemare 2022.

33 Ibid., 150; Yu Pei-chin 2020.


35 Kimgery and Vandiver 1985, 378–79. Dana Norris, Dennis Braekmans, Kelly Domoney, and Andrew Shortland (Norris et al. 2020, 508) found that purple enamels on metal and porcelain plates were produced either by manganese and iron or by mixing cobalt and gold, but these could not be detected with the methods used.

36 Gold-based orange enamels were detected on later eighteenth- and nineteenth-century nonimperial porcelain, but the authors do not indicate whether the ruby red was mixed with yellow colorants. Colomban et al. 2020a, 930.

37 Miao, Yang, and Mu 2010, 149–50.

38 Henderson, Tregear, and Wood 1989, 142–44.


40 Ibid.

41 Li et al. 2018; Duan et al. 2019.

42 It is possible that this method was adopted from enameling on copper alloys, where applying an opaque white base coat over the metal was necessary for the colors to pop.

43 This technique differed from most European glass and metal enameling, and was later replaced by a “pointillistic” method of mixing colors and creating gradients. Colomban et al. 2020b, 10–11.
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The Metropolitan Museum of Art possesses an etching of a street market scene in Ghent, signed by American architect William Welles Bosworth (fig. 1). Depicted in the print are stalls brimming with produce, vendors arranging their wares, casual passersby, and sketchier figures engaged in conversation, all against a backdrop of charming, though deteriorating, storefronts and stepped gable houses. Trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts (hereafter Ecole), Bosworth is better known for his major architectural commissions in the United States, such as the AT&T Building in New York (1913) and the campus of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge (1913–16; hereafter MIT), as well as for several notable projects carried out in the United States and abroad for his friend and patron John D. Rockefeller Jr.
Less studied, however, are Bosworth’s early works and artistic interests from the late 1880s and early 1890s, before his admission to the Ecole, when the young architect and gifted draftsman embraced a style distinct from the refined classicism of his mature work. This article will situate the etching in The Met within the earlier phase of Bosworth’s career, during which his affinity for medieval aesthetics and picturesque decay was prominent.

Born in Marietta, Ohio, William Welles Bosworth moved to Boston in 1885 to study architecture at MIT, then located in the city’s Back Bay neighborhood. In an essay written in 1951, the eighty-two-year-old Bosworth recalled his student years there. He recounted how his profound admiration of Henry Hobson Richardson’s newly completed Trinity Church and his resistance to the classicism taught by his professor Eugène Létang resulted in another professor, Theodore Minot Clark, recommending him for a position in Richardson’s Brookline, Massachusetts, office. His work for Richardson and, after the latter’s death in April 1886, for the firm of Shepley, Rutan, and Coolidge, started with the tracing of working drawings and progressed to making studies for large-scale projects. For instance, Bosworth produced full-size charcoal drawings of Romanesque and Byzantine column capitals to serve as guides for the carvers of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce Building. So much of what the youthful Bosworth observed in the offices of Richardson and his successors, from the plans for the Albany Cathedral to photographs of the abbey of Saint-Leu-d’Esserent in northern France, seems to have instilled in him a pronounced appreciation of Richardson’s Romanesque revivalism and of medieval architecture in general.

Upon his graduation from MIT, Bosworth was able to see in person the centuries-old European architecture that he had studied and admired as a student. William Rotch Ware, editor-in-chief of *American Architect and Building News* (*AABN*), the first professional architectural journal in the United States, established a drawing office for the publication in 1886. Ware hired Bosworth in 1888 and shortly afterward took the recent graduate to Europe. Bosworth described the trip as an “extended tour of architectural and artistic research, through England, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Italy, and France.”

It was during this journey with Ware that Bosworth captured the subject of the etching in The Met. This can be determined not only by the date on the plate but also by the row of buildings Bosworth so meticulously documented. He included the year, alongside his name, in two places: In the lower right corner “W. W. Bosworth • 90”—with the letter s and number nine both backward—is easily discernible. The second, less apparent signature and date can be found in minute script on a small sign that hangs over the door of a stepped gable...
house in the left center of the etching. The sign reads “W. W. Bosworth • Etcher Ghent 90,” with the number nine also backward. Perhaps Bosworth, likely new to the craft of etching, fumbled with the process of scratching numbers and letters in reverse on the plate. This resulted in the inverted characters being transferred to subsequent prints.8

Any minor errors that Bosworth may have made are overshadowed by the impressive specificity of the buildings he depicted. The details of each structure are so precise that the exact location in Ghent can be identified: the vegetable market at Sint-Veerleplein, a square bordered on its north side by the medieval Castle of the Counts, also known as the Gravensteen. The central features of Bosworth’s composition—a trio of stepped gable houses and the taller buildings that flank them—correspond with late nineteenth-century photographs of the area (fig. 2). These structures, which over the years included several houses, workshops, and cafés, were built against the outer walls of the old castle. A cotton mill had also been erected within the castle walls in the early 1800s (the mill’s smokestacks are visible in figure 2). The Gravensteen was so obscured by these buildings, both inside and out, that by the second half of the nineteenth century only the castle’s arched entryway and crenellated towers were visible. Long considered an aesthetic scourge, the structures that clung to the castle were demolished by 1894. By the time of Bosworth’s next documented trip to Belgium, in 1900, after he had completed his course of study at the Ecole, the buildings around the Gravensteen were gone—further evidence that he captured the subject of the etching on his previous European tour with Ware.9

The buildings that Bosworth so faithfully depicted were razed as part of an ongoing campaign of city planning and renovation in Ghent, similar, in some respects, to the modernization program of Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann in Paris. The previous decade had seen the implementation of the Zollikofer-De Vigne Plan, in which wide boulevards were cut through Ghent between 1880 and 1888 to connect the railroad station with the city center.10 Throughout the 1890s the tearing down of slums and other ramshackle buildings continued; however, in Ghent, these demolitions were accompanied by efforts to reveal, restore, and celebrate the city’s medieval monuments. As Steven Jacobs and

---

**fig. 2** Sint-Veerleplein, Rekelingstraat, and the Gravensteen. Photograph, before 1894. Ghent City Archive
Bruno Notteboom note in their study on the role of photography in Ghent’s urban transformation, the renewed interest in, and preservation of, historic buildings amid the effort to modernize signaled a “return to regionalism and picturesque sensibility.” In other words, Ghent’s modernization program did not aim to reorder the city to the point of erasing its regional character and history, but rather sought to provide residents and visitors with a well-ordered urban space and unobstructed vistas of medieval architectural treasures such as Saint Bavo’s Cathedral, Saint Nicholas’s Church, and, of course, the Gravensteen. A photograph of the castle taken about 1895 illustrates a final outcome of the campaign: the vegetable market at Sint-Veerleplein became an open and airy square complete with a view of the newly revealed castle, a cherished relic of Ghent’s medieval past (fig. 3).

Nineteenth-century guidebooks and architectural publications that predate these changes to Ghent’s urban fabric had long lamented the earlier condition of the Gravensteen. Thomas Roscoe’s 1841 Belgium: In a Picturesque Tour, for example, said of the castle, “It is to be regretted that the grand entrance should now be almost hidden from view by the erection of some wretched workshops and walls.” The mid-nineteenth-century Handbook for Travellers on the Continent likewise pointed out the shabbiness of the structures built around the Gravensteen, noting, “The small portion that remains of the building, consisting of an old archway and turret, is now incorporated in a cotton factory. The area within is occupied by houses of the meanest kind.” When American Architect and Building News covered the ongoing restoration of the castle in 1892, the journal celebrated the Belgian government’s effort “to deliver the building from the parasitical constructions that overlaid it.”

Throughout the nineteenth century, those “wretched workshops” and “parasitical constructions” were nevertheless an appealing subject to several photographers and printmakers. While visiting Ghent in 1847, Scottish photographers John Muir Wood and George Moir made early calotypes of the Gravensteen and the humble buildings that surrounded it. Sir Ernest George rendered a similar view of the area for the collection Etchings in Belgium, first published in 1878. Even in an 1894 publication that celebrated the restoration of the Gravensteen, the Belgian artist and writer Armand Heins included a rather pretty illustration of the medieval castle’s “maisons parasites” (parasitical houses).

Bosworth, however, in 1890, was arguably more fascinated by these dilapidated structures than other illustrators and photographers. Whereas his predecessors captured the one visible portion of the castle—the imposing towers at its entrance—Bosworth chose to exclude any trace of the Gravensteen from his etching. He shifted his focus away from the medieval landmark and instead reveled in what, for many, were unfortunate eyesores clinging to a once-majestic building. The demolition and large-scale restructuring that had already taken place in Ghent throughout the 1880s likely contributed to this decision; Bosworth may have sensed these structures would soon be gone. As a result, the etching presents a fading, Romantic view of the haphazard nature in which medieval cities like Ghent developed and the way in which quaint, local types functioned amid picturesque deterioration. In the foreground of the composition, produce is piled onto stalls as a market woman stacks baskets of various sizes. Behind her is a derelict property with its right entry and ground-floor windows boarded up. Despite the condition of the building, two figures converse in one of its darkened doorways. In front of the three adjacent, soot-stained houses, a man carrying wooden slats for a market stand crosses paths with a pair of monks. Strolling through Sint-Veerleplein, the two robed figures move toward a dingy row of houses and workshops, the chimneys of which emit hazy plumes of smoke.

A similar preference for targeting the battered peripheries of medieval monuments can be observed in two other works on paper that Bosworth produced during his European tour with Ware. In an 1889 pen
drawing made in northern France while visiting the Château de Josselin, Bosworth depicted not the medieval castle itself, but rather a side street leading to it (fig. 4). Reproduced in an article for the publication Pencil Points, the drawing’s subject was described as an “‘insignificant,’ but picturesque street of ‘tumble-down buildings’ possessing architectural qualities more rare and fascinating than the great chateau for which, almost alone, the town is noted.”19 Likewise, in his 1890 sketch of the Bethlehem Portal in Huy, Belgium (fig. 5), Bosworth omitted the soaring apse of the adjacent Collegiate Church of Notre-Dame, a feature often included in earlier representations of the subject made by printmakers such as Ernest George and Axel Herman Haig.20 Bosworth instead concentrated on the fourteenth-century Gothic entryway and its immediate, rather run-down surroundings. Consequently, his sketch provides a glimpse of the Bethlehem Portal before several modern alterations, including the addition of a Neo-Gothic canopy.21 The Virgin and Child on the trumeau at center as well as the two sculptures of bishops that flank them on the jamb—all later removed—are still in their original locations in Bosworth’s drawing. On the other hand, much of the relief sculpture from the tympanum, apart from two magi figures at upper right, is absent from the depiction. Underneath the mostly bare portal, a man with a cane rests against the jamb, his head turned toward a pile of rubble on the ground. Bosworth may have captured the portal in the midst of a late nineteenth-century restoration effort, but the sketch itself seems more like a Romantic rendering of a medieval ruin destined for further decay.

However marginal these subjects may seem, Bosworth’s early works on paper reflect common practice among students of architecture. Traveling abroad to make sketches of various buildings and monuments was, as he wrote in 1901, “research.”22 In Bosworth’s case, many of the drawings he made between 1888 and 1890 also served the specific purpose of illustrating the pages of American Architect and Building News.23 Though AABN editors like Ware favored American Colonial and Federal buildings as well as the classical principles advocated by the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, he, like the French institution, believed architects should be knowledgeable about all historical styles. This approach to architectural education on the part of AABN’s editors—who, as Mary N. Woods writes, “stood for academic training and professional practices, not the revival of any one style”—applied to the diversity of illustrations that appeared in the journal.24 In a 1917 obituary for Ware, Bosworth described what was required of the draftsmen employed in AABN’s drawing office, noting the different modes in which they were asked to work. They could be “called upon to make rendered perspectives in pen and ink or color,” or to depict “the picturesque architecture then in vogue requiring that form of presentation.”25 Above all, Bosworth recalled, “Ware loved a good drawing, especially one well calculated for reproduction.”26 All of this considered, Ware no doubt encouraged Bosworth to depict a variety of subjects during their travels, including medieval architecture, buildings in disrepair, and quaint street scenes.

After touring Europe with Ware, Bosworth returned to the United States, where he exhibited designs and took on commissions that were noticeably shaped by his admiration for Richardson and the picturesque mode in which he often worked for AABN. At the
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1891 exhibition for the Boston Society of Architects, he exhibited his sketch of the Bethlehem Portal alongside a neo-medieval design for a Magdalen Asylum, a reformatory for “wayward” women that was to be built in New York.27 He exhibited the same two renderings again in January of 1893, this time at the New York Architectural League’s exhibition; later that year, construction was completed on the Magdalen Asylum (fig. 6).28 This building, which once stood at West 139th Street and the Hudson River, had an ornate exterior with turrets; Neo-Gothic traceries; elaborate dormer windows; a Romanesque-style arch at its entrance; and a projecting nave and apse, part of the institution’s chapel. The Magdalen Asylum was Bosworth’s only large-scale architectural commission realized in this early style—a highly decorative, eclectic neo-medievalism inspired by his recent travels in Europe and his work for Richardson and Shepley, Rutan, and Coolidge.29

Even before the completion of the Magdalen Asylum, however, Bosworth must have felt the demise of the Richardsonian aesthetic and, consequently, the need for a stylistic shift. By 1891 the Romanesque Revival associated with Richardson—a style that had been embraced across the country—began to decline in popularity, most notably with the rejection that year of Neo-Romanesque designs for the upcoming 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago.30 Bosworth’s practice reflected these changing tastes. In 1892, he teamed up with Jarvis Hunt, nephew of architect Richard Morris Hunt, on the classically inspired Vermont State Building for the Columbian Exposition.31 By early 1893, the need for further training also became abundantly clear to him. After viewing his hybrid Romanesque-Gothic design for the Magdalen Asylum at the Architectural League’s exhibition that year, a critic from the New-York Tribune described Bosworth’s work as “bric-a-brac” and a “pastiche of sketch-book ideas.”32 Fellow architects Thomas Hastings and John Galen Howard must have thought Bosworth’s architectural concepts in need of further refinement, too. In a 1958 autobiographical essay composed in the third person, Bosworth recounted that, upon showing his sketches at the exhibition, “he was so urged by Hastings and Howard to go to Paris to study in the Ecole des Beaux [Arts] before getting too old to be admitted, that he closed his office and followed their advice.”33

After designing several other works, some built, others not, Bosworth departed for Europe in 1896, training first in London with Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, a painter of subjects rooted in classical antiquity.34 In 1897, he began his course of study at the Ecole, where he remained for the next three years. Bosworth returned to New York thoroughly prepared to work in a refined, classical mode, which he first brought to the firm of Carrère and Hastings. He would later work for high-profile clients such as AT&T president Theodore Newton Vail, National City Bank of New York president Frank A. Vanderlip, and John D. Rockefeller Jr., who, as Mark Jarzombek notes, found Bosworth’s “neoclassical aesthetic” appealing as it “spoke of control, restraint, and timeless validity.”35

In his 1958 autobiographical essay, Bosworth claimed that, after having witnessed the construction of the Boston Public Library Building in the early 1890s,
he “liked that style of architecture so much that he decided to stick to the ‘Greek’s [sic] concept of beauty’ for life,” but that is not entirely accurate.36 Given his training—first at MIT, then with Ware at AABN, and, most importantly, at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts—he was a true professional conversant in all historical styles; therefore his knowledge of, and appreciation for, medieval art and architecture, while undeniably pronounced in the early 1890s, never disappeared over the course of his career. Under the auspices of John D. Rockefeller Jr., Bosworth took up residence in France and, beginning in 1924, oversaw the restoration of Reims Cathedral (in addition to restorations for the Châteaux of Versailles and Fontainebleau).37 In 1933 he designed, in the Romanesque style, the American Student Center for the American Cathedral in Paris.38 Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Bosworth also played an instrumental role in the realization of The Met Cloisters, facilitating negotiations between Rockefeller and the sculptor George Grey Barnard, who procured much of the medieval collection for the enterprise.39

Because of his involvement with the Cloisters, Bosworth probably made the acquaintance of Edward Robinson, director of The Met from 1910 to 1931, and his wife, Elizabeth, sometime in the 1920s, if not before. The Robinsons and Bosworth shared many friends, including Rockefeller and the sculptor Paul Manship.40 Throughout the 1920s, Bosworth also donated several works of art to The Met, including an ancient Greek alabastron, or perfume vase, which would have been of great interest to Edward Robinson, a specialist in classical antiquities.41 It was from the Robinsons’ personal collection that Bosworth’s etching of Sint-Veerleplein in Ghent came to The Met, having been donated, along with several other works of art in 1952, upon the passing of Elizabeth Robinson. It is likely that Bosworth—described by Rockefeller as “a man of unfailing courtesy”—gave the etching to the couple as a gift.42

For its former owners, we can presume the etching would have been a picturesque record of a Ghent that no longer existed, as well as a charming, yet unassuming, addition to their notable collection of works on paper.43 The present examination of the etching, however, sheds light on the early period of an exemplary American architect’s long and prestigious career. Bosworth wrote of his excitement during the late 1880s as “those days of youth, when everything in life seemed like looking through a magnifying glass.”44 This enthusiasm for the inspection of a given subject, no matter how marginal or seemingly insignificant, is evident in his etching of Ghent. As a young draftsman, guided by Ware, Bosworth turned a sensitive eye to a dilapidated periphery, uninterested at that moment in the state of major monuments or in the classical aesthetics that would later come to define his life’s work.

**Andrea M. Ortuno, PhD**

**Associate Professor, Department of Art & Music, Bronx Community College, City University of New York**
NOTES

1 For Bosworth’s major commissions in the United States and abroad, see Bosworth 1922; Q. Jacobs 1988; Abt 1996; Jarzombek 2004; and Pasquier 2017a and 2017b.
2 Prescott 1954, 94; Q. Jacobs 1988, 1–2. Bosworth was admitted into MIT’s intensive two-year program, which he began in September 1885.
3 Bosworth 1951, 116. Bosworth wrote that Létang, a Beaux-Arts trained architect, was “outspokenly disgusted” by some of his early renderings.
4 Ibid., 124. Bosworth worked for Richardson for only two weeks in early 1886. He wrote that the architect died “a few weeks later,” after which Bosworth was employed by Richardson’s successors, Shepley, Rutan, and Coolidge.
7 Bosworth 1901, 1.
8 From whom Bosworth learned the art of etching is unclear. One possibility is American etcher Joseph Pennell, who Bosworth wrote was “his old friend and master.” See Bosworth 1951, 125.
9 Bosworth 1901, 3.
10 S. Jacobs and Notteboom 2018, 207.
11 Ibid., 203.
12 Ibid., 210.
13 Roscoe 1841, 107.
14 Handbook for Travellers on the Continent 1856, 132.
16 S. Jacobs and Notteboom 2018, 205.
17 George 1878, pl. 8.
18 Heins 1894, 30, 100. Another picturesque illustration of the Gravensteen before 1894 can be found in Heins 1907, 22. For a much earlier depiction of the buildings constructed against the castle, many of which appear in Bosworth’s etching, see Sanderus 1735, 1:168, first published in 1641.
19 Pencil Points 1925, 59. This drawing first appeared in 1889 in AABN 26, no. 730 (December 1889): 824. The AABN drawing office supervisor, David A. Gregg, was also present on this trip. Gregg’s rendering of the Château de Josselin appears in the same issue.
21 See, for example, the alterations made to the portal by the 1960s in Forsyth 1968, 46, fig. 7.
22 Bosworth 1901, 1.
23 Throughout 1889 many of Bosworth’s drawings from this tour appeared in the journal. Some seem to have been formally assigned illustrations to accompany an ongoing series on equestrian monuments. See, for example, AABN 26, no. 708 (July 1889): 23, 26. Others appeared as small insets, including sketches of medieval subjects such as the tower of the Collegiate Church, Le Folgoët, Brittany, AABN 26, no. 709 (July 1889): x, the portal of the Burgos Cathedral, Spain, AABN 26, no. 719 (September 1889): 151; and less notable buildings in disrepair, including an old mill in Florence, Italy, AABN 26, no. 708 (July 1889): 28; and a fifteenth-century shop in Thiers, France, AABN 26, no. 714 (August 1889): 101.
24 Woods 1990, 84.
26 Ibid., 273–74.
27 Boston Society of Architects 1891, 27, 33. Notorious for their often-inhumane treatment, Magdalen Asylums sought to reform women and girls deemed delinquent by courts and/or family members. Rehabilitation efforts at these institutions, which, in New York, could be Catholic, Episcopal, or nondenominational, consisted of strict religious instruction and hard labor in laundry facilities.
29 Ortuño 2022.
30 Jeffery Ochsner and Dennis Andersen (2003, 293–94) link the end of the Romanesque Revival with the depression caused by the Panic of 1893, which halted construction across the country. They write that when building projects resumed in the late 1890s, the Romanesque Revival was an “outmoded form” in most major cities. Quentin Jacobs (1988, 12) believes the economic downturn played a role in Bosworth’s decision to leave the United States and continue his education in Europe.
33 Bosworth 1958, 3. Q. Jacobs (1988, 8) believes that Bosworth meant his exhibited sketches impressed Howard and Hastings to the extent that they encouraged him to attend the Ecole, but Bosworth’s 1958 essay does not support that assumption. In it he makes no mention of what the two architects thought of his work.
34 For Bosworth’s works during this period, both realized and unrealized, see Q. Jacobs 1988, 160–68. On his time with Alma-Tadema, see ibid., 13–16, and Jarzombek 2004, 59.
35 Jarzombek 2004, 60, 71.
36 Bosworth 1958, 3.
37 Rockefeller, concerned over the state of these monuments, established a fund to restore them. See Q. Jacobs 1988, 169–70, and Jarzombek 2004, 140.
38 Jarzombek 2004, 140. The American Student Center once stood at 261, Boulevard Raspail.
39 Husband 2013, 5–6, 15–16.
40 Bosworth worked with Manship on the AT&T Building and refers to his friendship with the sculptor. See Bosworth 1951, 126. Manship, who produced a pair of portrait medals of Edward and Elizabeth Robinson (MMA 55.19.1–2), was present at the 1931 funeral of Edward Robinson, as was John D. Rockefeller Jr. See New York Times 1931.
42 See John D. Rockefeller Jr.’s recommendation for Bosworth to receive the AT&T commission in Husband 2013, 5. It seems Bosworth presented at least two other versions of the etching to acquaintances. He gave one to artist Eugenia S. Paul (correspondence with Paul’s daughter, Gerry Shattler, May 20, 2021). Another version of the print, formerly for sale online in 2021 (current location unknown), contains the following handwritten inscription under the plate mark: “My first etching. The Marketplace in Ghent in 1890. Now destroyed. To my dear friend Maria—”.
43 The works on paper that formed part of this gift from the estate of Mrs. Edward Robinson included drawings by Jerome Myers, watercolors by Maurice Brazil Prendergast and Roger Fry, and etchings by Max Klinger. See MMAB 1953, 15, 18.
44 Bosworth 1951, 115.
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