The Memorable Judgment of Sancho Panza: A Gobelins Tapestry in the Metropolitan Museum
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New tapestry designs were badly needed when the Gobelins manufactory reopened in 1699 after five years of inactivity; the splendid compositions of Le Brun must have begun to seem old-fashioned and rather heavy-handed. Certainly the first new series ordered by Jules Hardouin Mansart, who had just been made Surintendant des Bâtiments, the Portières des Dieux, is very different. Each piece shows a deity sitting gracefully on a cloud under an airy canopy, but most of the surface of the tapestry is open, providing a field for children, animals, birds, and masses of flowers. Thirty-six of these tapestries were made before 1703, as the royal palaces had an insatiable appetite for portières; they were also eminently suitable for presents. The designs were woven throughout the eighteenth century; well over two hundred individual pieces are recorded.

The designers had, in fact, hit upon a most successful formula for tapestries: clearly delineated central figures, dominating the composition, but small in comparison with the total area, amid a wealth of delightful accessories. It is basically the same scheme that the makers of millefleurs tapestries had used two hundred years earlier.

But the designs of the Portières des Dieux could not well be enlarged to make wall hangings and only some years later was the same general idea used for wide tapestries. What was to be the most frequently repeated Gobelins series of the eighteenth century was begun about 1714 with a set of ten very narrow pieces (1.30 m. wide) and five not much larger (2.30 m.) showing scenes from Don Quixote; the book was at that time extremely popular in France. Instead of a central figure, like the gods of the Portières, each tapestry has a small picture in the middle of an elaborate setting, the alentour. Charles Coyet received 200 livres for the design of each picture, but the alentour was worth 1100 to Jean Baptiste Blin de Fontenay. At the top of each tapestry is a medallion with the named bust of a paladin, one of the Don’s heroes, such as Amadis, Roland, and “Palmerin Dolive”; one is called, curiously, Ronnieaux. The Coyel picture is in an elaborate, flower-bedecked frame and below it are piles of armor and banners, with an inscription giving the subject of the central scene. The yellow background is made up of shaded squares called a mosaique simple. The fifteen

2. Maurice Fenaille, État général des Tapisseries de la Manufacture des Gobelins, 1re Partie, Période du dix-huitième Siècle (Paris, 1964), pp. 157-282, gives an account of all the Don Quixote sets. For the value of the livres, see p. 266, where the pay earned by a weaver in a week in 1749 is given as from seven to fifteen livres.
scenes of the first set take Don Quixote from his leaving home to his recovery from madness, but do not include a Memorable Judgment of Sancho.3

The series evidently pleased the then Surintendent des Bâtiments, the Duc d’Antin, as he ordered a set for himself in 1721 or 1722. He wanted all new paintings from Coypel and he wanted wide wall hangings, so a new alentour was designed, under Coypel’s direction; it was the work, principally, of Claude Audran, who had some part in the first alentour, many elements of which were preserved. Some of the motifs, probably flowers, were by Fontenay the Younger, and the animals were probably added by François Desportes. Coypel himself designed the two nude children lying on top of the frame of the central scene, replacing the medallions of the paladins; these, now nameless, were moved down to hang on either side. The piles of armor and flags at the bottom were greatly enlarged; some books, presumably the knightly romances that drove Don Quixote mad, and a dog were added on one side and some of the sheep that he mistook for an army on the other. A peacock appears at the top and a monkey clings to the flower garland on either side. The yellow background was given a more elaborate pattern, called a mosaique d’ornements. This alentour was expressly made “pour être alongé ou retrécy suivant la largeur,” according to the description by Garnier d’Isle, director of the Gobelins, in 1749.4

The Memorable Judgment is included in this, the second set. Coypel’s painting was made in 1727. His price had gone up; he asked 2000 livres and got 1200. The preliminary drawing is in the National Museum, Stockholm5 (Figure 1); the modèle, or cartoon, is in the Château de Compiègne, unfortunately in too damaged a condition to be reproduced, but its composition is faithfully reflected, reversed, in a print by F. Joullain (Figure 2). The tapestries, when woven on haute-lisse looms (Figures 3, 4), are in the same direction as the cartoon. In tapestries of this type, it is important that

5. Exposition Don Quixote, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Pau, 1955, no. 19, pl. vni.
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FIGURE 4
the compositions in the center be sufficiently forceful so as not to be swamped by the richness of the alentour. Comparing the drawing and the print, one sees how Coyppel strengthened his design, breaking up the rather stolid masses of the figures, giving depth by putting distant landscapes on both sides and, most importantly, emphasizing Sancho by flanking him with massive columns, topped by a gigantic piece of drapery. The artist making a picture to be reproduced in tapestry in the eighteenth century knew what to aim for. Jean Baptiste Le Prince, when he showed three paintings at the Salon of 1776, wrote that they were intended to be executed in tapestry at the Beauvais manufactory; he had consequently been obliged

tant pour les effets que pour la touche, de se prêter au genre & à la possibilité de l'exécution de ces sortes d'Ouvrages, qui, faits uniquement pour amuser les yeux dans les Appartemens, semblent exiger partout de la clarté & des richesses de détail.  

All Coyppel’s paintings for this series show his tendency, often commented upon, to arrange his characters as if they were on the stage; he was, in fact, an indefatigable, though usually unsuccessful, playwright.  

Voltaire wrote of him, unkindly,

On dit que notre ami Coyppel  
Imite Horace et Raphaël;  
A les surpasser il s’efforce  
Et nous n’avons point aujourd’hui  
De rimeur peignant de sa force,  
Ni peintre rimant comme lui.  

The most dramatic moment in the incident was chosen. The moneylender has just, at Sancho’s command, broken the stick that has been handed to him by the borrower; the coins, which one swore he had returned and the other swore he had never received, are scattered on the ground, to the amazement of everyone, except the borrower—and Sancho. A book of prints mostly after Coyppel was published in 1746 by Pierre de Hondt, who wrote in his introduction that the artist had gone to immense trouble to represent the “moeurs, coutumes, habillements et autres usages d’Espagne”; in the Memorable Judgment, indeed, the costume known in France as “à l’espagnole” is conspicuous, though it is more reminiscent of an earlier century than it is of Spain.

The Duc d’Antin soon decided he did not wish to pay for the set he had ordered for himself, and that it should be made for the king. Weaving continued in a leisurely way until 1735. Coyppel provided a painting a year from 1719 until 1727, three more in 1731, 1732, and 1734, and a final one, the twenty-eighth, in 1751; he died the following year. The third weaving, made about 1733, was a small one, and the fourth, of 1746 to 1749, contained twelve pieces; it was sold as a whole to the Duke of Parma in 1749 and is in the Palazzo Reale, Turin. But from this time until almost the end of the century the Don Quixote tapestries were continuously on the Gobelins looms and there was no question of producing sets of a reasonable number of tapestries for a single use. There were thirty pieces in the fifth weaving, twenty-three in the sixth, fourteen in the seventh and no less than sixty-seven in the eighth. These “sets,” which can be distinguished by their backgrounds or the type of loom they were woven on, often repeat subjects and include narrow trumeaux and portières; sometimes there are alentours without central pictures, or pictures without alentours. It is clear that the weavers were producing a stock of popular tapestries from which suitable selections could be made by the king at any time for any purpose. As Garnier d’Isle wrote in 1752:

Cette tenture a la commodité de pouvoir estre séparée en autant et si peu de pièces que l’on veut, et d’autant plus convenable à faire des présents du Roy aux Princes ou aux Ambassadeurs.

One such use is well documented. A certain M. Michel (of whom more later) gave a message from the

Marquis de Marigny, then the Directeur des Bâtiments, to Jacques Germain Soufflot, in charge of the Gobelins manufactory, some time before August 24, 1758, the date when Soufflot wrote to Marigny:

J’ai eu l’honneur de vous dire que j’avais donné ordre de délivrer ce qui était prêt de la tenture dont est chargé M. Michel pour la Russie, en conséquence de ce que j’en avais dit à votre part à la Muette, afin que cette partie pût arriver à temps au vaisseau qu’il fait partir; il m’a paru que vous approuviez ce que j’avais fait; cette délivrance consiste dans deux pièces de Don Quichotte que l’on a réunies pour faire la grande dont il avait besoin, trois Portières des Dieux, un écran, un sopha, et huit fauteuils à fleurs et ornements.

Marigny answered on September 2 that Soufflot would receive “incessament” the written order to deliver “la tenture de tapisserie dont M. Michel est chargé pour la Russie.” The agenda for the travail du roi on September 17 included the item: “Au comte de Woronzow, vice-chancelier de Russie, une tenture de tapisserie des Gobelins, 12 fauteuils et 2 canapés.” The set consisted of the Cowardice of Sancho, Don Quixote and Sancho on the Wooden Horse, the Judgment of Sancho and Don Quixote Given Drink through a Reed. It was the first two subjects that, as Soufflot wrote, had been joined to make a single piece; they are named in the bill submitted by the “tapisier rentrayeur,” Vavoque, in 1759.12

Nothing more is heard of the gift until March 20, 1759, when Soufflot wrote to Marigny:

On a fini la tenture de Don Quichotte que vous aviez ordonnée pour M. le Comte de Woronzow, ainsi que les fauteuils, canapés et écrans. J’ai appris ces jours derniers de M. Bouffé, banquier, que M. Michel avait chargé de faire partir ce qui nous reste, que ce qui avait été livré l’année dernière était dans un vaisseau qui avait échoué du côté de Hambourg; il ignore encore, Monsieur, si la pièce principale et les fauteuils et sopha qui étaient de cet envoi seront perdus; il espère même qu’ayant été encaissées avec soin elles n’auront peut-être pas été gâtées, si elles n’ont pas resté longtemps dans l’eau. Je lui demandai s’il avait des ordres pour le départ de ce qui nous reste; il n’en a point, il espère que M. Michel viendra bientôt; ainsi, Monsieur, à moins qu’avant son arrivée il ne lui vienne quelque lettre pour cela, je ne vous demanderai pas vos ordres pour la délivrance, et on les mettra en magasin dans la manufacture.

M. Michel apparently did not arrive and on July 22 Marigny ordered the tapestries to be handed over to Bouffé and Dangirard; they gave a receipt for a Memorable Judgment, Don Quixote Given Drink through a Reed, and “6 pièces de trumeaux pour servir à la dite tenture... plus un canapé, un écran et 4 fauteuils complets” on July 28. Soufflot forwarded it to Marigny on August 22, writing:

Monsieur, j’ai l’honneur de vous envoyer la récépissé de MM. Bouffé et Dangirard des tapisseries et meubles de la manufacture royale des Gobelins qu’on leur a livrés suivant vos ordres pour envoyer à Son Excellence M. le Comte de Woronzow. Les deux premières pièces ont été réunies en une, suivant les mesures que M. Michel en avait données. ... Les deux autres pièces ont aussi été rentrayées pour les ajuster aux places pour lesquelles elles étaient un peu trop grandes; c’est au moyen de ces opérations que l’on est parvenu à livrer, suivant la demande, cette tenture qui aurait exigé bien du temps pour la faire exprès, comme on a fait les six trumeaux.

The total cost of the four hangings, six trumeaux (especially designed by a painter called Boizot, and all finished by March 10, 1759), two sofas, two screens, and twelve armchairs was 31,810 livres, as recorded in the Livre de Présents du Roi. The payment was an interdepartmental one, made by the Affaires Etrangères to the Bâtiments du Roi for a third less than the actual cost of the material.13

Why did Louis XV give this expensive present to “Son Excellence M. le Comte de Woronzow,” or Count Michael Illarionovich Vorontsov, as he is usually called in English? The Seven Years’ War was raging in 1758 and it was important to tilt Russia to the French side. On February 9, 1758, the French Foreign Minister

12. The curious appearance of two pieces joined together is illustrated by an example of a later set in the Mobilier National (Seznec, “Don Quixote,” p. 176, fig. 4). The repetition of the alentour is not attractive. But the Vorontsov order may have suggested that two pictures or more could be placed on a single tapestry with an alentour designed for the purpose, a scheme that was brilliantly carried out in the Tentures de François Boucher; Maurice Jacques’s first sketch for one of these, with three pictures, was made in 1758 (Fenaille, Etat général, Deuxième Partie (1907) pl. facing p. 228). The Metropolitan Museum has an example with two pictures in the Croome Court tapestry set.

wrote to the ambassador in St. Petersburg, telling him to offer money and a set of Gobelins tapestries to the Grand Chancellor, Bestuzhev, but by February 21 Vorontsov, his assistant, had become Grand Chancellor.\textsuperscript{14} Fifty thousand rubles, or 250,000 livres, called a loan, and the Gobelins tapestries went to him instead.\textsuperscript{15} Catherine the Great, then merely the hated wife of the heir to the throne, speaks of Vorontsov in her memoirs as a lover of France; for him, she says cattily, “Louis XV, by way of a bribe had furnished a house in Petersburg with old furniture, which had first belonged to his mistress, the Marquise de Pompadour, who, when she began to tire of it, sold it to her royal lover at a profit.”\textsuperscript{16} There is no evidence to support this unlikely tale. Vorontsov’s palace, by Rastrelli, was, says his niece, Princess Dashkova, “furnished in the best and latest European style and could truly be called princely.”\textsuperscript{17}

Soufflot’s letter of August 22, 1759, already quoted, shows that “M. Michel” had given the dimensions needed for all three tapestries, one to be made very wide and the other two slightly narrower than usual. One might hazard a guess that the room where these tapestries were to hang had no fireplace on the long side facing the windows, being heated by stoves, so that a single very wide piece was needed to cover this wall. “M. Michel” has been identified with a Gobelins weaver of this name,\textsuperscript{18} but this is impossible; for one thing, the weaver, in accordance with his lowly status, was always called “sieur,” not “Monsieur,” which indicated a gentleman. The “M. Michel” of this transaction is certainly the same man who appears in a number of contemporary accounts, the son of a French craftsman brought to Russia by Peter the Great.\textsuperscript{19} In 1752, the French minister at Hamburg wrote about him to the Affaires Etrangères in Paris, describing him as a “marchand de galanterie”:

since he was raised in the palace he has been favored there and the nobles buy from him in preference to others. His successes have encouraged him and made him extremely energetic. He has already made seven or eight trips to France in great secrecy to buy merchandise and make purchases for the members of the court.

As a result of this letter, presumably, Michel became a go-between for the pro-French party in Russia, especially Vorontsov, and the French government.\textsuperscript{20}

The interior of the Vorontsov palace in St. Petersburg was destroyed by fire at the end of the eighteenth century, and the palace became the headquarters of the Knights of Malta during the reign of the Emperor Paul (1796–1801).\textsuperscript{21} Nothing has been heard of the large Don Quixote tapestry or the furniture, if indeed they survived the shipwreck near Hamburg, mentioned by Soufflot.

Several designs for sofa covers give an idea of what the upholstery probably looked like. The earliest, for a seat, is in the Metropolitan Museum (Figure 5); it is inscribed in a contemporary hand “Meuble pour Madame la Régente, 1721. La maîtresse de Don Quichote.” The name “Ant. Cypel” was certainly added by someone who knew that a Cypel had designed the Don Quixote tapestries, but not which. The ground of this drawing is a plain pale blue, so it is less likely to represent the design of the Vorontsov sofas than are four drawings for two sofas in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (Figures 6, 7), which have the yellow mosaique d’ornements ground of all the tapestries from the second through the sixth sets. A tapestry sofa back formerly on the New York art market (Figure 8) reproduces one of the designs in Paris; a companion piece for the seat (Figure 9) does not seem to be in its original form. Perhaps it has been put together from two chairs. All the designs are clearly related to

\textsuperscript{14} L. Jay Oliva, Misalliance, a Study of French Policy in Russia during the Seven Years War (New York, 1964) pp. 86–89.

\textsuperscript{15} K. Waliszewski, La Dernière des Romanovs, Elizabeth Ier, Impératrice de Russie, 1741–1762 (Paris, 1902) p. 470. He also received volumes of engravings, sumptuously bound, and a valuable cabinet of medals (Tamara Talbot Rice, Elizabeth Empress of Russia [New York, 1970] p. 154). Oliva, Misalliance, p. 89, names 250,000 livres as the bribe.

\textsuperscript{16} Dominique Maroger, ed., The Memoirs of Catherine the Great, trans. Mouna Budberg (New York, 1961) p. 253. Catherine is also quoted as saying of Vorontsov: “Hypocrisie comme personne, en voilà un qui était à qui voulait le payer; pas un cour à laquelle il n’émargéait” (Grand Duke Nicolas Mikhailowitch, Portrait russes des XVIIIe et XIXe Siècles, II (St. Petersburg, 1906) no. 205).


\textsuperscript{18} Mondain-Monval, Correspondance, p. 92, note 1.

\textsuperscript{19} Waliszewski, Dernière des Romanovs, p. 395. The father is described as an “ouvrier drapier de Rouen,” but Peter the Great also employed a Jean Michel, a joiner from France; he made the table at Peterhof that could be raised and lowered (Christopher Marsden, Palmyra of the North [London, 1942] pp. 61, 69).

\textsuperscript{20} Oliva, Misalliance, pp. 7, 35, 126, 131; Rice, Elizabeth, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{21} Rice, Elizabeth, p. 215. It is listed in modern guidebooks to Leningrad, but without indication of its present use.
the Don Quixote alentour. The Don Quixote given
Drink through a Reed of the Vorontsov set is not known
to exist, but the Memorable Judgment of this set can be
identified as the tapestry in the Metropolitan Museum
(Figure 4).

This tapestry was given by Mrs. Nanaline H. Duke
and her daughter Doris Duke in 1952. Nothing was
known of its history, except that it had been acquired
by Benjamin Duke, probably about 1912. The ground
is the yellow mosaïque d'ornements that was used for
the second through the sixth weavings only. The Mem-
orable Judgment of the second set, all twelve pieces of
which were given to the Spanish ambassador in 1745,
is in the Italian National Collection in Rome. The
third set had a different, much simpler, alentour. The
fourth was sold to the Duke of Parma in 1749; the
Judgment is in the Palazzo Reale, Turin (Figure 3).
The fifth set had a different alentour and the Judgment
from it is in the Mobilier National, Paris. Thus the
example in the Metropolitan Museum must be the one
from the sixth weaving, begun in April, 1752, and fin-
ished on December 24, 1754, in the haute-lisse work-
shop of Michel Audran, which is known to have been
the piece given to Count Vorontsov.

When the tapestry came off the loom it was 3 3/4 aunes
high and 4 3/4 aunes wide. These are almost the same
dimensions as those given for the piece now in Turin
when it was completed. The alentour was originally the
same on both, except that Coypel's two children on top
of the frame were omitted in the sixth set. The other

22. Fenaille, *Etat général, Première Partie*, p. 281, lists all
the weavings. Some others of the twenty-three pieces of the sixth set
are known to exist. Of six sold to a Treasury official, Jean Paris de
Marmontel, in 1763, Don Quixote Attacking the Puppets belonged
to Wildenstein & Co. in 1923 (Phyllis Ackerman, "Tapestries
of five centuries, VII: The weavers of the Louis periods," *International
Studio* 77 [1923] p. 61, illus.); the Theft of Sancho's Ass was in the
Katharine Deere Butterworth sale, Parke-Bernet Galleries, New
York, October 21–23, 1954, no. 505, illus.; the Ball at Barcelona
was in the MM.X ... sale, 19 Avenue d'Iéna, Paris, December 16,
1933, no. L, illus.; and Don Quixote Mistaking a Barber's Basin
for the Helmet of Mambrino was in the Ean F. Cecil sale, Sotheby's,
London, May 14, 1943, no. 134, illus. The four pieces sold to Mme
Véron in 1765 were in the collections of the Marquis of Hertford,
Richard Wallace, the Baron de Gunzburg, Clarence Mackay
(1926), and Mrs. Robert Z. Hawkins (Robert Cecil, "The Hert-
ford-Wallace collection of tapestries," *Burlington Magazine* 100
Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, is one of eight pieces given in
exchange for furniture to the *marchand tapissier* Charles Henry
Poussin in 1773.

**FIGURE 5**
Design for sofa seat with head of Dulcinea. Oil and colored wash on paper. The Metropolitan Museum of
Art, gift of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Wrightsman, 1970.522.1
FIGURES 6, 7
Designs for sofa backs and seats. Watercolors on paper. Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (photo: courtesy Musée des Arts Décoratifs)
FIGURES 8, 9
Gobelins manufactory, Paris, eighteenth century, sofa back and seat. Tapestry. Present location unknown
differences between the two tapestries today are explained in Vavoque's bill of April 5, 1759, already mentioned:

Rentraiture faite à la piece du Jugement de Sancho pour former une pièce de 14 pieds 8 pouces de cours; il a fallu rapprocher les bordures, guirlandes, drapeaux et animaux et remettre des morceaux de mosaïque à la place des médaillons que l'on a levé pour ladite rentraiture 20 a (aunes) 6 s. (seizièmes) à 6 l (livres) . . . . . . 122 l. 5

Ouvrage à l'aiguille pour accorder et achever la mosaïque, feuillage, branches et autres accessoires, 42 journées à 3 l. . . . . . . 126 l

The new width of 14 pieds 8 pouces exactly corresponds to the 15 feet 9 inches of the Metropolitan Museum tapestry. When this piece is compared with the Turin example (Figure 3), Vavoque's changes are apparent, the most conspicuous being the removal of the medallions with helmeted heads. On close study, small inconsistencies can be found. The two swags of flowers on either side at the top have somewhat awkward curves and the two birds standing on the right-hand swag are exactly alike, a solecism no Gobelins designer would perpetrate. In the lower right corner, above the helmet that is so crudely cut in two, is a meaningless piece of the sheep that dives behind the flags in the Turin tapestry. An even closer look, especially at the back, shows where the cuts were made, down the inner lines of the borders, with two more irregularly on each side to take out the medallions; the spray of leaves held by the monkey on the left originally fell from the top of the medallion. But Vavoque did his work well; it takes a forewarned eye to notice that anything was once different in this remaining portion of a very beautiful bripe.

On "le 1er vendémiare l'an 3ème de la République française une et indivisible," nine members of the jury appointed by the Comité de Salut public were at the Gobelins manufactory. The jury was composed of three painters, an architect (Percier), a sculptor, three hommes de lettres (one also an actor) and the directors of the Gobelins and Savonnerie manufactories. Their duty was to look at all the cartoons and decide which were sufficiently republican to be continued in use. They saw twenty-one of Coypel's Don Quixote paintings, apparently not including the Memorable Judgment, unless it was no. 17, "Donquichotte, sujet inconnu au jury," and approved them: "tous présentent un sujet qui, tournant la chevalerie en ridicule, les rend dignes d'être conservés." But they were nevertheless rejected, "comme peu avantageux à être exécutés en tapisserie parce qu'ils sont trop noirs." 23