

# G.R. Scott, Germantown

Autor(en): **Hayward, John**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Mitteilungsblatt / Keramik-Freunde der Schweiz = Revue des Amis Suisses de la Céramique = Rivista degli Amici Svizzeri della Ceramica**

Band (Jahr): - **(1959)**

Heft 47

PDF erstellt am: **17.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-395010>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## G. R. Scott, Germantown

Entgegnungen auf den Aufsatz von G. Ryland Scott  
im Mblt. Nr. 45 p. 17

von John Hayward, Victoria and Albertmuseum, London,  
und Ralph H. Wark, Hendersonville N. C. USA

1. John Hayward, Victoria and Albertmuseum, London

Dear Sir,

In your *Mitteilungsblatt* Nr. 45 you publish an article by Mr. Ryland Scott entitled «Herold at Du Paquire (sic) and Herold at Meissen 1720—1723». As the author refers to my own book on Du Paquier porcelain «for confirmation of many statements asserted» in the course of his article, I feel that I should point out that in some respects I do not agree with him. I do not propose to deal with the author's attributions to J. G. Herold of various pieces of Meissen in his own evidently very fine collection, though I am bound to say that I find it difficult to understand how either the late Dr. E. W. Braun or the authorities of the Copenhagen National Museum could have considered a gilt mark on a piece to constitute the signature of a painter rather than of a gilder.

Mr. Ryland Scott endeavours to identify pieces decorated by J. G. Herold, not only during his early years at Meissen, but also during his year at the Vienna factory of Du Paquier. In the case of Meissen we have Herold's own claim, made eleven years after the event, that he found no other painters employed at the factory when he arrived there in 1720. In the case of Vienna we know that both Hunger and Herold were capable of decorating porcelain, but, in view of the lack of success of the factory at the time and its small output, it is improbable that other decorators were employed. If, therefore, one can prove that an individual piece of Du Paquier porcelain was made before April 1720, the chances are that it would have been decorated by either Hunger or Herold, and probably the latter. Mr. Scott finds amongst the resources of his own collection no fewer than eight pieces which he considers to have been painted by Herold during his year at Vienna. My knowledge of these pieces is confined to the photographs of them published in the *Mitteilungsblatt* and I am therefore compelled to base my judgement on their shape

and ornament alone. I should nevertheless say that only four of them, figs. 3, 6, 8 and 9, appear to be the productions of the Du Paquier factory at all. Of these fig. 8 seems to have the greatest claim to have been produced during the time that Herold was working in Vienna — on account of the similarity of its decoration to the dated cup in the Berlin Kunstgewerbemuseum. To attribute it to Herold would be highly speculative, as there is no reason to think that this design was not used after Herold left the factory.

Fig. 6 appears to belong to a group of Du Paquier pieces decorated with Chinoiseries, of which I illustrated several examples in my book — amongst them figs. 8c, 12b, 12c, 17b and 17c. The number of pieces in this group seems so large that they can hardly all have been painted by Herold in his brief period at the factory, and in any case they are too diverse in style to have been produced in such a short time.

Fig. 9 is indeed an early piece, but I see no reason to place it as early as 1719—20; it could easily have been produced at any time during the first ten years or so of the factory.

Of fig. 3 I can only say that if it is, in fact, a piece of Du Paquier porcelain, and if it was, in fact, painted in the factory and not by a Hausmaler, I can still see no reason to associate it with J. G. Herold. Putto subjects were certainly popular as a form of decoration at Vienna, but the numerous articles decorated in this way do not date from the earliest years of the factory.

Figs. 4, 7 and possibly 2 belong to a group which has in the past been attributed to the Vienna decorator, J. P. Dannhoefer, working as a Hausmaler at Bayreuth. There are, however, certain difficulties about this identification. Firstly, the attribution to Bayreuth is based only on the similarity of the gilt borders to those employed later at the Metzsch

workshop. Somewhat similar borders were, however, also used by the Augsburger Hausmaler. Moreover, though there is a certain similarity between the borders, the palette used on these Chinoiseries is paler than the rather vivid colours achieved by Metzsch. A number of pieces decorated with chinoiseries in the Metzsch workshop are illustrated by Pazaurek, and it will be seen that the figures lack the curiously long bodies that are characteristic of the group to which figs. 4 and 7 belong. The attribution to Dannhoefer is based on circumstantial evidence — namely that he came from Vienna, where chinoiseries formed a popular type of decoration; assuming therefore, that pieces with chinoiseries such as figs. 4 and 7 were painted at Bayreuth, they must have been painted by Dannhoefer. The latter did not arrive at Bayreuth until 1737, yet the chinoiseries attributed to him look rather earlier, and I believe them to be so. In my experience this group is invariably painted on Meissen porcelain, often of the Boettger period but not necessarily so. The three examples claimed by Mr. Ryland Scott as Du Paquier seem to be no exception. The cup, fig. 7, is, for instance, of characteristically Meissen shape. The foregoing is far from constructive, but I believe that the most that can be said of this group is that they are the work of an outside decorator of Meissen porcelain working in the late 20's and early 30's perhaps at Bayreuth. Mr. Ryland Scott's attribution to the Vienna factory and to the year 1719/20 can be easily disposed of inasmuch as a saucer decorated with chinoiseries belonging to this group in the Victoria and Albert Museum bears the Meissen crossed swords mark and could not therefore be earlier than about 1724.

Finally, fig. 5 is also of Meissen and not Vienna shape. Whether it was painted in the factory or by a Hausmaler, I am unable to judge from the photograph.

In his article Mr. Ryland Scott says that the porcelain of the pieces numbered 2 to 9 is Du Paquier. I have shown that there is good reason to doubt this claim in respect of at least four of them. When examining the paste of European porcelain other than Meissen dating from before about 1725 it is necessary to remember that production was still very much in an experimental stage, and that for one reason or other a consistent mixture was not used. As a rule Du Paquier paste is grey in colour but I have seen pieces with a brownish tone that recalled Boettger's porcelain. Far more remarkable variations are to be seen in that made at the Vezzi factory in Venice. So much of the early Du Paquier porcelain is of primitive character that one cannot accept that feature on its own as constituting proof of a date before April 1720, when Herold left Vienna for Meissen. The only convincing proof would be a date and up to now only one dated piece from this period, that in the Berlin Kunstgewerbemuseum, is known.

## 2. *Ralph H. Wark, Hendersonville N.C. USA*

In his article on the above subject Mr. Scott has tried to identify certain types of painting on early Du Paquier porcelain as the work of Höroldt. He has quite successfully drawn comparisons between accepted Meissen painting by Höroldt of the years 1720—1724 with similar styled painting on early Du Paquier porcelain, however, I do not fully agree with all of his attributions, specially since I have had the privilege of inspecting all of the items in question.

I certainly agree with the supposition that during the one year when Höroldt was employed by Hunger at Vienna, Höroldt must have produced quite a large amount of decorated pieces. Certainly, not all of these pieces have been lost and there must exist quite a lot of them somewhere, even today. Up to the present no one has been willing or has had the courage to attribute painting on early Du Paquier porcelain as being by Höroldt, most of these pieces have been given to Hausmaler operating in Bayreuth around 1735.

With the numerous articles on the painting of Höroldt during his early Meissen period of 1720—1724 published in our July 1957 issue, it has become apparent, that Höroldt in his first years of painting at Meissen had a style and a palette of his own, something not found later, or copied by other Meissen artists. His Chinese figures lean towards the type associated with the later Bayreuth Hausmaler. His figures are slender and tall and the attributes he uses, tables, furniture, a certain rock formation and pagoda buildings are similar to paintings on Vienna porcelain, either executed at the factory, or outside work. This type of attributes we do not find on later Meissen painting, after 1725, when a more or less standardized Chinoiserie decoration is introduced, painted by a number of very able artists. Even Höroldt, when he is still personally painting after 1725 does not use them anymore. Since this early Höroldt style does appear on Meissen as well as on Du Paquier porcelain it is justifiable to try to attribute some of it on Vienna porcelain to Höroldt.

It is not correct to assume that some of the Du Paquier porcelains illustrated in Mr. Scott's article or similar one's, are specimens Höroldt and Stoeltzel brought back with them from Vienna in 1720 to submit to the Meissen Factory Commission, because the still preserved report lists the items actually submitted. Mr. Hayward has reprinted this part of the report in his article in the July 1957 issue which specifies the pieces as being:

- 3 flat saucers in blue
- 1 tea-bowl also in blue
- 2 chocolate beakers in blue
- 4 saucers in red enamel color
- 1 tea-bowl, likewise
- 3 chocolate beakers, likewise.

It thus becomes apparent that only pieces decorated in blue or red were produced. That Höroldt and Stoeltzel

brought back a larger amount of polychrome decorated porcelains does not seem likely, for then they would have submitted such colored porcelains.

It remains significant, however, that the report does mention that Höroldt was capable of painting in blue, red and other colors and in a manner whereby the painting after firing maintained its sharp outline and the colors melt into the glaze completely.

Of the Du Paquier pieces Mr. Scott illustrates, the most convincing piece to me is the Cup and Saucer fig. 5. This cup was inspected by the late Professor Braun at Nürnberg who pronounced it to be without a doubt the work of Höroldt at Vienna in 1719. The painting shows all the characteristics of Höroldt's Meissen painting of 1720—1724. On the cup the figure shown, leans against a cubbord which is decorated with panels of miniature Chinoiserie, found later on most Höroldt type Chinoiserie at the Meissen factory up to 1730. The figures, the types of hats and least but not last the palette is identical to Meissen work by Höroldt.

A pair of Cups and Saucers of which one is shown as fig. 6 come very close to the painting of the cup fig. 5, and although in color somewhat more intense, the palette is still the same quality, the drawing the same style. These two cups I would attribute also to Höroldt, Du Paquier 1719. All three of these pieces are most convincing.

Another Du Paquier piece, possibly the work of Höroldt, is the Sugar-Box fig. 2. It shows mainly very delicately executed floral motives with just two very small Chinese figures in the center of the bowl's long side. The flowers are identical in treatment to those of the cup, fig. 5. As to the Sugar-Box fig. 3, this I do not hold to be the work of Höroldt. It also is quite doubtful if the porcelain is Du Paquier. It could be Venice and a decoration by Hunger, who brought this shape with him from Vienna.

The little leaf-shape Dish, fig. 4 shows similarity to the plate Mr. Hayward illustrated as fig. 1 in his article in the July 1957 issue. However, the gold border ornament of Mr. Scott's piece indicates a later period than 1719, a style introduced with the approaching Rococo. This bird pattern was used extensively over a longer period copied from the oriental. The decoration dates after Höroldt's Vienna time.

The Cup and Saucer fig. 7, although a likeness to some extent to the tall figure on the Tankard fig. 13, is a later painting, possibly about 1730—1735. Again we have the late gold border ornament, something not found in 1719 painting. Then, in my opinion the porcelain is not Vienna Du Paquier but Meissen. My reason for so thinking is, that the shape is not a Vienna molding but rather a Meissen piece. The saucer is smaller in diameter with a smaller ring-foot. This foot is not as deep and straight walled like the Vienna modelings.

The cups of fig. 8 and 9 are beakers with a shape not made at Vienna during the year of 1719, but have the later, more

flaring form. Mr. Hayward has pointed out this fact already in his July 1957 article. The painting therefor, would not fit into the Höroldt time at Vienna.

As to some of the other specimens shown by Mr. Scott, it would appear to me that the Chocolate-Pot, fig. 15 is not a painting by Höroldt. It is true that the palette is similar to Meissen painting, including the Boettger luster, however, luster of this kind was also successfully produced at Vienna at a later date. Also we have on the spout a gold scroll border which indicates a date after 1725. The markings of this piece do not fit into any known Meissen marking. The large shape, with the type of its lid, is unknown as Meissen porcelain. If such a molding had been made there, other pieces would be recorded. The Rococo molding at the base of the porcelain holder for a wooden handle likewise indicates a period much later than 1720—1721.

This piece, specially with its incised markings indicates much more a Vienna porcelain, which also has many «moons» and is green by transmitted light, then a Meissen piece. The impressed cross-like mark surmounted by a triangle, is not that of Johann Donner used in 1712 on Boettger red stoneware, nor do we find this mark as a symbol used on porcelain around 1730 (list shown in our April 1958 issue).

With regard to the Tankard fig. 20, this I do not believe to be painted by Höroldt. All his paintings of Chinoiserie, his etchings and his sketchbook drawings indicate faces with flesh fill-in. This type of face painting only by iron-red lines is associated with Ehrenfried Stadler who came to the factory in 1723 at the age of 21 years and who was not an apprentice then. He very well could have painted this Tankard thus in 1725. In 1725 the underglaze-blue of Koehler was still in use. The type of Chinoiserie painting on this Tankard corresponds to the similar painting on a Dinner plate shown in Zimmermann, «Meissner Porzellan» page 72. Both pieces, however, differ from the usual Stadler painting and actually the artist of this style has not been determined up to now. Falling into this group is also the large Tankard in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, a gift from Mr. Thornton-Wilson. This large Tankard at the Metropolitan was erroneously attributed to Loewenfinck by the Antique Porcelain Company Ltd. when they advertized it in the «Connoisseur» before Mr. Wilson purchased it. It also has the underglaze-blue borders at top and bottom, highlighted with gold. The Chinese figures correspond to those of the Scott Tankard.

All in all it can be said, however, that a good start has been made in trying to locate some of Höroldt's early Vienna painting of 1719. The three or four pieces shown by Mr. Scott, fig. 2, 5 and 6 of the latter where there is a pair, give us a good yardstick to judge in future other early painting on Du Paquier porcelain, which must have been painted by Johann Gregor Höroldt. I do hope that Mr. Scott's article will bring forth other comments which will help in this direction.