

Herold at DuPaquire and Herold at Meissen 1720 - 1723

Autor(en): **Ryland Scott, G.**

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 45

PDF erstellt am: **22.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-394994>

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.

Herold at DuPaquire and Herold at Meissen 1720—1723

By G. Ryland Scott

(Fig. 1—20)

It is with great trepidation that I present this article on Johann Gregor Herold so soon after the fine articles that appeared in the July 1957 issue of this magazine.

The writer was trained in the law and therefore fully realizes the danger in drawing conclusions based on assumptions. However where complete proff is not available then it is permissible to draw conclusions from facts. Should the conclusions drawn here subsequently be shown erroneous it will not be the first that it has occurred in the porcelain field. After all it is the uncertainty regarding it that adds romance to collecting.

The DuPaquire factory did not adopt a factory mark nor did Herold, so far as we know sign any pieces that he painted there. Meissen on the other hand did have factory marks. The AR and Caduceus marks were used only in special cases. MPM and MPF were used for a few months in 1723 and KPM during the years 1723—24 only. Such marks are found only on Tea Pots and octagonal Sugar Boxes. The cross swords mark was adopted in 1724 and from 1725 on was required on all articles made at the factory. At Meissen decorators were not permitted except in rare cases to sign their work. A notable exception is the fine vase used as the front piece in the July 1957 issue of this magazine, which is dated and signed by Herold.

My Fig. 1 may be another such exception. The decoration is typical of Herold's personal work. Among other things we see a Chinese woman with hair like a wig, utensils with smoke rising and the spritely little dog. (See opinions expressed in the July 1957 issue.) At the footrim will be found this mark in gold. The National Museum in Copenhagen has a finely decorated cup and saucer having this identical mark. The display card says it is the personal signature of Johann Gregor Herold. The specimen shown here was expertized by the late Dr. E. Braun who considered it the signature of Herold.

For confirmation of many statements asserted here as facts see the excellent book on DuPaquire by our member J. F. Hayward. Also his article and the other fine ones appearing in the July 1957 issue of this magazine.

Porcelain of an unsatisfactory quality was made as early as 1718 at Vienna. It became necessary however, in order to improve the quality to secure the services of an Arcanist from the Meissen Factory. Samuel Stölzel was probably the best qualified man at Meissen and he arrived early in 1719. He remained about a year returning to Meissen in April 1720. During this period he made porcelain out of native clays and better porcelain with the «Schnorr» clay that was imported. Cups and saucers including the beaker type were certainly made during this period and very probably other small easily potted shapes. It must be remembered that at this time Meissen was making many fine potted shapes and had been doing so for some years. *I can see no reason why after Stölzel's arrival that any great difficulty should have arisen in potting any shape shown here.*

Hunger says that he employed and paid Herold to paint for a period of a year. Herold at the time was about twenty three years of age and is believed to have had previous decorating experience. As Herold left with Stölzel and went to Meissen in April 1720 he must have been employed by Hunger in April 1719, or thereabouts. Thus he was available as a painter for a year during the same period that Stölzel was employed to make porcelain.

Hayward makes the sound observation that Hunger as a decorator himself would not have employed another painter unless porcelain was available upon which to paint. It is well established that workmen at that period worked exceedingly long hours. (See Herold's report on this point in this issue.) From the above facts we can now draw our first conclusion. *Quite a large amount of porcelain was*

made by Stolzel and decorated by Herold during the year immediately preceding the date these men reached Meissen in April 1720.

The record is well established that the Meissen Factory received Herold with open arms. Certainly the direction of polychrome enamel decoration was turned over to him forthwith if not all types of decorating. By 1723 Herold had made such fine progress that he was appointed Hofmaler and for many years thereafter without interruption he had full charge, as Director of the Meissen Factory.

The question naturally arises as to what caused this enthusiasm and immediate acceptance of Herold. Why was the traitor Stolzel forgiven and reinstated forthwith? You have read the letters and deposition of Hunger. He stated that Herold and Stolzel had stolen all of his colours and that the art of polychrome painting was not known at this time at Meissen. (Cold painting was probably used.) This would of course furnish a part of the answer, but certainly not all of it. The report of the Commission to the King concerning Herold's ability to use other colours than blue and to have them remain smooth after firing and to artistically draw figures is more revealing. Even this does not fully answer the question.

My second conclusion is: *Herold and Stolzel not only took the colours and the blue and white pieces referred to in the report but also many fine pieces of porcelain painted in polychrome colours by Herold at DuPaquire with them.* It was this primarily that caused the enthusiasm and resulted in the unheard of action of turning over immediately this important work to a stranger and the complete forgiveness of the traitor Stolzel. These men had taken in my judgement specimens similar to those shown here as Figs. 2 to 9 inclusive. If this be true then and then only can we fully explain the matter. If none of these pieces were include certainly similar ones were used. In a short time Hunger also left DuPaquire for Venice and in 1723 the DuPaquire Factory was for sale. I am of the opinion that some of the specimens now generally dated 1720—25 were actually made and decorated while Herold was at the factory.

Hayward is certainly correct in saying he cannot with *certainty* point out specimens painted by Herold at DuPaquire. The Meissen examples which I show here are the type generally said by collectors to be by the hand of Herold. Yet until the revealing report of Herold himself, appearing in this issue was any *positive* proof available regarding them either.

I present Figs. 2 to 9 as specimens made at DuPaquire and painted by Herold. The shapes are such as could have easily have been made at the time and were those popular at Meissen at the time. The saucers are all badly warped. The gold and the enamel paint have in most cases a ten-

dency to peel off. The porcelain is DuPaquire and not Meissen. The pieces are all unmarked.

Fig. 2 is an octagonal sugar box. This shape is known in Bottger Red Stoneware and in white porcelain. Meissen continued to make them under the supervision of Stolzel after the arrival of Herold. This shape and tea pots were the only ones marked KPM in 1723—24. The form of this specimen is similar to the Meissen ones but not exactly the same. It has no mark. The decoration includes two tall but exceedingly small chinamen. This points to the tendency of Herold even before he came to Meissen to paint his chinoiserie tall. A similar small tall chinaman is shown on the Meissen octagonal sugar box Fig. 14 marked KPF. Fig. 2 has also as a part of its decor lacy shrubs apparently by the same hand as those found on Figs. 4 and 7.

Fig. 3 is another sugar box whose form is similar yet it is not identical with the others referred to as Fig. 2 and 14. It has no mark. The decoration is largely in schwarzlot of the early grey black shade. Included are cupids, trees a dog and birds. The swarm of tiny black birds in the sky are reminiscent of some of Herold's work at Meissen. Hayward in his book at page 44 says: «As schwarzlot had long been a usual form of decoration amongst the glass and faience decorators of Silesia, it is not surprising that it should have been adopted from the beginning at Vienna.»

Fig 4 is a leaf shaped dish whose decoration comprises brightly painted shrubs quite like those in Fig. 2 and 7. The colours are definitely like those Herold took to Meissen. In the center is a large bird quite like the one shown by Hayward in his article in this magazine, July 1957 as Fig. I. He there compared this specimen to the lost one which was dated 1719 and was decorated with polychrome enamel colours.

Fig. 5 is a cup and saucer beautifully decorated in the style usually associated with Herold. The palate is superb and includes red, green, many shades of purple and black. Here we have Herold at his best. It is also interesting to note a characteristic that Herold repeated in his painting at Meissen. I refer to miniature paintings appearing on vases and other objects on both the cup and the saucer. The miniatures are in colourful puce monochrome. The saucer like the others is warped and the gold on it has almost entirely disappeared. Dr. E. W. Braun expertised this piece and pronounced it to be in his judgement painted by Herold at DuPaquire. I have a great deal of respect for his opinion.

Fig. 6 is another tea bowl and saucer painted in the Herold style chinoiserie. It is one of a pair and while similar to Fig. 5 the colours and the painting fall far short of it.

Fig. 7 is still another chinoiserie cup and saucer. While the style here is quite different from the previous ones yet

it is like examples that Herold painted at Meissen. There is a striking similarity between the woman shown on this saucer and the one shown on Fig. 13, a small Meissen mug painted without doubt by Herold. When viewed together in my cabinet there can be little doubt that they are by the same hand. The palate also is identical.

Fig. 8 is a beaker type cup and saucer decorated with flowers and birds. The saucer is large and badly warped. The decoration is similar to that shown on a cream pot in Hayward's book, plate 5-c, there dated 1720—25.

Fig. 9 is also a beaker type but with a tremble saucer. It is similar to the one shown by Hayward on plate 3-c and there dated 1720—25. It is also identical with the one shown in the Karl Mayer catalogue as item 25 and dated 1720. Japanese flowers in Eisenrot monochrome is the decor.

Certainly some of the specimens presented here were painted by Herold. Unfortunately black and white photos do not give the true picture. When these specimens are placed along side of known Herold Meissen examples, painted in the DuPaquire colours, the kinship is unmistakable.

I pass now to much surer ground in my study of Herold during his first three years at the Meissen Factory. Practically all doubt has been removed by the Herold document of February 24, 1731. We can say with certainty that the Meissen Factory had made considerable progress in producing porcelain before the arrival of Herold. One has only to view the many fine specimens available to be sure of this. So when Herold reached Meissen he found facilities far superior to what had been available at DuPaquire. The exception was the polychrome enamel paint, how to bake it on the porcelain and artist capable of making the decorations. This Herold brought with him. From his own statement he personally made all of the decorations until he could train boys to copy his work. It seems certain now that all porcelain decorated from 1720 to 1723 that is well done is the personal work of Herold. Heintze in 1723 was about fifteen years old. *Please bear this in mind in connection with the Meissen examples shown here.* All are believed to be Herold's personal work. Herold was not only a very versatile painter but in the short three years he combined all the progress made at Meissen before his arrival with the knowledge and experience gained at DuPaquire, including no doubt very valuable knowledge from Hunger who probably has never received his proper share of praise. Among other things Herold and his associates learned how to make the porcelain white to better provide a foil for his paintings. He learned how to make the enamel paint and gold adhere to the porcelain. And finally he combined the fine lusters invented by Bottger with his pastel colored paints and finally changed his palate to a more practical one. This final palate is sometimes referred to as «Baroque». What it lost in soft shades in gained in brilliance.

Figs. 10 to 15 inclusive are examples of the personal work of Herold at Meissen using the DuPaquire palate.

Fig. 10 is a Bouillion Cup of early shape and without mark. It has the finest genre landscape painting that it has been my pleasure to see. The scenes have an extreme depth and the effect of the yellow sun rays is breath taking. While most collectors have always attributed such paintings to the hand of Herold, a few have questioned it on the ground that it was so different in style to his chinoiseries etc. The fact that these pieces were painted during the first two years of the factory when no other painters were there now removes all doubt.

Fig. 11 is a waste Bowl also finely decorated with genre landscape scenes. On one side it shows three hunters on horseback and on the other a strange animal resembling a goat more than a deer being brought to bay by three dogs. The master of the hounds with his bugle completes the scene. It is picked out in red only and has no mark. The inside of the bowl also has a beautiful landscape in Eisenrot monochrome. The other scenes are decorated in predominantly green, purple and brown colours.

Fig. 12 is a footed cream pot. It has three cartouches on the pot and miniature counterparts on the lid. It has no mark. It is also beautifully decorated as are the previous two pieces in genre landscape scenes in the pastel colours of DuPaquire and by the hand of Herold.

The beauty of these specimens is hard to describe. They compare favorably with the finest oil paintings.

Fig. 13 is a small tankard or mug. It is before the mark and is painted in the DuPaquire palate. It will be noted that the use of a cartouche to frame the painting was a creation of Herold after he reached Meissen. The decoration at DuPaquire did not use it as will be seen from the examples shown here and from Haywards book. The Meissen Factory had from the beginning difficulty in producing a satisfactory underglaze blue. Only Kohler was able to produce it and he took the secret with him to his grave in 1725. This small mug is interesting as it shows one of the earliest types of cartouche. Here is used a band of Kohler blue to frame the picture. A band of gold encloses the blue and Bottger luster is added and the frame picked out with Eisenrot scroll work. Later the frame became more elaborate. The decoration here is a variation made by Herold from one of his sketches. Several examples are shown in the July 1957 issue as illustrations of Herold's personal work. In this case five Chinese figures are in the group. The extremely tall woman standing at the left side with a fan in her left hand is quite like the one shown in my DuPaquire Fig. 7.

Fig. 14 is an octagonal sugar box dated 1723 and marked KPF. It is decorated with the DuPaquier palate and has as a part of the decoration a small but unusually tall china-

man on either side of the chinaman, will be seen Japanese flowers and Herold's favorite dog. The painting is not unlike our DuPaquire Fig. 2.

Fig. 15 is an unusually large chocolate pot. It is before the mark. The bottom is unglazed and the porcelain very green by transmitted light. It is literally honeycombed with «moons». Three symbols are deeply incised in the bottom and were placed there before firing. There is a numeral 20, in script, as are the other marks. A capital D and finally the mark \equiv , also reproduced in the July 1958 issue of this magazine page 40, as the mark of Johann Donner a moulder at Meissen during the Bottger period. This mark coupled with the D may have some significance. To me it is a most interesting specimen. The palate covers the entire DuPaquire range with Bottger's finest lusters added. The fable animals prove that Herold himself introduced them at Meissen. I don't recall seeing another such specimen combining porcelain before the mark and painted in fable animals with the early palate.

We come now to the third class of paintings ascribed to Herold. The colours are for the mostpart those sometime called «Baroque». In some cases we see a transition between the two. There are five Figures included, number 16 to 20.

Fig. 16 is an hexagonal tea cady with concave edges the earliest shape made. It is before the mark and the tall chinamen in the decoration have always been considered Herold's own work. Each panel is ofcourse different and they were in all probability copied by Herold from etchings.

Fig. 17 is a tea bowl and saucer of the earliest type and ofcourse before the mark. The tea bowl is decorated on one side only. Shown in the decoration is a seated chinaman and a woman. The saucer is picked out in Isenrot and has the early luster. A dragon is in the sky belching fire. A seated chinaman and two attendants serving tea with Herold's favorite dog complete the picture.

Fig. 18 is a tea pot dated 1723. It has the K. P. M. mark. The style of decoration differs from the more usual chinoiseries. On each side Herold has painted two large «Turks» instead of chinamen. The decoration is after Compt Feriol and called de la Levante.

Fig. 19 is a Tea Pot marked MPM. The decoration is very unusual and is taken from the Commedia dell'art of the Italian Players. It once more shows the versatility of Herold.

In appraising all of the work of this period we must remember that it was for the amusement of a cultivated and extravigant Court and had nothing to do with the uses of every day life. The passion of the day was for the exotic, foreign customs and people including Chinese and Turks. They were also interested in fantastic animals and ofcourse masquerades and the theater. At a later date some

of the finest figures made here and elsewhere drew on the Italian Comedy players for their inspiration. That Herold could portray all of these styles certainly proves that he was the greatest porcelain decorator of the century.

Fig. 20 is my last illustration and the palate is the «Baroque» at its best. The colours are extremely brilliant and Bottger's luster plays an important part. It is a Tankard before the mark. I am quite confidant that Herold painted it. If his belief is correct it shows that Herold himself introduced the style of outlining faces with a single red line. This style later became the trade mark of *Ehrenfried Stadler*. As he came to the factory as an apprentice in 1723 he could hardly have painted this piece. Herold in his report of 1731 makes it clear that he had to teach young men to paint on porcelain as no experienced painters were in existence. As further proff that Herold painted this tankard, we find certain characteristics of his work as pointed out by our members in the July 1957 issue. For example on the obverse side not shown in this photo will be found a chinese bird with his legs down as though about to land. Even the large butterflies in this painting have the same tendency. The chinaman's hat and the chinese woman's wig like hairdo are also characteristic. The most unusual feature however of this tankard is the Kohler blue not often found on specimens decorated in chinoiserie. It will be remembered that only Kohler had the secret of making satisfactory underglaze blue and that he took the secret to his grave in 1725. Here we find at the top and bottom a Lambrequin decoration in fine quality blue. It will be remembered that this general type of Lambrequin decoration in blue only was the decoration used at Rouen and Saint Cloud during the last quarter of the seventeenth century, in the reign of Louis XIV.

When I started to prepare this article I had not read, «Herold's Proposition of February 24, 1731». Without it the best that I could do was to say that most authorities agreed that tall chinamen on porcelain painted between 1720 and 1723 were by Herold's own hand. Exactly as in the case of DuPaquire, there was no *positive proff*.

When it now becomes certain that Herold in three years at Meissen personally painted so many different styles and when we realize the great number of pieces that were made, then I feel that my final conclusion is justified. *Herold did paint at least some of the specimes of DuPaquire shown here.*

All specimens shown here are from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. G. Ryland Scott with the exception of figure 19 which was kindly loaned by our neighbor Mrs. Charles B. Stout of Memphis, Tenn.

Tafel I



Fig. 1

Tea Pot, Meissen painted by J. G. Herold, about 1725. Sword mark.



Fig. 2

Octagonal Sugar Box, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold, before April 1720.



Fig. 3

Octagonal Sugar Box, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold, before April 1720.



Fig. 4

Leaf Shaped Dish, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold, before April 1720.



Fig. 5
Tea Bowl and Saucer, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold,
before April 1720.



Fig. 6
Tea Bowl and Saucer, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold,
before April 1720.



Fig. 7
Tea Bowl and Saucer, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold,
before April 1720.



Fig. 8
Beaker Cup and Saucer, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold,
before April 1720.

Tafel III



Fig. 9

Beaker Cup and Trembleus Saucer, Du Paquire painted by J. G. Herold, before April 1720



Fig. 10

Bouillon Cup, Meissen, with Genre Landscape decoration, painted by J. G. Herold about 1721—1722. No mark.



Fig. 11

Waste Bowl, Meissen, with Genre Landscape decoration, painted by J. G. Herold about 1721—1722. No mark.



Fig. 12

Footed Cream Pot, Meissen, with Genre Landscape decoration, painted by J. G. Herold about 1721—1722. No mark.



Fig. 13 Small Tankard, Meissen, decoration adaptation from Augsburg etching by Engelbrecht, painted by J. G. Herold about 1721. No mark.



Fig. 14 Octagonal Sugar Box, Meissen, painted by J. G. Herold 1723. KPF mark.



Fig. 15 Extra Large Chocolate Pot, Meissen, Fable Animal decoration, painted by J. G. Herold, about 1720—1721. No mark.



Fig. 16 Hexagonal Tea Caddy, early concave ribs, Meissen, painted by J. G. Herold, about 1723. No mark.

Tafel V



Fig. 17 Tea Basin and Saucer, Meissen, painted by J.G. Herold, about 1723. No mark.



Fig. 18 Tea Pot, Meissen, decoration after Compt Ferriol, painted by J.G. Herold 1723—1724. K. P. M. mark.



Fig. 19 Tea Pot, Meissen, decoration after Italian Comedy, rare, painted by J.G. Herold 1723. M. P. M. mark. From the collection of Mrs. Charles B. Stout.



Fig. 20 Tankard, Meissen, rare combination of Chinoiserie and Kobler Blue, painted by J.G. Herold about 1723. No mark.