

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

Band: - (1960)

Heft: 49

Artikel: Herold at Du Paquier and Herold at Meissen

Autor: Scott, G.R.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-395018>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 06.10.2024

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Herold at Du Paquier and Herold at Meissen

(Entgegnung auf die Kritiken von Hayward und Wark)

By G. R. Scott, Germantown

(Figs. 1, 2)

Appearing in *Mitteilungsblatt* Nr. 47 are two criticisms (by Mr. John Hayward and Mr. Ralph H. Wark) of my article in *Mitteilungsblatt* Nr. 45 entitled «Herold at Du Paquier and Herold at Meissen 1720—1723». In my article I contended that the painting on certain pieces in our collection which are attributed to Du Paquier and Meissen respectively was probably done by the same hand, i.e., that of J. G. Herold; accompanying my article were illustrations of the pieces in question. Mr. Hayward, who is, as he says, handicapped in not having examined these pieces, nevertheless on the basis of the illustrations says that only four of the eight pieces shown appear to be Du Paquier at all. The others he rejects because of shape and ornament. Mr. Wark, who has examined the pieces, is inclined to accept three of them as having been painted by Herold at Du Paquier, but they are not among the groupe which Mr. Hayward thinks may be Du Paquier. In view of this state of confusion I should like to reply to the criticisms of Messrs. Hayward and Wark.

First, let me clear up the reference in my article to the late Dr. E. W. Braun and also to his attribution of the cup and saucer shown in Fig. 5. An American army officer stationed in Germany during and after the last war, became a good friend of Dr. Braun, who at his own suggestion put together a porcelain collection for the officer, opportunities being present then that are not to be had today. This collection comprised one hundred German figurines and a few pieces of useful ware which were expertized by Dr. Braun, all of which later came into our possession. In 1957 my wife and I had the pleasure of reviewing some of Dr. Braun's attributions with him.

Mr. Hayward believes that Figs. 2, 4, 5 and 7 are not Du Paquier porcelain at all. Fig. No. 5 is rejected by him as not having a Du Paquier shape. The decoration is of course in the well known style used by Herold at Meissen. I have the opinions of the late Dr. E. W. Braun and of our member Mr. Ralph Wark, both of whom examined the piece, that it is Du Paquier porcelain and was painted by Gregor Herold while at Vienna. With respect to the matter of shape I think it is a mistake to assume that only crudely potted pieces were made by Stölzel at Vienna. It must be remembered that he was the leading arcanist and kiln-

master at Meissen for ten years before coming to Vienna and that many fine shapes were made during this period. The report of the Meissen Commission says, in referring to the specimens submitted by Herold in 1720, that «all of them were made in person by the workman Stölzel, now returned from Vienna». I recently examined eight tea basins, all before the mark was adopted and of Meissen manufacture, and found no two of them exactly the same in size or shape. I do not believe that anyone can say with certainty that Stölzel did not make a particular shape at Vienna; he could have made any shape there that he had previously made at Meissen and could also have made it again when he returned to Meissen.

With regard to Fig. 2, the octagonal sugar box, Mr. Hayward says that it may fall in the category of Figs. 4 and 7, to which he refers at some length. Such sugar boxes in various sizes were made in red stoneware and in Böttger porcelain. This piece is not one of them because in the first place it is porcelain and in the next it does not have a creamy paste, but it is made of Du Paquier porcelain of the type made at Meissen after feldspar had replaced the alabaster. At the Meissen factory during the years 1723—24 such pieces were popular and were invariably marked either MPM, KPF, or KPM. This specimen is unmarked. The decoration is in the style of Herold, and Mr. Wark attributes the porcelain to Vienna and the painting to the hand of Herold.

Mr. Hayward discusses at some length the decoration used in my Figs. 4 and 7, as to whether it could be the work of Danhoffer; but here as in his book he discards the idea and attributes the style to some unknown painter.

The outside or house decorators may be divided in my judgement into two groups. The first we give the name «Hausmaler» and by that we mean a private decorator, who by his creative work has made a name and place in the great collection of today. There was of course another group of decorators who secured porcelain of any make they could find and copied the factory designs and also that of the real «Hausmaler».

While recently in London Mr. Hayward was kind enough to show me the cup and saucer in the Victoria and Albert museum to which he referred in his reply to my article.

I have also examined other pieces having the same general design and I feel that we can now group them into three categories as follows.

The first are specimens of Du Paquier porcelain painted by Gregor Herold before he went to Meissen. Into this group I place Figs. 2, 4 and 7. The painting here is excellent, the colours are the early ones used at Vienna, the enamel paint however has a decided tendency to peel off.

The second group are those painted on early Meissen porcelain by Herold during his first few years at the Meissen factory. Into this category I place the Stout tea pot Fig. 19 in my original article, a tea pot without mark in a New York collection and two tea pots having the KPM mark in each case and one of them having the sword mark in addition. These last two are in the fine collection of our editor Dr. Ducret. (In the past these Ducret pieces have been attributed to «Hausmaler».) All of the pieces in this group are finely decorated and have the early palate but unlike the first group the enamel has no tendency to peel.

The third group includes the cup and saucer in the Victoria and Albert museum and a waste bowl in the Metropolitan museum in New York. In each case the porcelain is early Meissen. I also include a beaker cup and saucer in New York which is Du Paquier porcelain. All of these pieces are decorated in the same general style as the first two groups but in each case differ from them in that they are poorly painted and are unquestionably copies. The palate is not so early as the other groups. The paint has no tendency to peel.

My thanks are here extended to Mr. Otto Walcha for the information that Gregor Herold painted at Strassburg in 1718 and was a wallpaper decorator at the time Hunger brought him to Vienna.

The Stout teapot has the peculiar «mat decoration» which I later attribute to the hand of Herold. There can be no question that the styles of all these pieces are different from the ones developed by Herold *after* he came to Meissen.

The basic issue which I pose here for consideration is whether some of Herold's early work done at Meissen but in the style he created at Vienna is not being today erroneously attributed to hausmaler. In this connection I call attention to an article which appeared in the German Ceramic Circle's Bulletin, «Keramos», March 1959. In discussing a covered beaker in the Leipzig Museum, Mr. Richard Seyffarth, Porcelain Restorer at the Dresden Museum, gives some very sound reasons why he thinks this beaker was one of the pieces actually presented by Herold to the Commission in 1720 and therefore painted by him before his employment. He is convinced that many pieces attributed in the past to hausmalers are actually the work

of Herold during his first years at Meissen and believes that the erroneous attributions made by our authorities in the past arise from failure to appreciate the fact that Herold brought with him from Vienna, not only a new palette, but a new style of painting as well. Should we disagree with Mr. Seyffarth, then we must search for a hausmaler that fulfils the following requirements: He must have had at his disposal (1) undecorated Du Paquier porcelain of the early period, including a rare octagonal sugar box; (2) undecorated Meissen in some quantity of the period 1723—24; (3) a supply of the early Du Paquier paints; (4) a supply of the early Meissen paints; (5) the ability to paint chinoiserie in the general style of Herold, as well as his feathery flower designs, birds and Chinese rock formations. We must also account for the fact that some of the pieces show a decided tendency to peel, while others have no such tendency. What painter can be found who supplies these qualifications so well as Gregor Herold? Surely Gustav E. Pazaurek did not discover him nor have any of the other authorities in the field.

Mr. Hayward calls attention to the VH monogram on my Fig. 1, which appears in gold and not in enamel as is customary when the decorator is a painter rather than a gilder. But Herold was a gold, as well as an enamel, painter, and as the gold decoration would have been the last operation before the final firing, there is no reason why he should not have signed in gold.

As four of my eight pieces are suspected of not being Du Paquier porcelain, I wish to comment on the differences in paste and glaze here encountered. Mr. Hayward in his very excellent book quotes the authority Hauptman Kuhn as follows: «If a Meissen cup is set by the side of a Du Paquier one, the latter looks almost as though it needed washing.» He further points out that the glaze is a greyish white, not pure white like Meissen, and of poor quality. I readily agree with these statements, which he presents along with others to identify pieces as in fact Du Paquier.

The Meissen porcelain that we are concerned with here is of course of two entirely different types: (1) «Böttger», containing kaolin clay (Schnorr's earth after 1717) and alabaster as the china stone element until the death of Böttger in 1719; and (2) a quite different porcelain when feldspar was substituted for the alabaster. The first type, however, was made along with the new type until at least 1724, as is shown by a Böttger coffee pot in our collection carrying the crossed swords mark. The Böttger type has a smoky yellowish tone, and by transmitted light it is a yellowish brown, without «moons» or «tears». The type made with feldspar and improved from time to time varied from white to brilliant white and is green by transmitted light and frequently has «moons» and or «tears,» which

are quite pronounced on heavily potted pieces. It is not unusual to find the cup a different color from the saucer—which would indicate different formulae.

Early Du Paquier may in my judgment be divided into three categories: (1) that made with native clays before the arrival of Stölzel; (2) that made after his arrival with native clays; (3) that made after his arrival with Schnorr clay. The first is quite opaque and has a yellow brown color both by direct and transmitted light; it also has «moons» or large «tears». In fact the paste and glaze are so poor that one can readily understand why the services of Stölzel were so urgently required. The cup and saucer shown here for the first time are of this type. The second has a yellowish color by direct and transmitted light and more nearly resembles Böttger porcelain, *except* that «tears» occur. It can be readily distinguished from Böttger if one has had experience in such matters. The third has a greyish white tone, is green by transmitted light and frequently has «moons» and or «tears». This kind is more nearly like the Meissen made from feldspar, yet it is readily distinguishable. I feel that Mr. Hayward with his years of experience and vast knowledge might agree with my attribution of the porcelains discussed here if he had an opportunity to see them.

Coming now to the specimens that in Mr. Hayward's opinion appear to be Du Paquier porcelain: he doubts that Herold painted No. 6 for the reason that the type to which it belongs (illustrated in his book by Figs. 8c, 12b, 12c, 17b and 17c) is so large that he does not think that Herold could have painted so many pieces in a year's time. I cannot agree with this opinion, since painters of that day worked extremely long hours, as is shown by Herold himself in his now famous report, and since he was an experienced decorator. In any event an examination of the pieces to which he refers discloses no resemblance, in my opinion, to my Fig. 6, nor do any other illustrations in his book or those shown by Pazaurek. It will be noted that Mr. Ralph Wark, after examining my Fig. 6, attributes it to the hand of Herold at Vienna.

Mr. Hayward says that my Fig. 8 «seems to have the greatest claim to have been produced during the time that Herold was working at Vienna». Fig. 9 he agrees is «indeed an early piece»; but he sees no reason to say definitely that it was made and decorated while Herold was at Vienna. I cite as substantiation for my opinion that it is an early piece the attribution made in the Karl Mayer Catalogue by Dr. Otto von Falke and J. Folnesics, who there date it 1720. Furthermore, in the report to the Meissen Commission specific mention is made of three chocolate beakers decorated in monochrome red, as is this cup and saucer. It will also be noted that recent factory records published in the No. 47 issue of *Mitteilungsblatt*

disclose that the first work done by Herold after reaching Meissen was to decorate cups in monochrome red. The above references, added to Mr. Hayward's opinion that «it is indeed an early piece,» provides some reason to think Fig. 9 is of the early period and could have been one of the pieces taken by Herold to Meissen.

My original article was prompted by a desire to create a deeper interest in the man Gregor Herold and what he personally decorated at Vienna and Meissen. While much research needs to be done, I feel that at least a start has been made. As a result of my article an English collector sold me a cup and saucer which Mr. Hayward had expertized for him as follows: «With reference to the porcelain cup and saucer you have submitted for inspection, I have to inform you that it is, as you suggest, a piece of early Du Paquier. The imperfections in the potting, the paste, and the dryness of the colours, combined with a tendency to flake, all point to an early date in the history of the factory. It is, indeed, one of the earliest pieces I have ever seen, apart from the dated documentary piece at Hamburg.

You raise the question as to whether this piece is likely to have been painted by J. G. Herold during his brief period of employment at the factory. We know that he painted in colour, and this is certainly one of the earliest polychrome decorated pieces of Du Paquier I have seen, but until we find some documentary evidence as to his earliest style of painting, I should not like to make any definite attribution. On the other hand, it is very probably that he was the only decorator working at the Vienna factory at the time.»

Some time ago Mr. Ralph Wark called my attention to a peculiarity in the style of painting on five Meissen tea pots, each having either the MPM or KPF mark, all of them, in his opinion, painted by Gregor Herold in 1723. I refer to the style of painting a carpet, ground, or mat, as one may prefer to call it, in olive-green colour, upon which the design was placed. In every case the green is «mottled» or has a «stippled» effect not found on Herold's later work, or on that of any other Meissen artist. Later the «carpet» was a solid green of a quite different shade, not mottled or stippled. I have produced here the cup and saucer of uncontested Herold Vienna porcelain, and attention is drawn to the Wark KPF tea pot, also included in the same picture. One should note the «stippled» or «mottled» mat on the cup, saucer, and tea pot. I believe this to be a «documentary piece» of Du Paquier decorated by Gregor Herold at Vienna.

I hope that this additional evidence will be appraised by Mr. Hayward and our other members who may be interested in the matter. The tendency in the past has been to put all such Du Paquier pieces together and say that

they date 1720—25. I do not consider this grouping to be justified since Stölzel and Herold left in early 1720 to be followed shortly by Hunger; the factory was for sale in 1723. It would therefore not seem probable that many good pieces would have been made and decorated at that date. Items such as the cup and saucer, plate 3-c in the Hayward book, already questioned by Dr. Ducret, as well as Nos. 2 and 3 presented by Mr. Hayward in his article appearing in the *Mitteilungsblatt* No. 39, deserve in my very humble judgment to be given further thought and study. The little beaker cup decorated in red only No. 2 above was recently inspected by me and it is certainly the kind of piece that Herold took to Meissen. It also is the «stippled» decoration which I believe to be the work of Herold.

Turning now to the criticisms of Mr. Ralph Wark, I have already commented upon the questions raised concerning Figures 4, 7, 8 and 9 and see no need to discuss them again with particular reference to his observations. As for the Du Paquier pieces, I am pleased that he agrees with my attribution of Figs. 2, 5 and 6 to the hand of Herold at Vienna; he did not, however, think it possible that these were the pieces brought to Meissen by Herold. I have said only that pieces like them were probably taken to Meissen. He calls attention to the report to the Commission which mentioned only cups painted in blue or red; my Fig. 9 is in monochrome red. The report did, however, comment on the success of Herold's figures painted on Du Paquier porcelain, and Mr. Wark points out that the report mentions that Herold was capable of painting in blue, red, and other colours.

As for his criticism regarding two of the twelve Meissen items attributed by me to the hand of Herold, I cannot agree with him that the large chocolate pot is Vienna porcelain. I have carefully examined this piece in bright sun light and by transmitted light in comparison with

the acknowledged Meissen specimen Fig. 13 and I find the paste and glaze identical. Vienna porcelain was never like Meissen; in all respects, though, it is true that Vienna, like Meissen during the 'twenties, has a green translucency and shows «moons». Heavily potted pieces of Meissen such as the chocolate pot will show a deep green and large «moons,» as does this piece. Had the piece been Vienna it would undoubtedly have been marked with the shield. From 1744 to 1749 it would have been incised or impressed, and after that date marked in blue under the glaze. This piece is not marked. As admitted by Mr. Wark, the palette, including the intense Böttger lusters are like those found on early Meissen. They were not found even on Meissen at a date around the middle of the century. The fabled animal decoration suggests that Herold himself also introduced this style. Also of interest is the presence of the «mottled» green in the decoration of this piece, shown more clearly on the obverse side.

Fig. 20 is attributed by Mr. Wark to some «unknown painter». I feel that after the report of Herold in 1731, any piece of Meissen before the mark, like this piece, finely decorated with a brilliant Herold palette, including the intense Böttger copper luster, having an unusually good Köhler blue, and Chinese birds and well painted butterflies, as well as the characteristic hat of the Chinese emperor and the wiglike hair of the empress, should be considered the personal work of Gregor Herold. As stated in my article, Stadler could hardly have painted it, although the face in outline only has been thought by some to be work that he did at a later date (for an authentic painting by this artist see Plates 46 and 47 in *Veb Verlag Der Kunst Dresden*).

May I in closing take this opportunity to join Mr. Wark in hoping that these articles will bring out other comment, and thus increase the knowledge concerning the greatest ceramic painter that Europe has produced.

Monsieur Dortu

Par Dr. E. Pelichet, Nyon

Jusqu'ici, la personnalité de Jacques Dortu n'est connue qu'à travers les diverses études de caractère historique consacrées à la porcelainerie de Nyon, à laquelle il donna le plus clair de son talent.

On le sait grand voyageur en Europe et brillant céramiste, plein d'initiatives.

Enfin, fidèle à la foi protestante, qui fut la cause de l'exile de son père en Allemagne, il est demeuré Français.

Il s'est inscrit à la Bourse française, en arrivant à Nyon. Il y joua d'ailleurs un certain rôle. Il fallut, quelques années plus tard, les effets de la Révolution vaudoise pour qu'il acceptât de devenir Vaudois.

Mais quel était-il lui-même, dans son comportement quotidien? C'est à travers les comptes de la porcelainerie qu'on le découvre.

Il y apparaît tout d'abord comme un grand fumeur. Il

Tafel I



Abb. 1. Teapot and cover by J. G. Herold, Meissen, KPF, 1724. (Scott)



Abb. 2. Teacup and saucer by J. G. Herold, Du Paquier, 1720. (Scott)