

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain: some overlooked groups 1700 -1750

A paper read by Errol Manners at the Courtauld Institute on 18th October 2003

Writing in 1932 W. B. Honey said that it was not until about 1750 that we have evidence for the English decoration of oriental porcelain.¹ Over the years evidence has emerged to contradict this view and I hope to show that the extent of the English decoration of oriental porcelain in the first half of the 18th century has been not slightly but very greatly underestimated.

There has been an assumption that the European decoration of oriental porcelain, often dismissively referred to as clobbering, was largely the preserve of

the Dutch; the Dutch did, of course, have a very important enamelling industry, but so it seems, did England. It is necessary to look again at certain groups that we are used to calling 'Dutch-decorated' and consider what actual evidence exists for these attributions and whether they should be changed.

The first English enamelling on any ceramic body was executed on stonewares. Perhaps the earliest example is the well-known slip-cast salt-glazed teapot that is attributed to the Elers brothers; Vauxhall period of around 1690 (1). This teapot was thought to be unique; but another enamelled example² of the same type has recently appeared; which adds to the likelihood that the enamelling was added at or shortly after the time of manufacture. Somewhat similar, at least in its use of blue and white enamel and graduated dots, is a beautifully potted Dwight tankard of about 1695, now in the Chipstone Foundation (2)³, which is painted with a leaping hare and two 'jumping boys', a popular design taken from contemporary Chinese blue and white porcelain.



1. Elers brothers glazed and slip-cast teapot attributed to their Vauxhall period, circa 1693. Perhaps the earliest enamelling on any ceramic body in England. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



2. A salt-glazed tankard. John Dwight, Fulham, c. 1695, enamelled in blue and white and a band of gilding with a leaping hare and figures taken from Chinese export porcelain. (Courtesy, Chipstone Foundation; photo, Gavin Ashworth.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

The next group of English-decorated pieces are a number of Elers red stonewares enamelled with a thickly applied opaque white and sometimes green with touches of red. The modest quality of the enamelling on some pieces, such as the tankard (3)⁴, contrasts curiously with the careful finish of the potting and it is hard to imagine the Elers brothers themselves condoning it unless it was simply an experiment. The Goldweitz teapot(4)⁵, enamelled just in white, is much more carefully executed, and a splendid teapot from the Solon collection (5), whose present whereabouts is not known to me, is still more ambitious in design and according to the description in the catalogue of the Solon sale is also touched with green enamel.⁶

A number of examples of this rather disparate group of enamelled Elers wares are found in museum collections in Holland and Germany, sometimes with very early provenances.⁷ This might suggest that the



3. Elers red stoneware mug with opaque white enamel. The rather crude enamelling contrasts curiously with the fine quality of the potting, perhaps suggesting an experimental work. c. 1695. (Jonathan Horne Antiques Ltd.)



4. More carefully executed enamelling on a typical Elers teapot, c.1695. (Harriet Goldweitz collection.)



5. Elers teapot from the collection of L.M. Solon enamelled in white and green in the same style as found on London salt-glazed stonewares such as (11). (Present whereabouts unknown.)

decoration was added on the Continent, but it is significant that this type of decoration does not appear to occur on the much more plentiful Yixing or Dutch redwares, made by Ary de Milde and his contemporaries, which is what one might have expected if the enameller was independently decorating wares that were available to him there. The fact that these types of decoration exist exclusively on Elers wares suggests they are contemporary with the pottery, dating from the late 17th century, and that they were added in England.

Next we come to a more coherent group that is clearly related to the earlier pieces, in particular to the Solon teapot, but which is more technically and artistically developed. Firstly the stoneware tankard from the National Museum of Wales, which was brought to the attention of this society in 1939 by Bernard Rackham⁸ (6 a & b). This bears the inscription ‘Farmer. Anno Domini.1706’ painted in iron-red within a scroll on the paler lower half; the darker brown slipped upper half is enamelled with the Arms of Farmer. The enameller employed a distinctive style of broad bodies of colour with thick jewel-like blobs and dots similar to the earlier group

but with a more developed palette of green, blue, yellow, black, red and white; the opacity of the enamels and the use of white make them particularly suitable for use on a dark ground. The less opaque enamels were frequently applied over the thick white enamel for added prominence. When Rackham was writing it was thought that this type of stoneware was from Staffordshire but it is now accepted as Fulham. Rackham speculated that the enameller was of German or Dutch origin and indeed the use of these thick opaque enamels is strikingly similar to and the technique very likely does derive from the decoration of German stonewares of the earlier 17th century such as those from Creusen, which in turn had adapted their techniques from those of glass decorators.

In all I have only been able to find six examples of this group of enamelled stonewares. They are all probably Fulham and presumably enamelled by the same hand or at least in the same workshop:—



6a. London salt-glazed tankard enameled with the Arms of Farmer and the date 1706. The thick opaque enamels are well suited to use on a dark ground whilst iron-red works well on the lighter lower section. (Amgueddfa ac Oriolau Cenedlaethol Cymru, National Museums & Galleries of Wales, Cardiff.)



6b. A side view of (6a)

1. The Farmer Arms tankard enameled in 1706. National Museum of Wales, Cardiff. (6a & b)
2. A tankard with the Arms of the London Livery Company The Worshipful Company of Bricklayers and Tylers.⁹ Private collection, ex. Jonathan Horne.(7)
3. A tankard with a swan in flight over the motto 'DOE IN MIRTH AS IN SORROW'¹⁰ 21 cm high. The High Museum, Atlanta.(8a & b)
4. A tankard with an oak tree above the motto 'NE CHANGE JAMAIS', the lower section painted with an unidentified cityscape. This has the impressed WR excise mark, which was introduced in 1700.¹¹ 14 cm high. Private collection, ex. Jonathan Horne. (9a & b)
5. A splendid punch bowl with bold ribs of silver form. 14.3 x 24.1 cm. The Saint Louis Art Museum. (10)
6. A conical coffee pot with characteristic bird painting in just red, green and white. The Chipstone Foundation, Milwaukee, USA. (11)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners



Bernard Rackham noted the same hand on Chinese porcelain.¹² The style is immediately identifiable with vases of flowers and birds in floral roundels being the most frequent motifs; it is usually found on brown-glazed, popularly called ‘Batavian’, wares which vary from a pale straw colour to a dark chocolate brown, a ground as well suited as the brown stonewares to the opacity of these enamels (12). It is very uncommon to find anything other than small bowls and teabowls used (13). Rarely other colours might act as a ground, such as on the powder-blue bowl recently sold from the Cora and Benjamin Ginsburg collection.¹³ The London origin of the stonewares and the tankard made for a London Livery Company (7) suggest a London workshop.

7. A London salt-glazed tankard with the Arms of the London Livery Company ‘The Worshipful Company of Bricklayers and Tylers’. (Jonathan Horne Antiques Ltd.)



8a. A tankard inscribed ‘DOE IN MIRTH AS IN SORROW’. Iron red green and yellow are used in the floral band around the lower section. 21 cm high. (High Museum of Art, Atlanta, Georgia. Frances and Emory Cocke Collection, 1988.29.)



8b. Front view of (8a).



9a. A tankard with an oak tree above the motto 'IE NE CHANGE JAMAIS'. The lower section is painted with an unidentified town-scape. This has the impressed WR excise mark which was introduced in September 1700. 14 cm high. (Jonathan Horne Antiques Ltd.)



9b. Side view of (9a).

What has not been previously recognised is that this enameller or at least his workshop also used a different style of enamelling on white Chinese porcelain; the thick opaque enamels used on the darker grounds were not needed here. A small bowl from the Watney collection (14a & b) is important as a link between the two groups.¹⁴ The pale brown exterior has the typical dotted flower bouquets but the white interior is painted in green and iron-red with a black outline with strutting cockerels between flower heads. This design by the same hand can be found on a number of other pieces¹⁵ such as the *blanc-de-chine* tankard in the Victoria and Albert Museum (15). Force of habit has led us to consider this sort of decoration to be Dutch, and indeed W. B. Honey published the companion piece (16) in the Victoria and Albert Museum as such.¹⁶

The floral band on the paler lower half of the

tankard from the High Museum, Atlanta, (8a & b) which includes a strong yellow and black outlines, can also be matched to another *blanc-de-chine* tankard in the Victoria and Albert Museum (18).



10. A splendid punch bowl with bold ribs of silver form. Designs in roundels of this type are also found on Chinese porcelain, 14.3 x 24.1 cm. (The Saint Louis Art Museum.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners



11. Conical London coffee pot enamelled in white and green by the same hand as found on a group of Chinese porcelains such as (12). (Courtesy, Chipstone Foundation; photo, Gavin Ashworth.)



12. A Chinese porcelain brown-glazed bowl, so-called 'Batavian ware'. Kangxi period circa 1700. Enamelled by the same hand as the coffee pot (11). This type of enamelling is only found wares with a dark ground colour, usually brown. (Ex. Watney Collection.)



13. A small 'Batavian' mug with decoration in roundels. Kangxi period, circa 1700. It is rare to find this type of enamelling on any Chinese porcelain other than bowls and teabowls.

The acceptance of the decoration of these pieces as English leads to the reassessment of quite a large class of related work largely on *blanc-de-chine*, which was the most widely available white porcelain. Distinctive features include ogival panels (16), which perhaps derive from Middle Eastern designs found on imported Chinese porcelains, and various border patterns that prove useful in identifying related pieces (20). In particular it leads to a handsome group that

uses red and seeded-green grounds derived from Arita wares and distinctive standing figures (21, 22 & 27). This group can also occasionally be found on *Jingdezhen* porcelain. Another rare sub-group of this type of decoration (24 & 25) characterised by the use

of thin washes of iron-red, yellow, gold and a distinctive lime-green can be shown to belong to this group by comparing the wavy-edged lappets on the borders of the small mug (23) with those on another unusual variant of this form (24).



14a. A 'Batavian' teabowl with typical London enamelling on the exterior. Kangxi period. (Ex Watney collection.)



14b. The interior of (14a). The decorator has here used the thin iron-red and the green on the white porcelain. This enamelling, with the strutting cockerel, can be match exactly with the painting on (15) and a large group of wares that have, in the past, been attributed to Dutch decorators and must now be considered English, presumably London.



15. A Chinese *blanc-de-chine* tankard, with London decoration added in the first decade of the 18th century. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



16. A Chinese *blanc-de-chine* tankard, with London decoration added in the first decade of the 18th century. The ogival panels are a characteristic of this early London enameller. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners



17. The most common type of London decoration on the most widely used *blanc-de-chine* form. (Ex Watney collection.)



18. A Chinese *blanc-de-chine* tankard, Dehua, with London decoration matching that found on the lower, paler half of the London stoneware tankard (8). (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



19a. A London decorated *blanc-de-chine* beaker with unusual figurative decoration. (Amgueddfeydd ac Oriolau Cenedlaethol Cymru. National Museums & Galleries of Wales. NMW A 36816.)



19b. The reverse of (19a).



20. A *blanc-de-chine* small cup or ‘capuchine’ with the ogival panels found on (16), the same imitation of silver gadrooning can be seen on (21). (Ex Watney Collection.)



21. Another *blanc-de-chine* small cup or ‘capuchine’ typical of the more elaborate London decoration that used iron-red grounds copied from Arita wares. (Private collection.)



22. A *blanc-de-chine* lidded pot with particularly elaborate figural decoration. Most examples of this form appear to be London decorated. (Ex Watney collection.)

It is difficult to know why these groups have traditionally been considered Dutch, as there is no evidence for this attribution. Much evidence exists, of course, for the attribution of many other groups to Holland, in particular the collection of Augustus the Strong of Saxony, now held in the *Zwinger*, Dresden, which shows a cross-section of what was available in Holland in the first two or three decades of the eighteenth century. The decoration of the groups that I show here as English are not represented in Dresden and are mostly found in English museums and collections.

The only dated piece of these early groups that we have seen so far is the ‘Farmer’ Arms tankard of 1706, and so it is not possible to establish a precise chronology. However a developing palette and complexity suggests some progression, the simpler decoration of the coffee pot (11) perhaps predating that of the tankards (6, 7, 8, & 9) by a few years (conversely it could indicate a degeneration over time).

It is striking that Kakiemon ¹⁷ designs, which were particularly favoured by the Dutch enamellers (26), seem not to have been attempted in England until the

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

1740's although the necessary colours were available; this is probably a question of local fashion. There were important collections of Japanese Kakiemon in England formed in the late 17th century such those of Queen Mary and at Burghley House; but, whilst the taste for Kakiemon was very strong at the highest courtly levels on the continent in the 1720's and 30's¹⁸ and consequently expensive, it seems to have fallen from favour in England until a popular revival in the 1740's and 50's.

It seems that little or no English enamelling appears on Japanese porcelain in these early years in contrast to its frequent occurrence in Holland; the English, unlike the Dutch, were not trading directly with Japan in the early 18th century, and so did not have the supply of cheap undecorated square sake, or gin, (26) bottles and apothecary bottles (sometimes referred to as 'gallipots') that were so favoured by the Dutch decorators.

I have no new documentary evidence for who the enamellers were. Richard Kilburn found an entry



23. A *blanc-de-chine* mug with the typical ogival panels of London decoration and a curious wavy surround to the bead border that links it to a related group of London-decorated wares such as (24). (Private collection.)



24. A *blanc-de-chine* mug of unusual form with the wavy-edged lappets found on the border of (23). The use of thin washes of iron-red and the bright lime-green and yellow enamels can also be seen on (25). (Private collection.)



25. A *blanc-de-chine* mug. A particularly good example of a rare sub-group of London decoration using thin iron-red washes, this example has an elaborate gilt cell-pattern ground. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)

dated 1705 for a payment of 7 shillings for ‘painting tea potts’ in the account book of Captain Thomas Bowrey, an East India merchant who set up a relative in a china shop in Wapping.¹⁹ Robin Hildyard found in the *London Tradesman* of 1747 a notice that could also refer to this group, or perhaps a slightly later one:

‘Some Years ago a Workman came over from Holland, and in a Pot-House in the Borough [presumably Southwark] gave some Stone Wares the Colours common to the earthen, he succeeded so well, that cups and other vessels, even upon that first essay, came little short of China-ware: But the project was no sooner known to be in any Forwardness to become useful to the Public, than ways and means were found to send the Projector out of the way, and with him the scheme vanished’.²⁰

Enamellers of glass were also recorded but there is little or nothing that can be attributed to them. Richard Kilburn also discovered that Capt Thomas Bowrey had arranged in 1704 for quite large quantities of glass to be made in London, in shapes suitable for the Indian market, such as hubblebubbles and gorgelets. He then commissioned a well-known dealer in glassware named Matthew Weston to gild, silver, engrave and paint them.²¹

Blanc-de-chine was the best and most widely available white porcelain for decorators in the early part of the century. It is striking that there are a number of shapes of *blanc-de-chine* that



26. A Dutch-decorated Arita square flask, c. 1710-30. Most early Dutch decoration was in the Kakiemon style which does not seem to have been used by the English decorators until the 1740's, nor did the early English decorators appear to have used Japanese porcelain. (Private collection.)



27. A *blanc-de-chine* porringer with London decoration, first quarter of the 18th century. Single-handled porringers are a form found in English silver and pewter but not on the continent and would have been intended primarily for import into England. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



28. A silver porringer, London Britannia standard, 1698-9, mark of William Keatt. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners



29. A silver 'Gorge mug', London, 1683. Mark of George Garthorne. A form derived from German stonewares but in this proportion characteristically English and found in Elers and Dwight and other stonewares. (Victoria and Albert Museum, anonymous loan.)



30. A *blanc-de-chine* mug with London decoration of the first decade of the 18th century. Another form derived from English silver and stoneware. (Samuel Grober collection.)

derive from exclusively British forms of the late 17th century in silver, pewter, stoneware and delft and must have been commissioned and intended specifically for the British market. These forms were probably ordered by English merchants as part of their 'Private Trade' rather than by The East India Company itself. British ships were regular visitors to Amoy (now Xiamen) in Fujian province, only 70 miles from Dehua, where they were made.

Amongst the forms which can be said to be of British derivation are:

1. Single-handled porringers (27). A shape found in British (and American) silver (28) and pewter but not in Holland or elsewhere on the continent. Single-handled porringers are also found in English but not Dutch Delft, where two-handled versions were favoured. The Chinese versions often have covers. The porringer form ceased to be made in metal in England around 1725-30 but its use was continued in America. Worcester made porringers in the late 1750's and perhaps these were for export to the American market.²²



31. A silver 'capuchine', maker's mark for Thomas Robinson, Chester, 1690. The London decorators of (20 & 21) went as far as imitating the gadroons of this English form.



32. A *blanc-de-chine* saltcellar with London decoration c. 1710. A rare form copied from a late 17th or early 18th century silver shape associated with the English as opposed to the immigrant Huguenot silversmiths. (© Copyright The British Museum.)

2. Globular mugs with ribbed cylindrical necks (15 & 25). Found in English silver (29), delft, Elers redwares, John Dwight (2) and other stonewares. It ultimately derives from a larger form in German stoneware.²³
3. Cylindrical tankards with two bands of horizontal ribs (30). Also found in English silver, delft, Elers redwares (3), John Dwight and other stonewares.
4. Small 'capuchine' cups²⁴ (20 & 21). Also found in English silver (31), delft, Dwight and Elers stonewares.
5. Pear-shaped lidded pots with handles set at right angles to the spout (22). Reasonably similar English silver prototypes exist.²⁵ This form is sometimes called a chocolate pot. It rarely if ever, exists in the white, most examples having early English decoration of varying quality;²⁶ the author is not aware of examples with Dutch decoration.
6. A waisted circular saltcellar (32). A rare form, two examples with early English decoration are

Errol Manners – The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain

in the British Museum (BM 1980.7-28.612). It is a late 17th or early 18th century shape associated with the English as opposed to the immigrant Huguenot silversmiths. It may not be an exclusively English form as similar can be found in Saint Cloud porcelain suggesting also a French prototype which may not have survived. Dutch and German circular salts tend to be larger and more elaborate.²⁷

Although intended for the English market it should be noted that they were also sometimes imported to the continent and that undecorated 'capuchines', for instance, are well represented in the collections at Dresden where their English shape has long been recognised.²⁸ The Dutch, the main suppliers of oriental porcelain to Dresden, could have bought these pieces from the Chinese merchants who traded between Fujian and their base in Batavia. Dr. Christian Jörg has also pointed out that English East Indiamen were sometimes known to take their cargoes to Holland to avoid the import duties levied in England and has suggested the possibility that some of these shapes might have arrived on the continent in this way.

Armorial wares offer clues to the next group of English decoration of the 1720's and 30's. A Chinese Kangxi period teapot (33a & b) with underglaze blue bands has been enamelled in iron-red, gold and black with the arms of Goodwin and the cipher 'TG' in what David Howard has described as an 'English' style, possibly for Thomas Goodwin, a linen-draper of Fleet Street, London.²⁹ David Howard dates this to c. 1720 and points out that teapots with finials of this shape ceased to be imported by about 1725. Distinctive bold scrolls and heavy use of gold bordered in iron-red characterise this group, and these features can also be found on a number of Chinese saucer dishes enamelled with the arms of Grand-George (34a & b), a family of Huguenot extraction who had settled in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.³⁰ David Howard dated these dishes on stylistic grounds to c. 1735. They have a more developed palette than the Goodwin teapot including a thickly applied opaque white, a blue, which tends to

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

muddiness, and a small amount of green. These dishes introduce further design elements, such as a ground of black ‘whorls’ derived from *famille rose* porcelain.

Another member of this family, a bowl (35a & b) with everted rim, is inscribed ‘ANNO DOMINI 1722’ within iron-red scrolls, and is enamelled with a coat of



33a. A Chinese teapot circa 1720, enamelled with the Arms of Goodwin and the cipher ‘TG’ possibly for Thomas Goodwin, a linen-drapeer of Fleet Street, London. The distinctive bold scrolls and heavy use of gold characterise this group and this can also be found on a number of Chinese saucer dishes enamelled with the Arms of Grand-George (34) and (35). (Photograph courtesy of David Sanctuary Howard.)



33b. The reverse of (33a).



34a. A Chinese saucer dish enamelled with the Arms of Grand-George circa 1735. This has a more developed palette than the Goodwin teapot and a ground of black ‘whorls’ derived from *famille rose* porcelain. (David Battie Collection.)



34b. A detail of the border of (34a).

arms which it has not been possible to identify. The bowl has an English provenance descending in the Dysart and Tollemache families of Ham House in Richmond.³¹ The arms cannot be English as the coronet in English heraldry indicates a Marquis, and there are none that match it. The coronet could also be

that of an untitled nobleman from elsewhere in much of Europe but according to Dr. Jochem Kroes of the *Centraal Bureau Voor Genealogie* at The Hague, it is not Dutch; Huguenot arms are a possibility, as the Tollemache family did have some Huguenot ancestry.³² The two ciphers seem to incorporate 'M, E and possibly L' And 'M and C or D'. The elaborate mantling of the arms in iron-red and richly applied gold as well as the style of the ciphers indicates that they belong to the same group as the Goodwin and Grand-George pieces. I think it likely that further study

will reveal that some further Chinese armorial wares were in fact decorated in England, but identifying them can be surprisingly difficult.

One can suggest a possible chronology based on the use of enamel colours and the introduction of design elements such as the 'whorl' patterns taken from the sort of *famille-rose* porcelain imported in the 1730's. The 1722 bowl simply uses iron-red, gold and rather muddy blue enamel that has a tendency to flake. The Grand-George dishes also make use of a black, white and green. Many other pieces from the same stable



35a. A Chinese bowl with an unidentified Coat of Arms is inscribed 'ANNO DOMINI 1722' from Ham House in Richmond. The Arms are neither English nor Dutch and could perhaps be Huguenot. The gilt mantling and muddy blue enamel are characteristic of English work. (Private collection.)

35b. The exterior of (35a).



36a. An English-decorated Chinese bowl, circa 1735. The border relates directly to the Grand-George dishes (34a & b) and is typical of a large class of English decorated wares of modest quality that have previously been attributed to Dutch workshops. (Private collection.)

36b. Detail of the border of (36a) with the whorls also seen on (34).

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners



37a An English-decorated Chinese bowl celebrating Admiral Vernon's capture of Portobello in 1739. A distinctive aubergine enamel is found on this class. Another type of decoration that has, in the past, been attributed to Holland without any evidence and should now be considered English. (Private collection.)

such as the bowl (36a & b) which can be linked by comparing details of their borders (34b & 36b) add a thick yellow. A very large group of pieces like these, often less carefully executed than the armorial examples, have, in the past, generally been classified out of habit as Dutch-decorated; but they do not correlate to any of the many groups that we know to be Dutch, and so should be re-attributed to England.

The simplest way of enhancing dull Chinese blue and white porcelain was by adding the iron-red and gold of the Imari palette, and so this forms much of the most basic work of both the Dutch and English decorators. Dutch-decorated Imari patterns are plentiful in Dresden, and although superficially similar to these English groups they are discernibly different; one finds the long Japanese figures and some iron-red and seeded-green grounds both of which the English and Dutch enamellers copied directly from the Japanese.



37b. The exterior of the Admiral Vernon bowl (37a).



38. Admiral Vernon. A mezzotint by I. Faber after J. Bardwell.

The use of an opaque white enamel is very much a feature of English decoration throughout the 18th century,³³ it occurs only rarely and sparingly in Holland,³⁴ Hilary Young noted that according to Chambers' Cyclopaedia of 1756, the enamels used in Britain came 'chiefly from Venice and Holland', and white was among those specified as coming from Venice.³⁵ Perhaps it was less readily available to the Dutch.

Again I have no new evidence for who might have been the decorators of these pieces but documentary evidence of some active enamellers has been published.³⁶ We know that the list of apprentices bound to Freeman of the Worshipful Company of Glass Sellers of London (which was also the China dealers' company) preserved in the Guildhall Library includes the entry: 'Abraham Giles, son of James Giles of St Giles in the Fields- China Painter, bound to Philip Margas for seven years on 26th June 1729'.³⁷ Philip Margas, an important 'chinaman', was a large purchaser of oriental porcelain at the East

Errol Manners – The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain

India Company sales. This James Giles was the father of the James Giles who was to become the most distinguished outside decorator of porcelain in the 1760's and 1770's.

Richard Kilburn discovered, in the Corporation of London records, a list drawn up in 1723 of monies owed to Henry Akerman, another London dealer in



39a. The interior of a small Chinese bowl with smiling sun that can be found on examples of the Vernon bowls (37b) and on other English-decorated wares, circa 1740-45. (David Battie collection.)



39b. The exterior of (39a) with green panels derived from Arita porcelains.

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

china and glass. Here ‘Giles China painter’ owed Akerman £18-5s-4d and ‘Campman China painter’ owed £12-4s. We know that a supply of suitable porcelain was readily available, as Geoffrey Godden pointed out that in the china-ware purchasing order for the ‘Townsend’ in 1726 there are listed the normal 150 chests of useful porcelains ‘most blue and white’ and also ‘some entire white china of all the before mentioned sorts’.³⁸

I know of three bowls, decorated in the same workshop and probably by the same hand, that depict Admiral Vernon³⁹ (37a & b). Vernon was the toast of the town after his spectacular capture of the fortress of Portobello on November 22nd 1739 and this feat was commemorated in numerous prints⁴⁰ and as many as 130 different medals were struck in his honour- more than for any other naval hero of the time.⁴¹ Since he fell from grace with the Admiralty and was struck off the list of flag officers in 1746, these bowls must date from his period of popularity around 1740.⁴²



41. An English-decorated Chinese teapot with the smiling sun, in the Imari palette which incorporates the original Chinese underglaze blue and the characteristic muddy blue enamel and of the English decorators. (Private collection.)



40. A typical English-decorated Chinese teapot, related to (39), which form a large class of wares that have also been attributed to Holland in the past. (Private collection.)

The Admiral is depicted holding his baton in a pose popularised by the medals and prints (38), within a border of naval trophies and Red Ensigns.⁴³ A distinctive aubergine enamel is a new addition to the palette, but we still see the rather muddy blue found on the earlier armorial pieces. The exteriors of the bowls differ somewhat but again have a type of decoration that would generally have been attributed to Holland in the past.

John Sandon pointed out the feature of a small smiling sun which can be a useful diagnostic tool for identifying English decoration of this period. It can be seen on the exterior of the Vernon bowl (37b) and also occurs above a cockerel in the interior of the small bowl (39a & b). This seeded green ground in panels, derived from Arita porcelain, is found in turn on quite a large class of which the teapot (40) is a typical example; here we see again the ever popular standing oriental, presumably Japanese, figure and the use of the white enamel. The sun again appears on the teapot (41) decorated in the typical Imari palette of iron-red, gold and blue. The acceptance of the decoration of these pieces as English leads to another large class of related wares being re-attributed to English enamelling workshops.



42a. A London salt-glazed stoneware mug of c.1700-05 enamelled and dated 1739. The draughtsmanship and the use of the aubergine enamel perhaps indicate that it comes from the same workshop as the Vernon bowls (37). (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



42b. detail of (42a) inscribed AML 1739.



43. A Limehouse teapot, 1745-48, decorated with the popular 'man-in-a-red-coat' that is also found on Chinese porcelain. (Samuel Grober collection.)



44. A Chinese teapot with the 'man-in-a-red-coat', circa 1745-50. Note also the similarity of the treatment of the buildings. Variations of this pattern continued into the late 1760's at least and can be found on outside decorated Worcester porcelain of this date. (Private collection.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

45. A Chinese porcelain tea bowl with the 'fruiting tendril' design that is unique to this workshop and also occurs on Limehouse porcelain, circa 1745-48. (Private collection.)

The same aubergine, noted on the Vernon bowls, can be seen on a curious early London salt-glazed tankard (42a & b) enamelled with the initials A, L, M and dated 1739 in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The tankard itself is of earlier London stoneware dating from around 1700-05. It is tempting to draw some parallels with elements of decoration on early Bow 'incised R' group wares such as the cell pattern and cross and zigzag borders.⁴⁴

All the pieces we have seen so far predate the first English porcelains. When Limehouse porcelain did arrive in 1745 it is not surprising to find that the existing enamelling workshops turned their attention to it.

Bernard Watney was the first to identify and classify the polychrome decoration of Limehouse porcelain. He divided it into four groups: an orange-red group; a Kakiemon group; a bold *famille rose* group; and a group of landscapes after Chinese export copies of European landscapes which often include a man in a bright red coat.⁴⁵ All these types are found on Chinese porcelain. The most elaborate is this last group. The buildings are stiff angular versions of those found on Chinese export porcelain, but the figures beside barrels derive, perhaps indirectly, from the harbour scenes of Meissen (43 & 44). Close variants of these designs continued for many years, the same red-coated man appearing on outside-decorated, probably



46a. A Chinese beaker vase decorated in London with a medley of Kakiemon designs, the 'fruiting tendril' design in the interior link it to the Limehouse group. (Present whereabouts unknown.)



46b. Interior of (46a).

in the James Giles workshop, Worcester teawares of the 1760's. The dotted treatment of the leaves is another characteristic of English decoration.

The Kakiemon group, on Limehouse and Chinese porcelain, includes a distinctive fruiting tendril (45) that is quite unlike any oriental design and unique to this family, and which is of great help in isolating the group. Helen Espir brought to my attention a Chinese beaker vase (46a & b) published by W.W. Winkworth, which is important for the identification of other pieces of this group.⁴⁶ The vase itself appears to be of *Jingdezhen* porcelain rather than *blanc-de-chine*. The interior of the mouth has the characteristic 'fruiting tendril' design and the outside is decorated with a range of accurately drawn popular Kakiemon motifs. The quail pattern on the large silver-shape ewer (47) shares the spikiness in the drawing that is quite different from the precise and sometimes laboured earlier Dutch versions of Kakiemon. This group seems to be the first English attempt at Kakiemon. The use of areas of solid colour particularly turquoise (48 & 49) but also pink and plum is typical of this group, and again is found on Limehouse.



48. A London-decorated *blanc-de-chine* mug, Kangxi, from the same workshop, enamelled c. 1745-50. 'Blanc de chine' porcelain had not been imported in any quantity for over twenty years but was still amongst the best available white porcelain. (Private collection.)



47. A Chinese ewer decorated in the same workshop as (46), circa 1745-48. A 'spikiness' of the Kakiemon designs is typical of English work in contrast to the more pains-taking earlier Dutch versions of Kakiemon. (Christopher Girton collection.)



49. A London-decorated *blanc-de-chine* porringer and cover, Kangxi, from the same workshop, enamelled c. 1745-50. (Peabody Essex Museum.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

50. A London-decorated *blanc-de-chine* figure of *Guanyin*, Kangxi. A number of figures were ‘enhanced’ in this way. The broad washes of turquoise and other colours are a characteristic feature of this group. The painting of the kakiemon designs is reminiscent of Chelsea porcelain of the raised-anchor period, which suggests a date for the decoration closer to 1750. (The Victoria and Albert Museum.)

Much of the best of the Kakiemon group is on *blanc-de-chine* porcelain, which was still the most widely available fine white porcelain, although it had ceased to be imported in any quantity for 25 or 30 years.⁴⁷ A *blanc-de-chine* figure of *Guanyin* (50) shows the typical areas of solid colour and a style of Kakiemon painting reminiscent of raised-anchor Chelsea and so perhaps dates to nearer 1750.

It can be shown that this workshop also decorated some white salt-glazed stoneware; the fruiting tendrils design appears on a teapot (51a & b) that also has solid

colour washes. Another teapot, decorated in the same workshop, now in the Henry Weldon Collection (52), is inscribed with the initials WH.⁴⁸ These have been published as being the initials of ‘William Horologius’, but this has been shown to be based on a misunderstanding.⁴⁹ Some of the salt-glazed forms that bear London decoration are not typical of Staffordshire and may prove not to have been made there.

One must be cautious in attributing all Kakiemon designs on salt-glazed stoneware to this group, as Kakiemon designs were certainly also done in Holland. For instance the British Museum has a salt-glazed teapot (MLA 1942,4-11,3)⁵⁰ that matches



51a. A salt-glazed teapot with the ‘fruiting tendrils’ found on (45) and crane design decorated in the same London workshop that worked on Chinese and Limehouse porcelain. Circa 1745-48. (Private collection.)



51b. The reverse of (51a)



52. A London-decorated salt-glazed teapot signed with the initials WH. Circa 1745-48. (Henry H. Weldon Collection, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.)

exactly typical Dutch versions of this pattern, on Chinese porcelain, in which birds in flight are drawn with characteristic solidity. Simeon Shaw claimed that Dutch workmen at Hot Lane introduced enamelling on Staffordshire stoneware before 1751, and English salt-glazed wares are known to have been in Holland at this time,⁵¹ so there is plenty of opportunity for confusion to arise.

It is interesting to look again at some of the decoration on salt-glazed stoneware that does not seem typical of Staffordshire work and consider where it might have been added. It is probable that London workshops decorated more than is generally acknowledged. A finely decorated group of salt-glazed wares decorated with Jacobite subjects has always seemed to stand apart from typical Staffordshire decoration and also uses the aubergine enamel previously noted, these must date from, or shortly after, the time of the rebellion in 1745 and perhaps some might also be London work.

54. A Limehouse sauceboat that exhibits both *famille rose* and Kakiemon elements indicating that both types of decoration were executed in the same workshop. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)



The bold *famille rose* type of decoration is the type most commonly found on Limehouse and also on Chinese porcelain (53). The thick application of the opaque enamel was ideal for blotting out the underglaze blue on both types of porcelain. The quality of this work was very variable, and is hard to imagine it emanating from the same workshops that produced the best of the Kakiemon decoration but there are occasions when Kakiemon elements are found incorporated with the heavier *famille rose* style, such as on the sauce boat (54) in the Victoria and Albert Museum suggesting a common origin.



53. A Chinese teapot with typical Limehouse-type *famille rose* decoration. This is the most common and least skilful type of English decoration of oriental porcelain of the 1740's. The heavily applied opaque colours are successful in obliterating the original underglaze blue. (David Battie collection.)

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

An armorial bowl of this group was stolen from the Hartlepool Museum.⁵² David Howard says whilst the arms are not positively identifiable due to inaccuracies of the colours, they are almost certainly English and the helm is that of an English gentleman. The arms are possibly those of Langan (of Ireland), Lawrence, Knapp or Trotman.⁵³

The evidence suggests one or more London-based workshop that was decorating Limehouse porcelain, white salt-glazed stonewares and a great deal of Chinese porcelain. It is not clear whether the Limehouse enamelling was work subcontracted and commissioned by Limehouse or simply the result of the workshop's own entrepreneurial opportunism; if the latter, we might have expected to see some Bow decorated in the same manner unless it was confined to the period 1745-47 before Bow had established a significant production. Some early Bow was evidently decorated outside the factory; the striking similarity between a salt-glazed patty (55) pan and a very early Bow sauceboat (56) was commented on at the ECC 'Miscellany of Pieces' meeting, held on the 15th

March 2003. But those pieces of Bow that could be outside decorated do not seem to be related to the Limehouse and other wares that are discussed here.

There is no evidence to identify these pieces with any particular workshop but it is worth considering a William Duesbury connection. Salt-glazed cranes,⁵⁴ for instance, enamelled with the broad washes of colour that we associated with the Limehouse-related group have been attributed to the Duesbury workshop on the strength of descriptions in his 'London Account Book' of 1751-53. Among the entries is one for '1 pr of Hostrigsis (crossed out) crame candles' (57), i.e. for ostrich or crane candlesticks,⁵⁵ and the account book begins with instructions for colouring a Turk,⁵⁶ which at this date is likely to be a salt-glazed stoneware figure (58):

'To Dress the Turk Soldr
Cap the front Blue Black red of it
The Wast Cote and Sleevs Blue
The Sandals Yellow Breeches
Red and belt'

According to Llewellynn Jewitt, Duesbury was born in 1725 and so would have been 20 years old when the Limehouse factory was established. Certain sums of money are entered in his 'London Account Book' under 1742, suggesting that he was active at this time and engaged in business at an age of only 17.⁵⁷ John



56. A salt-glazed 'patty' pan with similar enamels to the Bow sauceboat (55). (Private collection.)



55. An early Bow sauceboat circa c. 1748. Some early Bow was probably decorated outside the factory by decorators who also worked on salt-glazed stonewares. (Private collection.)



57. A Salt-glazed crane enamelled with the broad washes of colour that is seen on the Limehouse related group have been attributed to William Duesbury on the strength of descriptions in his London Account Book of 1751-53. (Henry H. Weldon Collection, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.)



58. A salt-glazed figure of a Turk. (Henry H. Weldon Collection, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.)



59. A 'dry-edge' Derby shepherdess with London-type flower painting, c. 1752/3. (Victoria and Albert Museum.)

Mallet has pointed out that the book is not really an account book at all, and that it does not describe the activities of an enamelling workshop (as is commonly supposed). Rather, only very occasionally do the entries specify enamelling, perhaps suggesting that most pieces were simply being retailed, repaired or mounted with flowers, as is sometimes indicated⁵⁸ (as with the 'Lisard candle Sticks, 0-0-6' entered on the 8th June 1751). Furthermore Robin Hildyard has suggested that the prices seem surprisingly low for retail values. If Duesbury was mostly retailing and occasionally subcontracting enamelling to different workshops, this would help explain the disparity between the style of decoration of the salt-glazed pieces associated with him and that of Dry-edge Derby (59) and other figures characterised by the fine London-style flower painting that also seem to be described in the accounts. Perhaps Duesbury was subcontracting some of the work to enamellers, such as the younger James Giles (born 1718 and

apprenticed in 1733), to whose early period some of the London flower painting can reasonably be attributed, or Thomas Hughes, who was recorded as a china painter at Warner Street, Clerkenwell, in 1747.

To set up an enamelling workshop would require only a modest investment, essentially a small muffle kiln; we know that in Holland decorators worked from home and the German term '*hausmaler*' indicates the same. Although it seems increasingly clear that the amount of outside enamelling in the first half of the 18th century was much greater than realised in the past, it could well have been organised as a cottage industry. This would explain why it has left so little trace in the record and why such a chronicler as R. R. Angerstein,⁵⁹ who was interested in larger scale industrial processes, does not refer to it in his Travel diary of 1753-55. In the second half of the century James Giles, in particular, organised an enamelling workshop on an industrial scale, which did leave a considerable record.

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

While perhaps not carried out on an industrial scale in the first half of the eighteenth century this paper adds to the growing body of evidence that considerably more enamelling was taking place in England than has hitherto been thought. Much of the work that has been attributed to Dutch enamellers

must now be reassessed, and it also seems that some work that has generally been assumed to be Chinese, armorial and other export ware, must also be reconsidered for possible reattribution to English workshops.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank those who have offered their help so generously, in particular Helen Espir, Hilary Young, John Ayers, Robert Barth, David Battie, Dr. Jan Daniel van Dam, Aileen Dawson, Anton Gabszewicz, Alan Green, Malcolm Gutter, Jessica Harrison-Hall, Robin Hildyard, Jonathan Horne, David Sanctuary Howard, Dr. Christian Jörg, Dr. Jochem Kroes, John Mallet, Henriette Manners, Roger Massey, Robert McPherson, Roger Quarm, Pamela Roditi, John Sandon, Timothy Schroder, Simon Spero, Tom Walford, Bernard and Mavis Watney, John Whitehead, Robert Williams, Timothy Wilson and Thomas Woodcock L.V.O., Norroy and Ulster King of Arms.

NOTES

¹ W. B. Honey, 'German & English Decorators of Chinese porcelain', *Antiques Magazine*, March 1932, p.107-111.

² Christie's, London, 6 December 2004, lot 273.

³ The Bertram K. Little and Nina Fletcher Little Collection, sold Sotheby's New York, Oct. 1994 and now in the Chipstone Foundation.

⁴ Jonathan Horne, *A Collection of Early English Pottery*, part XII, no.337.

⁵ H. Goldweitz, 'An American Collection of English Pottery: A Chronology 1635-1778', *Trans ECC*, Vol. 12 Part 1, 1984, pl. 24b.

⁶ Catalogue of the Pottery and Porcelain in the collection of L. M. Solon, Messrs. Charles Butters and Sons, Hanley 26-28 November 1912, lot no. 484, also illustrated in 'The Solon Collection of Pre-Wedgwood English Pottery' by the Collector, part II, *The Connoisseur*, II, 1902, p.79, pl. IV.

⁷ For instance the following enamelled Elers wares: a mug, unpublished, from the collection of Jean Royer (1737-1807), now in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. A teapot from the Herzog Anton Ulrich Museum, Braunschweig, illustrated by Robin Hildyard in '*Schwarz Porcelain*', Museum für Lackkunst, Münster, Germany, 2003, pl. 94. A teapot, presumably Elers ware, from the Porzellansammlung, Dresden, illustrated in Zimmerman, *Die Erfindung und Frühzeit des Meissner Porzellans*, Berlin 1908, pl. 50 (left). A teapot wrongly attributed to China or Böttger stoneware in the Germanisches National Museum, Nürnberg, *Böttgersteinzeug*

und frühes Meissener Porzellan, Nürnberg, 1982, pl.15. An unpublished mug in the Groninger Museum, Groningen. That these pieces are found on the continent should not surprise as Jan Daniël van Dam has shown that much Elers ware was exported to Europe and can be found in German and Dutch museums, see '*European Redwares: Dutch, English and German Connections, 1680-1780*', T. Walford and H. Young (eds), *British Ceramic Design, 1600-2002*, 2003, pp. 36-37.

⁸ B. Rackham, 'A Dated Staffordshire Mug in the National Museum of Wales, Cardiff', *Trans ECC*, Vol. 2, Part 8, 1942, pp. 145-8.

⁹ Jonathan Horne, *A Collection of Early English Pottery*, part VIII, no.204.

¹⁰ The High Museum, Atlanta, '*English Ceramics*', *The Frances and Emory Coker collection, Atlanta*, 1988, no. 17.

¹¹ Jonathan Horne, *English Pottery and related works of art*, 2003, no. 03/13.

¹² Rackham acknowledged that W. B. Honey had also noted this work on Chinese porcelain but he had felt that it was the work of independent decorators on the continent. See W. B. Honey, 'Elers Ware', *Trans ECC*, Vol. 1, Part 2, 1934, footnote on p. 14.

¹³ Sold in the Cora and Benjamin Ginsburg collection, Northeast Auctions, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, U.S.A., August 2nd, 2003, lot 1918, now in the Chipstone Foundation.

- ¹⁴ The Watney Collection of Chinese Porcelain decorated in Holland and England, Bonhams, London, November 7th, 2003, lot 2 (part).
- ¹⁵ So far I know of five examples of *blanc-de-chine* painted with this cockerel motif.
- ¹⁶ W. B. Honey, 'Dutch decorators of Chinese porcelain', *Antiques Magazine*, February 1932.
- ¹⁷ Throughout this paper I use the term 'Kakiemon' to describe wares decorated in the style and palette that has become associated with these Japanese export wares rather than in the more strict, and correct, sense of wares actually coming from the Kakiemon kilns themselves.
- ¹⁸ Kakiemon wares were being added to the collection of Augustus the Strong nearly up to the time of his death in 1733 and Meissen was itself making them in quantity from c. 1728; John Whitehead points out that there was a notable absence of Kakiemon in the large collection of Japanese porcelain belonging to The Regent of France, Philippe duc d'Orleans who died in 1723, (see John Whitehead 'Porcelains in the Inventory of the Regent', *French Porcelain Society Journal*, vol. 1, 2003, p. 11-45). The commissions of Rodolphe Lemaire from Meissen, which he intended to sell in France as genuine Japanese porcelain, and the subsequent court case make it clear that Kakiemon was very much sought after in France by the late 1720's and that the Dutch were supplying this need. It is evident from the collection of the Prince de Condé and the specialisation of his own porcelain factory, Chantilly, that Kakiemon continued strongly in favour in France through the 1730's at a time when it had ceased to be imported from Japan.
- ¹⁹ Rosalind Pulver, 'An early eighteenth century China shop', *Trans ECC*, Vol. 12, Part 2, 1985, p.121, Guildhall Library MS 3041/1 p. 3.
- ²⁰ Gordon Elliot, *John & David Elers and their contemporaries*, 1998, text to pl. 1.
- ²¹ Guildhall microfilm 24177/1, 288 & 1539, I am grateful to Helen Espir for bringing this to my attention.
- ²² An example has been excavated in Philadelphia: see the front cover and end note of *The American Ceramic Circle Journal*, vol. XII, 2003. Anton Gabszewicz informs me that a single Bow example is known, in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum C.40&A-1938.
- ²³ Early Ming dynasty tankards of this form exist in blue and white from the Xuande period (1426-1435); these were copied directly from Persian bronze prototypes. They do not reoccur in Chinese porcelain in the intervening years and so any similarity of shape is coincidental.
- ²⁴ Robert R. Wark, '*British Silver in the Huntington Collection*', Huntington Library, San Marino, CA, 1978, no. 54, for a 'small mug'.
- ²⁵ A somewhat similar London silver chocolate pot of 1706 with the maker's mark of Richard Syng is illustrated in Vanessa Brett, *Sotheby's Directory of Silver, 1600-1940*, 1986, fig. 563. Normally a chocolate pot has an aperture in the top for a stirrer or molinet. Nomenclature was not set in stone at this date as can be seen from a silver tapering cylindrical pot in the Victoria and Albert Museum, (M. 399-1921), of a form that would always be described today as a coffee pot that bears a contemporary inscription stating that "This silver tea-pott was presented to ye Comtte of ye East India Company by ye Right Honul George Berkeley....".
- ²⁶ An examples with typical English decoration of more routine quality is illustrated in Regina Krahl and Jessica Harrison-Hall, 'Ancient Chinese trade ceramics from The British Museum, London', Taiwan, 1994, p.329, no. 147, where it is described as decorated in Holland, partly at my instigation, in line with the view then prevailing.
- ²⁷ I am grateful to Timothy Schroder for this information.
- ²⁸ Professor Dr. Fritz Fichtner, *Chinesische Porzellane aus der Provinz Fukien unter europaischem Einfluss*, Keramische Rundschau, Berlin 1937, (Jahrgang 45, no. 4, s.33-35 –no. 5, s.47-50), pp 3-23, for illustrations of tankards and cups from the Staatlichen Porzellansammlung, Dresden, and their relation to the English stoneware prototypes.
- ²⁹ David Sanctuary Howard, *Chinese Armorial Porcelain*, 2003, vol. II, p.147.
- ³⁰ David Sanctuary Howard, *Chinese Armorial Porcelain*, 1974, p.257. When published it was not realised that these dishes were decorated in Europe but David Howard noted that they did not conform to any accepted group of Chinese export porcelain.
- ³¹ By descent in the Dysart and Tollemache families at Ham House to Sir Lyonel Tollemache, 4th Bt. Acquired by Ronald A. Lee, who had befriended Sir Lyonel and preserved many items from the attic, which were being disposed of and were about to be put on a bonfire. Ronald Lee subsequently presented some items to the National Trust and presented the family papers that he had saved from the flames to the Richmond Borough Council. Ronald A. Lee collection, Sotheby's, 28 November 2001, lot 106 and introduction on p. 148.
- ³² I am grateful to Thomas Woodcock L.V.O. F.S.A., Norroy and Ulster King of Arms and to David Sanctuary Howard for help in interpreting the arms.
- ³³ Helen Espir, 'Overview of the Display at The British Museum, East Meets West: Oriental Porcelain decorated in Europe', *Transactions of The Oriental Ceramic Society*, vol. 65. 2001-2, pp. 123-4.
- ³⁴ Examples of the Dutch use of opaque white enamel are lots 54 and 55 in The Watney Collection of Chinese Porcelain decorated in Holland and England, Bonhams, London, November 7th, 2003.
- ³⁵ Hilary Young, 'Eighteenth-century English decorators of Chinese porcelain', *Apollo*, November 2002, p. 18.
- ³⁶ Hilary Young, *Ibid.*, for a summary of existing documentary evidence.
- ³⁷ W. B. Honey, 'The Work of James Giles', *Trans ECC*, Vol 1, Part 5, 1937, p. 22.

The English Decoration of Oriental Porcelain – Errol Manners

- ³⁸ Geoffrey A. Godden- *Oriental Export Market Porcelain*, 1979, p. 363.
- ³⁹ I am indebted to Roger Quarm of the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, for identifying Admiral Vernon.
- ⁴⁰ For instance the mezzotint by I. Faber after J. Bardwell.
- ⁴¹ The Marquess of Milford Haven, *British Naval Medals*, 1919, no. 186 is one of many medals that could have acted as a prototype for the design in the Vernon bowls.
- ⁴² William Hogarth still refers to Vernon in his painting ‘*Canvassing for Votes*’ of 1755, in Sir John Soane’s Museum, where an old barber is seated explaining to his companion with broken pieces of his pipe how Vernon had taken Portobello with six ships.
- ⁴³ In the 18th century the Red Ensign was not, as it is now, the flag of the Merchant Navy but referred to a naval squadron or an independent command, see Timothy Wilson, ‘*Flags at Sea*’, 2nd edition, 1999, pp. 25 and 26.
- ⁴⁴ Anton Gabszewicz, ‘Bow Porcelain: The incised ‘R’ marked Group and associated wares’, *Trans ECC*, Vol. 17, Part 2, 2000, pl. 25 and 34.
- ⁴⁵ B. Watney, ‘Limehouse Coloured Ware’, *Trans ECC*, Vol. 15, Part 1, 1993, p. 65.
- ⁴⁶ W. W. Winkworth, ‘European Kakiemon’, *The Antique Collector*, October 1970, p.217, pl. 4 & 9. The present whereabouts of this vase is not known to me.
- ⁴⁷ Opinions differ on when *blanc-de-chine* porcelains ceased to be imported to Europe. I follow the view taken by John Ayers that it largely stopped early in the 18th century. For a discussion of this see John Ayers, *Blanc de Chine, Divine Images in Porcelain*, China Institute Gallery, New York, 2002.
- ⁴⁸ Peter Williams and Pat Halfpenny, *A Passion for Pottery, Further Selections from The Henry Weldon Collection*, New York 2000, No. 41.
- ⁴⁹ Miranda Goodby, ‘The First Salt-Glaze Enameller?’ *Northern Ceramic Circle Newsletter*, no. 84, December 1991, pp. 10-11, in which the sequence of events which lead to the imaginary Willem Horologius being invented and then entering the literature are explained. Hilary Young, *English porcelain, 1745-95*, 1999, p.156, publishes the trade card of William Hussey dated 1764 who one might speculate could have been the one intended.
- ⁵⁰ Illustrated in *Porcelain for Palaces, The Fashion for Japan in Europe 1650-1750*, The Oriental Ceramic Society, 1990, pl. 343.
- ⁵¹ Jacobien Rensing-Wolfert, ‘The Delft Background, References to early petit-feu technique and over-decoration from Dutch archives’, *Transactions of The Oriental Ceramic Society*, vol. 65. 2001-2, p. 132; an inventory of the stock of Jan Verhaast, an enameller from Delft, taken at his death in 1740 includes the stock of Chinese porcelain ‘decorated by the deceased’; also listed were 300 plain white pieces, Chinese as well as Delft and two English pieces, probably salt-glazed stoneware.
- ⁵² Jean Martin and Andrew Holley, ‘Colonel William Thomlinson’s Collection of Chinese 18th Century Export Porcelain’, *Hartlepool Museum Service*, 1993, pl. 1. no. 8.
- ⁵³ David Howard, unpublished correspondence.
- ⁵⁴ Leslie B. Grigsby, *The Henry H. Weldon Collection, English Pottery, Stoneware and Earthenware 1650-1800*, 1990, no. 170, p. 308.
- ⁵⁵ William Duesbury’s London Account Book, 1751-53, *English Porcelain Circle Monograph*, Mrs Donald MacAlister, 1931, p. 34.
- ⁵⁶ Leslie B. Grigsby, *The Henry H. Weldon Collection, English Pottery, Stoneware and Earthenware 1650-1800*, 1990, no. 187, p. 331.
- ⁵⁷ William Duesbury’s London Account Book, 1751-53, *English Porcelain Circle Monograph*, Mrs Donald MacAlister, 1931, p. 9.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid 1751-53: There are a number of other indications that Duesbury was involved either directly or indirectly in enamelling, for instance on August 28 1752 (p. 84) we find Duesbury buying colours: ‘Recvd of Wm Duesbury the sum of six pounds nineteen shillings in full for the collors’ from a Friederich Vorge Witts or Virkekewits. There are a few instances such as: ‘Feby 6 1752 A sawser to inamil’. ‘A pr plates to inamil’ where Duesbury feels it necessary, occasionally, to specify enamelling, suggesting that this was not what the other entries in the account book are concerned with.
- ⁵⁹ *R.R. Angerstein’s Illustrated Travel Diary 1753-1755, translated by Torsten & Peter Berg*, London 2001.