them a great deal of the Buddhist spirit. The orbital ridges form a continuous line across the face, and above the nose are modelled as a pronounced ridge, a notable feature, inasmuch as in pre-Sung days the line of the eyebrows was continued downwards to the point of the nose.

The prettiness of the whole, and a certain realism about the attitude and features point to this figure having been made during the Southern Sung dynasty (A.D. 1126—1279). This was a great period of Art, fostered by peace and luxury, when painting, sculpture and ceramics all attained a high perfection; and it is significant that the Emperor Hui-Tsung, who was deposed A.D. 1126, had commanded his artists to study direct from nature.

The figure probably represents one of the B导弹sattva, divine beings, dwelling in the Buddhist heavens, who in myriads of years to come will attain the perfection of a Buddhahood. It has been suggested that this is a figure of Maitreya, the next Buddha to come, who in the early days of Buddhist art in India and in the conventionalised Chinese form was commonly represented in a sitting posture, wearing the long hair of a Brahmin ascetic, and holding a vase in his hand. This attribute is not shown here,

though the original right hand may possibly have held it.

The Museum is fortunate to get such a beautiful piece of Chinese wooden sculpture. Perhaps it will be the means of raising the interest of the authorities in this branch of art and knowledge; for either from a mistaken policy, or neglect, our young orientalists are never sent to the countries they are studying, the only means by which they can really get in touch with their subject. Even so young a Museum as that of Cleveland, Ohio, thinks it worth while to send to China a competent scholar to study and collect on its behalf.

It will, at any rate, be of no small interest for the British public to be able to see this fine example of Chinese mediaval art in conjunction with the splendid pottery Lohan of a few centuries earlier in date, which, it may be as well to recall, the nation also owes to the well-directed energies of the National Art Collections Fund.

Both these figures once formed part of a series similar in size and design; in the case of the Lohan we know this to be so, as others of the set exist; it is not unlikely that in the case of this wooden figure also certain of its brethren may have survived.

PAUL DE LAMERIE, GOLDSMITH

BY E. ALFRED JONES

P A U L DE LAMERIE, to give him his correct name, is now a personality in the eyes of the collector of and dealer in English Plate of the 18th century, and his name is often mentioned with almost as much reverence as that of Benvenuto Cellini. Whether the objects from his atelier be in good or in bad taste—and, alas! how often can they not be included in the second of these categories?—it may come somewhat as a shock to the collector of the wares of this Anglo-French goldsmith to learn that not all the specimens of plate bearing his distinctive punches were wrought entirely by his own hands. He had his collaborators and apprentices just as had Vandyck and Rubens and other artists. Proof for this definite assertion is forthcoming from a document of considerable interest, now brought to notice, it is believed, for the first time.

This is none other than the last will and testament of Paul De Lamerie, citizen, goldsmith and freeman of the City of London. By this will he directs his executors immediately after his death to make an inventory of the particulars and weight of all his stock of plate, finished and unfinished, and to sell the whole by public auction.

All the unfinished plate was directed to be finished forthwith and made fit for sale by “being boiled and burnish’d”. Langford, the auctioneer in Covent Garden, was to be employed to sell the plate, provided he would consent to do so at the same price as any other auctioneer. Paul De Lamerie’s dwelling house in Gerrard Street, Soho, and his two leasehold houses in the Haymarket are mentioned in the will. A bequest was made to his kind and indulgent daughter, Mary De Lamerie, for her tender care and affectionate regard for him during his long and tedious illness of many months duration. To his bookkeeper, Isaac Gyles, for his long and faithful services, he bequeathed forty guineas.

The question will have arisen as to the precise directions for the finishing of the unfinished plate in De Lamerie’s workshop. It is stipulated in his will that his two journeymen silversmiths, Frederick Knopfell and Samuel Collins, should receive a legacy of £15 and £20 respectively, on condition that they consented to remain in the employ of the executors until they could finish and make ready for sale all the unfinished plate in the workshop at the time of the death of De Lamerie. The larger legacy left
Cruet frame by Paul de Lamerie. 1750-51. (Lord Swaythling)

Sauce ladle, by Paul de Lamerie. 1750-51. (Lord Swaythling)

Paul de Lamerie, goldsmith
to Samuel Collins suggests that he was either the greater favourite or the more skilled craftsman of the two.

According to Jackson’s *English Goldsmiths and their Marks*, the latest date on which the punch of Paul De Lamerie was registered at Goldsmiths Hall was 1749, but the date of his death, as is proved by his will, was between the 24th May, 1751, the date of his will, and 8th August in the same year, when it was proved. But although 1749 may be the latest date at Goldsmiths Hall for his punch, there are two pieces of plate stamped with his mark for the year 1750-51, namely, the cruet stand and sauce ladle here illustrated [Plate], in the great collection of old English plate of Lord Saythling, now on exhibition by the generosity of the owner at the Victoria and Albert Museum.

This raises an interesting problem. The fact that De Lamerie had been ill for several months before his death is known from his will. Could these two pieces have been finished by his two journeymen, Knopfell and Collins, after the master had been stricken by his mortal illness?

Another point of interest is now revealed for the first time: that the maker of a silver rose-water dish of the year 1751-52 in the Synagogue in Duke Street, Aldgate, was Paul De Lamerie’s journeyman goldsmith, Frederick Knopfell, who entered his mark at Goldsmiths Hall in 1752, and therefore started the business of silversmith on his own account the year after his master’s death.¹

Paul De Lamerie left no son to carry on his craft. Two unmarried daughters are mentioned in his will, Mary and Lucy, a married daughter, Susannah De Baufre, and his wife, Lucy. Two of the executors were Charles Ffouare, of St. Stephen’s, Walbrook, and John Malliet, of Wardour Street, who do not appear to have been of his own craft.

The mark of Samuel Collins was not registered at Goldsmiths Hall, and therefore it is assumed that he became a journeyman to another goldsmith after the death of Paul De Lamerie and after he had fulfilled the injunctions of his master.

The subject of the English journeyman silversmith has not been considered in any of the books on old English plate. Research on this interesting side of the art of the goldsmith would probably yield valuable results. One contribution to it may be made here in regard to a London woman-goldsmith, Hester Bateman, whose mark, registered at Goldsmiths Hall in 1774, is found on a very large number of pieces of plate between that year and 1790, when she appears to have died or retired from business.

The explanation for the great quantity of plate made in the workshop of this woman-goldsmith is that she had in her employ no fewer than forty silversmiths in the year 1786, when one of them, Benjamin Bull, was indicted for feloniously stealing some silver cuttings from this workshop. In the same year one Abel Beck was one of the craftsmen employed there. Such was the great amount of silver metal in the workshop and the dishonesty of the workmen that as much as £3 to £4 worth of the metal was lost in a day almost without notice by the owner. The name of Peter Bateman, a son of and silversmith with Hester Bateman, is mentioned in the trial of the thief.² He was doubtless the silversmith of this name who was afterwards a partner with Jonathan Bateman, whose combined mark was registered in 1790, probably after the death of his mother. He was also perhaps the Peter Bateman who entered the combined mark of Peter and Ann Bateman in the following year.³

¹Jackson’s *English Goldsmiths and their Marks*, p. 368.
²Old Bailey Sessions Papers.
³Jackson, Ibid., p. 206.

ODILON REDON
BY CLAUDE ROGER-MARX

ODILON REDON was born at Bordeaux in 1840, but this strange genius, whose originality escapes definition, was never a prophet in his own country. Isolated among his contemporaries and almost without connection with the past, his most fervent admirers were recruited from abroad. Among the northern peoples, and especially the Dutch, lovers of mystery, he became a veritable cult, while France hesitated before this exotic flower, whose perfume troubled her. The force and unity of the French school lie in its profound realism; Ingres, Courbet and Cézanne are all proofs of this. The French genius, with its love of order and clarity, is always afraid of wandering. Imagination frightens it. The action brought against Delacroix is recommenced every time an artist attempts to evade the real. Nowhere perhaps in the history of art or literature can one find an example of such a singular creature as Odilon Redon. He seems to have been endowed with the power of escaping from all that imposes conditions on human existence. By some mysterious means he gets free from the laws