Luxury in Silk

Eighteenth-Century Fashion

English summary of the book *Luxus in Seide – Mode des 18. Jahrhunderts* by Adelheid Rasche
Translated by Tas Skorupa

Luxury

Although in the context of Christian doctrine the consumption of luxury items was considered extravagant and morally corrupting, under the influence of the policies of national economics in the eighteenth century the view became prevalent that luxury could make a positive contribution to the wealth of the people and the state. In this reassessment, a special role was given to the women of the aristocratic and bourgeois upper classes. In the course of the eighteenth century, women became the main consumers of luxury products, thus ensuring that the demand remained constant and the luxury industries and craftspeople, which were important factors in the economy made a good profit.

Luxury fashion products at this time were precious items made of rare materials: fabrics with gold threads, the finest muslin from India, rose-cut diamonds. These products were especially coveted if they had to be imported from abroad, thus making them more expensive. Rare objects were also considered luxury items. All of these items were made by craftsmen, and a considerable amount of time was required to, for example, prepare a loom for a complex floral pattern. It could take several days to produce one running meter; thus the product was only manufactured in small quantities and sold at high prices.

Fashion in the Eighteenth Century

The eighteenth century is considered the greatest period of the French-influenced style of fashion for both men and women, although toward the end of the century there was an increase in influence from England. Until the 1770s the nuanced court etiquette for clothing based on the French model dictated the spectrum of clothing for the upper classes from the official *grande robe de cour* to the more private *negligé* and *déshabillé*. All European countries and their capitals were oriented toward the fashion innovations from France in terms of cut, decoration, and design. Silk fabrics from Lyon, accessories from the Parisian merceries, and jewelry sets from Parisian jewelers were in demand and were offered for sale in all European centers of commerce in spite of the high import taxes.

In the eighteenth century fashionable clothing was worn especially by nobility and the upper bourgeois classes. Due to the widespread practice of passing on worn-out clothing to servants as well as through strict policies for the selling old clothing, fashionable clothing sometimes found its way—with a certain delay—into the lower classes.

From the perspective of contemporaries, however, the presence of fashion that bridged the classes was also seen as a threat to the order of society. Beyond its function of protecting the body, luxurious clothing primarily served as a symbol of social standing and the economic prosperity of individual families and persons, thus making the social hierarchies visible in

In: Adelheid Rasche, Luxus in Seide. Mode des 18. Jahrhunderts
(Kulturgeschichtliche Spaziergänge im Germanischen Nationalmuseum 19). Nürnberg 2018,
Heidelberg: arthistoricum.net 2022, https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.1141

public. The authorities tried to establish rules for the different classes through repeated sumptuary laws and detailed legislative texts with threats of punishment: any transgression of the established limits for jewelry, sumptuous fabrics, or fittings was penalized with fines as an endangerment of social stability. Clothing was supposed to continue to function as a visible symbol of belonging to a certain class that could be seen by everyone. This is why, for example, fabrics and lace with gold and silver threads, luxury furs, foreign-woven silk, embroidery, and gold and silver jewelry were only permitted for the upper classes.

In Germany, in addition to the direct role models—high-ranking people who brought their clothing and accessories directly from France or had them made using French models—it was possible to inform oneself about new developments in both German and international fashion at the regularly held fairs in Leipzig and Frankfurt am Main. The local sumptuary laws played an indirect role in influencing public fashion, because their detailed listings of fabric types, colors, and cuts provided a good overview of what was new and thus desirable. In addition, for the first time in European history there was a vigorous discourse on fashion that took an increasingly positive direction in the course of the eighteenth century. It was conducted in philosophical treatises, in the widespread weekly newspapers of all sorts, in pocket calendars, and in the 1780s in fashion magazines and even in plays.

Other written sources that are just as important for research today are satirical texts and lexicons—two genres that also had their heyday in this period. In addition to entertaining by exposing faults and aiming to improve prevailing conditions, satires almost always had didactic goals. They also gave a forum to topics that would have been improper in a serious tone, and could be discussed without embarrassment. Encyclopedias—especially the thirty-five-volume *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* that was published between 1751 and 1780 by Denis Diderot and Jean Baptiste le Rond d'Alembert, served to disseminate knowledge to a broad public and to this day are an essential source for understanding historical products, production methods, and distribution. For our publication on women's clothing of the eighteenth century, we frequently referred to *Das nutzbare, galante und curiöse Frauenzimmer-Lexikon* (The Useful, Genteel, and Curious Woman's Lexicon), the third edition that was published in 1773, and also to Carl Günther Ludovici's *Eröffnete Akademie der Kaufleute, oder vollständiges Kaufmanns-Lexikon* (Open Academy of Merchants, or Total Merchant Lexicon), published in 1767.

Incentive for the Exhibition and Catalogue

The incentive for this publication and exhibition was the acquisition of a silk dress from the 1750s from the collection of a family in central Germany in the summer of 2017. The light blue silk dress with a flower-and-lace pattern entered the museum collection along with a hoop petticoat—made of cyclamen-colored silk satin and whalebone hoops—that possibly belongs to the ensemble; both the stomacher and the lace cuffs, which were originally part of the dress, have been lost.

The high quality of the dress and hoop petticoat, as well as their relatively good state of conservation led to the desire to present these one-of-a-kind acquisitions as soon as possible in the context of a special exhibition. The unusual cut of the dress—known as the fitted Andrienne—and the just as unusual hoop petticoat are to be the focus using the current methods of clothing research.

The team of the textile, clothing, and jewelry collection used the few months since the acquisition of the silk dress and the hoop petticoat to inspect the pieces, locate comparative objects, and consult libraries and archives. Not all of the unresolved questions regarding the history of their production and use can be answered at this time—and due to the sparse source material it is possible that many of our hypotheses will not be able to be proven without doubt. What we can confirm is the extreme rareness of finding a silk dress from the mid-eighteenth century in an unaltered, original condition, thus giving us a view of the authentic cut that can only be observed today in a handful of fitted Andriennes in just a few collections.

Luxury in Silk: Eighteenth-Century Fashion presents opulent women's clothing, jewelry, and accessories of the upper levels of society and represents just a small part of the reality of clothing at that time. Most people were so constricted by their financial and social limits that they continued wearing their clothing until it wore out. Only the extraordinary pieces with strong emotional connections were saved. Unfortunately, many of the original clothing stories have been lost over time so that today only in a few cases do we have a personal narrative. The luxurious fitted Andrienne of light blue patterned silk fabric and the red-silk hoop petticoat give us the rare opportunity to take a trip back into the era of the Rococo. Using scientific analysis with current methods of historical clothing research, the exhibition presents in the best possible light the high material value, the representational character, and the incredible aesthetic quality of fashionable women's clothing from the eighteenth century in the context of one individual consumer.

The Andrienne Dress

The form of the fitted Andrienne, which was called *Taille-Andrienne* in German, came into being between 1740 and 1750. It was a special form for contemporaries, and today it is extremely rare in collections of fashion history. This type of clothing is mentioned for the first time in Germany in Johann Heinrich Zedler's supplement volume to the *Grosse vollständige Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschafften und Künste, welche bißhero durch menschlichen Verstand und Witz erfunden und verbessert worden* (The Great Complete Universal Lexicon of All Sciences and Arts, Which Have Been Invented and Improved by Human Reason and Wit), which was published in 1751. The entry reads: "Andrienne is a long dress for women, which was once completely open in the front. After a while it was only left open at the top. And this is the form that it still has, only that it is now made with the waist, and is thus called a fitted Andrienne, since it once did not have a waist. The Andrienne is tied tight when it is put on." (Zedler 1732–54, supplement volume 1, column 1448). The third edition of the *Frauenzimmer-Lexicon* (Women's Lexicon) of 1773 also lists the Andrienne—along with entries on *Robe* and *Manteau* as keywords. It also includes the special features, already noticed by Zedler: "Fitted Andriennes are tied at the front, and today's *robbes rondes* [*sic*] seem to derive from them." (Corvinus 1773, vol. 1, col. 135).

Other names for the loose morning dress worn at court known as the Andrienne—now also called the Adrienne—that became fashionable starting around 1700 were *sac*, *saloppe*, *Kontusch*, *Schlender*, *robe volante*, *robe battante*, or *robe de chambre* (Gorguet Ballersteros 2017, pp. 72–73). Since the contemporary terms are rarely accompanied by clear descriptions, it is difficult today to match clothing with the individual terms, especially since there are also differences from country to country.

Upper-class clothing of both men and women were divided into the following categories at the end of the Ancien Régime: *grande parure* (gala dress), *parure* (clothing for festive events), *négligé* (everyday dress), and *déshabillé* (indoor clothes) (see also exh. cat. Munich 2014, p. 6). Certain clothing cuts, fabric types, and ornamental forms were only permitted or appropriate for certain categories. For contemporaries the different clothing types were immediately recognizable and understandable in their hierarchical order, but this knowledge has been lost for the most part today.

THE SILK DRESS AT THE GERMANISCHES NATIONALMUSEUM

The fitted Andrienne acquired in 2017 belongs to the category *parure* since the dress was made with colored, patterned silk fabric without gold or silver threads and its basic form with a small train corresponds well to this festive type. The original Andrienne, which was not fitted at the waist, was not appropriate for court galas, since it was of the *négligé* type. Even the more developed fitted Andrienne remained inappropriate as court dress, which was traditionally conservative.

Published here for the first time, the one-piece silk dress consists of approximately 12.5 meters of patterned silk fabric in tabby weave, of which more than nine lengths of fabric were used. The bodice is tightly fitted at the top and accentuated on the back with a closed series of folds, with the opening of the décolleté pointing downward: the front middle seam is closed from the bottom only until about the height of the lap, to make it easier to put on the dress, especially the tight bodice. Over the long opening of the breast, which is reinforced with chintzed linen on the inside, there was originally a decorated, triangular, stiff stomacher as an application, which covered the underclothing and was attached with pins. Stomachers were often made from the same fabric, but sometimes they were independent of the dress and made of lace, ribbons, and other precious materials and embellishment. A stomacher is unfortunately not preserved in this case, and it cannot be known whether the original was made of the same light blue silk fabric or another material.

For the correct fitting of the bodice a body piece made of cotton fabric and whalebone insertions was integrated that could be tightened at the back with laces. The open front is sharply cut, and just like the back middle, stabilized on both sides with whalebone, and furnished with rows of holes for the laces. After putting on the underclothes—a long cotton shirt and another corset in the form of separate laced stays—the dress was pulled on and brought into the correct form using the laces on the back and front. The ideal body modeling was achieved in this way with the emphasized tight bodice that contrasted with the expansive dress as a conscious transformation of the natural body.

The fitted sleeves covered the upper arms and end in cuffs gathered in folds in the form of *manchettes à*

raquette, which were called *Flossen* (fins) in Germany at the time (Szeibert 2017, p. 16). The sleeves are completely lined with chintzed linen, and the cuffs are stiffened with paper. One of the cuffs still includes the original lead disk that added weight on both sides and can be clearly seen in X-rays. The cuffs were originally combined with additional white lace cuffs, so-called *engageantes*, which have been lost.

The dress, which protrudes expansively at the waist and was worn over a supporting hoop petticoat, is folded on the side in eleven pleats of varying size. The width of the dress could be additionally varied by pulling a drawstring that was applied on the inside. Below the rectangular neckline on either side of the impressive backside of the dress there are four wide, flat folds that are affixed to the semicircular curving, protruding skirt of the dress.

If you look a little more carefully, you will see that especially the upper portion of the bodice is not completely symmetrical. This sort of discrepancy is often seen in handmade historical clothing; it can be an indication of the erratic build of an individual client, or merely negligence in the cutting and finishing.

However, the tailor was especially attentive to the precise use of the fabric in the back and middle of the front, in order to exactly coordinate the placement of the floral motif. The white spiraling flowers at the top of the back folded area is perfectly symmetrical, except for a minor difference in the width. The fabric was staggered in the front and back middle on the left and right to take advantage of the height of the pattern repeat so that each time, a bouquet of flowers decorates the turned-up front edges of the bodice at breast level. On the skirt, the white flowers form a closed medallion, in the middle of which there are two bouquets that face each other.

The inner seam of the dress is lined with a strip of chintzed linen, which is wider at the back and protrudes at the hem to give the fragile material additional protection.

State of Conservation

The first evaluation of the sewing threads reveals that for the most part the fitted Andrienne is preserved in its original cut. Minor repairs from more recent times can be detected in the area of the pocket opening, and a poorly executed repair between the bodice and the skirt as well as a faulty seam have caused the fabric to twist on the right side of the dress.

One detail on the inside of the dress still remains unclear at this point in the evaluation: iron and brass rings have been applied to a total of six of the seams and threaded with linen bands that made it possible to gather the dress. Dresses of this type are known in the fashion of the 1770s as *robes à la polonaise*, although this fashion novelty only worked with dresses that were worn over an additional skirt—which is not part of this type of dress. It is possible that these ties were added in the second half of the nineteenth century. At that time the dress was altered in several ways: a pleated lace insert was added to the neckline, and the original lace decoration on the sleeves was replaced with machine-made lace, probably because it had been either damaged or lost. In addition, a jabot for use as an additional décolleté insert and a pair of cotton half-gloves decorated with lace have been passed down with the dress. There is no documentation on why the dress was altered in this way. Since the stomacher was probably already lost in the nineteenth century, it was probably necessary to cover the broad opening on the front of the dress in a different way. These additions were removed for the museum presentation of the dress.

The Light Blue Silk Fabric

Various patterns are woven into the light blue silk background with a height of pattern repeat of 43.5 to 45 centimeters. A wave-shaped garland of flowers with white, five-petal blossoms and medium blue pointed leaves branch off in the lower third into large bouquets of different flowers in shades of white, pink, and red. Intertwined in these dominant vine and flower motifs there is an approximately 5.5 centimeter-wide, white woven lace ribbon with oval forms and lozenge-shaped inserts that bring an additional dynamism to the pattern. Between the flower bouquets and the lace band the surface is filled with groups of small, white scattered flowers.

The silk fabric is a *gros de Tours* in a modified twill weave, whose pattern was produced using liseré and brocaded effects. At least a dozen different silk threads were used, and in the bouquets the weaver used an additional cream-colored thread, called *cordonnet*, as an ornament.

With the support of the Herbarium Erlangense at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, an attempt was made to determine exactly which flowers are depicted, in spite of the fact that draftsmen did not always follow the exact forms of nature. The spiraling blossoms of the dress's fabric are based on common jasmine (*Jasminum officinale*), a climbing plant with fragrant flowers. The bouquets contain, with various variations in the details and in the foliage above, a primrose hybrid of Primula elatior, in the center a rose and two rosebuds, and below probably a type of carnation or a peony (*Paeonia officinalis*).

The principle pattern elements of the silk fabric—undulating tendril motifs with flower garlands, bouquets, lace ribbons—belong to the most popular fabric patterns that were designed and produced between 1740 and 1775 in a great range of variations in all European centers of silk weaving of the era. The highest quality of patterned silk was designed and produced in Lyon, the center of silk weaving of this period. Silk from Lyon was sold in large German cities, on the one hand offered by the dealers, often Huguenots from France who had settled there. On the other hand, the trade fairs in Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig offered a broad assortment of new silk fabrics on a regular basis (cf. Middell 1999). Other European centers of silk weaving with complex patterns were Amsterdam and Haarlem (Colenbrander 2013), Krefeld, Germany (Rouette 2004), and in Berlin and Zurich (Paepke and Palmer in Schorta 2000). It is quite rare that a sample of silk fabric can be assigned to a specific place and manufacturer (Markowsky 1976).

With a weaving width of about 54 centimeters the fabric of our dress corresponds with the regulations of fabric width for patterned silk that are documented for Lyon; however, fabrics of this width were also manufactured in other places. An additional aid in determining the provenance could be the intact selvage, which can be seen from the inside on all of the fabric panels of the fitted Andrienne (fig. 4): it is striped lengthwise in white and red and at a width of 0.7 to 0.8 centimeters quite broad in comparison to other known selvages. Until now scholars have done little work on the geographical assignment of different selvages (Cousin 2000). The museum collections that we consulted in preparation for this exhibition (Paris, Lyon, Amsterdam, Berlin, Krefeld) and a private collection in Switzerland did not provide any directly comparable selvages. They are generally narrower: only several silks that are attributed to Spain have similarly wide and two-part selvages.

A direct comparison with fabrics from the period was just as unsuccessful up until now (Markowsky 1976, exh. cat. Milan 1990, Rothstein 1990, Colenbrander 2013). The published collections indicate the popularity of this pattern with wavelike garlands of blooms, bouquets, and bands of lace in the 1750s and 1760s; however, they do not correspond to the extent that it is possible to make a definitive attribution of our light blue silk fabric to a particular place. The closest example is a medium blue silk fabric, which is preserved in a pattern book from 1763–64 (Victoria & Albert Museum, London, inv. T.373-1972). The book was assembled in Lyon for the English market. The swatch that is tipped in with sealing wax on folio 33v (fig. 11) is a silk satin with floral garlands, bouquets, lace ribbon, and scattered flowers. Although on first glance there is a great similarity with the light blue silk fabric of the Nuremberg fitted Andrienne, the swatch, which is attributed to the Lyon silk weaver Nicolas Brossard (Miller 2014, p. 256), is actually much more complex, three-dimensional, and colorful. For this reason it is possible that the light blue silk fabric is either a simple variation of this fabric design from another silk weaver in Lyon or a variant that was manufactured in Germany or Holland in the same period.

The acquisition of this sort of silk fabric was a costly affair that exceeded the tailor's fee by multiples. Prices of Lyon fabrics are listed in the London pattern book as eleven *livres* per French ell (ca 119 centimeters) as an average price (Miller 2014, p. 17). Thus, an estimated use of at least twelve meters of fabric would mean that the material costs were at least 110 *livres*. To put this in perspective: an unskilled laborer in Lyon earned about 250 livres annually, while a master weaver earned about 600 livres.

The Family Tradition of the Andrienne Dress

Eighteenth-century clothing was created as a personal fit for a particular person. Usually the clients chose and bought the fabric and other necessary materials themselves, brought them to the tailor, and discussed their individual wishes. All special aspects of the cut, details of the decoration, and deviation from the usual silhouette resulted from the collaboration between client and tailor.

It is likely that the light blue silk fitted Andrienne from Nuremberg also has its own individual and complex genesis. Stories of clothing that have long been in family possession are often closely linked with the original reality, although they may contain mistakes, fragmentary memories that falsify the story, or made-up anecdotes.

Why would a family in central Germany have kept a silk dress and a hoop petticoat for over 250 years? Each generation could have had different reasons for keeping the light blue silk dress and the red hoop petticoat and passing them on to the next generation. We cannot know today if both of these pieces were originally produced at the same time to match each other and be worn by the same person. Stylistic analysis reveals that they were both produced around the year 1760. The hoop petticoat is somewhat less ample than the dress, yet it is possible that it was worn with the dress. The unusual color of the cyclamen-colored silk fabric does match the rose pattern of the dress fabric. Many elements speak in favor of a common provenance and original unity, especially the fact that both objects were kept so long by the family.

It is possible that the original wearer decided one day that she would not continue wearing the dress, but she nevertheless kept it. The next generations kept the pieces perhaps out of piety and in memory of their mother or grandmother. It is unlikely that the dress and hoop petticoat were worn in the years between 1790 and 1850 because fashion in this period had totally renounced the silhouette of the Rococo period. In the mid-nineteenth-century, however, the forms of the eighteenth-century experienced a renaissance in the so-called Second Baroque: circular and oval dress shapes, worn over a hoop petticoat now called a crinoline, were considered modern. In this period the family probably rediscovered the dress. As already described, new lace decorations and other accessories were added in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is not known if the silk dress was worn as formal attire for a party or perhaps for a costume ball.

The dress and the hoop petticoat were stored in a suitcase, which is also probably from the end of the nineteenth century; newspapers, which were put in the suitcase to protect the pieces, bear the dates 1893 and 1954. The suitcase also contains packages of moth powder dating from the 1950s. A glass negative from this period is also in the family collection, showing a young girl wearing the fitted Andrienne in a flower-filled garden. This is likely the last time that this family piece, which had been so carefully safeguarded, was worn.

In 1994 Claus Petzold, a descendent of the family in Magdeburg, summarized the family lore as follows:

> “According to an unverified family tradition this dress was worn by an ancestor of ours at Hartenfels Palace, and it was passed down via the Bormann family to the Metzdorf family—my grandmother, Luise Metzdorf. As a Rococo dress it must have been worn in the mid-eighteenth century. Hartenfels, which is near Torgau, was the residence of the electors of Saxony for a time, and it is possible that the wife or daughter of one of our pastor ancestors, who were based in Saxony, wore such a splendid dress at the palace. Or perhaps she worked for a lady there, or maybe just got the dress as a present there.
>
> My hypothesis is that our ancestor Mauritia, Luisa Juliane Eck, who was born around 1734 and married the pastor Johann Christian Uschmann from Zahna, owned and wore this dress, because her strange name Mauritia suggests that she was named after Duke Moritz from the duchy Saxony-Naumburg-Zeitz, who until his death also ruled over Henneberg and also the city of Schleusingen, where the Ecks were pastors and where Mauritia Eck was probably born in Albrechts and christened Mauritia in honor of the local sovereign. That is plausible in terms of time and circumstances.”

Investigations

The two paragraphs of this source were the starting point for a search for clues about the original wearer of the fitted Andrienne. Using the names and places mentioned in the summary as well as a family tree provided by the family, it was possible to check and supplement the biographical data. Research in church archives gave a more complete image of Mauritia’s family situation. The name given at her baptism was Juliana Luise Mauritia Eck, and she was born in 1739 in Albrechts in Suhl, Thuringia. Her parents had lived there since 1735; her father, Johann Ludwig Eck (1702–1741) was the pastor in Albrechts, as his father, Johann Georg [I.] Eck (1665–1728), and his grandfather, Georg Eck (1627–1693), had been before him. Following the death of her father in 1741, her mother remarried in 1750. In 1752 her second husband, the pastor Johann Georg Beutner (1713–1773), was transferred to Seegrehna, now part of Wittenberg, where he was pastor until 1759.

Mauritia’s own wedding was held on January 11, 1757, in Seegrehna, where she married the deacon Johann Christian Uschmann (ca. 1720–1774), who from 1760 until his death was the head pastor in Zahna. Between December 1757 and May 1768 she gave birth to a total of six children in Zahna. Of her five daughters and one son, only three of her children reached adulthood; three died as babies in 1758, 1759, and 1764.

The second clue in the text cited above is the legend that the dress had been worn at Hartenfels Palace. However, Torgau had lost its court in 1694 when Elector Johann Georg IV of Saxony died at an early age, and the last documented festivity there had been in 1711, on the occasion of the wedding of Russian Crown Prince Alexei to Princess Charlotte Christine of Braunschweig (1694–1715). Since 1717 Torgau had been a garrison town. In the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763) the city, which was occupied by the Prussians, suffered considerable damage. The suburbs were burnt down, the Palace was repurposed as the headquarters of the Prussian War Department and military hospital, and the bridge over the Elbe was destroyed. In light of these facts it is unlikely that the silk dress in our possession can in fact be connected with the palace in Torgau.

Hypotheses about the Circumstances of the Silk Dress and Unresolved Questions

As has already been mentioned, analyses of the dress and fabric history of the present state all support a dating of around 1760. If you combine the stylistic analysis with the biographical data of the supposed wearer of the dress, there is the option of supposing that the light blue silk dress was the wedding dress of Juliana Luise Mauritia Eck. Unlike later times, wedding dresses in the eighteenth century were never white, but always corresponded with the general type of festive dress made of patterned silk fabric (Zander-Seidel 2002, p. 195). According to a person's social position, the fabric used could be worked with metal threads or, as in the present example of the fitted Andrienne, it could be made of colorfully patterned silk.

Juliana Luise Mauritia married in 1757, which corresponds very well with the stylistic dating of the dress's silhouette. She would have been eighteen years old, and the narrow waist and narrow sleeves are appropriate for this age. The hypothesis is further supported by the fact that the dress is the only one that was passed on in the family over the long period of over 250 years. Wedding dresses are the type of clothing that were most likely to be passed on in earlier centuries, not only because of their material value but also their emotional value.

A counterargument could be seen in the dating of the light blue silk fabric due to the similar pattern in a preserved pattern book from 1763, as outlined above. Future research will need to establish a more exact chronology of the preserved brocaded silk fabrics with garland motifs that will make a more exact dating of the fabric possible.

If the dress actually was the wedding dress of the pastor's daughter Juliana Luise Mauritia Eck from 1757, there are more questions for future research: How did such a luxurious wedding dress of precious silk fabric come into the possession of a pastor's daughter in the small town of Seegrehna near Wittenberg? Had she received an inheritance after her father's death, thus making such an expense possible? Can the will of her father, Pastor Johann Ludwig Eck, be located, which possibly outlines how his estate should be divided up among his three daughters? Did her mother take a trip to Leipzig or Berlin with her some time before the wedding in order to buy the fabric? Or was the very fashionable light blue silk fabric a present from a wealthy person to the local pastor family? Where did they then locate the right tailor who was able to cut and sew the dress to such high standards? Did tailors of this sort work in nearby Wittenberg? Are there archives of the local guilds there that contain the order books of the tailors?

It would also be important to investigate the more general question about the clothing conventions for weddings in the Protestant church in the mid-eighteenth century. Was the bride permitted to wear a silk dress to her wedding like a bourgeois bride? The local sumptuary laws generally did not apply to nobility and clerics, so corresponding rules would have had to have been issued by the church directly. It can be assumed that the clothing befitting the social status of family members of the clergy could be made of silk fabric for certain events, however, certainly without costly metal threads.

Finally, it would also be important to locate and investigate portraits of Protestant families, especially portraits of women. Both the individual biographies and the living situations of the women should be considered in order to correctly evaluate their clothing.

If future research reveals that the hypothesis of the wedding dress of 1757 does not hold water, a second indication to investigate would be the silk fabric's dating of 1763 as outlined above. A possible significant event for making the dress would have been the festivities following the Treaty of Hubertusburg, which ended the Seven Years' War in February 1763. During the Prussian occupation of Saxony during the war, Saxony had suffered great losses in its civilian population as well as looting and forced payments. Wittenberg and many places in the surroundings were burnt down and badly damaged.

At the present it is difficult to evaluate whether the pastor's daughter Juliana Luise Mauritia Uschmann, née Eck, from Zahna near Wittenberg, would have been able to buy the highly fashionable patterned silk fabric to have a dress made in 1763 or shortly thereafter. She would have been twenty-four years old and already been through four pregnancies. Her fourth child died in 1764, which would have been the beginning of an additional period of mourning, thus requiring a more sober and simpler style of dress.

Ultimately it must also be considered whether the attribution of the silk dress to Juliana Luise Mauritia Eck as the original wearer is actually a mistake in the family tradition. This would necessitate further genealogical studies to find other contemporary women in the other branches of the family and to learn more about their situations.

THE HOOP PETTICOAT

No single item of women's clothing in the eighteenth century was more controversial and contested than the hoop petticoat. The ample, stiffened petticoat, which shaped the different clothing silhouettes of the Rococo, did not only provoke moralists in the church and in politics to disagree and criticize. In England, Germany, and France countless critical texts and satirical prints were published, which spoke out against this fashion, simultaneously contributing to an even larger dissemination of the hoop petticoat.

The collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum contains over a dozen different hoop petticoats from the eighteenth century, which makes it the only collection of its scope in the world. In the following section we will present the hoop petticoat that was acquired with the light blue silk dress. According to the current state of knowledge, it is one of the extremely rare examples of hoop petticoats made of silk. Finally, to put it in context, we will describe two other stiffened petticoats—a "large hoop petticoat" and the extremely rare *Poschen*, or *demi-pannier*.

The hoop petticoat T 8504 (cat. 2) is made of cyclamen-colored silk fabric of satin weave with red warp threads and antique pink-beige weft threads. With its two parallel, oval-shaped stiffeners, it was called a "small hoop petticoat" in the terminology of the eighteenth century, and was also known as a *Springrock* or *Hans* in German (Reinhard 1757, part 2, pp. 74–75). Reaching down to about the knees, the skirt supported the dress that was worn over it, especially in the hips, which is why above the first row of hoops semicircular stiffeners were inserted at an angle to catch the weight of the dress. Wide pocket openings—on one side edged in yellow—permitted the wearer to reach into the separate cloth pockets that were usually tied around the waist. The petticoat's waistband is flexible and equipped with a linen drawstring that enabled it to be tightened at the waist. A slit in the back that extended to the first hoop made it easier to put it on and take it off. All of the stiffeners, which are inserted on the inside of the skirt, are made of whalebone in different thicknesses and widths. These are covered in a pink linen encasement that is divided in the middle by a vertical stitch into two narrow tubes. The individual strips of whalebone are five millimeters wide and one to two millimeters thick; there are several strips in each tube to achieve the necessary stability. The ends of the rods are reinforced with light-colored leather or linen fabric and attached to one another with strong linen threads. Every hoop has bands sewn to them on the inside, a total of three pairs, with the help of which the form of the petticoat could be made narrower or could be further varied.

The original silhouette of this hoop petticoat is somewhat distorted due to deformations in the lower row of hoops, possibly due to the way it was stored. Overall it seems that this stiffened petticoat was used quite often, which is apparent due to a series of small repairs. On the outside the silk fabric is especially worn in the area of the whalebone hoops, where the red silk threads have broken loose. Traces of various seams in the upper part point to earlier alterations, which need to be examined more thoroughly.

The hoop petticoat T 3073 (cat. 5) belongs to the category of *grand panier*, which according to contemporary sources were composed of at least four hoops that increase in size toward the bottom (cf. Zander-Seidel 2002, p. 47) and considerably longer than the "small" hoop petticoats. They were round in the early eighteenth century, and at mid-century they took on a more oval form and were called *panier à coudes* ("elbow petticoats," in German known as *Ellbogen-Reifrock*), because the forearms could be rested comfortably on the almost horizontal side hip paddings. In the French-influenced court etiquette of most European courts this type of hoop petticoat was obligatory and replaced the earlier cone-shaped dress silhouette of Spanish court fashion.

The circumference of the largest, bottom hoop, which supports the dress at an angle towards the outside, is about three and a half meters. The petticoat is cut from four lengths of light-colored linen measuring eighty-seven centimeters in width, which are pieced together and chintzed. The stiffeners are made of approximately one-centimeter-wide whalebone sticks that are stacked in pairs and sewn into channels. All seams were additionally accentuated on the outside with a light blue edging. Similar to the cyclamen-colored red hoop petticoat there are wide pocket openings at the top; the waist is fastened on both sides with metal hooks and eyes.

The stiffened hip frames that were strapped on in the 1770s and 1780s as a shape-giving undergarment instead of the hoop petticoat were called *demi-panniers* in France, *Poschen* in German, deriving from the French word *poche* (pocket), and pocket hoops in England (Zander-Seidel 2002, p. 47). They were made of light-colored linen and whalebone, and they gave the dress that was worn on top of it a similar silhouette to the *petit pannier.* Pocket hoops were considered comfortable to wear (exh. cat. New York 2015, p. 118), and the pockets that were sewn

into them could be used by the wearer to carry things such as gloves and other accessories.

The production of hoop petticoats, which were usually ready-to-wear goods with adjustable waists, lay in the hands of specialized workshops and tailor shops. The distribution of locally made and imported pieces was handled by local mercers. The major trade fairs in Leipzig and Frankfurt am Main were also important trading centers for new petticoats.

Contemporary Criticism

The hoop petticoat was quite controversial in its time; it was the most discussed item of women's clothing in the Rococo. Nearly all sumptuary laws of the period forbade servants from wearing it, including the Nuremberg law of 1741 (Zander-Seidel 2002, p. 48) and the Saxon "Mandat wieder den [*sic*] Kleider-Pracht" (Mandate against Magnificence in Clothing) of 1737, in which Duke Frederick of Saxony explicitly addressed women of common citizens, craftspeople, journeymen, servants, and soldiers as well as farmers' wives and maids, who were forbidden from wearing silk and other fabrics that had not been manufactured in Saxony, as well as the whalebone and similar types of hoop petticoats (Mandat 1737, p. 3).

The first critical publication regarding the use of hoop petticoats was published as early as September 1713 on the occasion of the Leizpig Michaelmas Fair under the title "Curious Thoughts about the So-Called Contouche and Hoop petticoat." The thin volume apparently sold very well—the third edition was already released in 1717. The anonymous author divides his critique into three main parts. The first is a general accusation against the "love of innovation," that is, against the actual reason for every change in fashion that was especially blamed on women. The second argument was aimed at the enormous amount of space required by women wearing hoop petticoats. The third and most important point regarded the largest of all threats, namely the moralistic dangers that were associated with the hoop petticoat. On the one hand the hoop petticoat made women sexually too attractive by accentuating the lower part of the body that swung seductively as she walked and by simplifying the practical access to pleasure due to its exposed form. Simultaneously its bell shape made it possible to conceal pregnancies; for this reason it was jokingly called a "blanket of sins." On the other hand, from the perspective of husbands and fathers the hoop petticoat gave women unprecedented sexual freedom and a certain amount of independence because now every woman could individually define her own private sphere.

"Satyrische Abhandlung von den Krankheiten der Frauenspersonen, welche sie sich durch ihren Putz und Anzug zuziehen" (Satirical Treatise on Women's Diseases as a Consequence of Their Finery and Clothing), the treatise by Christian Tobias Ephraim Reinhard (1719–1792) that was published in two parts in 1756 and 1757 (cat. 7), had a different focus. Reinhard, who was a Prussian doctor, listed different dangers and physical impairments that hoop petticoats inflicted on women: The hard hoops hit their knees and ankles, the upper hoops pushed on their organs. Wind made it difficult for the wearer to keep her balance, and in cold weather she was susceptible to abdominal pain. His critique was especially aimed at the large hoop petticoats that weighted down the hips to such an extent that the entire body was affected detrimentally.

The prints that were published as popular broadsheets around 1750 can be seen as a reaction to the exceptionally large hoop petticoats. They demonstrated the purported end of this fashion by showing servants carrying an extensive hoop petticoat on a pole to the city gate (cat. 10b). The accompanying text castigated the great space required by women dressed in this way, making it impossible for any man to approach them; they also criticized the considerable rise in the price of whalebone, which was needed in such large quantities.

Whaling and the Production of Whalebone

Whalebone was one of the most important products needed for the production of hoop petticoats as well as for stiffening corsets; it was lightweight, elastic, robust, and flexible—thus ideally fulfilling all of the necessary requirements.

Since the early seventeenth century whalers made trips to Greenland for the production of whale oil, and in the eighteenth century there was a great rise in the number of trips due to the great demand for whalebone. They were among the most dangerous but also most lucrative branches of early deep-sea fishing and were highly respected by contemporaries. Carl Günther Ludovici related that around 1760 the Dutch sent 160 to 200 ships to the north with crews of up to fifty men every April. In Hamburg around fifty ships were sent to sea, in Bremen fifteen, and entrepreneurs in Lübeck and Emden each sent three ships (Ludovici 1768, vol. 5, col. 661–94). The whalebones that were sold in the Netherlands and in the cities of northern Germany were considered the highest quality and were sold at especially high prices due to their length—up to four meters—and thickness.

The distinctive characteristics of whalebone, which was used as a stiffener in most of the hoop petticoats in German collections, has not been the focus of fashion scholarship. With its large collection of whalebone hoop petticoats, the Germanisches Nationalmuseum will concentrate on studying different questions relating to the structure, production, and distribution of this material in the context of future projects.

ACCESSORIES: THE EMBELLISHMENT OF CLOTHING

Aesthetics, function, and symbolism are three aspects that are associated with accessories. Some accessories, such as gloves, muffs, stockings, and shoes, had the primary purpose of protection from cold. Fans and umbrellas were originally for protection from heat. Bags, on the other hand, are functional accessories for carrying personal things. What all fashion accessories have in common is their decorative design.

In addition to underwear, every type of outerwear is completed with accessories that serve to complete the overall appearance. The choice of different accessories allows the wearer to express her own style in a special way. Within the boundaries set by sumptuary laws, the choice of materials, decorations, and size also influenced a woman's appearance as was fitting to her social status, but it also could have the effect of raising her social prestige. With different accessories she could create new fashion combinations with little effort using clothing she already owned.

Accessories were produced all over Europe in the eighteenth century, but there were local specializations. In addition to the Paris dealers who had good international networks, the most important marketplaces for the German-speaking countries were the Leipzig Fair, which took place three times a year, and merceries, the shops that specialized in fancy goods and accessories (called *Galanteriewaren* in German) in the different cities. These dealers sold cloth as well as all types of accessories: lace, embroidery, ribbons, buttons, bows, tassels, caps and other head coverings, stockings, nightgowns, aprons, neckerchiefs, collars, cuffs, feathers, gloves, muffs, fans, jewelry, shoe buckles, sachets and bags, perfume and powder (Ludovici 1767, col. 1934–35).

Several eighteenth-century objects from the collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum are excellent examples of the significance of accessories—and it is easy to imagine some of these items as accessories to the light blue silk dress, although none of them were actually ever used with this dress. Due to the lack of information available on these objects, most of which entered the collection more than one hundred years ago, there are unfortunately no substantiated dates or definite localizations of the place it was produced in or worn—nor do we have the names of the women who originally wore or owned them. Nearly all of the pieces appear to have been used intensively by the original wearer or later users. Additional damage came about in later decades or centuries due to material fatigue, the effects of light and warmth, and improper storage or use.

Fans

Fans are among the accessories that are most strongly associated with the Rococo period today; and in fact, the majority of surviving female portraits from the eighteenth century include this useful and symbolic prop. The wide range of production in the eighteenth century is reflected in the many types of fans that have come down to us, from luxurious one-of-a-kind pieces to popular, mass-produced pieces. Generally consisting of a double-layered fan leaf made of paper, parchment, or silk, the fans were painted or printed; the sticks were made of carved wood, ivory, or whalebone, and were often partially painted or decorated in other ways. The leaves were decorated with a wide variety of subjects, including mythological scenes, bucolic scenes, vedutas, and contemporary events. Paintings and prints were often the source of the subject matter.

The four fans chosen for this exhibition from our collection show different themes and present different levels of quality of eighteenth-century production. The rare cockade fan T 2679 (cat. 27) from the mid-eighteenth century is composed on both sides of multiple colored prints from the Augsburg workshop of Martin Engelbrecht (1684–1756). One side shows couples dressed in courtly attire doing gardening, while the other side has small scenes with Cupid, the god of love. He is presented in different professions, which are labeled with German and French lettering: Cupid as a messenger, gardener, grinder, beggar, and so on. The middle section with its wooden core with metal embroidery on faded silk corresponds with the original color that can be seen in what is left of the tassels and is listed in the inventory. Both the background of the embroidery and the silk fabric that was used between the paper leaves were originally salmon colored.

The two other fans are simpler (T 1913 and T 2056, cats. 23 and 24) and were probably originally given as

gifts to loved ones. Both the maypole scene and the shepherd's idyll with the symbolic representations of an open birdcage and a faithful dog have erotic undertones. Similar motifs can be seen in various European fan collections, although the maypole motif is especially common in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands.

The fan painted with India ink by the Munich court painter Georg Sigismund Rösch (1713–1766) is an exceptionally unique piece (T 3719, cat. 25) that was made around 1750. The signature, which is highly unusual on eighteenth-century fans, includes the painter's dedication to his employer, Clemens Franz, Prince of Bavaria (1722–1770). The motif on the front shows the Roman goddess Minerva at her loom, who is probably embodied by Maria Anna of Pfalz-Sulzbach (1722–1790), who married the Bavarian prince in 1742.

Gloves

Both pairs of mitts (T 6006, T 3485/86, cats. 22 and 21) of embroidered silk cloth were more for the stipulated covering of the forearms when going out than for protection against the cold. Since most eighteenth-century dresses were made with half-length sleeves with the obligatory lace cuffs that ended just below the elbow, gloves were necessary accessories. Mitts, which at the time were called *mitaines*, the French term, are open at the bottom, making it possible to move the fingers and wear rings. *Mitaines* have an additional decorative value since they could be color-coordinated to the dress and also be decorated with embroidery. Corresponding embroidery patterns can be found in the sample books of Margaretha Helm and Amalia Beer from the 1710s and 1720s (see cats. 83 and 82). It can be assumed that mitts were usually not custom made but were sold as readymade products in merceries.

Shoes and Slippers

Women's shoes with embroidered outer material, on the other hand, were made to measure in the eighteenth century. The basic form of the vamp and the sides of the shoes was traced onto the chosen fabric, which was usually silk, and embroidered in specialized workshops (see cat. 82). These semi-finished products were sold, and local shoemakers at the final destination adapted the embroidered fabric to make custom-fit shoes for his customer, adding a leather sole and the necessary lining.

A closer inspection of the light pink pair of shoes (T 4320, cat. 42) reveals that they had an interesting second use that has not yet been documented. Originally made of a light-colored patterned cloth, these shoes were modified in the 1760s with a second layer of fabric that was custom-applied to the edge of the sole so that it was not visible from above. These shoes were probably re-covered to match a new dress. Unfortunately, the matching dress is not documented in our collection. It is very rare that this sort of combination is passed down, since shoes were usually discarded earlier due to greater wear and soiling. Overshoes called *pattens* or *patins*, which were attached to the shoes using leather laces, were worn to protect fragile shoes when worn outside (T 2298, T 2299, cat. 39).

Slippers, which were known by their French name, *mules*, were sometimes worn by ladies on the street. They were made of leather or cloth, and their soles were often lined with soft material like cotton, like the bright pink pair of calfskin *mules* (T 381, cat. 60) and the medium blue suede *mules* with ribbons and lace (T 887/888, cat. 41).

Stomachers

The museum's collection contains an exceptional three-part ensemble consisting of stomacher, collar, and muff (T 998, T 999, T 1000, cats. 18 a–c). The stomacher, with its triangular shape that tapers down toward the bottom, decorated the front of the bodice. It was worn over a skirt and stays and covered the open front of the bodice. As Corvinus reports, it was made of "gold, silver, lace, gauze, or ribbon, also with colorful silk that was embroidered or sewn in many ways, either decorated or undecorated." He also writes: "This type of stomacher is sometimes also composed of white gauze with golden or silver shells or silver tassels or loops of ribbons" (Corvinus 1773, vol. 1, col. 1900). This text also mentioned that stomachers are often coordinated with a decorative collar, called a *Palatin.* The decorative collar of our ensemble thus substantiates this description, and there is also a matching muff.

The stomacher has a pattern of blossoms and bunches of fruit and leaves embroidered in silk and metal threads, with silvery metal ribbons and lace on the front. It originally had small bird feathers in gleaming green in the area of the three-dimensional bouquets of roses on the edges, which are incompletely preserved. Instead of feathers the muff has silk embroidery and soft chenille embroidery.

Although we do not know the name of the woman who originally wore this ensemble, we can be certain of her high social status. The sumptuary law that was issued by the city of Stralsund in 1729 stated that only

the nobility was permitted to wear silver stomachers and corresponding collars on Sundays (Kleiderordnung 1729, p. 2). Similar regulations were probably valid in the cities of southern Germany, where this ensemble is localized according to the inventory.

Lace and Other Textile Accessories

In addition to the above-mentioned accessories, other elements were an essential part of an upper-class lady's wardrobe. Lace was especially popular as trim on underclothing, head coverings, the décolleté, and on elbow-length sleeves. The lace frills below the cuffs—called *engageantes*—were attached in multiple rows as *volants*, and could be sewn in or tied on to be combined with different dresses. The neckerchiefs that were known as *fichu*, made of fine fabrics with lace edging or decorative embroidery along the edges could be used just as flexibly, were used to cover the décolleté. Bows and ruffles as well as artificial flowers and feathers were used as additional accessories on clothing.

Bags

Bags like today's handbags did not exist in the eighteenth century. However, small purses for coins, which could be kept in the clothing were part of every prestigious wardrobe. The exquisite shield-shaped purse (T 2426, cat. 30) with knot stitching has the portrait of a woman on one side and the portrait of a man on the other, both wearing fashionable clothing from the first half of the eighteenth century, and there are exotic palm trees in the background. Other purses with similar motifs can be found in the collections of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York, the Victoria & Albert Museum in London, and the Bayerisches Nationalmuseum in Munich.

A second type of bag that was very popular in the second half of the eighteenth century was the drawstring bag made from elegant silk fabrics. It could be attached to the belt by a strap or held by the drawstrings. The blue and white bag in our collection (T 2728, cat. 29) is an unusual example that was made of narrow silk ribbons in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Both sides of the bag are woven from these ribbons, with decorative edging all around that is composed of four decorative bands twisted in pairs at irregular intervals. The inside of the bag is lined with blue taffeta.

Head Coverings

Women of all classes wore head coverings of different forms, materials, and quality during the day and whenever they left the house. The tight-fitting bonnet (T 2349, cat. 16) is covered with blossoms and leaves embroidered in silk on a ground that is worked with metal threads. The front edge is bordered with a wide lace made of metal threads with large, blossom-formed arches that surrounded the face in a playful way. The second bonnet (T 2597, cat. 15), which is probably from the early eighteenth century, is in the rare shape of a boat. The sides are made of green silk satin and decorated with two different sorts of metal lace and a tasseled border that once shone in silver and gold. For the base of the cap a floral brocade in matching green was cut out in a curvaceous form and was bordered with tassels of metal threads.

A PARASOL FROM THE 1780S

The word *parasol* is listed in a German dictionary for the first time in 1715. The definition given in the first edition of the popular *Frauenzimmer Lexicon* reads: "A parasol is actually a canopy made of oilcloth that is carried on a stick over the head of a woman to protect her from the heat of the sun." (cited after Spary 1995, p. 15). In the third edition of 1773, it was revised to say that the material could be oilcloth, linen, or silk, and the frame could be made of wood, whalebone, steel, or brass (Corvinus 1773, vol. 2, col. 2398–99).

The term *parasol*, which was also often used in German, is proof that well into the nineteenth century France was the source of all fashion innovations. The production of parasols was in the hands of two branches of trade: purse makers for the covering and woodturners for the shaft and the ribs. In 1776 in Paris a cooperative guild of purse makers, glove makers, and belt makers was formed that had the sole right to produce parasols. They made or sold the parasols along with the necessary ribs made out of whalebone, wood, or cane, and they covered them with oilcloth, canvas, or silk.

Parasols were sold by traveling salesmen and mercers, who had broad networks in Europe. This is probably how the first parasols in the early eighteenth century made their way to the German Trade Fairs—especially Frankfurt and Leipzig. At this time both cities also had "Shops for Parisian Goods" that sold French silks and other luxury products related to clothing (Spary 1995, pp. 206–08).

There is evidence that umbrella making was established as a trade in German-speaking countries around the mid-eighteenth century. Several French craftsmen are known to have settled in German cities, probably for economic reasons. In a list of master craftsmen in Nuremberg that was published by a sort of controlling board of the guilds, there are entries for two parasol makers that could be significant for the parasol in the collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (T 2692): Georg Leonhard Kartether received permission to produce parasols in 1743, and Georg Andreas Geiersberger in 1756 (Spary 1995, p. 111). There are also archival sources in Munich, Cologne, and Frankfurt am Main that document both the production and sale of parasols in those cities. However, the production by local craftsmen did not cover the demand for this luxury product of fashion in German-speaking countries. As in the case of other accessories, the ones imported from France were considered especially desirable, even if the prices were considerably higher (Spary 1995, pp. 122–37).

The museum's parasol entered the collection in 1898 as a gift from the Munich art dealer Böhler; the inventory book lists Nuremberg as the place of production. Since so very few eighteenth-century parasols are documented in the major European museums, the Nuremberg piece has to be considered especially rare.

The canopy is composed of ten spandrel-shaped segments of printed linen. The cutting was probably done with stencils to ensure accuracy. On the lower edge there is a cream-colored strip of silk, 8.5 centimeters in width, that is composed of pieced-together fabric with a scalloped edge and a pounced pattern of holes. The bud-shaped ferrule is beautifully carved from ivory, under which there are four light-colored silk rosettes, made with a serrated cut, with a hacked pattern and a light blue band. The material of the silk roses corresponds with the silk strips on the lower edge of the parasol. Based on the corresponding cream color of the canopy, the silk roses, the band, and the light blue, this is certainly the original design.

According to the current state of research the canopy and the shaft were originally together. The plain frame, with its simple stretchers, tracks, and hinges as well as the shaft and the turned handle are worked in dark brown wood (plum, cherry, and an additional type of wood from fruit trees). One stretcher has evidence of an old repair. The connections between the wooden parts as well as the technique suggest that it was made in the eighteenth century. The shaft is custom made, and the parasol can be opened up all the way. All of the connections of the fabric to the frame are done with cotton twine.

The striking linen fabric, with two different printed motifs, each of which fills five segments, was especially designed and produced for a parasol. The complex copper-plate printing with the pigment Prussian blue, an iron compound that was mixed with lead white here, has a rich ornamental cartouche framework with leaves and volutes. In the first section there is a large sunflower and a sun with a face, and above that a bird with a branch. In the second section the main motif is a flying bird, probably an eagle, over which there is a small sunflower. The text banderoles are written in French and German: "I turn toward the sun" and "I bring and distribute the pleasant air from the sea." The choice of motifs of this emblem-like printed fabric thus directly refers to the purpose of the parasol: keeping direct sunlight and hot air away from the bearer.

Sunflowers, which originally came from Central America and were called the "Golden Flower of Peru" or "Indian sun," were first cultivated in 1510 in the Royal Botanical Garden in Madrid, where they had been brought by explorers to the New World. In 1613 Basilius Besler catalogued them in the fifth part of his *Hortus Eystettensis*; they are also included in other plant books of the seventeenth century, always in admiration of their large size and their spectacular flowers. Starting at this time the sunflower embodied a specific Christian symbol: the flower's constant turning toward the sun was seen in analogy to the souls of believers, who turned their heads to Christ as the light of the world.

Both motifs, which have a height of the pattern repeat of at least thirty-nine centimeters and become considerably narrower toward the top, were probably printed in opposite directions on the same cloth to optimize the use of material. The width of the fabric cannot be determined because the entire width of the fabric was not used.

Printing on fabric with copper plates became very popular in the last quarter of the eighteenth century in France, Switzerland, in several German cities, and in various manufacturers near Vienna. The printed fabrics of the highest quality, which were called *indiennes* at the time, were produced with complex motifs in several regions of Switzerland, in Jouy-en-Josas on the outskirts of Paris, in Alsace and Normandy, and in England. Since the surviving patterns and printed fabrics from these production centers are considerably different in terms of the motif on our parasol, it has to be assumed that it was probably produced in a German workshop that cannot be localized more precisely. Perhaps a printmaking workshop in Augsburg or Nuremberg provided the designs for the printing plates, since it is common

that they produced subjects with bilingual texts there. Although an Augsburg calico printer is documented as early as the late seventeenth century, no samples of their fabric printing from the eighteenth century have been passed down to us. Another clue points to calico manufacturers near Vienna, which were also known for their high-quality copper-plate printing (Hampel 1971). Yet since there are no samples from the eighteenth century that can be definitively attributed to these manufacturers, it is impossible to be more specific about where the fabric used in the canopy was produced. The references in the inventory to Nuremberg as the place of production probably indicate the assembly of the parasol, using a fabric covering that was produced somewhere else.

The parasol's sunflower motif in connection with the words "I turn toward the sun" and the eagle as a symbol of the skies certainly primarily refer to the practical function of the parasol. Its movability enables the bearer to always turn it toward the sun in order to protect herself from the rays. The Christian symbolism that has already been addressed probably indirectly resonates here as well; it justified the use of this luxury product in the context of Christian doctrine of salvation. The striking and high-quality printed motif also probably contributed to fact that the parasol was kept for many years and was given to the museum in 1898.

JEWELRY

Eighteenth-century jewelry of noble and bourgeois provenance that has survived until today is only a fraction of the jewelry that was actually produced. Many pieces were later modified due to new tastes or melted down because of the metal's value, and the gems were removed or reused in new jewelry. Personal jewelry of individuals was frequently divided up among heirs, and even ensembles were often separated. A comprehensive history of Rococo jewelry must take into consideration not only surviving jewelry and inventories, but also especially portraits, which can give clues about when they were worn and the specific use of individual pieces. An eloquent testimony of the diversity of jewelry designs is given by various series of etchings from France, Italy, Germany, England, and the Netherlands, which were published by jewelers and goldsmith during the entire century. In 1723, for example, the second part of a series of twelve etchings based on designs of the jeweler J. Bourguet was published in Paris under the title *Livre de taille d'*épargne *de gout ancien et moderne propre pour les aprentifs orfevres* with examples for pendants, bracelets, and earrings called *girandoles* (fig. 49). In this way stylistic innovations were quickly transmitted over borders, which often complicates making a precise localization of surviving pieces—especially since stamps and maker's marks are often missing. Most of the selection of jewelry from the Germanisches Nationalmuseum and one private collection presented here have never been published before. They also rarely have a definitive provenance, which is why we cannot make any conclusions here about dating and place of origin.

Design elements such as openwork depicting vines and blooming branches, irregular shell ornaments, flower forms, bows, rosettes, stars, and crosses. Especially in the second half of the century, asymmetrical designs were popular, as well as movable elements with drop or tear-shaped gems as a pendant.

Diamonds were the most popular gemstone of the eighteenth century. A splendid set of jewelry, consisting of a necklace with a pendant and two ornamental pins, is the property of a foundation, the "Paul Wolfgang Merkel'sche Familienstiftung," and has been on permanent loan to the Germanisches Nationalmuseum since 1970. It originally belonged to Margarete Elisabeth Merkel, née Bepler (1765–1831). She probably received and wore this precious set with over 125 rose-cut diamonds on the occasion of her wedding in 1784. The necklace successfully combines the most popular pendant forms of the Rococo period—bow and cross. The ornamental pins, the actual pins of which may have been added later, were used to attach the *fichu* or were used to decorate her hairdo.

Due to the popularity of diamonds, lawmakers were regularly obligated to regulate who could wear these precious gems. The corresponding sumptuary laws varied in detail from place to place. The law that went into effect in Stralsund in 1729, for example, stipulated: "All diamonds, whether they be earrings, brooches, rings . . . are forbidden with a penalty of 25 Reichstaler, but the First Estate is permitted to wear real pearls. The other Estate should not presume to wear not even a pearl or any other gems under the punishment of confiscation, and to avoid any frauds it is forbidden to wear fake pearls." (Kleider-Ordnung 1729, p. 2). Only the aristocracy and clerics, to whom the dress code did not apply, were allowed to wear diamond jewelry in the Hanseatic city of Stralsund as much as they wanted and their finances permitted.

For this reason it made sense to produce artificial diamonds. Two eighteenth-century attempts are particularly noteworthy, although it is difficult to separate truth from legend. Starting in the 1730s the

Alsatian jeweler and inventor Georg Friedrich Strass (1701–1773) offered imitation diamonds in his Paris shop. They were made of glass with a mixture of bismuth, thallium, and metallic salts. The cut stones were then backed with metal foil, which was later replaced by a reflective mirror layer applied by vapor. The experiments of the Viennese goldsmith Joseph Strasser were similar, and in 1758 he produced transparent lead crystal that could be cut like diamonds and was also adequately brilliant. However, his invention is said to have been forbidden by Empress Maria Theresia with the argument that these artificial diamonds jeopardized class order. He sold his invention to an unknown person in Paris, where such gemstones were soon sold at high prices (Hampel 1970, p. 61). Imitation diamonds are still called *Strass-Steine* (Strass stones) in German-speaking countries today due to the two inventors.

Cut minerals such as marcasite, pyrite, and hematite as well as chrysoberyl and quartz, often used as colorless or neutral gemstones, were also an economical substitute for diamonds. The silver-gilded cross pendant T 381, for example, is composed of ten facetted pyrites in bezel settings of gilded silver (cat. 60).

The most popular type of jewelry in the eighteenth century were earrings and hair ornaments, pendants for necklaces, rings, and brooches that were usually worn in the center of the stomacher. Sets of matched jewelry were often designed together and were called *parure* (full sets) or *demi-parures*.

Earrings called *girandoles* were particularly popular in the eighteenth century. This term, also used in German-speaking countries, originally referred to a multi-armed candelabra with three to five cut-glass drop pendants. This form was transferred to earrings, producing dainty constructions with drop pendants, like the *demi-parure* LGA 4689, which has a matching brooch and pendant (cat. 56). According to the inventory, this set from the first half of the eighteenth century was made in Spain or France. There are symmetrical ornamental arches with looping forms above, with a central diamond in a grain setting. Below there are three movable drop-formed diamonds pendants with little bows at their tips.

Velvet ribbons with medallion pendants like T 4601 (cat. 57) are often seen in portrait paintings; the medallions usually contain the portrait of a loved one. Our pendant contains a half-figure portrait of an unknown man painted with watercolors on ivory in the 1770s. Stylistic elements suggest that it was painted in Germany. The man's coat with its matching waistcoat of light blue moiré silk with silver embroidery and silver buttons, his lace tie, and his allonge wig all indicate his high social standing. A dark band over his lace jabot is formed by the ribbons from his wig bag. The cover of facetted glass is impressively framed by an oval garland of flowers with asymmetrically positioned rose-cut diamonds. The slider on the velvet ribbon, which makes it possible to adjust the length of the necklace, is probably original.

Giardinetto rings, with open heads in the form of a bouquet or basket of flowers with colorful gems or bright diamonds, were another popular type of jewelry in the eighteenth century. In Germany they were also called *Bukettring* (bouquet rings). Ring T 249 (cat. 45), dated to the mid-eighteenth century, has an asymmetrical flowering branch with various colored gems arranged as flowers around a central cut almandine in a gold setting. This ring, which was acquired by the museum in 1875 from the Nuremberg jeweler Christian Gottfried Ferdinand Winter (1828–1881), probably originally had a transparent, colored gem instead of the opaque, turquoise-colored glass gem, similar to the transparent glass gem with the green-colored painted backing. Both the finely crafted ring T 3566 with flowering forms made of diamonds and four gemstones as well as the ring T 5729 that is set only with diamonds are of the *giardinetto* type (cats. 48, 49).

Shoe buckles (cat. 64–66), which were always used in pairs and stored in cases, could be worn according to taste and colors on various pairs of shoes. They were attached through the straps with which the shoes were fastened. Shoe buckles were made of various types of metals like gold, silver, steel, tombac, or other alloys. Starting in the 1750s they were often decorated with real or imitation diamonds as well as colored stones. The shoe buckles LGA 739 (cat. 65) are worked with loop shapes in silver and are set with polished stones.

Wearing jewelry on clothing was one of the most important ways of distinguishing oneself in the eighteenth century, and it also served to distance oneself from other social classes. The decoding process of the decorative elements that were permitted within one's own social class—which was divided into categories of weekdays or Sunday, day or evening—enabled the contemporary viewer to quickly categorize other people. Knowledge about these instantaneous distinguishing features are for the most part lost today, which is why jewelry is usually mostly evaluated only in terms of aesthetic criteria and material value. Apart from this social function, jewelry was usually the most precious material possession a woman could have; it remained her own personal asset when she married and was passed on directly when she died. Jewelry is thus not just decoration but also a speaking symbol of riches and status.

THREE FASHION PROFESSIONS

The Art of Tailoring

Two particularly rich contemporary sources can be consulted to better understand the duties and working methods of eighteenth-century tailors. In 1777 a fifty-page essay on the training, necessary tools, specializations, and the range of a tailor's products was published in the fifteenth volume of Peter Nathanel Sprengel's *Handwerke und Künste in Tabellen* (Crafts and Arts in Charts). The twenty-volume lexicon called *Schauplatz der Künste*, which was published between 1762 and 1795 and contains some translations from the famous French encyclopedia by Diderot and D'Alembert, includes an article on tailoring that is even more comprehensive. In volume sixteen, published in 1788, there is an almost eighty-page text on tailoring by François Garsault, which had been originally published in French in 1769. Following a cursory naming of the major types of clothing for men and women, it outlines the tools, stitches, measuring, cutting, and finishing in detail.

There are separate chapters in both publications on tailoring stays for women and children. Stays (*Schnürleib* in German) were defined as "a piece of clothing that is worn directly on top of the shirt and surrounds the body, reaching from the shoulders to the hips. . . . It has the useful purpose of making women's waists beautiful." Tailors who specialized in stays needed "more care, more dexterity and perfection" (Schauplatz der Künste 1788, vol. 16, pp. 44–45) for their work, for which they needed in addition to their tools most of all whalebone, different types of stiffened and soft canvas, thread, and silk string.

Sprengel differentiates between three types of stays in his treatise. "Common stays", which are tied at the back and have a closed, arched front. "English stays" are tied at the front and back, while the fronts are so narrow that there is a separate breast piece made of silk in the center. The "corselet" on the other hand is sewn together on the backside in the middle, and both of the front parts are tied together where they abut. On cutting, which is done with the help of paper patterns on linen, he writes: "Stays are composed of twelve, often only ten, special pieces." (Sprengel 1777, p. 364). The position of the whalebone that was inserted as stiffeners was marked in chalk according to the width and length of the strips so that the subsequent quilting seams formed channels into which the strips could easily be inserted. After this preparatory work on the individual parts, they were sewn together, padded, and could be covered with silk fabric as was desired.

The stays in the collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum T 6317 (cat. 77), which are dated ca. 1780, consist of fourteen cut parts that together form the front, side, and back pieces as well as the straps. The individual cut parts are composed of a different number of fabric pieces; particular care was taken to ensure that the pattern was symmetrical. The stays are sewn in the back, and the front edges have round, trimmed holes for the laces. A separate, similarly worked breast piece is also preserved. All around consistently narrow whalebones are sewn in, which can be seen clearly in an X-ray. The strips are thinner in the side areas in the front and back middle, which made it more comfortable. The straps also contain short, diagonally inserted whalebone stiffeners. Several of the tabs, which serve to make it fit better around the hips, have light-colored leather edges. A total of eight tabs are attached at the back, which were then inserted into the waistband, and they are lined with light-colored leather for a smoother fit. To create the desired expansive silhouette, sickle-shaped, quilted hip padding were sewn onto the outside of the back tabs. This hypothesis is supported by the regularly spaced stitching holes and the fact that fabric is considerably lighter in these areas. During the restoration of 2018 this original placement was restored. The stays with its embroidered silk and decorative borders are noticeably worn in the straps and in the linen padding.

Tailors in the eighteenth century were paid craftsmen who were organized in municipal corporations with differing guild regulations. After three years of apprenticeship, journeyman status was achieved, which was followed by several years of journeying and then a certain amount of time in the city where the journeyman wished to become a master. The requirement for becoming a master was the payment of set dues to the guild as well as the guild's approval of the required master piece. For example, the tailor regulations that were released in Magdeburg in 1737 specified that a future tailor for women had to produce stays and a complete dress under the supervision of his master (General-Privilegium 1737).

Master workshops that were specialized in men's or women's clothing, sometimes even in a certain item of clothing like stays, are documented in larger German cities. Usually masters were allowed to employ only one or two journeymen, sometimes including their wives or daughters, and several apprentices (Jacobsen, vol. 1, p. 791). Widows of tailors were permitted to continue business with journeymen, but they could not take on any more apprentices.

The Magdeburg regulations of 1737 also inform us about the relationship between customers and tailors. The customer generally provided the fabric and accessories such as buttons, and he commissioned a tailor for the cutting in his house. The tailor was obliged to return all leftovers and unneeded material to the client. The price of the commissioned garment could be negotiated, but the guild authorities did not tolerate unfair price fixing between individual master tailors. In comparison with the cost of the material the tailor's fee was just a small part of the overall costs.

The production of all linens such as shirts, linen pants, whalebone petticoats, and caps did not require guild membership. Married or unmarried women who could sew were also allowed to produce women's clothing per order, but were not permitted to sell it on the open market. In many cities the sale of ready-made clothing was generally forbidden to ensure that the local tailors retained the privilege of individual production.

The Art of Embroidery

Also known as "sewing work" in contemporary German literature, embroidery was equally applied to interior textile decoration, clothing, and accessories in the eighteenth century in order to increase the representative impact of the objects by decorating them. The history of their production, stylistic development, and material implementation have been studied by Uta-Christiane Bergemann (Bergemann 2006).

As in other areas of textile production, embroidery from Paris and Lyon was a luxury item that was particularly in demand and distributed in all of Europe by various trade routes. According to later sources, the Paris guild of silk embroiderers had 165 masters as members in 1765. Many of the samples that were designed there were disseminated by the corresponding designs and produced elsewhere. Vienna was considered the center in German-speaking countries; forty-five embroiderers are documented there in 1747 (Bergemann 2006, pp. 36–37); in all other German-speaking cities—Berlin and Leipzig were other centers—their numbers are much lower. Gold and silver embroidery was the most expensive type of embroidery due to the material and the complicated workmanship required. The silk embroidery of the eighteenth century that has survived in great numbers is characterized by subtle nuances of color. Called "needle painting," it was especially suited for realistic flower motifs.

Due to the minimal expense of the tools needed—frame, needles, and thread—embroidery was produced not only in professional workshops but also often in homes. Embroidery was considered a respectable activity for girls and women in both bourgeois and aristocratic circles. Designs were available in various pattern books. In our context it is particularly important to mention two popular books from Nuremberg. Amalia Beer's *Wol-anständige und Nutz-bringende Frauen Zimmer-Ergözung, in sich enthaltend ein Nach der allerneuesten Façon eingerichtetes Neh- und Stick-Buch* (cat. 81) was published around 1720 with fifty plates; Margaretha Helm's three-part work *Kunst- und Fleiß-übende Nadel-Ergötzungen oder neu-erfundenes Neh- und Stick-Buch* (cat. 83) was released around 1725, including over 150 etchings, some of which were folded. Both works contain full-sized patterns for decorative borders and corner ornaments, which could be embroidered on handkerchiefs, the edges of clothing, aprons, and other garments. They also contained more complex designs for stomachers, bonnets, slippers, and furniture coverings.

Professional embroidery workshops were established at the courts, in nunneries, and in studios in cities such as Berlin, Dresden, and Nuremberg (Bergemann 2006, p. 34). Following a seven-year apprentice and journeyman period, a master embroiderer could establish his own workshop. The designs for the works that were commissioned from the studio were usually drawn by the master himself or by a special pattern draftsman; the assistants or additional domestic workers executed the samples and the order. In addition to mastering all of the embroidery techniques and being able to produce them consistently, a profound understanding of color was necessary.

In many cities embroidery was controlled by a guild, while in others it was a free artistic profession that was not bound by regulations. However, the embroidery workshops were not allowed to make clothing or accessories with their products.

In addition to the well-established master workshops in Lyon, starting in the mid-eighteenth century large proto-industrial manufacturers were created in which six thousand embroiderers would take on commissions and also make semi-finished products in large numbers that were distributed to dealers all over Europe (Bergemann 2006, pp. 50–54). Examples of half-finished products are embroidered components of waistcoats, dresses, or shoes, with the contours already drawn in but not yet cut out. The floral embroidery on yellow silk satin in the collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (Gew 2551a, cat. 82) was made for a woman's shoe. The large bouquet became the vamp with a long tongue, and

the individual carnations decorated the sides of the shoes and formed the front straps that were passed through the buckle. The shoemaker used the embroidered covering to custom-make shoes for his client. Although the design appears to be French, there are no comparative pieces that would allow to confirm this hypothesis; the embroidery could have been executed at a German workshop.

A particularly attractive combination of silver and silk embroidery with a rich variety of stitches can be seen in the practically unworn stomacher T 1006 (cat. 80). Its raised embroidery with metal threads representing vines is laid out symmetrically only in the lower, stiffened part; the upper part was embroidered asymmetrically over the entire surface of the deep pink silk that is visible through the net-like structures. The lateral placement of the floral group with daffodils, carnations, roses, star-of-Bethlehem, and peonies is unusual. This piece was probably made by a professional workshop that would have produced the stomacher for a festive occasion either as a commissioned piece or as a semi-finished piece. According to the inventory, the stomacher came from a Nuremberg family collection and is classified as a “Nuremberg work” without any explanation. A similar piece in the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Hamburg has a similarly placed flower arrangement, this time combined with goldwork (inv. 1893-292, fig. 74). The subsequent finishing of both pieces—inner stiffeners, lining, and the metal-lace border—was apparently done by different hands.

Four albums by Anna Magdalena Braun (1734–1794), which were compiled between 1773 and 1793 with a wide variety of her own homemade needlework (embroidery, lace, ribbons, silk flowers, braiding, and beadwork), give us an idea of the high quality of domestic embroidery. From her mother and grandmother she had learned various techniques and pattern types, many of which were no longer common, which she wanted to document and pass on to her daughters. A piece of embroidery with a floral wreath, a medallion with silhouettes of cut paper, and corner ornaments that was created around 1780 (cat. 85), she called “little band embroidery.” The bouquet with hyacinths or bellflowers, daffodils, roses, and star-of-Bethlehem (fig. 75) was created with “real-picture stitch,” which is probably the same as “needle painting.”

Silk Weaving

After centuries of Italian dominance, in the first half of the eighteenth century Lyon became the center of silk weaving in Europe, in terms of both the quality of the different fabrics as well as the variety of patterns. Around 1760 there were approximately thirty-eight thousand people working in the silk weaving industry, which was one third of the population (Miller 2014, p. 12). The quality of silk from Lyon, which was carefully monitored by the Grande Fabrique, a sort of guild, ensured its international reputation and high prices in the luxury market. Europeans who held themselves in esteem tried to get original goods from Lyon; even the high import taxes, that caused the prices to skyrocket, were not an obstacle.

A successful silk manufacturer was divided up into numerous subsections, as is outlined in the article *Die Seidenfabrik* (The Silk Manufacturer) that was published in the fourteenth volume of Sprengel’s *Handwerke und Künste* (Sprengel 1776, pp. 348–654). In addition to first-class raw silk, good spinners, throwsters, winders, and dyers were needed to produce the basic material of the quality required. A long passage in Sprengel’s text is devoted to the complicated installation of the appropriate types of looms for the different types of fabrics and patterns, ranging from simple silk-weaver benches and draw-and-cone looms to the complex drawloom. The drawloom, called *métier à semple* in French and *Zampelwebstuhl* in German, with its shafts and a harness that was pulled by a helper, was a predecessor of the Jacquard loom that was first used in the early nineteenth century. The instructive model (cat. 76, fig. 76) of this loom, which was invented by Joseph-Marie Jacquard (1752–1834) in Lyon in 1805 with a mechanical system of punched cards that made the boys who pulled the strings superfluous, was a revolutionary loom. Still used today for high-quality works, it can create patterns of any desired complexity.

Apart from Lyon, where the most sophisticated fabrics were woven, other European centers for silk weaving in the eighteenth century were Amsterdam and Haarlem in Holland (Colenbrander 2013), Zurich in Switzerland (Palmer in Schorta 2000), and Krefeld (Rouette 2004) and Berlin (Paepke in Schorta 2000) in Prussia during the reign of King Frederick the Great. A precise localization of existing silk fabrics is only possible in a few cases (Markowsky 1976).

Brocaded silk fabrics, which were divided into “normal” fabrics with up to fifteen different silk colors and “rich” fabrics with additional gold and silver threads, were one of the costliest cloths of the Rococo. Complementary weft threads in the necessary colors were inserted using a swivel brocading sley only as long as the pattern required.

Starting in the 1740s the most popular patterns with naturalistic floral garlands and bouquets, later also with lace ribbons, were produced with a wide range

of variations in all European centers of silk weaving (exh. cat. Milan 1990). These meandering patterns are represented in most textile collections with many examples. Several hundred samples are archived in the textile museum in Lyon alone, although only a few of them can be attributed to specific silk manufacturers.

Many fabrics entered museum collections in the nineteenth century by way of the international art market; this is also the case for a large part of the fabric collection of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum. These acquisitions mark the point when any information on provenance and dating that might have been know until then was lost. As a result our knowledge about the specific origins of individual fabrics remains speculative because there is a lack of basic research. Archive research and well-documented pieces should be the starting point for future studies so that we can begin to bring a chronological and geographical order to different pattern and color combinations, the varying plasticity of the motifs, and the attention to detail with twisted ornamental threads and other effects. Once that has been established, it will be easier to begin classifying other objects.

In the following a selection of fabrics with floral garlands, bouquets, and lace ribbons from our collection will be presented in an attempt to visually classify the light blue fitted Andrienne. The silk fabric with a light-colored background Gew 926 (cat. 69), with a repeat height of 34 centimeters, is dominated by an airy garland composed of white and red-white mottled blooms, probably from the family of carnations. A rising bouquet of wild roses of similar coloration in the interstices is placed after each bend in the floral garland. The design of the bright red silk fabric Gew 913 (cat. 71), which has a height of the pattern repeat of 46.4 centimeters, is in comparison quite static. The garland is formed from a white lace with different mesh inserts, bows, and fruit or floral branches. Rather stiff bouquets with red and blue flowers are inserted in the areas in between without any attempt to integrate them.

Sumptuous lace garlands dominate the design of the fabric Gew 912 (cat. 73), which was probably originally much more vibrant than the pale red we see today. Four different, practically round elements made of tulle lace form the meander, which channels off into a bouquet in three places. Two smaller groups pick up on the light color of the lace while adding the forms of green leaves. The third bouquet, composed of a branch of a mountain ash with white blossoms, roses, and a blue anemone, is the largest, and it is executed in nine colors (white, blue, three shades of green, two shades of red, pink, yellow). The composition is dynamic and balanced.

The silk fabric Gew 911 (cat. 70) features a meandering lace band of simple tulle with inserted blossoms on a violet background. The flatly applied lace band is accompanied by small lateral festoons in bright green with button-shaped blossoms. Parallel to those, there are strikingly robust branches of grapevines, from which sumptuous roses grow. Due to the narrow cut of the sample, which has only one selvage edge, it is difficult to tell if the vines and bouquets originally formed a continuous garland. It is also impossible to conclude if there were two rows of branches and flowers between the lace bands, which is suggested by the inclination of the bouquets.

The silk fabric Gew 986 (cat. 72), which has a height of pattern repeat of 44.5 centimeters, has the most sophisticated design. The meander band is divided into different interlocking elements: small compact bunches of blossoms with white leaves, groups of heart-shaped leaves, bunches of ears of grain, and intricate red-white segments that are reminiscent of a silk droguet pattern. Large bouquets with leaves that were consistently executed in two shades of green are inserted in the interstices. The background, which has faded to light gray, was originally a shade of lilac.

The silk fabric Gew 909 (cat. 74) from the late eighteenth century is in the same tradition as the preceding patterns with lace garlands and bouquets. Patterned band garlands with sharp bends are woven into a green-and-white-checkered background. They are accompanied by rows of thick green leaves with white blossoms that hang conspicuously. Bouquets with leaves that are unusually executed in horizontal strips are seen in the interstices. These individual observations as well as the width of the fabric give the impression that this is a late variation on the "garland motif."

Distribution and Communication of Fashion

Luxurious silk clothing and the corresponding fashion accessories were exclusively reserved for customers of the upper classes of society. They had the necessary funds to buy these costly goods, and with them they could represent their own social standing within the limits that were prescribed by sumptuary laws. They learned about innovations through a network of dealers and distribution channels throughout Europe.

In the course of the eighteenth century communication about fashion innovations, about cuts, patterns, decorations, new producers and distributors was fed by a vast offering of text and image sources that can only be summarily mentioned here. Fashion was written about in newspapers and lexicons; satirical texts and plays were based on

current fashion phenomena that the readership was familiar with. Sermons and moral weeklies warned of the excesses of fashion and terrestrial pleasure; sumptuary laws tried to reflect the established social forms in the external appearance of people. In the private sphere, letters, memoirs, and travel reports give much information on new and out-of-date fashions as well as how they were ordered and produced. Eighteenth-century visual sources, which contribute information about dress and fashion, their use within society, and the combinations of individual pieces of clothing in interaction with the human body: portrait paintings, series of graphics, illustrations in fashion magazines that began to be published on a regular basis starting in the 1780s, caricatures, and broadsheets.

In addition to conversations, which are lost to us today, the contemporary consumer of fashion used these different media—depending on his or her means—to learn about fashion innovations. Another popular means for getting news was the long-established tradition of mannequins that were sent from France all through Europe to present the newest fashions in aristocratic circles (Peers 2004). An etching by Christian Gottlieb Geyser (cat. 87) from around 1780, with the title *French Fashion Domination over Europe*, shows a mannequin—called a Pandora at the time—being dressed. A woman is slipping a petticoat onto the life-sized wooden figure, still naked, before dressing her in the items of clothing that are ready in the foreground; fashion-interested ladies with tall hairdos and bonnets sneak a first peek at the soon-to-be-presented novelties through the window.

Smaller mannequin-like dolls had a similar function; they were used to present new fashions and were only in second place intended as dolls for children. The doll HG 8797 (cat. 86) wears a dress that is based on the type *robe à l'anglaise*, with a tight-fitting bodice and a round-shaped dress of green silk taffeta. The seams of the bodice as well as the hems of the dress and the sleeves have a light-colored border. The hems of the sleeves, the décolleté, and the head covering are decorated with lace. A small parasol with metal edging takes up the color of the pink bows on the sleeves. The finishing of this fashionable dress from around 1750, which is accurate in every detail, suggests that the doll was created as a mannequin. It would be interesting to know who commissioned such dolls, how often they were given new outfits, and finally if such dolls served as models for the tailors or if they only circulated in private circles.

Supplement to the publication
Luxus in Seide – Mode des 18. Jahrhunderts by Adelheid Rasche
(Kulturgeschichtliche Spaziergänge im
Germanischen Nationalmuseum 19). Nuremberg 2018,
ISBN 978-3-946217-14-5