

Botta Adorno, Empress Maria Theresa and Brussels Tapestry in the Mid-Eighteenth Century. Part I

KOENRAAD BROSENS

Relying on newly excavated archival sources, this two-part study seeks to map the genesis and development of the plan conceived by Antoniotto di Botta Adorno (1688–1774), Minister Plenipotentiary of the Austrian Netherlands from 1749 to 1753, to support the Brussels tapestry industry by promoting Brussels tapestries as diplomatic gifts. The first part sheds fresh light on the lives and mutual relations between the tapestry producers (tapissiers) who populated the landscape in the 1750s — Peter van den Hecke (1680–1752), Daniel IV Leyniers (1705–1770) and the half-brothers Jan Frans (1697–1774) and Peter II van der Borch (1712–1760) — and analyses the slow maturation of Adorno's plan in the summer of 1749. The second article will describe the way in which Botta Adorno made the project a reality and will also examine the strategies devised by the Minister and the Brussels tapissiers and the context in which they sought to apply them.

INTRODUCTION

In his pioneering work *Les Tapisseries Bruxelloises* (1878), Alphonse Wauters discussed the sharp decline of the Brussels tapestry industry following the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748) which propelled the Low Countries into a renewed period of Austrian domination under the rule of Maria Theresa (1717–1780), Archduchess of Austria and Empress of the Holy Roman Empire (Fig. 1).¹ The fall in the number of tapestry workshops from four in 1750 to just one in 1768, as recorded by Wauters, together with the City Council's 1777 pronouncement, which Wauters quotes, that tapestry had become an art that 'for want of turnover, would sooner or later be compelled to abandon its artists to abject destitution',² are unequivocal: the industry was moribund. Interestingly, Wauters also quoted Dérival de Gomicourt, who, when visiting Brussels in 1782, not only described the industry's decline but indeed asserted that it would long since have collapsed altogether 'had the late Count of Cobenzl not propped it up with his own money'.³ The reference is to Count Karl Johann Philipp von Cobenzl (1712–1770), Minister Plenipotentiary of the Austrian Netherlands from 1753 to 1770.

Wauters's contemporary Charles Piot had alluded *en passant* to Maria Theresa's support of the ailing industry four years earlier, remarking that she purchased Brussels tapestries every year to 'enrich the palaces of Vienna'.⁴ What is more, Joseph Laenen revealed in 1901 that Cobenzl's predecessor, Antoniotto di Botta Adorno (1688–1774) who served just four years as Minister Plenipotentiary from 1749 to 1753, had evidently



FIG. 1. Matthias de Visch, *Empress Maria Theresa*, oil on canvas, 1741–1760, GRO0451.1, 274 × 204 cm, Groeningemuseum Bruges. © KIK-IRPA, Brussel.

made some efforts to set in place a permanent grant scheme by promoting Brussels tapestries as parting gifts for diplomats (Fig. 2).⁵ Finally, the publication in 1903–1904 of an industrial census carried out in 1764 states that ‘the Vienna court grants them [the Brussels tapestry producers] commissions worth some 20,000 to 25,000 guilders a year’.⁶

These four publications thus provide an excellent point of departure for a study of the precise nature, development and impact of the Austrian support for the Brussels tapestry industry.⁷ Yet this issue has never been placed on the art historical agenda. Belgian historians writing before 1950 developed a narrative ‘helicopter perspective’ when looking at the history of the post-Aix Austrian Netherlands, assigning the leading roles to two figures: Maria Theresa’s Viceroy, Prince Charles of Lorraine (1712–1780) whose political influence was limited, and Cobenzl who, while seeking to balance national and Austrian-Habsburg interests, developed economic policy in the Netherlands.⁸ But references to Cobenzl’s support for the Brussels tapestry industry were



FIG. 2. Jean-Baptiste-François Bosio, *Antoniotto Botta Adorno*, brush and brown wash over graphite underdrawing, 49.19.92, 17 × 11 cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
The Elisha Whittelsey Collection, The Elisha Whittelsey Fund, 1949, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

cursory, and Botta Adorno and his tapestry project did not feature in these discussions at all. The period 1950 to 1990 saw, besides the publication of the first (largely superficial) English language studies of the Empress,⁹ numerous in-depth studies of the institutions and economy of the Austrian Netherlands.¹⁰ The tapestry industry, however, remained under the radar; since the industrial census of 1764 (reissued in 1974) described it as having been ‘virtually wiped out’, it was not very appealing as a research subject.¹¹ As a result, tapestry was omitted from the kaleidoscopic exhibition *Maria Theresa und Ihre Zeit* (1980)¹² and an initial art-historical essay on the Brussels tapestry industry during the Austrian regime (1989), which was brief and highly speculative, passed over Botta Adorno and his project in silence.¹³ Nor was Botta Adorno’s plan included in Brassat’s influential *Tapisseries und Politik* (1992), despite its inclusion of a chapter on the custom of using tapestries as diplomatic gifts.¹⁴

The rapid growth of studies focusing on the eighteenth-century Brussels tapestry industry, from the early 1990s onwards, did not improve the situation since most focused on the production *before* 1750.¹⁵ The handful of publications that looked at the period after 1750 highlighted the key role of Maximiliaan de Hase (1713–1781), a Brussels artist who had occasionally surfaced in the 1970s and 1980s studies¹⁶ but these also — and primarily — demonstrate that our knowledge of the Brussels tapestry industry after 1750 is tentative and full of gaps. Thus, the corpus of sets attributed to Maximiliaan de Hase is far from well defined. Several sets have been attributed to De Hase on the basis of archival documents,¹⁷ but these have never been studied in detail, and a pioneering attempt to expand De Hase's œuvre as a tapestry designer on the basis of stylistic criticism proved untenable.¹⁸ Meanwhile, the biographies of the last Brussels tapestry producers remained missing altogether. No one posed the question of whether the crisis afflicting the industry had inspired them to collaborate or led to conflict, and the precise role of the Empress and her Ministers in the promotion of the tapestry industry remained unresearched. In line with this trend, Michael Yonan's recent acclaimed study of the role played by art and gift exchange in shaping Maria Theresa's monarchical identity pays no attention whatsoever to tapestries.¹⁹

In short, the research track that had been opened up around 1900 has remained unexplored and is threatened with being forgotten altogether. Clearly, then, there is a pressing need for an inclusive, in-depth study of the genesis, nature and development of the Austrian support for the Brussels tapestry industry. Such analysis would be of interest not only because it would finally embed Brussels tapestry into ongoing discussions about the production and consumption of tapestry in Europe in the second half of the eighteenth century, but also because it would contribute to the debate on the culture of gift-giving and shed new light on the place early modern governments assigned to creative industries within their economic policy. By focusing on Botta Adorno's pioneering attempts to restore Brussels tapestry through imperial support between 1749 and 1753, this present data-driven study aims to become a cornerstone of future research on these issues.

A substantial body of new archival data extracted from various sources yields the necessary fuel and framework. Among the most important of these newly excavated sources are: the Brussels parish records; Botta Adorno's correspondence with Emanuel Teles da Silva Conde Tarouca (1696–1771), President of the Conseil Suprême des Pays-Bas (1740–1757) and, in that capacity, the link between the Minister Plenipotentiary and the Empress; and, finally, Maximiliaan de Hase's *Memorie Boeck*, a journal in which the artist kept meticulous records of his production between 1744 and 1780.²⁰ In view of the quantity and quality of the new findings, this study will be divided into two articles. In this first one, I shall start by introducing the Brussels *tapissiers* who populated the landscape in around 1750: Peter van den Hecke, Daniel IV Leyniers, Jan Frans and Peter II van der Borcht, before moving on to discuss in detail the genesis of the plan that Botta Adorno tried to develop in the latter half of 1749 to support the Brussels tapestry industry. The project's actualisation will be dealt with in the second article which will also present a critical reflection on the strategy devised by Botta Adorno and the Brussels *tapissiers*.

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, Brussels City Council had exempted the city's tapestry producers, designers and wool-dyers from militia duties and from taxes on the consumption of wine and beer, as well as giving them rent subsidies in compensation for their efforts to develop the industry which benefited the local economy.²¹ Each year afresh, the City Council evaluated whether the beneficiaries of these dispensations could continue to enjoy them. There are no known lists of names of beneficiaries dating from the seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries, but between 1731 and 1779 they were recorded in the various Registers of the City's Treasury which now are preserved at Brussels City archives. These lists show which *tapisiers* ran independent workshops in this period. In 1749, when Botta Adorno arrived in Brussels, four workshop directors are listed: Peter van den Hecke, Jan Frans van der Borcht, Peter II van der Borcht and Daniel IV Leyniers. Research conducted in Brussels' parish records brought to light new biographical data on these producers that also illuminates the relationships between them.

Peter van den Hecke, born in 1680,²² was the son of the *tapisier* Jan Frans van den Hecke (1638–1710)²³ and Catharina Urselinckx (d. 1697).²⁴ After his father's death, Peter van den Hecke immediately took over the workshop on the corner of *Hoogstraat* and *Waystraet* (opposite the Capuchin monastery) in the parish of Our Lady of the Chapel, along with the privileges that had been granted to Jan Frans van den Hecke since 1681.²⁵ In 1695 Peter van den Hecke's elder sister Anna (1677–1700)²⁶ married the *tapisier* Gaspar van der Borcht (1675–1742)²⁷ whose workshop was also 'near the Capuchins' in the parish of Our Lady of the Chapel.²⁸ A few years after Anna's death, Gaspar van der Borcht was married for a second time, in 1703, to Anna Pillois.²⁹ However, the ties that had been established between Peter van den Hecke and Gaspar van der Borcht remained intact throughout the first half of the eighteenth century. In 1715, for instance, they were co-executors of the last will and testament of the *tapisier* Judocus de Vos (1661–1734), a pivotal figure in the production and trade of Brussels tapestries,³⁰ and in the 1720s and 1730s Peter van den Hecke and Gaspar van der Borcht frequently acted as joint poor relief officers for the parish of Our Lady of the Chapel.³¹ Naturally enough, they also occasionally collaborated in the tapestry business.³²

In 1725, Jan Frans, the son of Gaspar van der Borcht and Anna van den Hecke, opened a new workshop at the *Muntplein* in the parish of Our Lady of Finisterrae, very close to that of Judocus de Vos.³³ Jan Frans, born in 1697 and named after his grandfather and godfather Jan Frans van den Hecke,³⁴ spent half of his apprenticeship training as a painter with Jan van Orley (1665–1735) who was by far the most prolific and successful Brussels painter and tapestry designer in the first thirty-odd years of the eighteenth century. The entry in the guild register shows that Van der Borcht spent the other half of his apprenticeship training as a *tapisier*.³⁵ It has been claimed that Jan Frans van der Borcht was banished from Brussels in 1719 in punishment for taking part in an uprising against the Austrian Viceroy the Marquis of Prié³⁶ but, in fact, it was a forty-year-old cloth-maker by the same name who was banished from the City — together with Maximiliaan de Hase's father Gabriel.³⁷ Since the City Council granted Jan Frans van der Borcht privileges as early as 1726, it is clear that the new Van der Borcht workshop was a major production centre from the outset.³⁸ The godparents

chosen by Jan Frans van der Borcht and his wife Maria Bruneau for their children, who were born in the 1720s and 1730s, suggests that Jan Frans remained on amicable terms with his father Gaspar and the Van den Hecke family, so that the three workshops (Van den Hecke, Van der Borcht/*Hoogstraat* and Van der Borcht/*Muntplein*) may be assumed to have operated in a network in which family relationships and trust spilled over into occasional collaboration.³⁹

After the death of Gaspar van der Borcht in 1742, Jan Frans's half-brother Peter II, born in 1712 from Gaspar's second marriage,⁴⁰ took over the Van der Borcht/*Hoogstraat* workshop as is clear from the application for privileges he submitted a few weeks after his father's death in which he stated that he had 'taken over the management of the same, and that he [was] now working with all the assistants every day in the same manner as his aforementioned late father'.⁴¹ In January 1744, Peter II van der Borcht moved the workshop to *Parochiaanstraat*, a short street that led to the Church of St Gudula.⁴² De Hase's *Memorie Boeck* and the correspondence between Botta Adorno and Tarouca make it clear that the close ties between the workshops of Jan Frans and Peter II van der Borcht remained intact until the end of 1751. For De Hase was still executing commissions for the shared account of the 'Srs. Vander Borcht' which are always mentioned together in letters and invoices written and paid by Botta Adorno. But in December 1751, Botta Adorno ordered a *Teniers* set that was to be produced by Peter II van der Borcht and Daniel IV Leyniers (to be discussed in Part II). From 1752 onwards, whether or not this is coincidence following the death in February that year of Peter van den Hecke who acted as the family's nestor and 'godfather',⁴³ De Hase constantly worked under one or other of the two half-brothers which obviously shows that each was by then pursuing his own independent path. It is universally assumed that Peter II van der Borcht died in 1763,⁴⁴ but the archives reveal that he was actually buried in 1760.⁴⁵ The entry in the parish records states that he was still living on *Parochiaanstraat* and was unmarried at that time.

Daniel IV Leyniers, who had enjoyed privileges since 1730⁴⁶ and was the son of Urbanus Leyniers (1674–1747) whose reaction to the Brinck affair's outcome had cost him his monopoly position as dyer for the *tapissiers*, had opened a tapestry workshop in 1712 and had developed it into a remarkably successful business by pursuing a shrewd investment policy.⁴⁷ After his father's death, Daniel IV Leyniers took over the tapestry workshop.⁴⁸ The last year in which he received support from the City was 1767.⁴⁹ The Leyniers factory closed a year later, leaving Jan Frans van der Borcht, from 1768 onwards, as the sole workshop director in Brussels. He died in 1774⁵⁰ but his privileges were immediately taken over by his son Jacob (1735–1794) who kept the workshop operational until his death in 1794.⁵¹

Now that the producers who played a role in Botta Adorno's plan have been clearly identified, we shall take a closer look at the Minister's attempts to support the Brussels tapestry industry.

SUMMER 1749

On 22 February 1749, just a few months after the signing of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle which ended the War of the Austrian Succession, Maria Theresa appointed Botta Adorno as Minister Plenipotentiary of the Austrian Netherlands.⁵² Botta Adorno,

who arrived in Brussels at the beginning of April, would hold this position for just a few years. At the beginning of September 1753 he returned to Italy where he was likewise appointed Minister Plenipotentiary.⁵³ In his attempts to get the economy and the governance of the Low Countries back on the rails, he naturally kept in close contact with the Viceroy Charles of Lorraine⁵⁴ but also, and more importantly, with Maria Theresa's President of the Conseil Suprême des Pays-Bas, Emanuel Teles da Silva Conde Tarouca.⁵⁵

Basing his account on the correspondence between Botta Adorno and Tarouca, Laenen revealed, back in 1901, that Botta Adorno had exerted himself to support the Brussels industry by promoting tapestries as diplomatic gifts.⁵⁶ A closer look at this correspondence allows us to analyse in detail the patient enthusiasm with which Botta Adorno and, to a lesser extent, Tarouca endeavoured to place tapestries on the imperial agenda.⁵⁷

On 25 June 1749, some three months after taking up his post, Botta Adorno wrote to Tarouca, outlining his plan 'to procure some decent profits for the country in general and the workers [tapestry-makers] in particular'.⁵⁸ The newly appointed Minister had calculated that the Austrian government was spending 40,000 to 50,000 guilders a year on precious stones purchased from foreign jewellers for incorporation into gifts, such as portraits and snuffboxes, to be presented as parting gifts to foreign diplomats leaving Vienna. Indeed, as Yonan recently demonstrated, Maria Theresa and the Vienna court participated fully and cautiously in the rituals of gift exchange; diplomatic gifts were meant to establish and refine political relationships and acted as a kind of payment for successful negotiations or as a reward for services rendered.⁵⁹ Botta Adorno took the view that 'in these Provinces one could [also] find gifts worthy of sovereigns', and his thoughts immediately went to 'high-warp tapestries, which are not made anywhere else as well or as cheaply as here'.⁶⁰ Furthermore, if designated as gifts, Botta Adorno pointed out, they could bear the Empress's coat of arms, advertising their provenance in a clear and permanent fashion. Finally, the Minister added that he would be happy to supervise these commissions and asked Tarouca to put the plan to the Empress. At first sight, it may seem rather curious that Botta Adorno did not refer to France's long tradition — which still existed at the time — of using tapestries as diplomatic gifts to give more weight to his plan, for it is unlikely that he was not familiar with this custom.⁶¹ However, the Minister might very well have decided against including this information as he must have realised that there were major differences between Paris and Brussels that could only arm any adversaries. First, the tapestry workshops in Paris and Beauvais were *royal* undertakings (which, however, does not mean that French *tapissiers* only worked for the king) that had been catering to the needs of the French king and court since the early seventeenth century. Brussels and Flemish tapestry, on the other hand, had never benefited from this kind of state support. In addition, contemporary French tapestry design was more in tune with the changes in fashion and interior decoration that threatened the medium. Thus, Botta Adorno must have feared that, by using Brussels and France in one sentence, he would only provoke a reaction that would, basically, highlight the utopian nature of his plan; in fact, neither history, the present, nor the foreseeable future gave him solid arguments supporting his programme.

In his reply of 5 July, Tarouca underlined the fact that Maria Theresa's predecessor, Charles VI (1685–1740), had rejected a similar project to support the Brussels industry

which had been proposed by the Conseil Suprême.⁶² However, Tarouca promised to put it to the Empress nonetheless and professed himself cautiously optimistic, since Maria Theresa had shown some interest in tapestry in the past. In the early 1740s she had purchased 'four [sets], three of which are currently used at court' — Tarouca unfortunately failed to identify them.⁶³ Furthermore, the Empress had recently expressed a desire to purchase a new series, and Tarouca therefore asked Botta Adorno to ask the Brussels '*manufacturiers*' to compile lists of 'all the tapestries they have in stock at the present time, and even those that are currently in production, and are at a sufficiently advanced stage that they might be delivered in the near future'.⁶⁴

Naturally enough, Botta Adorno responded enthusiastically to this hopeful news. On 16 July he promised Tarouca to despatch the requested lists as soon as possible, meanwhile supplying a brief description of the Brussels production context: 'the most renowned workshop, to wit, that of [Judocus] Vos, no longer exists', he noted but, besides a number of sets, De Vos's storeroom contained 'several cartoons that were never executed, and that could be used for tapestries'.⁶⁵ In addition, Brussels still boasted 'three or four renowned workshops' — Botta Adorno's equivocation may possibly be explained by the fact that the Van der Borcht half-brothers had two factories but worked together on a permanent basis — although the Minister Plenipotentiary stated that these faced imminent bankruptcy without government support. He reported that the domestic market was completely saturated and exports were suffering from high import duties.⁶⁶

Only three days later, Botta Adorno despatched three *mémoires* written by Brussels *tapissiers* to Tarouca.⁶⁷ Jan Frans van der Borcht listed a six-part and a three-part set of the *Triumph of the Gods*, a nine-part *Story of Achilles*, a five-part set depicting *The Continents* and a seven-part *Teniers*. Van der Borcht noted down meticulously the subjects, dimensions and prices of these sets. He did not name the designers, but we know that the *Triumph of the Gods* and *Achilles* series produced by Van der Borcht were designed by Jan van Orley and the landscape painter Augustin Coppens (1668–1740) and *The Continents* by Philippe de Hondt (1683–1741), a tapestry designer with a marked preference for Watteau-esque imagery and formal language.⁶⁸ Finally, Van der Borcht's *Teniers* compositions were recycled cartoons of the series designed by David II Teniers (1610–1690).⁶⁹ Peter II van der Borcht compiled a *mémoire* that partly overlapped with his half-brother's: the list, equally detailed (albeit without attributions to designers) included the six-part *Triumph of the Gods*, the nine-part *Achilles* and the five-part *Continents*, all of which were also listed by Jan Frans van der Borcht.⁷⁰ Peter II added a four-part set of Philippe de Hondt's *Continents* as well as a five-part *Don Quixote* (also after De Hondt),⁷¹ a six-part *Story of Moses* (after Van Orley and Coppens)⁷² and, finally, a six-part *Teniers* (possibly after the same recycled cartoons that were also used by Jan Frans). Finally, Daniel Leyniers listed three sets that were in storage: a six-part *Story of Don Quixote*, a six-part *Famous Men after Plutarch* and a six-part set entitled *Les Plaisirs Humaines* — a series that, as is clear from the subjects depicted, was a *Teniers* set. Like his colleagues, Leyniers described in detail the subjects, prices and dimensions but not the artists. However, it is known that Leyniers's *Don Quixote* was designed by Van Orley and Coppens and the *Illustrious Men* by Victor Janssens (1658–1736) and Coppens.⁷³ Leyniers had diverse *Teniers* sets in his catalogue⁷⁴ and it is therefore unclear who designed the *Teniers* set mentioned in the *mémoire*.

A week later, on 26 July, Tarouca wrote that he would soon be proposing Botta Adorno's plan to the State Chancellor, Count Anton Corfitz Ulfeld (1699–1769) and was hopeful of a favourable outcome.⁷⁵ The main obstacle, he added, was the fact that the Viennese court was entangled in a web of credit and debts spun by the jewellery suppliers which was precisely why the similar project had been rejected under Charles VI. In this letter, Tarouca further explained that the new set that the Empress wanted to buy was intended for the Emperor's '*grande anti-chambre*' (great antechamber) in the Hofburg, a complex of mediaeval and Renaissance buildings within the City walls that remained the principal Imperial seat and the preferred setting for diplomatic occasions. In the ceremonial series of rooms and halls to which visitors to the Hofburg were granted or denied access — according to their rank and position — the great antechamber was between the small (or first) antechamber and the *Ratstube* (Council Chamber) in which the Emperor held court and the most important ceremonies were held.⁷⁶ Pending the order of the new series, the Empress wanted to buy one *Teniers* tapestry straight away, to add to a five-part *Teniers* that the Court had purchased through Charles Ferdinand van Königsegg-Erps (1696–1759), Minister Plenipotentiary of the Austrian Netherlands in 1743–1744, from Jan Frans van der Borcht in November 1743.⁷⁷ In all probability, this is one of the four series that Tarouca had mentioned in passing in his letter of 5 July 1749. Since it is clear that *Teniers* sets in the Habsburg collection were broken up over time and that tapestries were regrouped into 'new' sets in the nineteenth century, these five-plus-one tapestries cannot be linked with confidence to any of the *Teniers* sets that are preserved in the Austrian national collection.⁷⁸ Botta Adorno was also asked to send borders measuring a total length of 200 ells (approx. 138 metres) although '*important soit peu de quel dessein elles seront*' ('the motifs on which being of little importance'). These were needed to enlarge certain unidentified tapestries that had been furnished with painted borders, creating an effect that was — as one may well imagine — '*assez mauvaise*' ('quite horrible').

Botta Adorno immediately passed the commissions on to Jan Frans and Peter II van der Borcht. They packed and shipped the requested borders at once, which of course means that they were supplied from existing stock.⁷⁹ The borders arrived in Vienna twenty days later.⁸⁰ In the meantime, efforts were made to elaborate the plans for the set of tapestries for the great antechamber in more detail to which end Botta Adorno sent two new lists on 16 August, a month after he had sent the first three *mémoires*.⁸¹ One of these, compiled by Jan Frans van der Borcht, included the nine-part set of *Achilles* (which also featured in his first *mémoire*) and a description of the cartoons for Van Orley's *Moses* series. This choice shows that Van der Borcht clearly understood the key importance of monumentality and gravitas when dealing with the great antechamber. The second *mémoire* that Botta Adorno sent on 16 August was drawn up by Peter van den Hecke who had not sent one the month before, for reasons that remain unclear. He listed five sets that he had in stock: one seven-part and one four-part *Story of Psyche*, a six-part *Don Quixote*, a six-part *Seasons and Elements* and an eight-part *Teniers*. This *mémoire* also omitted the artists' names, but we know that Van den Hecke's *Psyche* was designed by Jan van Orley and Augustin Coppens,⁸² his *Don Quixote* by Philippe de Hondt (the cartoons for this set were also used by the Van der Borchts),⁸³ and his *Seasons and Elements* by Lodewijk van Schoor (c. 1650–1702).⁸⁴ The designer of Van den Hecke's *Teniers* set is unknown.

However, on 19 and 20 August, even before receiving Botta Adorno's letter and the accompanying *mémoires*, Tarouca wrote that quite possibly *no* new set would be ordered for the great antechamber. For it seemed that Jakob Andreas Lenôble (born 1703), whom Maria Theresa had appointed in 1747 as *Hofmobilieninspektor* (roughly 'Inspector of Court Furnishings') and who thus bore responsibility for managing the Imperial art collection and the interior of the residences, wanted to use a fairly new six-part *Achilles* set by Jan Frans van der Borcht.⁸⁵ This set had belonged to the collection of the recently deceased Count Casimir Heinrich von Wurmbbrand-Stuppach (1680–1749).⁸⁶ The tapestries would obviously have to be altered to fit the great antechamber, but Lenôble thought this perfectly feasible.

Botta Adorno reacted to this news with predictable coolness, but promised Tarouca on 27 August that he would discuss Lenôble's plan with Jan Frans van der Borcht.⁸⁷ Equally predictably, he wrote to Tarouca again, on 30 August, to say that Van der Borcht did not believe that the tapestries could be altered as suggested so '*le manufacturier*' would therefore formulate its own alternative proposal with an estimated production time of eight to nine months.⁸⁸ Only a few days later, Botta Adorno wrote that Van der Borcht had suggested producing a new twelve-part *Achilles* set.⁸⁹

While the plans for the antechamber series slowly started to take shape in August 1749, Tarouca also tried to interest the court in Botta Adorno's project of purchasing a number of sets each year for use as diplomatic gifts. On 6 August 1749, a month after he had encouraged Botta Adorno to entertain an optimistic view of the Empress's reaction to the plan, Tarouca conceded that he had not yet broached it to her.⁹⁰ Two weeks later, he wrote that the plan had finally been mentioned but had not been received enthusiastically.⁹¹ Still, he added, he was not the kind of man to be easily discouraged by obstacles, and he promised to keep the plan alive in Vienna.

A letter of 26 August from Tarouca shows that he kept his word,⁹² for he had suggested using a six-part *Don Quixote* set by Peter van den Hecke that had belonged to the Imperial collection since the early 1740s as a gift since the tapestries were too small to be used at court. This series was evidently the second of the four unidentified sets that Tarouca had mentioned in his letter of 5 July — more specifically, this was the one that was in storage. But Lenôble had decided to furnish the *Don Quixote* pieces with borders so that they *could* be used at court and he had asked Botta Adorno to purchase the required borders from Van den Hecke.⁹³ The contract between Botta Adorno and Van den Hecke was concluded on 30 August.⁹⁴ This account makes it clear that the unsigned six-part *Don Quixote* set in the collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, was produced by Van den Hecke in or around 1743 and did not originally have wide borders (Figs 3 and 4).⁹⁵

Thus, within the two months following the letter in which Botta Adorno had proposed his plan to Tarouca, tapestries had been firmly reinstated on the imperial agenda: the court had ordered borders (for unspecified tapestries) and a *Teniers* tapestry from the Van der Borcht half-brothers as well as borders from Peter van den Hecke for his *Don Quixote* series. Besides all this, the court was thinking of ordering a new series for the great antechamber. In the meantime, Botta Adorno's gift plan had started to take root and, on 13 September 1749, Tarouca had good news to report: the Empress was willing to 'assent to our proposition of the presentation of these tapestries as gifts, where appropriate, to foreign ministers and others', but she would not release any funds for



FIG. 3. Peter van den Hecke (Brussels) after Philippe de Hondt, *Don Quixote is Knighted*, wool and silk, c. 1743, T LII 1, 354 × 336 cm, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. By permission of Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

them until the *Teniers* tapestry and the borders for the *Don Quixote* had been delivered and the plans for the great antechamber had been finalised.⁹⁶

In the days and weeks that followed, Tarouca expressed his impatience. He advised Botta Adorno on the manner in which the tapestries and borders that had been ordered should be sent to Vienna and urged the Minister to send new lists or *mémoires* as soon as possible.⁹⁷ On 27 September, the Van der Borch half-brothers despatched the sixth *Teniers* tapestry, *The Hunt*.⁹⁸ Botta Adorno — who had not yet been apprised of the



FIG. 4. Peter van den Hecke (Brussels) after Philippe de Hondt, *Don Quixote at the Ducal Court*, wool and silk, c. 1743, T LII 4, 348 × 456 cm, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. By permission of Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna.

Empress's promise — immediately informed Tarouca that it was on its way, but admitted that the borders for the *Don Quixote* were delayed.⁹⁹ A few days later, on 1 October, Botta Adorno — who had still not yet received the good news from Vienna — wrote that the *Teniers* tapestry would leave Liège the following night.¹⁰⁰ He expected it to reach Vienna around mid-October but, as it happened, Tarouca was not able to report its arrival until 15 November.¹⁰¹

On 8 October Botta Adorno finally received Tarouca's letter notifying him of the Empress's agreement and he immediately wrote to express his pleasure.¹⁰² However, the Minister must have understood that developing his gift plan further would be far from easy: it was not rooted in the past, the Empress herself had evinced little enthusiasm and less alacrity in responding to it, it was clear that *Hofmobilieninspektor* Lenôble was not on his side and it was far from certain that the sum the Empress had in mind would meet his expectations and that the support would be renewed annually. In short, the project remained based to a large extent, if not completely, on Botta's gift for improvisation and his tenacity. How Botta Adorno tried to rise to these challenges and fleshed out the project will be addressed in the second article of this study.

Botta Adorno, Empress Maria Theresa and Brussels Tapestry

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank fellow art historians Guy Delmarcel, Leo De Ren, Katlijne Van der Stighelen, Klara Alen and Astrid Slegten and also Dominique Joie and Beverley Jackson (the latter for her excellent translation of the article, as always, from the Dutch).

REFERENCES

- ¹ A. Wauters, *Les Tapisseries Bruxelloises* (Brussels: Baertsoen, 1878), pp. 363–83.
- ² In the original: ‘faute de débit, sera tôt ou tard forcé d’abandonner ses artistes à la plus déplorable misère’; *ibid.*, p. 378.
- ³ In the original: ‘si le feu Comte de Cobenzl ne l’eût soutenue des ses propres deniers’; A. Dérival de Gomicourt, *Le Voyageur dans les Pays-Bas Autrichiens*, 1 (Amsterdam: Changuion, 1782), p. 173; Wauters, *Les Tapisseries Bruxelloises*, p. 381.
- ⁴ C. Piot, *Le Règne de Marie-Thérèse* (Leuven: Fonteyn, 1874), p. 233.
- ⁵ J. Laenen, *Le Ministère de Botta-Adorno dans les Pays-Bas Autrichiens pendant le Règne de Marie-Thérèse (1749–1753)* (Antwerp: La Librairie Néerlandaise, 1901), pp. 205–08.
- ⁶ In the original: ‘la cour de Vienne leur [the Brussels tapestry producers] passe pour 20 à 25000 florins de commandes par an’; A. Julin, *Les Grandes Fabriques en Belgique vers le Milieu du XVIIIe Siècle* (1764) (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1903–1904), p. 62.
- ⁷ A fifth (very brief) study that can be included here is: G. Cumont, ‘Tapisseries de la maison du Prince Charles de Lorraine et tapisseries mentionnées dans les “Gastos Secretos” (dépenses secrètes) du Gouvernement autrichien (1744–1789)’, *Annales de la Société d’Archéologie de Bruxelles*, x (1896), pp. 349–52.
- ⁸ L. Perey, *Charles de Lorraine et la Cour de Bruxelles sous le Règne de Marie-Thérèse* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1903); C. de Villermont, *Le Comte de Cobenzl, Ministre Plénipotentiaire aux Pays-Bas* (Bruges: Desclée-De Brouwer, 1925); G. De Boom, *Les Ministres Plénipotentiaires dans les Pays-Bas Autrichiens, Principalement Cobenzl* (Brussels: Lamertin, 1932); J. Schouteden-Wery, *Charles de Lorraine et son Temps (1712–1780)* (Brussels: Dessart, 1943). To obtain a better picture of Vienna’s share, these authors had at their disposal A. von Arneth’s monumental *Geschichte Maria Theresias*, 1–x (Vienna: Braumüller, 1863–79) and *Briefe der Kaiserin Maria Theresia und ihre Kinder und Freunde*, 1–iv (Vienna: Braumüller, 1881). The first in-depth study of the economic situation in the Austrian Netherlands is H. Van Houtte, *Histoire Economique de la Belgique à la Fin de l’Ancien Régime* (Ghent: Van Rysselberghe and Rombaut, 1920).
- ⁹ R. Pick, *Empress Maria Theresa: The Earlier Years, 1717–1757* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966); C. A. Macartney, *Maria Theresa and the House of Austria* (London: English Universities Press, 1969); K. A. Roider, *Maria Theresa* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973). Studies devised on a similar basis are G. Fussenegger, *Maria Theresia* (Vienna: Molden, 1980) and F. Herre, *Maria Theresia* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer and Witsch, 1994).
- ¹⁰ P. Moureaux, *Les Préoccupations Statistiques du Gouvernement des Pays-Bas Autrichiens* (Brussels: Université de Bruxelles, 1971); P. Moureaux, *La Statistique Industrielle dans les Pays-Bas Autrichiens à l’Époque de Marie-Thérèse*, 1–II (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1974); P. Lenders, ‘Ontwikkeling van politiek en instellingen in de Oostenrijkse Nederlanden. De invloed van de Europese oorlogen’, *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis*, LXIV (1981), pp. 33–78; H. Hasquin ed., *Oostenrijks België, 1713–1794* (Brussels: Gemeentekrediet, 1987); P. G. M. Dickson, *Finance and Government under Maria Theresia 1740–1780*, 1–II (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987); H. Houtman-De Smedt ed., *Overheid en Economie. Economische Aspecten van de Overheidspolitiek in en met Betrekking tot de Oostenrijkse Nederlanden* (Antwerp: University Press, 1989); H. Coppens, *De Financiën van de Centrale Regering van de Zuidelijke Nederlanden aan het Einde van het Spaanse en onder Oostenrijks Bewind (ca. 1680–1788)* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1992); M. Galland, *Charles de Lorraine, Gouverneur Général des Pays-Bas Autrichiens (1744–1780)* (Brussels: Université de Bruxelles, 1993).

¹¹ Moureaux, *La Statistique*, p. 72.

¹² W. Koschatzky ed., *Maria Theresia und Ihre Zeit* (Vienna: Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1980).

¹³ I. De Meûter, 'De wandtapijtindustrie te Brussel ten tijde van het Oostenrijks bewind', in *De Oostenrijkse Nederlanden, het Prinsbisdom Luik en het Graafschap Loon in de 18^{de} eeuw* (Hasselt: Provinciebestuur Limburg, 1989), pp. 79–90.

¹⁴ W. Brassat, *Tapissierien und Politik* (Berlin: Mann, 1992).

¹⁵ F. Huygens, 'Mozes in de Zuidnederlandse tapissierskunst. Traditie en vernieuwing in twee tapijten van Jasper van der Borcht', *Bulletin des Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire*, LXV (1994), pp. 257–304; N. de Reyniès, 'Jean van Orley cartonniér. La tenture d'Achille au Musée Jacquemart-André', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, CXXV (1995), pp. 155–76; N. de Reyniès, 'Jean van Orley. Une tenture de l'histoire de Psyché', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, CXXV (1995), pp. 209–20; K. Brosens and G. Delmarcel, 'Les aventures de Don Quichotte. Tapisseries bruxelloises de l'atelier Leyniers-Reydam's', *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art*, LXVII (1998), pp. 55–92; K. Brosens, 'Brussels tapestry producer Judocus de Vos (1661/1662–1734) — new data and design attributions', *Studies in the Decorative Arts*, IX (2002), pp. 58–86; K. Brosens, *A Contextual Study of Brussels Tapestry, 1670–1770: The Dye Works and Tapestry Workshop of Urbanus Leyniers (1674–1747)* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2004); K. Brosens, 'The Story of Psyche in Brussels tapestry c. 1700. New data on Jan van Orley, Jan-Baptist Vermillion and Victor Janssens', *The Burlington Magazine*, CXLVII (2005), pp. 401–06; K. Brosens, 'Eighteenth-century Brussels tapestry and the *Goût Moderne*. Philippe de Hondt's sets contextualized', *Studies in the Decorative Arts*, XIV (2006–2007), pp. 53–79; K. Brosens, 'Revisiting Brussels tapestry, 1700–1740: new data on *tapissiers* Albert Auwerx and Judocus de Vos', *Textile History*, XLIII (2012), pp. 180–96.

¹⁶ As a rule, eighteenth-century Flemish painting has been disparaged and/or ignored by scholars; see S. Ansiaux and J. Lavalleye, 'Notes sur les peintres de la cour de Charles de Lorraine', *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art*, VI (1936), p. 306; P. Bautier, 'La peinture au dix-huitième siècle', in P. Fierens ed., *L'Art en Belgique du Moyen Âge à Nos Jours* (Brussels: La Renaissance du Livre, 1938), p. 393; P. Philippot, 'Een nieuw bewustzijn van de kunst', in D. Coekelberghs and P. Loze eds, *1770–1830. Om en rond het Neo-Classicisme in België* (Brussels: Gemeentekrediet, 1985), p. 22; P. Philippot, 'Kunst: van barok tot neoclassicisme', in Hasquin, *Oostenrijks België*, p. 387. The only studies in which De Hase is accorded a role are D. Coekelberghs, *Les Peintres Belges à Rome de 1700 à 1830* (Brussels and Rome: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 1976), pp. 393–94; C. Lemoine-Isabeau, 'Les tapisseries de Cyrus par Maximilien De Hase, 1771–1775', *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art*, XLVII (1978), p. 212; W. Scheelen, 'Enkele minder bekende werken van de Brusselse schilder Maximiliaan de Hase (ca. 1718?–1781)', *Arca Lovaniensis*, xv–xvi (1987), pp. 95–125; G. Delmarcel and F. Huygens, 'A propos du tapissier Jean-Baptiste Vermillion, du cartonniér Maximilien De Hase et d'autres ateliers bruxellois du XVIII^e siècle', *CIETA Bulletin*, LXXIV (1997), pp. 146–58; K. Brosens, 'The final convulsions of Brussels tapestry: *The Legend of the Miraculous Host, 1769–1785*', *The Burlington Magazine*, CLV (2013), pp. 82–87.

¹⁷ Wauters, *Les Tapisseries*, pp. 360 and 373; Lemoine-Isabeau, *Les Tapisseries*, p. 212.

¹⁸ See, for example, Delmarcel and Huygens, 'A propos du tapissier', p. 153 on the one hand, and Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, p. 119 and Brosens, *Eighteenth-Century Brussels Tapestry*, pp. 53–79 on the other.

¹⁹ M. Yonan, *Empress Maria Theresa and the Politics of Habsburg Imperial Art* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011).

²⁰ I am currently working on a monograph on De Hase which will naturally include an annotated edition of the *Memorie Boeck*. See also K. Brosens and K. Van der Stighelen, 'Paintings, prices and productivity. Lessons learned from Maximiliaan de Hase's *Memorie Boeck* (1744–1780)', *Simiolus*, XXXVI (2012) [2013], pp. 173–83.

Botta Adorno, Empress Maria Theresa and Brussels Tapestry

²¹ K. Brosens, 'The organisation of seventeenth-century tapestry production in Brussels and Paris. A comparative view', *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, xx (2004), pp. 274–77.

²² Parochieregisters, 19 July 1680, 350, fol. 188v, Stadsarchief, Brussels (BSA); I. de Stein d'Altenstein, *Annuaire de la Noblesse de Belgique*, xxxi (Brussels: Librairie Polytechnique de Decq et Duhent, 1877), pp. 261–69 includes a genealogical study of the Van den Hecke family but the survey is far from complete.

²³ Parochieregisters, 4 June 1710, 415, fol. 135v, BSA.

²⁴ Parochieregisters, 31 January 1697, 159, fol. 40r, BSA.

²⁵ Registers der Tresorije, 15 November 1710, 1307, fols 21v–22v, BSA. A copy of the application for privileges, submitted on 27 September 1710, was preserved; Liasse 778, BSA. The 1681 document recording Jan Frans's privileges (Registers der Tresorije, 11 October 1681, 1303, BSA) extended the fiscal benefits that had been granted in 1662 (Registers der Tresorije, 24 May 1662, 1298, BSA).

²⁶ Parochieregisters, 19 March 1677, 349, fol. 163r, BSA; Parochieregisters, 17 December 1700, 414, fol. 70r, BSA.

²⁷ Parochieregisters, 13 June 1675, 348, fol. 307r, BSA; Parochieregisters, 27 October 1742, 419, fol. 213r, BSA; Parochieregisters, 29 June 1695, 394, fol. 53r, BSA.

²⁸ As is clear from the entry that Daniel IV Leyniers noted down in his *Doodtboek*: 'Anno 1742 den 25 october's avonts ten 7 uren is gestorven cosijn Jaspar van der Borcht . . . Tapissier bij de capucinen . . .'; for the full entry and the *Doodtboek*, see Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, pp. 18–19, 349.

²⁹ Marriage contract, 7 November 1703, Notariaat Generaal van Brabant, 1993(2), Algemeen Rijksarchief Anderlecht, Brussels (BARA).

³⁰ Will, Judocus de Vos, 14 February 1715, Notariaat Generaal van Brabant, 1072, BARA. For De Vos's role, see Brosens, 'Revisiting Brussels Tapestry'.

³¹ Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, pp. 347–49.

³² Brosens, *Eighteenth-Century Brussels Tapestry*, p. 58.

³³ Parochieregisters, 7 May 1725, 449, fol. 215r, BSA.

³⁴ Parochieregisters, 28 April 1697, 354, BSA. A year earlier, almost to the day, a son had been born to Van der Borcht and Van den Hecke, whom they baptised Jan Frans (Parochieregisters, 23 April 1696, 354, BSA), but this child died before his first birthday.

³⁵ Ambachten en Gilden, 819, fol. 7, BARA; Pinchart, *La Corporation*, p. 483.

³⁶ Wauters, *Les Tapisseries Bruxelloises*, pp. 345–46; Gallemarts, *Reeks Wandtapijten*, p. 161.

³⁷ A. Henne and A. Wauters, *Histoire de la Ville de Bruxelles*, II (Brussels: Perichon, 1845), p. 222; De Cacamp, *Oude Geslachten*, p. 244.

³⁸ Registers der Tresorije, 25 September 1726, 1308, fols 218v–20r, BSA.

³⁹ Jan Frans van der Borcht's children were baptised in the Church of Our Lady of Finisterrae: Gaspar (godfather: Gaspar van der Borcht; godmother: Christina Bruneau; Parochieregisters, 4 January 1727, 438, fol. 141v, BSA), Gaspar (godfather: Gaspar van der Borcht; godmother: Christina Bruneau; Parochieregisters, 20 May 1728, 438, fol. 172v, BSA), Anna Françoise (godfather: François van den Hecke; godmother: Anna Lucia van der Borcht; Parochieregisters, 8 June 1729, 438, fol. 13r, BSA), Peter (godfather: Peter van der Borcht; godmother: Theresia van der Borcht, Parochieregisters, 6 February 1731, 439, fol. 52v, BSA), Jan Peter (godfather: Peter van den Hecke; godmother: Maria van den Brande; Parochieregisters, 2 November 1733, 439, fol. 115r, BSA) and, finally, Jacob (godfather: Jacob Wielemans; godmother: Anna Theresia van der Borcht; Parochieregisters, 439, fol. 164r, 7 September 1735, BSA).

⁴⁰ Parochieregisters, 8 April 1712, 3, 59, fol. 9v, BSA.

⁴¹ In the original: 'aengenomen . . . het selven huijshouden, ende vervolgens dagelijcx is werkende met alle de knechten gelijk wijlen sijnen voorschreven vader heeft gedaan'; Registers der Tresorije, 11 December 1742, 1310, fols 10v–12r (quotation on fol. 11r), BSA.

⁴² Notariaat Generaal van Brabant, 3539, 25 January 1744, BARA.

⁴³ Parochieregisters, 19 February 1752, 421, fol. 41r, BSA.

⁴⁴ For example, M. Crick-Kuntziger, 'Tapisseries bruxelloises du XVIIIe siècle de l'histoire de Moïse', *Bulletin des Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire*, xvi (1944), p. 108; Delmarcel, *Vlaamse wandtapijt*, p. 363; Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, p. 349.

⁴⁵ Parochieregisters, 5 October 1760, 168, fol. 113v, BSA. The notion that Peter II van der Borcht died in 1763 derives from Wauters; he wrote that tapestry sets woven by the late Peter II had been sold at auction in Brussels in 1763 (Wauters, *Les Tapisseries Bruxelloises*, p. 373) which led tapestry scholars to conclude that he must have died that year.

⁴⁶ Registers der Tresorije, 2 December 1730, 1308, fols 326r–27r, BSA.

⁴⁷ Brosens, *A Contextual Study*.

⁴⁸ Leyniers and Van der Borcht were the two unnamed '*fabricateurs de tapisserie*' mentioned in the 1764 industrial census; together they employed '*12 à 18 ouvriers*'. According to the 1762 census, Leyniers had at that time seventeen looms, nine of which were in use; at Van der Borcht's workshop, eight of the fifteen looms were in use at that time. See Moureaux, *La Statistique Industrielle*, II, p. 72.

⁴⁹ Registers der Tresorije, 1312, BSA, p. 130.

⁵⁰ Parochieregisters, 16 April 1774, 171, fol. 46r, BSA. The entry makes it clear that he had died on 31 March.

⁵¹ Registers der Tresorije, 1312, BSA, pp. 539–41.

⁵² The War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748) was a series of related conflicts in Europe, North America and India over Maria Theresa's succession to the Habsburg dominions.

⁵³ The fact that Botta Adorno spent relatively little time in the Netherlands may well explain why he has received so little attention in the historical literature, certainly in comparison to his successor Cobenzl. Laenen, *Le Ministère*, is still the most detailed study. De Boom, *Les Ministres*, includes the clarification *Principalement Cobenzl* in the title, and in publications such as E. Discailles, *Les Pays-Bas sous le Règne de Marie-Thérèse (1740–1780)* (Brussels: Muquardt, 1872), Piot, *Le Règne*, pp. 68–69, and H. Hasquin, 'Sur l'administration du commerce dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles', *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, xx (1973), pp. 430–33, Botta Adorno was mentioned only in passing, if at all, while Cobenzl and Stahrenberg were accorded more prominent positions. For the origins and role of the position of Minister Plenipotentiary, see P. Lenders, 'Wenen en Brussel: bevoogding die een eigenheid aanvaardt', in Hasquin ed., *Oostenrijks België*, pp. 49–54 and H. Hasquin, 'Services d'assistance et de contrôle auprès des gouverneurs des Pays-Bas méridionaux (XVIIe–XVIIIe siècle)', *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique*, LXI (1990), pp. 447–68.

⁵⁴ C. Lemaire ed., *Karel Alexander van Lotharingen, Gouverneur-Generaal van de Oostenrijkse Nederlanden* (Brussels: Generale Bank, 1987); C. Dumortier and P. Habets eds, *Bruxelles-Tervueren. Les Ateliers et Manufactures de Charles de Lorraine* (Brussels: CFC, 2007); L. De Ren and E. Derveaux, *Charles-Alexandre de Lorraine. Prince de l'Europe des Lumières* (Ars-sur-Moselle: Domini, 2012).

⁵⁵ There is very little literature on Tarouca: see T. von Karajan, *Maria Theresia und Graf Silva-Tarouca* (Vienna: Gerold, 1859); E. Silva-Tarouca, *Der Mentor der Kaiserin* (Zurich: Amalthea, 1960) and C. Benedik and J. Garms, 'Zwischen Architektur und Verwaltung. Die Direktion Graf Silva Taroucas und die Karrieren von Ignazio Valmagini, Nikolaus Pacassi und August Gottlieb Lederer im Hofbauamt', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen*, XLVII (2005), pp. 335–67. For the Conseil Suprême des Pays-Bas, which was abolished in 1757, see M. Baelde, 'De samenstelling van de Hoge Raad der Nederlanden te Wenen (1717–1757)', in *Album aangeboden aan Charles Verlinden*, I (Ghent: s.n., 1975), pp. 1–15 and M. Baelde, 'De afschaffing van de Hoge Raad der Nederlanden te Wenen (1757)', in *Recht en Instellingen in de Oude Nederlanden tijdens de Middeleeuwen en de Nieuwe Tijd. Liber Amicorum Jan Buntinx* (Leuven: Universitaire Pers, 1981), pp. 567–75.

⁵⁶ Laenen, *Le Ministère*, pp. 205–08.

⁵⁷ The archives of Botta Adorno are preserved in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan. This huge resource was described by A. Cauchie at the end of the nineteenth century: A. Cauchie, 'Le Maréchal Antoniotto de Botta-Adorno et ses papiers d'état', in *Compte Rendu du Troisième Congrès Scientifique International des Catholiques Tenu à Bruxelles du 3 au 8 Septembre 1894* (Brussels: Polleunis et

Botta Adorno, Empress Maria Theresa and Brussels Tapestry

Ceuterick, 1895), pp. 397–423. The structure remained unchanged throughout the twentieth century but the old numbering (as used, for example, by Laenen, *Le Ministère*) was revised. For this study, the documents used were primarily the ‘Cartelle Grandi’ since they include the correspondence with Tarouca.

⁵⁸ In the original: ‘pour procurer quelque juste avantage au Païs en général et aux ouvriers [tapissiers] en particulier’; Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 25 June 1749, Cartelle Grandi (CG) x145inf, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan (MBA).

⁵⁹ Yonan, *Empress*, pp. 58–65. See also H. Duchhardt, ‘Das diplomatische Abschiedsgeschenk’, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, LVII (1975), pp. 349–50.

⁶⁰ In the original: ‘dans ces Provinces-ci on pourroit trouver des présents dignes de Souverains’ and ‘des hautessees, qu’on ne fait nulle part ni si bien, ni à si bon marché qu’ici’.

⁶¹ For a clear overview and explanation of the prevailing practices, see Brassat, *Tapissierien*, pp. 82–94 and N. de Reyniès, ‘Les ateliers des Gobelins. La permanence d’un site et d’une activité’, *Monuments Historiques*, CXC (1993), pp. 13–14.

⁶² Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 5 July 1749. CG x145inf, MBA.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ In the original: ‘outes les tentures qu’ils peuvent actuellement avoir en magasin, et même celles qu’ils auront en œuvre, et assez avancées pour pouvoir être livrées dans le terme convenable’.

⁶⁵ In the original: ‘la fabrique de l’ouvrier le plus renommé ci-devant savoir [Judocus] de Vos ne subsiste plus’; ‘plusieurs cartons, qui ne furent pas executés, et sur lesquels on pourra peut-être faire executer la tenture’; Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 16 July 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.

⁶⁶ In the original: ‘Ces fabriques s’éteindront faute du debit, vu que ce païs-ci étant déjà pourvu de tentures ... ayant coupé l’entrée à ces manufactures par des impôts exorbitans dont on vient de les charger’, *ibid.*

⁶⁷ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 19 July 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.

⁶⁸ De Reyniès, *Jean Van Orley*; Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, pp. 152–59; Brosens, *Eighteenth-Century Brussels Tapestry*.

⁶⁹ K. Brosens, *European Tapestries in the Art Institute of Chicago* (Chicago, New Haven and London: Art Institute of Chicago and Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 191–98.

⁷⁰ Peter II van der Borch, *Mémoire*, [possibly July 1749], CG x164inf, MBA.

⁷¹ Brosens, *Eighteenth-Century Brussels Tapestry*.

⁷² Huygens, *Moyses*.

⁷³ Brosens and Delmarcel, *Les Aventures*; Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, pp. 141–44 and 147–51.

⁷⁴ Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, pp. 140 and 160–65.

⁷⁵ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 26 July 1749. CG x145inf, MBA.

⁷⁶ For the complex architectural history of the Hofburg, especially the ‘grande anti-chambre’, see M. Dreger, *Baugeschichte der K.K. Hofburg in Wien bis zum XX. Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Schroll, 1914), pp. 211, 235 and 277. Other extremely informative texts include O. Raschauer, ‘Die kaiserlichen wohn- und zeremonialräume in der Wiener Hofburg zur zeit der Kaiserin Maria Theresia’, *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, xcv (1958), pp. 283–90 and C. Benedik, ‘Die repräsentationsräume der Wiener Hofburg in der ersten hälfte des 18. jahrhunderts’, *Das 18. Jahrhundert und Österreich*, VI (1990–1991), pp. 7–21.

⁷⁷ Tarouca enclosed a copy of the invoice of 3 December 1743 with his letter. The set was 4½ ells in height and consisted of the following scenes: *Village Fête* (9 ells wide), *Fish Market* (8 ells wide), *The Harvest* (7¼ ells wide), *Skating* (5¼ ells wide), and *Winter Scene* (4 ells wide).

⁷⁸ Series LI and LIV (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum) bear the signatures of Jan Frans van der Borch and his half-brother. The first of these consists of six tapestries, but the subjects differ from those mentioned in the invoice (see previous note); the second one consists of thirteen pieces. See E. von Birk, ‘Inventar der im besitze des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses befindlichen Niederländer tapeten und Gobelins’, *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allehöchsten Kaiserhauses*, II (1884), pp. 171–73.

- ⁷⁹ Jan and Peter II van der Borch, *Mémoire for Botta Adorno*, 7 August 1749, CG x164inf, MBA.
- ⁸⁰ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 27 August 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ⁸¹ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 16 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁸² De Reyniès, *Jean Van Orley*.
- ⁸³ Brosens, *Eighteenth-Century Brussels Tapestry*.
- ⁸⁴ Brosens, *A Contextual Study*, p. 122.
- ⁸⁵ Lenôble was raised to the nobility in 1756, becoming Jakob Andreas Edler von Edlersberg.
- ⁸⁶ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 19 and 29 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA. For the early history of the *Hofmobilieninspektor* en het *Hofmobiliendepot*, see E. Ottillinger and L. Hanzl, *Kaiserliche Interieurs. Die Wohnkultur des Wiener Hofes im 19. Jahrhundert und die Wiener Kunstgewerbereform* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1997), pp. 17–18.
- ⁸⁷ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 27 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁸⁸ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 30 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁸⁹ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 3 September 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ⁹⁰ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 6 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁹¹ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 19 and 20 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁹² Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 26 August 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ⁹³ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 27 August 1749, CG x145inf, MBA.
- ⁹⁴ Contract, Botta Adorno and Van den Hecke, 30 August 1749, CG x164inf, #283, MBA.
- ⁹⁵ For this *Don Quixote* set (T LII), see Birk, ‘Inventar der im Besitze des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses’, p. 171 and R. Bauer, ‘Szenen aus dem Roman Don Quijote’, *Wohnen im Schloss. Tapissereien, Möbel, Porzellan und Kleider aus drei Jahrhunderten* (Eisenstadt: Rötzer-Druck, 1991), pp. 86–95. Bauer pointed out that the wide borders were added later and that the pieces originally had only narrow interior borders.
- ⁹⁶ In the original: ‘*condescendre à notre [sic] proposition touchant les presents à faire convenablement aux ministres étrangers et autres de ces tapisseries*’; Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 13 September 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ⁹⁷ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 17 and 27 September 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ⁹⁸ Jan and Peter II van der Borch, *Mémoire for Botta Adorno*, 27 September 1749, CG x164inf, #265, MBA.
- ⁹⁹ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 27 September 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ¹⁰⁰ Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 1 October 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ¹⁰¹ Tarouca, letter to Botta Adorno, 15 November 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.
- ¹⁰² Botta Adorno, letter to Tarouca, 8 October 1749, CG x146inf, MBA.

KOENRAAD BROSENS is Professor in the History of Art Department of the University of Leuven. His publications include *A Contextual Study of Brussels Tapestry, 1670–1770* (Brussels, 2004), *European Tapestries in The Art Institute of Chicago* (Chicago, New Haven and London, 2008) and *Rubens: The Constantine Series. Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard* (London: Harvey Miller, 2011).