

LONDON CERAMIC CIRCLE at Morley College Occasional Paper No 5

Josiah Wedgwood's Green Frog service

Its life in Russia from 1774 to the present day



Chesme Palace at Kekerekeksinen by J-B Traversay
(*Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg*)

Gabriel Newfield

NOTICES

First published in 2009, this work has been revised from time to time. In April 2022 a major revision was completed: factual errors as far as possible corrected, all claims reviewed, new material added and the whole updated. I also tried to make it easier to read, including relegating some argument and much factual detail to the Notes (after the main text), signed in the text like this: [17]. Minor references that could now be out-of-date, such as that a named person may have changed their job, retired or died, have generally been left as they were.

Most of the copies made previously – all printed hard copies; not many (fewer than 100) – were given away, many to the people and organisations named or referred to on the next page or in the main text. With rare exceptions, it is now only available *online* and *free*, on request from me, or from the London Ceramic Circle as Occasional Paper No 5.

The painting on the front cover shows the palace the service was made for. This is where, from the late 1770s, it was displayed and used by the Russian Empress, Catherine II (‘Catherine the Great’). **The images on the next page and several later pages**, on what would otherwise be blank spaces, of the double-headed eagle, a heraldic symbol of empire, show how Russia has altered it over time. She began using it in 1472 when Grand Prince of Muscovy Ivan III (‘Ivan the Great’; 1440-1505) first used it in his seal. Ever since Russia emerged as a state it has figured in her coat of arms, apart from the Soviet period when it was replaced as the state emblem by the hammer and sickle.

The photograph of a serving dish on the back cover shows what the service’s pieces look like.

The service has sometimes, perfectly reasonably, been called ‘Josiah Wedgwood *and* Thomas Bentley’s Green Frog service’, since both were partners in the firm, the sole partners, when the service was commissioned and when it was later delivered to St Petersburg. Settled usage, however, describes the firm’s products as ‘Wedgwood’ and has used ‘Wedgwood’ as shorthand for the firm’s name, including the period of the partnership, which ran from 1768 till Bentley’s untimely death in 1780. Although Bentley contributed much, it was Wedgwood who, in 1759, founded the firm which, bearing his name, survived till 2009, its 250th year, when it virtually collapsed. Its later years, both pre- and post-collapse, have received much comment, some well-informed, but a definitive account remains to be written. The crisis in the life of the firm also threatened survival of the Wedgwood Museum, a curated repository of Wedgwood ceramics and other items associated with the firm. When, in 2014, as a result of a national campaign, it was rescued, its status was radically changed and it acquired an opaque new name, *the V&A Wedgwood Collection*, though many still think of it by its former name, which accurately describes what it was and is, and is used here.

All abbreviations are marked in the text. There are only two conventional initialisms, ‘SHM’ for the State Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg (many references) and ‘V&A’ for the Victoria and Albert Museum in London (a few). All Russian and other foreign words, including the names of people and places, have been transliterated as required, and a few have also been anglicised, notably *Ekaterina* (shown as Catherine), and *Sankt-Peterburg* (shown as Saint Petersburg).

Copyright © Gabriel Newfield 2009; major revision 2022 I have asserted my right to be identified as the author of the work. No part of it may be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, for any commercial purpose, including copying for sale or resale. Reproducing, storing or transmitting it, in whole or in part, for the purpose of non-commercial research, private study, criticism or review, is permitted. If in doubt, and for anything else, contact me.

Please send comments, enquiries, requests and other messages to: gabrielnewfield@tiscali.co.uk, See also feedback box on page 42.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have received help from a number of people and organisations. I am particularly indebted to Robin Gurnett, Peter Hayden and Michael Raeburn. Also to James Boyle, Helen Espir, Minnie Holdaway and Pat Latham; the British Library, the National Art Library and the library of the Royal Institute of British Architects; and all whose works I have cited.

I am grateful also to the people and organisations who own or have created the illustrations shown, and in particular to the publishers of the *Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg*, Helen Espir, the UK Government Art Collection, the State Hermitage Museum (St Petersburg), Inverkeithing Museum, Pensoft Publishers, Saint-Petersburg.com, the Russian Information Network, Peter Sobolev, the Victoria and Albert Museum (London), the Wedgwood Museum (Barlaston, near Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire) and Wolfgang Wüster.

In my investigation, described in Appendix 3, into the place name Kekerekeksinen, I received invaluable advice and encouragement from Lars-Gunnar Larsson. I owe thanks also to Peter Hayden, Jyrki Kalliokoski, Manja Lehto, Eeva Leinonen, Terttu Nevalainen and Michael Raeburn; Graham Camfield of the British Library of Political and Economic Science (London School of Economics), Wojciech Janik of the library of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (University College London), and Helen Sullivan of the Slavic Reference Service of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and the cultural affairs section of the Finnish Embassy in London.

I have benefited from a number of websites, including the website of the State Hermitage Museum, and have made careful use of Wikipedia.

In acknowledging, here and in the following pages, my use of sources and illustrations, and in seeking and obtaining permissions – and having regard to the work's publication history and planned future (see previous page) – I trust that I have kept within the bounds of accepted fair use. (If I may have fallen short, please contact me.) Should a significant change in publication arrangements be planned or considered, the people and organisations concerned will be consulted/re-consulted.

To all who have helped me, knowingly and unknowingly, living and dead, many thanks. I am of course responsible for any and all errors.



1472
Seal of Ivan III



1589



Empress Catherine II (1729–96) [oil painting (detail)] by Richard Bampton, 1782 (SHM)



Josiah Wedgwood (1730–95) [enamel on Wedgwood ceramic] by George Stubbs, 1780 (Wedgwood Museum)

CONTENTS

Notices	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
List of paintings, photographs and other illustrations	vi

Main text

1 Introduction: what, why and how.....	1-2
2 A brief life of the service in Russia	2-3
3 The service`s origins and character.....	3
4 The service`s original home in Russia: a palace with three names	4-11
5 The battle of Chesme of June 1770 and its place in Russian history	11-13
6 Chesme church	13
7 The service in use: ceremony and spectacle	13-15
8 The service after Catherine`s death: neglect and rediscovery	16-19
9 Later history of the palaces and the places where they were located	19-20
10 A visual interlude	20-23
11 Russia and Saint Petersburg: then and now	23
Notes	23-30
Bibliography	30-32

Appendixes

1 How to find Chesme Palace and Chesme church in St Petersburg today	32
2 Some main unanswered questions	33
3 Kekerekeksinen: the enigma of an 18 th century Ingrian place name	33-41
Feedback: comments, enquiries and other messages	42

LIST OF PAINTINGS, PHOTOGRAPHS AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

Chesme Palace (<i>Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg</i>) (as Figure 13)	Front cover
Images of the Russian double-headed eagle.....	iv, 21, 32 & 42
Empress Catherine II (SHM)	v
Josiah Wedgwood (Wedgwood Museum)	v
Fig 1 The service`s frogs	4
Fig 2 Winter Palace (Hermitage) (Peter Sobolev)	4
Fig 3 Summer Palace (Catherine Palace) (Peter Sobolev)	4
Fig 4 Outline map of contemporary Russian Federation	5
Fig 5 Outline map of historical Ingria (Russian Information Network)	5
Fig 6 Outline map showing the relative positions of the Winter Palace, Chesme Palace (the `wayside stop`) and the Summer Palace	6
Fig 7 Yuri Velten	7
Fig 8 Longford Castle (UK Government Art Collection)	8
Fig 9 Plan of Longford Castle	8
Fig 10 Chesme Palace: <u>Plan</u>	8
Fig 11 Chesme Palace: <u>Elevation</u>	8
Fig 12 Chesme Palace and church in the late 18 th century, by an unknown artist.....	10
Fig 13 Chesme Palace and church, probably in the 1790s, by J-B Traversay (<i>Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg</i>)	10
Fig 14 Map of part of Aegean Sea	11
Fig 15 Admiral `Sir` Samuel Greig (Inverkeithing Museum)	12
Fig 16 Chesme church	13
Fig 17 King Gustavus III of Sweden	14
Fig 18 Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II	14
Fig 19 King Stanislas II August of Poland	14
Figs 20 & 21 Part of the service, in its store cupboards in the SHM, in the early 21 st century (Helen Espir)	16
Fig 22 Dr Lydia Liackhova, in the SHM (Helen Espir)	16
Fig 23 Pieces from the service, in a vitrine at Peterhof, in 1909	17
Fig 24 The original Chesme Palace, in 2005 (Peter Sobolev)	20
Fig 25 Part of the expanded palace, in 2005 (Peter Sobolev).....	21
Fig 26 One of the added wings, in 2005 (Peter Sobolev)	21
Fig 27 Chesme Palace, probably in the mid-20 th century (SHM)	21
Fig 28 The original palace, in the early 21 st century (Saint-Petersburg.com)	22
Fig 29 Aerial view of the palace and the church, in the early 21 st century (Saint-Petersburg.com)	22
<i>Rana ridibunda</i> (European Marsh Frog) (Wolfgang Wüster)	35
<i>Rana ridibunda</i> (European Marsh Frog) (Sergius Kuzmin & Penfold Publishers).....	35
Wedgwood serving dish, image of green frog in border (V&A)	Back cover

1 Introduction: what, why and how

In Saint Petersburg, the former Russian imperial capital, there survives a large and unusual dinner and dessert service made for the reigning Russian Empress Catherine II (‘Catherine the Great’; 1729–96) at the Staffordshire pottery, already gaining national and international recognition, that had been set up in 1759 by the English master potter Josiah Wedgwood (1730–95). Since early in the 20th century it has been generally known, in Russia and England (and elsewhere), as the Green Frog service (henceforth ‘the service’). Accounts of it have usually focused on how it was made and decorated in England in 1773 and 1774, referring only briefly to what happened to it after it reached Russia. This short monograph [1] is chiefly about its life in Russia, with special reference to people and places in and around St Petersburg, including the Empress herself (henceforth ‘Catherine’) [2]; the imperial Winter Palace, to which Catherine gave a new name, ‘the Hermitage’; the complex of buildings including the Winter Palace, that is now the State Hermitage Museum (henceforth the ‘SHM’); and the smaller palace for which the service was made, situated to the south of Catherine’s St Petersburg at a place then known as Kekerekeksinen.

Anyone writing on this topic today must acknowledge the importance of two publications of the 1990s, the definitive work written and edited by Michael Raeburn and others, wholly on the service (Raeburn *et al.* 1995); and the work edited by Hilary Young, containing much material on the service, that accompanied the Victoria and Albert museum’s (henceforth ‘V&A’) 1995 ‘Genius of Wedgwood’ exhibition (Young 1995). I am indebted to the contributors to these works, and in particular to Ludmila Voronikhina (latterly Senior Research Associate at the SHM) and Lydia Liackhova (Curator of European Ceramics at the SHM), for their contributions on the service’s history in Russia, and to Michael Raeburn.

Most of the primary sources on the topic are in Russian, Swedish, Finnish and Turkish, which I do not have, so I have had to rely heavily on personal communications and secondary sources, augmented where possible by translations of primary sources. While my account inevitably overlaps with Voronikhina’s (1995) and Liackhova’s (1995), it differs from theirs in several ways. I have explored byways with the aim of illuminating matters related, directly or indirectly, to the service’s life in Russia, including information, some of which will be unfamiliar to many non-Russian readers, on the historical and topographical context. A few examples. When the service was commissioned, the palace where it was to be kept and used had not yet been built. I show where it was to be located and try to explain why it was to be built at that place and at that time, and how frogs come into the story. I also describe what sort of palace it was; why, in its first few years, it had three different names, Kekerekeksinskiy Palace, La Grenouillère, and Chesmenskiy (or Chesme) Palace; what the connection was between the palace and the naval Battle of Chesme of June 1770; why this battle was important to Russia; and hence why, when the service was in use in Catherine’s lifetime, it is known to have been referred to as ‘the Chesme glazed earthenware service’. In addressing these topics I inevitably introduce material that does not figure in Voronikhina’s or Liackhova’s accounts.

What prompted me to venture into this field? I had two main reasons. When I visited St Petersburg some years ago I failed to find the palace for which the service had been made. I was so ignorant that I did not even know its present name, nor where to look, although it is in fact quite easy to find (see Appendix 1 on page 32). My other reason was that I was dismayed to find misinformation about the service being propagated by reputable sources.

Some examples. In the massive two volumes edited by Vitaly Suslov [3] on masterpieces in the SHM's collections, it is stated that the service was commissioned from the firm in 1770, but that there was then a long delay while negotiations took place regarding the price to be paid, which is why work did not begin till 1773 (1994:II:565). Yet it is well-documented that Catherine's commission did not reach Staffordshire until March 1773 and that the firm at once began work to make it, without waiting for agreement on price. It is true that at the end of May work did stop, and was not resumed until the end of July, when news came that St Petersburg had agreed the price. So there *was* a delay, but of only two months, a short time for a big contract achieved without the aid of email, airmail or telephone.[4]

Another example. On the back of a replica plate from the service produced around 1995 for the Wedgwood Collectors' Society of New York, it is stated that the service 'was intended for [a palace] near Petrodvorets...'. Better known as Peterhof ('Peter's Court'), Petrodvorets refers to a small set of adjacent palaces established by Tsar Peter I ('Peter the Great'; 1672–1725). It lies to the west of St Petersburg, on the south coast of the Gulf of Finland. Yet the service was actually made for an inland palace, some distance from Peterhof, due south of St Petersburg. Aileen Dawson (1995:98), Robin Reilly (1995:191) and the firm of Wedgwood itself (2010:2) have made a similar error. And again, a number of quite recent sources say that the service's palace became, in the 1830s a refuge for old soldiers, and then go on to say, incorrectly, that this remains its chief use. Armed with the overconfidence of the keen amateur, I resolved to try to put together an accurate account, free as far as possible from factual errors, with all guesses or speculations clearly marked.

I have tried to give a reasonably full account, but there remain gaps in our knowledge, in part no doubt owing to my shortcomings as an investigator. Since some unanswered questions are both important and unobvious, I make no apology for drawing attention to them in the text, and have also summarised them (see Appendix 2 on page 33). I assume no prior knowledge of Josiah Wedgwood or his work as a potter. With the general reader in mind, I have as far as possible avoided use of technical terms, as the story ranges over a number of fields, including business history, the topography of the St Petersburg region, language studies and linguistics, and Russian political, naval and architectural history. There are many illustrations, but very few – only one each – of Catherine, Josiah and how the service looked. Readers who would like to see pictures of these are recommended to seek images online. For the service, just enter 'the Green Frog service'. You will be deluged!

Where I give actual dates of events in pre-revolutionary Russia, or which rely on older Russian sources, I give them in the Old Style (O.S.), except where otherwise stated. Remember that Russia did not adopt the Gregorian calendar until 1918.[5]

2 A brief life of the service in Russia

Taking the service as a whole, what sort of life has it had in Russia? The answer is that it has largely survived – though not without some damage – for about two hundred and fifty years, despite the danger of breakage that inevitably faces any ceramic service, a number of wars and revolutions, and the hazard of being moved several times, including two trips to England, in 1909 when a number of pieces were lent by Tsar Nicholas II for the firm of Wedgwood's jubilee Exhibition, held to mark the 150th anniversary of Josiah Wedgwood's first setting up in business on his own account; and in 1995 when about 300 pieces were lent by the SHM to the V&A for its 'Genius of Wedgwood' exhibition, held to mark the 200th

anniversary of Josiah's death in 1795. And on several occasions in the present (21st) century pieces from the service have been lent to museums for special exhibitions, both abroad and within Russia itself. The most dramatic incident in its life occurred in 1777 when, soon after its installation in the newly built Kekerekeksinskiy Palace, 95 pieces were stolen. (It seems most were quickly recovered by the police.) It was only in use from 1777 to 1796, the year of Catherine's death, a period of 19 years, less than 10% of its lifetime. After 1796 it was neglected and largely forgotten for over 100 years until its rediscovery in the early 20th century. It was twice evacuated, to Moscow from 1917 to 1921, and to Ekaterinburg (known as Sverdlovsk from 1924 to 1991) from 1941 to 1945. In 1921 the entire surviving service was brought together at the SHM, where at present some pieces are always on display, though most of the service remains in store most of the time.

3 The service's origins and character

Josiah Wedgwood had been introduced to the Russian imperial court through the good offices of the British ambassador, Lord Cathcart (1721–76), who had 'secured the friendship and even affection of the Russian Empress...', and his wife, Jane (1722–71), who was also befriended by Catherine (Hamish Scott [in DNB] 2004).[6] The service was commissioned from Josiah and his partner Thomas Bentley (1730–80), on behalf of Catherine, in March 1773, by Alexander Baxter, a Scottish member of the Russia Company, who was at the time Russian consul-general in England.[7] Scott says that Catherine's commissioning the service was partly the result of Jane Cathcart's efforts (2004). This could well be true. However, while Jane's efforts may have directly influenced Catherine in 1770, when the latter ordered from Wedgwood the so-called 'Husk' service, a much simpler and smaller dinner and dessert service, her unfortunate death in St Petersburg in November 1771 has a bearing on how she could have influenced Catherine's decision on the Frog service.

Although Catherine never visited England, she had an insatiable appetite for the neo-Gothic, for English gardens and British design, all of which are exemplified in the service and in the new palace for which it was intended. Unusually with a service for such a client at that time, it was to be made not of porcelain but of earthenware, a special cream-coloured earthenware that Wedgwood had invented some years earlier. (In or about June 1766 Queen Charlotte, the wife of King George III, had so admired it that she had granted him permission to call it, in her honour, Queen's Ware, and to style himself Potter to Her Majesty.) The pieces of the service were to be painted to show views of British scenery and notable buildings of England, Scotland and Wales (though not Ireland), and each piece was to show a different view ('real views and real buildings').[8] It was largely finished by June 1774, when most of it was displayed at the firm's new London showrooms in Greek Street in Soho (admission only by ticket), although at this time 150 pieces were yet to be painted. The completed service was packed into 22 crates and finally arrived in St Petersburg shortly before 8 October 1774 [presumably O.S.], when payment was approved in St Petersburg.[9] According to present day SHM sources, it consisted of a dinner service of 680 pieces and a dessert service of 264 pieces, a total of 944 pieces. Each piece bore one or more views, painted on-glaze in monochrome enamel, a total of 1,222 views. Present day Wedgwood sources give slightly bigger numbers, 952 pieces and 1,244 views.[10] The monochrome purplish-black (dark sepia) colour used for painting the pieces was at the time called 'mulberry black' or 'delicate black'.

4 The service's original home in Russia: a palace with three names



Figure 1 The service's frogs

On the left: wreathed in OAK, as on the dinner service

On the right: wreathed in IVY, as on the dessert service

At Catherine's direction, all the pieces of the service were to bear the image of a green frog (Fig 1), and every image was to be exactly the same, a stylised frog within a frame in the shape of a heraldic shield. The reason was that, from the outset, it was her intention that the service should be kept and used at a new palace, not yet built, to be located at a place associated with frogs. (On its own, of course, the fact that there were frogs at the place does not explain Catherine's wanting an image of a frog on every piece - see page 9 and [19].) The place selected has been described as a wayside stop or staging post on the journey from the Winter Palace (Fig 2) in St Petersburg to the Summer Palace (Fig 3) at Tsarskoe Selo ('Tsar's village').[11] It lay about 8 ½ km (5 ½ miles) due south of the Winter Palace, while Tsarskoe Selo lay about 16 ½ km (10 miles) further south from the stop.



Figure 2 Winter Palace (Hermitage) at St Petersburg (Peter Sobolev, after 1997)




Figure 3 Summer Palace (Catherine Palace) at Tsarskoe Selo (now Pushkin) (Peter Sobolev, 2002)

At this time St Petersburg was still young, having been founded by Peter the Great, initially as a fortress, in 1703, and designated by him as Russia's new capital city only nine years later, in 1712.[12] Remember how enormous Russia was in the 18th century (and still is), and how close St Petersburg lay (and still lies) to the western edge of the country (Fig 4). It is no surprise that in Russia it has been called her 'Window on the West'. Remember too that during Catherine's reign the Russian empire expanded further, especially towards the west,

coming to include all or large parts of present day Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belarus, Poland and Ukraine. One of Peter's main reasons for choosing this particular location was that he was determined to consolidate Russian control over the Swedish Baltic province of Ingria (Fig 5). The Russian conquest – more correctly, re-conquest – of the province had not been completed until the summer of that year (1703), and the new soon-to-be city was to be established in its heart. In 1710 the entire province was renamed as St Petersburg, and later become the Russian governorate of that name.[13] In the 18th century its indigenous population is said to have consisted chiefly of Finnish speakers.




Figure 4 Outline map of contemporary Russian Federation



Figure 5 Outline map of historical Ingria
(Russian Information Network, 2000-2004)

The place chosen by Catherine for construction of the new palace was largely deserted, consisting of marshy ground overgrown with shrubbery and trees – and inhabited by frogs. Numerous published accounts say that the place was known to the local population as *Kekerekeksinen*, that this was a Finnish word, and that it meant 'frog-marsh'. There was a raised mound there, on which stood a wooden building which courtiers, and Catherine herself, sometimes jokingly referred to as the *Kekerekeksinskiy* or imperial dacha. (The dacha of a reigning emperor or empress would be expected to be much grander, as at Peterhof or Tsarskoe Selo.) The new palace was to be built on the same mound. Not intended for residential use, it was to be a transit palace (*putevoi*), chiefly to provide rest and refreshment for travellers and to serve as a venue for occasional special banquets.

There is a puzzle about the site's original name. There is no reason to doubt that both the Russian court and the local population knew it as *Kekerekeksinen*. Did the locals speak Finnish? It would be safer to say that they spoke one or more of the Baltic-Finnic languages of the Finno-Ugric language family that were in colloquial use in Ingria in the 17th and 18th centuries. And clearly the palace was to be built on a frog-marsh. What is problematic are the associated claims: that *kekerekeksinen* was a Finnish word; and that it meant 'frog-marsh'. Having consulted scholars familiar with the history of the Finno-Ugric languages, I have concluded that both claims, though they receive support from reputable sources including the SHM and the Wedgwood Museum, are at best unsubstantiated and misleading. The truth, as so often, is both complicated and elusive. (Since this topic may be of limited interest to some readers it is discussed separately: see Appendix 3 on pages 33-41.)

Why did Catherine choose this place for the new palace? The site was attractively isolated, and in its slightly tamed naturalness more like the setting for a pastoral idyll than a real wilderness with its hidden perils. Perhaps the wooden building was getting beyond repair? It is, moreover, on record that the court regularly stopped at the site when travelling between

St Petersburg and Tsarskoe Selo, sometimes staying for as little as an hour. The entire journey took well under a day, and the site was conveniently located (Fig 6) for a lunch stop or a mid-morning break. So if a new palace was to be built, why find a new site when the existing one had pleasant associations?




Figure 6 Outline map showing the relative positions of the Winter Palace (Hermitage) in St Petersburg (as it was in the 18th century); the 'wayside stop' (now Chesme Palace) at Kekereksinen (now embedded in greatly expanded modern St Petersburg); and the Summer Palace, at Pushkin.

There is, however, another possible reason. There is a legend that after the great Russian naval victory over the Turkish fleet at Çeşme ['Çeşme' in modern Turkish; transliterated Russian 'Chesme'] in the eastern Aegean in June 1770, a messenger was dispatched to bring the glorious news to Catherine. Finding that she had already left the Hermitage and was on her way to Tsarskoe Selo he hurried after her, finally catching up with her at Kekereksinskiy. Such was her joy that she decided then and there to commemorate the victory by building a new palace on the site of her meeting with the messenger.

Could this tale be true? Even if we make wildly optimistic assumptions, the supposed messenger could not have reached Catherine till mid- or late July, the battle having taken place over three days, from 24 to 26 June 1770 (O.S.). Might the annual migration of the court to Tsarskoe Selo have taken place as late as this? In his short history of Tsarskoe Selo, published to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of 'the village', Sergei Viltchkovsky says that Catherine almost always celebrated her birthday on 21 April (O.S.) at Tsarskoe Selo. Also that 'from 1763, Catherine, except for two or three years, lived at Tsarskoe Selo during spring and summer...' (Viltchkovsky 1910) Did the move in 1770 take place, exceptionally, as late as July? Such a late move seems unlikely. It is of course possible that Catherine had migrated to Tsarskoe Selo as usual in the spring, but later for some reason had returned to St Petersburg, and was on her way back when the messenger caught up with her. Diaries of courtiers, the *Kamer-furiersky Zhurnal* daily ceremonial register (henceforth, for convenience, 'the court circular'), and Catherine's own memoirs would be expected to provide a definite answer, so the apparent absence of any mention of such a momentous incident in any of these places suggests that it did not occur.

It would thus be prudent to treat the legend not as a proven record of historic fact but more as a mythical affirmation that there was a definite connection between the two events, the naval victory and construction of the new palace. And there is little doubt that the events were connected. We know that the service was commissioned in March 1773, and that around this time she also commissioned the architect Yuri Velten (1730–1801) (Fig 7) to



Figure 7 Yuri Velten (1797) by Stepan Semyonovich Shchukin (c1754–1828)

design the new palace.[14] We also know that at this time the plans for the palace had not been finalised. What I have tried unsuccessfully to find out is when Catherine first had the idea of getting a new palace built, and whether, when she did, she already had it in mind that it might in some way serve to mark the naval victory. That she was determined to commemorate the victory is beyond doubt. There is a Chesme Hall within the Grand Palace at Peterhof, decorated with twelve large paintings depicting phases of the battle, work on which began in 1771; and a Chesme Column at Tsarskoe Selo, designed in 1771, though erected a few years later.[15] And, as we shall see, it was massively commemorated at the Kekerekeksinen site, by the erection of Chesme church over the period 1777 to 1780; and by giving the palace a new name, Chesme (Chesmenskiy) Palace, although, like the old wooden building, it too was spoken of informally as the imperial dacha.

Just as I failed to find out when Catherine first thought of having a new palace, I have also failed to find out whether there was a time gap between when she first thought of commissioning the service and March 1773, when it was actually commissioned. It may be that Catherine first thought of both early in 1773, and then at once commissioned them. It is possible, though, that she had thought of them some time before, even years before, but that at this period she had had more pressing matters demanding her attention, such as growing unrest among the peasantry [16], the big outbreak of bubonic plague in Moscow in 1771, the intractable problems of Russia's international relations and the continuing war with Turkey. (The peace treaty that ended the war was not signed till July 1774.) She had also, as is well known, a wide range of cultural and intellectual interests, which showed itself in her obsession with collecting, constructing and commissioning – her 3Cs – and, powerful as she was, could not do everything at once. It is apparent, however, that affairs of state never stopped her completely: her mania for collecting paintings, for instance, actually reached its peak in the late 1760s and early 70s. While it would help to have a time series showing the year by year level of Catherine's 3Cs activity in the 1770s, it may be that we will never know exactly when she first thought of commissioning the palace and the service. Did Catherine ever consider the possibility of the service being made by any maker other than Wedgwood? The strict answer to this question has to be that we do not know. Robin Reilly observes, however, that by the time the service was commissioned the name of Wedgwood was firmly established at the Russian court, and suggests that 'it is doubtful whether the Empress would have been content to commission the service from any other manufacturer, even if another could have been found to undertake it'. (Reilly 1989:88)

The new palace was to be in the English style, and ‘was designed as a two-storied [moated] Gothic castle on a triangular plan with round turrets at each corner and a large round tower in the centre; in its original form it had a rusticated ground floor, lancet windows and battlemented parapets.’ (Voronikhina 1995:14) Much has been written on Velten’s sources, and it has been suggested that his design was based on Longford Castle in Wiltshire, which was also one of the English buildings used to decorate a piece of the service (a round cover). Wedgwood’s source for the decoration on the cover was a painting by George Lambert (1699/1700-1765), (Fig 8).



Figure 8 Longford Castle from the South West (detail), George Lambert (1743) (UK Government Art Collection)




Figure 9 Plan of Longford Castle, from Vitruvius Britannicus, Volume 5

Longford Castle had been built around 1590. The principal difference between the two buildings was the absence in the Castle of a central tower. Velten may have been familiar with the Castle from Volume 5 of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, which had been published in 1771 (Fig 9).[17]

Compare the Castle with Velten’s designs for the new palace (Figs 10 and 11).




Figure 10 Chesme Palace: Plan (Velten 1774)




Figure 11 Chesme Palace: Elevation (Velten 1774)

There is controversy as to whether Longford Castle was Velten’s chief source. I do not intend to enter that debate, though it is worth noting – as we have seen – that while the plans of the two buildings are indeed similar, there are greater differences in their elevations, and that comparing them is not helped by the fact that both buildings have been greatly modified since they were first erected. Some scholars have suggested that (old) Inveraray Castle was a major influence on Velten; indeed Dmitri Shvidkovsky (2007:238)

describes it, without qualification, as *the* model for Chesme Palace, although in his earlier book (1996:188) he had argued against the Inveraray connection.

Construction of the new palace began in 1774 and was finished in 1777. Once it was complete the service was installed in it. Since the service had arrived in St Petersburg in 1774, it is natural to ask what happened to it during the three years the palace was being built. Was it exhibited at the Winter Palace or elsewhere, or was it merely checked, repacked and put into store awaiting transit? There is circumstantial evidence that it was not exhibited.[18] Regarding transfer of the service from St Petersburg to the new palace, we know that in Russia in the 18th century many roads were poor – rutted and very bumpy – making transport of fragile ceramics often safer in winter by smooth-running sledges along snow-covered roads, but I have failed to find evidence on when or how the transfer actually took place.

Initially the official name of the new palace was Kekerekeksinskiy Palace, though Catherine herself spoke of it (as she had the site itself) as La Grenouillère, and was still doing so in 1779, according to the then British envoy-extraordinary, Sir James Harris (later Lord Malmesbury) (1746 – 1820) in a letter to his father dated 3 June 1779 (probably N.S.). ('Grenouillère' is a French word, dating from the 16th century, for a marsh or swamp populated by frogs.)[19] In the letter to his father Harris gave a description of the service, which had been shown to him by Catherine when he had visited the palace on 20 May 1779 (O.S.) (Liachhova 1995:208).

What did the palace look like during Catherine's reign? I show two pictures of it on the next page, both probably made fairly soon after it was completed. I think the first one (Fig 12) is almost certainly a tidied-up, prettified portrayal of the scene. I found the second picture (Fig 13) in the online version of the *Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg*, which states that it was painted by a J B Traversay (see box on page 11). It offers a more plausible image of what the palace may have looked like at the time, given what we know about the site. Both also show the new church – about which more below – to the left of the palace. In her biography of Josiah Wedgwood, Eliza Meteyard described this palace as 'the most fantastic, and yet most beautiful of [Catherine's] country retreats'. (1866:II:305)

What I cannot do is show any paintings, engravings, photographs or other images of what the palace looked like inside, since all my attempts to find such images have failed. There is, however, no shortage of written accounts, including some from the 1780s and 90s. 'One of the attractions of the palace was the collection of full-length portraits of all the reigning kings and queens of Europe and their families – of course including Catherine herself – placed in the central hall and in ten rooms around it. On the upper parts of the walls there were marble bas-reliefs portraying all the Russian rulers and monarchs [from the 9th century onwards].' (Voronikhina 1995:14) She mentions several such accounts, including Svetlov (1782).

* * * * *




Figure 12 Chesme Palace and church at Kekerekeksinen in the late 18th century, by an unknown artist



Figure 13 Chesme Palace and church at Kekerekeksinen, probably in the 1790s, by J-B Traversay (*Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg*)

The marquis de Traversay There was a French family called Prévost de Sansac that was able to trace its noble origins back to the 11th century. A member of this family, Jean-Baptiste (1754–1831), was a professional sailor who served in the navies of France and Russia. As a young officer he served with distinction in the French navy in the American Revolutionary War. Around 1788 he received the hereditary title of marquis de Traversay from King Louis XVI, by a process loosely comparable with that involved in the revival of dormant British peerages, combined with success in identifying a sufficient number of noble and titled ancestors in preceding centuries. In 1790 he left France for his and his family's safety to live in Switzerland, and it was while there that his name was put forward to Catherine, with the approval of King Louis, in response to a request from her, as part of her continuing programme of strengthening the leadership of the Russian navy. He came to Russia for the first time in May 1791, staying till August, and returned in July 1793 to live and work permanently in Russia. It is reasonable to assume that the amateur painter 'J B Traversay' and the naval officer 'Jean-Baptiste, marquis de Traversay' were one and the same person; so the painting (Fig 13) must have been painted either in the summer of 1791 or during or after July 1793, and not, as stated in the *Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg*, in the 1780s. In the early 19th century, under Catherine's successors, Traversay – by then known as Ivan Ivanovich de Traversay – was made Grand Admiral of the Black Sea, and later became minister of naval affairs in the Russian government. Only in 1996 did he become the subject of a full-length biography, written by one of his direct descendants, Madeleine du Chatenet (née Traversay) (du Chatenet 1996).

5 The Battle of Chesme of June 1770 and its place in Russian history

On 24 June 1780 (O.S.) Catherine officially renamed the palace, this date having been chosen as marking the 10th anniversary of the Russian victory over the Turkish fleet during the Great Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74. (This was one of a dozen wars waged between the Russian and Ottoman empires between 1568 and 1918.) Çeşme is a town on the Aegean coast of Turkey. In the map (Fig 14) it can be seen to the left of the word 'TURKEY'.



Figure 14 Map of part of Aegean Sea

It lies near the tip of the Turkish peninsula which juts westward into the Aegean. [The tip is only about 7 km (5 miles) from the – now Greek – island of Chios.] It is about 75 km (46 miles) west of the city of İzmir (Smyrna until 1923), and takes its name from the Turkish word 'çeşme', which can mean 'spring', of which there were many in the area. The battle, in the bay of Çeşme and the nearby strait, was possibly Russia's greatest ever naval victory, and certainly one of Turkey's greatest naval defeats.

Admiral 'Sir' Samuel Greig [20] The battle figures also in British naval history, since the sailors of the Russian fleet included several British (chiefly Scottish) officers. With the ending of the Seven Years War in 1763, there were many British naval officers languishing on land on half-pay. In the same year, Catherine sent a request to Britain to lend her some competent naval officers to improve the Russian fleet, also holding out the prospect of rapid promotion. Five were selected, and I offer as an example Samuel Greig (1736–88), born in Inverkeithing in the kingdom of Fife, who went to Russia in 1763. At Chesme he was both a commander of ships in the battle and adviser to the Russian commander-in-chief, Admiral Count Aleksei Grigorievitch Orlov (1737–1808), who later confided to Catherine 'that he knew nothing about sea affairs; that even at Chesme he had done nothing himself; and that Greig had done everything' (Richard Warner [in DNB] 2004).[21] Greig later played a large part in strengthening the Russian navy through the introduction of major organisational reforms in such varied spheres as ship construction, naval discipline, methods of arming warships and naval training. During a home visit in 1777 he was granted the Freedom of the city of Edinburgh, and in 1782 was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, though he never became a Fellow of the Royal Society of *Edinburgh*. He died of a fever during the war of 1788–90 between Russia and Sweden, after Russia's victory in the naval battle of Hogeland, which he had led. He was given a state funeral and is buried in a grand Palladian mausoleum (designed, on Catherine's orders, by Giacomo Quarenghi) in the Lutheran cathedral in Reval (Tallinn since 1918) in Estonia, at the time a governorate of the Russian empire. At the time of his death he was Grand Admiral Greig and had received numerous honours from Catherine, including honorary membership of the imperial Academy of Sciences and knight-hoods of the orders of St George, St Anna, St Vladimir and St Andrew. He is remembered in Russia as 'the father of the Russian navy'. The painting (Fig 15) by Ivan Argunov (1729–1802) is now in Inverkeithing Museum. Priscilla Roosevelt says that Argunov, a leading court painter of the day, was a member of a family of talented serfs which produced three painters and two architects. She says they were treated quite well but very poorly paid (1995:247).



Figure 15 Admiral 'Sir' Samuel Greig (1773) by Ivan Petrovitch Argunov (Inverkeithing Museum)

The battle has been described as Turkey's greatest naval defeat since the 3rd battle of Lepanto of 1571, in which Turkey is said to have lost 20,000 dead and wounded, and 190 ships sunk or captured.[22] Russian accounts give the number of Turkish dead at Çeşme as 11,000 and Russian dead as under 600, with similarly disproportionate losses of ships. To Russia this victory was in itself a great achievement. Its importance to Russia was also that until 1769 no Russian warship had ever entered the Mediterranean, that previous encounters in April and May had been minor, making Chesme – reverting now to the Russian transliteration when using the Roman alphabet – Russia's first ever big naval battle in the Mediterranean and her most decisive ever naval victory over Turkey. The achievement was stupendous, the more so considering the long and challenging voyage, taking from four to six months, that the Russian fleet had had to make from the far north, via the North Atlantic, the Strait of Gibraltar and most of the Mediterranean.[23] It was also symbolically important to Russia, given her peculiar position as a huge country that for much of its

history had been virtually landlocked, hemmed in to the north by ice, to the west by the Swedes and to the south by the Ottomans.[24] So it is not surprising that Catherine wanted the victory to be marked grandly, in buildings, paintings and other memorials.

6 Chesme church



Figure 16 Chesme Church

On the same day that Catherine renamed the palace (24 June 1780 [O.S.]), she consecrated a new Russian Orthodox church (Fig 16), dedicated to St John the Baptist and to be known as Chesmenskaya (or Chesme) Church. Located close to the palace, the church was also designed by Yuri Velten. Built over the period from 1777 to 1780, its foundations had been laid soon after completion of the palace. Both are major examples of Gothic revival (neo-Gothic) buildings in or near St Petersburg. In Russia its architectural style is sometimes referred to as pseudo-Gothic.

7 The service in use: ceremony and spectacle

There are few references to the service in use, who ate from it and when they did so, though an early description of the palace, from 1782, singles out the service as one of its highlights. Lydia Liackhova says that during the first few years of the palace's existence Catherine paid periodic visits, most being brief stops *en route* between St Petersburg and Tsarskoe Selo, which gave her an opportunity to relax but did not involve the kind of entertaining that might have called for use of the service. In what follows, I draw heavily on Liackhova's account of when and how the service was used (1995). The court circular, describing the occasion of the visit (mentioned above) by Sir James Harris in May 1779, says that Catherine 'deigned to drink coffee with both the gathered retinue and accompanying persons, and the duration of her visit to the palace was over an hour'. Obviously the service was not used on this occasion since it contains no cups. The same entry in the court circular indicates that the service was at this time seen chiefly as a cabinet service, intended more for display than for use. During the spring and summer of this year (1779) it seems that Catherine dropped in at the palace quite often, usually taking coffee there.

The palace was not, however, used only for Catherine's brief halts, nor was the service just a conversation piece. There is evidence that it was in use on special occasions, especially the banquets associated with grand ceremonies. In 1777, for instance, King Gustavus III of Sweden (1746–92) (Fig 17), a first cousin of Catherine's, visited Russia for a month under the pseudonym of Count Gotland and attended the ceremonial laying of the foundations of Chesme church on 6 June (probably O.S.).[25] At the dinner for 36 which followed the ceremony 'the table was laid with a glazed earthenware service'. This must have been the Frog service, since no other dinner service was kept at the palace.

The service was used again on 24 June 1780 (O.S.), the 10th anniversary of the Battle of Chesme, when Holy Roman Emperor Joseph II (1741–90) (Fig 18) visited St Petersburg under the name of Count Falkenstein, and was present when the church was consecrated and the palace's name changed.[26] At the ceremonial lunch which followed the consecration the number at table was 56. (Numbers at table are discussed below.) The official account again refers to the service as the 'glazed earthenware service'. And the following year,



Figure 17
King Gustavus III
of Sweden



Figure 18
Holy Roman Emperor
Joseph II



Figure 19
King Stanislas II August
of Poland

again on 24 June (O.S.), after the ceremonial service, presumably held at the church, commemorating the Chesme victory, Catherine held a banquet at the palace for 53 persons. In 1782 and 1783 Catherine stopped off at the palace on 24 June, but no banquets were given, and from June 1784 the ceremonies and any related celebrations marking the anniversary of the victory were held at Tsarskoe Selo.[27]

The palace was used only briefly for other official court activities. On 18 February 1791 [probably O.S.] there was a 'sleigh procession' followed by a luncheon for 105 persons, including of course Catherine herself, using 'the Chesme glazed earthenware service'. This seems to be the first time that the court circular referred to the service as the Chesme service. A traveller who visited the palace in 1794 described it as a 'pleasure palace'. (Georgi 1794) On 10 February 1795 [probably O.S.] there was another sleigh procession, with Catherine and a myriad of grand dukes and duchesses and other elevated persons, and this time there were 112 place-settings.

Since the service had been made to serve only 50 persons, extra pieces are likely to have been required when the number at table was to exceed this number. It seems that the difference was made up with pieces manufactured by the imperial porcelain factory in St Petersburg. They were said to be in the style of the Wedgwood service, but with a number of differences, including some use of gilding. This factory is still producing wares and in 2005, after a number of name changes over the years, reverted to its original name, the Imperial Porcelain Factory. I have been unable to find an estimate of the number of extra pieces that were ordered. Moreover, although the service was intended for only 50, it contained 288 flat plates, 120 soup plates and 144 dessert plates. To judge how many extra pieces were needed on any specific occasion, one would need to have some idea of how many plates and other dishes were likely to be used by each person at table in St Petersburg court circles in the later 18th century. This in turn would depend on the number of courses,

the number of dishes required for each course, and the extent to which dishes were changed for every course. Are there surviving documents, such as diaries, menus or notes on court etiquette, which would make it possible to arrive at a credible estimate? And when extra pieces were ordered, for how many additional diners was provision being made, and was the size of the order boosted to allow for breakages?

George Williamson, of whom more below, suggests a special relationship between use of the service and the presence of English visitors: '[Catherine] clearly used the service upon many occasions, especially when she desired to honour the English [*sic*] ambassador or any English visitor, and for a while in the Russian Court it was the custom that when a new English Ambassador was accredited, the Wedgwood service was used at the first dinner party at which he was present'. (1909:38) Williamson tells this story again in a later book, adding that he came across it while carrying out a search at the British Museum (1925:221). Regrettably he does not identify his source. I suspect he was mistaken and that the custom, if it was a custom, involved a different Wedgwood service, the 'Husk' service, which was kept and used at a different palace.

I came across only one other significant reference to the service in this period of its life. This was in the diary of the former king of Poland, King Stanislas II August (1732–98) who, as Count Stanislas Poniatowski, had been Catherine's lover in the 1750s, and who was shown round the palace in 1797 by her son, the new Tsar, Paul I (1754–1801). (Fig 19) [28]

Why are records of the service in use so meagre? It is not reasonable to expect it to have been mentioned, other than on special occasions. If Catherine visited the palace, accompanied by only a few other people, as we know she sometimes did, and made some use of the service, the court circular would no doubt record the visit, but it would surely be asking too much to expect it to go into such detail as to say, for instance, that 'the Empress took a light lunch using dishes from the Chesme glazed earthenware service'. Moreover, if the British views decorating some pieces, especially the plates, were to be appreciated, it would be easier for them to be handled and examined when the service was not in use. And we should not forget that the painted decoration was done with on-glaze enamel, which would not stand up to heavy use. Michael Raeburn (personal communication) has observed that a few pieces have suffered badly through use.

Another point to bear in mind is that while the service was seen as special by Catherine, and is so regarded by many ceramic enthusiasts today, for most people for most of its active life the service was probably viewed as just one of many useful domestic items of good quality in the imperial household. Indeed, to jump ahead in time for a moment, Liackhova (1995:-212) quotes an 1896 letter from the directorate of the Court Marshal's department at St Petersburg which is a model of faint praise: 'Although [it]...is not a work of any particular artistic significance, its importance as a historical rarity is indubitable'. It was not only in Russia that the service failed to gain unqualified approval. In June 1774, the very well-connected Mary Delany, having visited the London preview exhibition, described it disparagingly as 'crockery ware'. More recently, W B Honey (1948:3) was equally dismissive, describing the service, which he saw as Wedgwood's only important attempt to make use of 'the art of the porcelain-painter, of the miniaturist in enamels', as 'artistically a failure'. [29]

8 The service after Catherine's death in 1796: neglect and rediscovery

It is unsurprising that nothing was heard of the service in use after Catherine's death, since most of the people who knew of it were probably not interested in it, and many others were probably unaware of its existence. It is unlikely to have been used while it remained at Chesme Palace. After its removal from the palace it could have been used, but no records have come to light which suggest that it was. And when it came into the care of the SHM it would then, like most objects in most museums, be there so that it could be preserved and if necessary conserved, sometimes (or always) displayed, but definitely not to be used.

After Catherine's death, the palace was deserted, though I came across a charmingly implausible and totally unfounded suggestion that the palace and the surrounding area had come into the hands of Count Aleksei Orlov and become famed for its race-track and for his summer garden parties.[30] And in 1828 an English traveller, Dr Augustus Bozzi Granville, FRS (1783–1872), reported in the published journal of his travels that the imperial apartments 'are in a dilapidated state, and entirely stripped of furniture'. The service remained at the palace, in the same three large sideboards where it had been kept in Catherine's lifetime, until 1830, when it was removed, by order of Tsar Nicholas I (1796–1855), to the English Palace at Peterhof. As mentioned above, Peterhof lies to the west of St Petersburg on the Gulf of Finland, at a straight line distance of about 25 km (15 ½ miles) from the Winter Palace. A few pieces (one example of each type) were transferred in 1879 to the Cottage Palace at Peterhof, where they remained until 1921 when they were finally acquired by the SHM. There they were reunited with the rest of the service which, having remained at the English Palace till September 1912, had then been transferred to the Hermitage. In the same year some pieces from the service were lent to a Petersburg-based imperial institution, the Academy of Arts, for inclusion in a special exhibition held to celebrate Wedgwood ceramics. At the SHM some pieces are always on display, about 60 at present, but most are kept in the reserve area in large storage cupboards. Below are quite recent (early 21st century) photographs of two of these cupboards, piled high with pieces from the service (Figs 20 and 21), and the adjacent cupboard containing pieces of Du Paquier porcelain with, in front of it, Dr Lydia Liackhova, Curator of European Ceramics (Fig 22).



Figures 20 & 21 Part of the Green Frog service in its storage cupboards
State Hermitage Museum, St Petersburg

Figure 22 Dr Lydia Liackhova
(Photographer: Helen Espir)

The present account has described the service's movements over time. It must be stressed, however, that for most of the period from Catherine's death till the early years of the 20th century it was neglected and largely forgotten, and might have remained so had it not been for the persistence and persuasion of an eminent English art expert of the day, George

Charles Williamson (1858–1942), who first became interested in the service in 1906. He wrote twice about the service, first in a big book devoted entirely to it and published in 1909, and later in a chapter of a further book published in 1925. The latter chapter gives more details of the circumstances of the service's rediscovery. He himself saw it as 'enter[ing] more fully into personal details' than he had thought appropriate in the earlier book (1925: 218). In the following account I draw on both these sources. Williamson visited Russia on several occasions and says that he had already established a relationship with the Russian Emperor (Tsar Nicholas II; 1868–1918), before the latter began to investigate the service. It is unfortunate that while Williamson is usually clear on the order of events, he seldom offers even approximate dates.

At an early stage he consulted Major Frank H Wedgwood, a director of the firm, about the fate of the service and was told that as far as he knew it no longer existed. This spurred Williamson to send off a flurry of letters asking about the service to a number of officials and palaces in Russia. All who replied assured him that the service was no longer in existence, and one high official angrily told him to stop asking questions. Exasperated, and doubting that he was being told the truth, Williamson next wrote directly, via the British foreign office, to the Emperor, who replied 'speedily', saying that '[he] had never before heard of the service ...and would have inquiries started at once concerning its whereabouts'. (1925:221) Shortly afterwards, Williamson received a further letter, which told him 'that the service had been found ... in an underground pantry in one of the palaces at Peterhof, a room that had not been opened for perhaps seventy years or more'. (1925:221-222)

The service must have made an impression on the Emperor, since he directed that it be put on show in the English Palace at Peterhof, in well-designed glass display cabinets (vitrines) made for the purpose. These are illustrated by Williamson. (1909: plate facing page 4) (Fig 23). It is not certain how many pieces were shown, but Williamson implies that it was the entire service: 'The whole of the service has now been removed from the place where it was hidden, and occupies a series of fine vitrines in the English Palace at Peterhof.' (1909:5)




Figure 23 Pieces from the Green Frog service in a vitrine at Peterhof (from Williamson 1909)

In the vitrines the pieces were set out upon velvet, 'as to the colour of which I [Williamson] had the honour to be consulted'. (1925:225) Around this time 'further applications were made to the Emperor, and the interest of Her Imperial Majesty, the Empress Marie Feodorovna was sought'. (1909: 4) [31] These included a request – which was granted – that pieces from the service be lent for a jubilee Exhibition being organised by the firm in 1909 to celebrate the 150th anniversary of Josiah's setting up business on his own account in 1759. [32]

Williamson's work culminated in December with the publication of his book on the service. (1909) It contains a complete catalogue of the pieces and views, and illustrations of over 120 pieces, based on photographs taken specially for the book by Tsar Nicholas's own photographer.[33] And the same month pieces from the service were put on show in London at the jubilee Exhibition.[34] Williamson had been invited to go to Russia to collect

pieces for the Exhibition, but was unable to go, being ill at the time, and Frank Wedgwood had gone instead, 'to receive the pieces that were placed at his disposal by the Emperor'. (1925:223) It appears that he was given some discretion in selecting these pieces. There has been uncertainty about the number of pieces lent, but there is little doubt that thirty-four is the correct number. The illustrated catalogue for the Exhibition, issued by the firm, lists 34 pieces, bearing a total of 49 views (Wedgwood 1909); Williamson (1909) listed 26 pieces bearing 37 views, but later (1925:229) gave the number of pieces lent as 34; and Voronikhina (1995:16) also gives the number as 34.

When the service was 'misaid', so also was the catalogue that Thomas Bentley had prepared, which had accompanied the service when it was sent to Russia in 1774 (see [10]). Unlike the service itself, it has never been found. In the absence of a catalogue, it would have been impossible to check what was present and what was missing from the rediscovered service. Once again Williamson came to the rescue. He tried to find a copy in England, and says, without giving any details, that he eventually tracked one down among a mass of waste paper in Liverpool! He had it copied and printed, and when the pieces that had been lent were returned to Russia after the jubilee Exhibition 'a number of copies of the unique [reprinted] catalogue' were sent as well, by Williamson himself (1925:229).

Over the years a number of pieces have gone missing, though it is not known to what extent this has been due to accidental loss, breakage, theft, sale, or some other (unlikely) cause. In 1830, when the service was removed from Chesme Palace, 836 pieces remained. In the year 2000, the number of pieces held by the SHM was 767, indicating a cumulative loss since 1774 of about 18%. The number of flat plates and ice cups that have failed to survive is disproportionately high. Michael Raeburn has pointed out (personal communication) the remarkable fact that none of the pieces catalogued by Williamson for his 1909 book went missing over the next 80 years or so, despite revolutions, wars and sieges. Not all, however, was rosy. In the introductory essay that he wrote for the catalogue of the jubilee Exhibition, Arthur Hayden commented on the condition of the service: 'As may be imagined, many pieces of so large a service have been broken in use, and some of those shown [at the Exhibition] have met with nasty accidents, made almost invisible by careful restoration by [a] Mr Abbott of Kingston-on-Thames'. (Wedgwood 1909:5) 'Restoration' is also mentioned by Williamson, who says that when the service was rediscovered, it was noted that many of the pieces were damaged, including missing handles and knobs. During his visit to Russia it seems that Frank Wedgwood offered to get these missing parts replaced, the firm having retained the necessary moulds and drawings. We may infer, therefore, that the pieces brought to England for the Exhibition, some of which had been worked on by the Mr Abbott mentioned by Hayden, were probably accompanied by an additional number of damaged pieces brought over for the attention of the firm itself. (1925:223)

And the service's condition today? In 1995, when approximately 300 pieces lent for the V&A's Exhibition were displayed behind thick glass in sealed cases, they appeared to be in good condition, though if any had suffered conservation this may not have been apparent to the naked eye while they were on display. What of the 480 or so pieces that were not lent? Recent published accounts do not say whether or when the condition of the service as a whole was last assessed and, if so, whether a condition report was prepared. Such a report would probably give details of pieces that were undamaged (or had only minor superficial damage); pieces that had been damaged and then well conserved; and damaged pieces that

had not received attention. It might also indicate (where known) the circumstances of damage, including damage (if any) that could have occurred while the pieces were in the care of the SHM itself.[35]

There is also the matter of how the service was referred to. While it was being made, Josiah Wedgwood called it 'the Russian Service'. In its early years in Russia it was simply described as the earthenware or glazed earthenware service and then, after 1780, as 'the Chesme glazed earthenware service'. Only in the 20th century did it acquire a fixed name, again perhaps thanks to Williamson, though he himself referred to it in his 1909 book as 'the Imperial Russian dinner service'. When the book was reviewed by Nicolai Rothstein in the Russian journal *Starye Gody* in February 1910, the term 'Green Frog service' appeared in the title of the review, and this may be the first time that the service had been referred to in print by this name. Anyway, the name caught on, in Russia and elsewhere, and has stuck.

It is possible that Williamson, through his book, was responsible for the confusion in some quarters, mentioned on page 2 above, about the location of the palace, for he writes: 'The service was intended for use in the palace of La Grenouillère (*sic*), *which now forms part of the Palace of Peterhof*, near St Petersburg'. [my emphasis] (1909:7)[36]

Williamson gives an enticing footnote to his account of the service, saying that the hugely rich American financier and banker, John Pierpont Morgan, 'made a determined effort to try and purchase the service from the Emperor, but was not of course successful'. (1925:233) Had Morgan succeeded, it might have ended up not in the care of the SHM in St Petersburg but of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York! (On Morgan's interest in the service, see [33].)

Having been rediscovered, the service has not again been entirely forgotten in Russia. It, together with the palace and the church, feature as minor sights on the St Petersburg tourist trail, and it is described generously on the SHM's website. It is also occasionally singled out for public mention, such as when pieces from the service were included in a special exhibition, *A Sentimental Journey - Wedgwood in Russia*, held at the SHM from December 2012 to March 2013. This exhibition was an example of the Russian custom of celebrating significant anniversaries, as it was deliberately planned to mark the centenary of the Wedgwood exhibition held in St Petersburg in 1912 (see page 16 above).

9 Later history of the palaces and the places where they were located

Some place names have changed. Tsarskoe Selo became Detskoe Selo ('Children's village') after the 1917 revolution and later, in 1937, was renamed Pushkin. This marked the centenary of the death of Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837), the Russian poet, dramatist and writer of stories. He had been in the first intake of thirty pupils at the lycée which had operated from 1811 to 1843 in an annexe to Catherine Palace (see [11]), to provide a liberal education for boys 'of the best families, who should afterwards occupy important posts in the Imperial Service'. (Viltchkovsky 1910)[37] The city of St Petersburg, after almost 90 years as Petrograd and then Leningrad, in 1991, after a referendum, became St Petersburg again. Peterhof, as already mentioned, was for some years from 1944 known by its Russianised name of Petrodvorets until, in 1997, its official name was changed back to Peterhof. In this case both names continue in use. The Winter Palace, its external appearance virtually unchanged since Catherine's reign, now forms part of the SHM.

Chesme Palace and church, built on the 'frog marsh', remain in being.[38] The church was badly damaged during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45 (as it is known in Russia) and later very well restored (1970–75). For some years it served as a branch of the Central Naval Museum, with displays focused on the Battle of Chesme, but since 1991 it has regained its position as a place of public worship while continuing to show naval displays.

And Chesme Palace. From Catherine's death in 1796 until the early 1830s it seems to have been largely unused. In 1812, under Tsar Alexander I (1777–1825) the circular room on the ground floor was converted into a church, and in 1825 Alexander's own body lay in state there on its way back to St Petersburg for his funeral. It was occupied during the summers of 1827 and 1828 by young girls from a charitable institution while their own building was being reconstructed. In 1832–34, by a decision of the new Tsar, Nicholas I (1796–1855), it was converted into a hospital and almshouse for old soldiers, initially chiefly for veterans of Napoleon's invasion of Russia (the Patriotic War of 1812, as it is known in Russia). Conversion left its external appearance largely unchanged, apart from removal of the battlements of the central tower. Its size and structure were, however, greatly altered, residential space being created by adding large wings at the three turreted corners, each on its own roughly as big as the original palace (see, for example, Fig 27 below). In providing a mixture of medical care and sheltered accommodation it became known informally as 'the invalids house'. It seems to have continued in use as a refuge for old soldiers well into the 20th century, though I have failed to find out when their admission ended and when any were last in residence. Some accounts say that the body of Rasputin lay briefly at the palace after his assassination in 1916, but the actual resting place was probably Chesme church. In the 1930s the Road Transport Institute was located at the palace. After the War of 1941–45 there was further restoration and reconstruction, and the buildings are now occupied by part of the St Petersburg State University of Aerospace Instrumentation (SUAI).

10 A visual interlude

This section consists of photographs of Chesme Palace – and the wings added in the 19th century – as they have survived to the early 21st century, now changed and embedded in the buildings of SUAI, starting with some taken in the summer of 2005 by Peter Sobolev (Figs 24, 25 & 26). He says that 'when I started to take pictures the security guard came out and tried to prevent me. But he couldn't find a reason why I shouldn't take the pictures...' [39]



Figure 24 The original palace (Chesme Palace), in 2005 (Photographer: Peter Sobolev)



Figure 25 Part of the expanded palace



Figure 26 One of the added wings

Views of Chesme Palace, in 2005 (Photographer: Peter Sobolev)

The black and white photograph below (Fig 27) is not dated. I have, however, seen another (much poorer) photograph, dated 1950, of the same scene, and having compared them I can confirm that this photograph shows the original palace as it looked around that time, flanked by two of the three added wings. What is striking is the area of open ground in front of the buildings, featureless apart from a few young trees, in marked contrast with the scene shown in the second photograph (Fig 29) on the next page.



Figure 27 Chesme Palace, probably in the mid-20th century (SHM)



1667



1730



1800

The photograph (Fig 28) was taken by Saint-Petersburg-com, a web-based company only set up in 2001, so there is no doubt that it shows an elevation of the old part of the palace as it has looked quite recently.



Figure 28 The original palace, in the early 21st century (Saint-Petersburg.com)

The remarkable aerial photograph below (Fig 29), taken by the same company, shows palace and church, now almost hidden within a dense wood, yet only a step away from the massive urban sprawl of redeveloped southern St Petersburg. It shows how close palace and church are to one another.



Figure 29 Aerial view of the palace and the church, in the early 21st century (Saint-Petersburg.com)

It is interesting to compare the photographs in this section with the 18th century paintings on page 10 above. In examining them, we have to bear in mind that the palace is triangular, so that when we look at images showing a side view of the palace they may not all be showing the same side.

11 Russia and Saint Petersburg: then and now

The common tendency to idealise the unhistoric past has a particular relevance to the tale I have told. Russian society in Catherine's time was founded on the autocratic power of the ruler, the hereditary privileges of the nobility, almost inconceivable disparities in wealth, and the institution of serfdom which condemned the greater part of the population to a lifetime of permanent deprivation.[40] This should be remembered as we observe how much the former Kekerekeksinskiy Palace has changed since the 1770s. Where once its pastoral peace was disturbed only by sounds of the countryside – the singing of birds, the lowing of cattle, the bleating of goats and, of course, the croaking of frogs – it lies now in an area which, under plans made during the Stalin period, was to be greatly developed, in a largely unsuccessful attempt to create a new city centre within a long-established heavy industrial area, to the south of the historic centre by the river Neva. Almost out of sight among the trees, it is now surrounded by the roar of heavy traffic and other trappings of a big 21st century city: schools and hospitals, hotels and restaurants, department stores, a sport and concert complex, huge public buildings, enormous residential blocks, great roads, two Metro stations and massive patriotic memorials such as Catherine herself might have commissioned. By contrast the old imperial centre of the city, with its many canals (and streets) still lined by grand palaces, churches, museums, monuments, statues and other architectural gems, remind us that Saint Petersburg is one of several northern European cities that has been dubbed 'the Venice of the North'. Over the past century Russia's view of its Tsarist past has been markedly volatile, ambivalent and complex. What should we, as outsiders, make of it? I must leave you to judge for yourself.

Notes

[1] The year 2009 marked both the 250th anniversary of Josiah Wedgwood's first setting up in business on his own account, on the 1st of May 1759 at the Ivy House works at Burslem in Staffordshire, and a critical stage in the collapse of the firm of Wedgwood as a ceramic manufacturer. This monograph grew out of lectures I gave in anticipation of the 250th anniversary to the Wedgwood Society of Great Britain in 2007 and Morley College Ceramic Circle (now the London Ceramic Circle) in 2008. A shorter version was published by the Wedgwood Society (Newfield 2009).

[2] From 1547, when Ivan IV, Grand Prince of Muscovy ('Ivan the Terrible'; 1530–84), assumed the title of Tsar, all the rulers of Russia bore that title until, in 1721, Peter the Great was acclaimed 'Imperator [Emperor] of all the Russias', and bore that title for the last four years of his life. The new title, and Imperatrina for woman rulers and consorts, was then borne by all his successors, though the titles Tsar and Tsarina have remained in popular use. The first woman to rule the empire was Peter's second wife, Catherine (1684–1727). On Peter's death she had been elected to succeed him, as reigning Empress, though she was related to the imperial family only by marriage. Her succession created a precedent from which a princess of the small German principality of Anhalt-Zerbst later benefited. In 1745 this princess, Sophie Friederike Auguste, aged only 16 and renamed Ekaterina (Catherine), was married by arrangement to the heir to the Russian throne, a grandson of Peter the Great, also called Peter. Some years later, in 1762, much happened quickly (all dates N.S.): on 5

January, Peter succeeded as Emperor; on 9 July, he was forced to abdicate and Catherine, his young wife, was proclaimed reigning Empress; on 17 July, he was dead, allegedly murdered; and on 22 September she was ceremonially crowned. Bear in mind that at this time both court and country had become accustomed to woman rulers, empresses having ruled for 33 of the 37 years since the death of Peter the Great: Catherine I (1725–27), Anna (1730–40) and Elizabeth (1741–62).

[3] Vitali Suslov ran the SHM in the gap between Boris Borisovitch Piotrovsky (1908–90), who was Director from 1964 to 1990, and his son, Mikhail Borisovitch Piotrovsky (1944–), who has been Director since 1992.

[4] All the evidence is that Wedgwood acted quickly and was eager to undertake Catherine's commission because of the prestige to be gained. Indeed later the same month he referred to her, in a letter to Bentley dated 23 March 1773, as 'my Great Patroness in the North', not how one would expect him to have described her had he intended to enter into prolonged haggling over price.

[5] It was only in 1700, by decision of Peter the Great, that Russia adopted the Julian calendar. This was also the year in which many (non-Catholic) European countries at long last began to adopt the further calendar reforms which had been promulgated by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582. Having only just adopted the Julian calendar, Russia's failure to adopt the Gregorian reforms at this time, while it was an opportunity missed, is perhaps understandable.

[6] Lieutenant General Sir Charles Schaw Cathcart, 9th Lord Cathcart, KT, was a Scottish lord who, after a successful military career and having no previous diplomatic experience, served as British ambassador to the imperial Russian court from 1768 to 1772. His wife, a sister of Sir William Hamilton, the antiquarian and husband of Nelson's Emma, introduced Catherine to her brother's antiquarian work, and was active in assisting Josiah Wedgwood in his attempts to find a market in Russia (Scott 2004). Scott refers to her as 'Jean Cathcart', but most sources refer to her as 'Jane Cathcart', the name by which she was known in her lifetime. (*Burke's Peerage* hedges its bets and has her as Jean *and* Jane!)

[7] The Russia Company (or Muscovy Company) was a chartered trading company, the first major English joint-stock trading company, which operated from 1555 to 1917. Baxter had been granted its freedom in 1752. The consul-general post was new, created with the object of promoting Russia's commercial interests in Britain, and Baxter was its first holder. In January 1773 he was in St Petersburg, making one of his periodic visits to Russia, when he received formal notification of his appointment, and it was probably during this same visit that Catherine instructed him to commission the service from Josiah Wedgwood on her behalf. He served as consul-general for 30 years, from 1773 to 1803. He lived in style in Kensington, then a London suburb, with a portrait of Catherine, painted in Russia and perhaps a present from her, hanging in one of his drawing rooms. For his services as intermediary between Catherine and Wedgwood in 1773 he received a commission of 10% and several of the imperfect pieces of the Frog service. (Main source: Cross 2001)

[8] The quoted words are from Wedgwood's letter to Bentley of 29 March 1773. He is alluding to Catherine's commission, and his tone is anxious, as if protesting 'Will we really have to decorate *all* these pieces with real views and real buildings?'.

[9] According to Voronikhina (1995:13) the total amount paid by Catherine was 16,406 roubles and 46 kopeks, which she says was then equivalent to £2,700. Gaye Blake Roberts (Raeburn *et al.* 1995:41) says that the account submitted had been for £2,290-12s-4d, and offers a possible explanation for the difference.

[10] These Wedgwood figures accord with traditional English accounts, which seem to have been derived chiefly from the catalogue, later for many years lost, which Thomas Bentley prepared for Catherine in 1774. The catalogue had a very long and effusive title: *Catalogue and General Descrip-*

tion of a Complete Service of Porcelain [sic] or Queen's Ware ... All Painted in Enamel, and Executed according to the Orders and Instructions of the Most Illustrious Patroness of the Arts ... by Her Imperial Majesty's Very Humble and Most Grateful Servants. Wedgwood and Bentley, 1784. It identified each view, assigned a catalogue number to every piece, and also gave every piece a reference number which was painted in brown enamel on the reverse. Often the two numbers were the same. The discrepancy between the Hermitage figures and the Wedgwood figures is explained largely by a supposed miscalculation on Bentley's part, and by inclusion in the Wedgwood figures of eight spoons which, according to the SHM, were never found.

[11] The main Summer Palace building at Tsarskoe Selo had been completed in 1756. It was later named the Catherine Palace, after Empress Catherine I.

[12] Several small happenings in 1703 played a part in what we now call 'the founding by Peter the Great of the city of St Petersburg'. The name was given initially to a wooden church which was being built within the precincts of a new fortress. The conventional story in Russia is that it was by cutting a sod to mark the start of construction of the fortress, on 16 May 1703 (O.S.) [27 May N.S.], that Peter founded the city. Construction of the church began soon afterwards, on 29 June 1703 (O.S.), and the church was dedicated to Saints Peter and Paul, this date being the feast of these apostles in the Christian calendar of saints. (It has been suggested that Peter chose 29 June because this was his own name day.) Peter referred to the church, and later the fortress (previously unnamed), and then the entire growing settlement, by several similar names, including Sankt Piter Burkh and Sankt Pieterburch(t). (His spelling was not consistent.) Some authorities link Peter's name choices with the contact he had had with Dutch people from early in his life, and his said to have spent more time in the Dutch republic than in any other foreign country, but others give greater emphasis to his entire experience of life outside Russia. Later, under Peter's successors, the name of the young city was Germanised as Sankt-Peterburg.

The founding of St Petersburg was a remarkably bold move: the creation, involving much loss of life, of what soon became a city and port on what was essentially a bleak mosquito-ridden flood plain where, hundreds of years earlier, the Swedes had also built a fortress, albeit a short-lived one. Its designation as Russia's capital in 1712 meant its becoming Peter's chief place of residence and the centre of government, and hence the place where members of the court were expected to live. By the time Peter died in 1725 its population was about 40,000, and it continued to grow rapidly. It has been generally accepted that at Catherine's accession in 1762 its population had risen to about 120,000, and that when she died in 1796 it was about 220,000. George Munro warns, however, that such estimates should be treated with great caution and regarded as very approximate. He argues that the 1762 figure is an overestimate, the true figure probably being closer to 100,000; and that the 1796 figure is almost certainly an underestimate, the true figure being closer to 250,000 (2008:49-52). By 1800 it was one of the ten largest cities in Europe.

[13] Ingria, the land of the Ingrians, has also been known as Ingermanland. This was the name by which the region was known to the Swedes, who referred to its ancient Finnic inhabitants as Ingers. In some contexts the names have been used interchangeably to refer to the same geographical entity, and the Swedish name continued to be used by Russia into the 20th century for some official purposes. In the course of its history Ingria changed hands several times. In the modern period, under a peace treaty between Russia and Sweden in 1617, it had been annexed to Sweden. The Russian conquest of the other two Swedish Baltic provinces, Estonia and Livonia, was not completed until September 1710 when, as mentioned above, Ingria was given its new name. At the end of the Great Northern War, in 1721, all three provinces were formally ceded to Russia.

[14] Yuri Matveevich Velten (or Felten) (1730–1801), the chosen architect, was born in St Petersburg of German parentage, and was otherwise known as Georg Friedrich Velten (or Veldten). His

father, Matthias Velten, had migrated to Russia and joined the staff of a Petersburg-based imperial institution, the then new Academy of Sciences. Early in Yuri Velten's professional career he worked under architect Bartolomeo Francesco Rastrelli (1700–71), whose own major projects in St Petersburg included the Winter Palace and the Smolny Monastery and, at Tsarskoe Selo, the Catherine Palace. From 1789 until his death Yuri Velten was Director of another Petersburg-based imperial institution, the Academy of Arts, which had been founded by Empress Elizabeth in 1757. (For a portrait painting of Velten, see Fig 7 on page 7 above.)

[15] The twelve paintings in the Chesme Hall at Peterhof were painted over the period 1771–73 by the German landscape painter, Jacob Philippe Hackaert (1737–1807). Around the same time the English marine painter, Richard Paton (1716/17–1791), was commissioned to paint four huge pictures of the battle which were displayed at the Hermitage and then, in 1779, transferred to the Throne Room at Peterhof. There are also memorials to the victory at Gatchina Palace: the Chesme Obelisk, commissioned by Catherine during, or possibly prior to, 1775, and the Chesme Gallery, which was probably not constructed till the 1790s.

[16] Peasant risings became common in Russia, with over 50 in the 1760s alone. In 1773 a rising began which continued until January 1775 when, after many battles, its chief leader, Emelian Pugachev, was executed. This was much the biggest rising in Russian history: it is estimated that between 9,000 and 10,000 rebels were killed in just one important battle in late 1774. In the 1770s Catherine initiated fewer major building projects than in the 1760s or afterwards, which lends circumstantial support to the suggestion that Pugachev's rebellion and other state problems diverted her attention at this time, as well as soaking up tax revenues (Munro 2008:251-2). There is no reason to doubt the strength of her longer-term commitment to construction, illustrated by a remark she made in July 1770 in a letter: 'I found Petersburg virtually wooden and will leave its buildings dressed in marble'.

[17] Volumes 4 (1765) & 5 (1771) of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, by John Woolfe, James Gandon & Matthias Darly, were entirely separate from Volumes 1, 2 & 3, published between 1715 and 1725 under different authorship. In their introduction to Volume 5, the authors state that construction of the original Longford Castle had been completed in 1591, but that 'the many and great alterations it has undergone, have hardly left any other traces of the original, than its triangular form' (Woolfe *et al.* 1771:10). It has been suggested that the Russian architect Vasiliy Neelov, who had been sent to England by Catherine for six months in 1771 to study landscaping, may have brought a copy of the new volume with him when he returned to Russia (Roosevelt 1995:37).

[18] The gist of the argument is that if the service had been exhibited in St Petersburg during the period 1774-77 while it was awaiting transfer to the new palace, this would have been mentioned in contemporary accounts, but no such accounts have been found, and it is reasonable to infer that the reason they have not been found is that they do not exist and that the service was not exhibited. An observer whose voluminous correspondence has been published was Robert (later Sir Robert) Gunning (1731–1816), who succeeded Lord Cathcart as British representative at the Russian court from June 1772 to early 1776. (He is said to have become one of Catherine's favourites and to have had many private audiences.) Thus he was in post when the service arrived in St Petersburg and for some time afterwards. In diplomatic letters to his minister in London he mentions occasions when services were commissioned by Catherine or received as gifts by her, including a porcelain service from Frederick the Great of Prussia which in August 1772 was 'exposed in the Palace for several days; where persons of every Rank have been admitted to see it' (Raeburn 1995a:42). Raeburn observes that during Catherine's reign imperial taste had political significance, and that some incidents that might be regarded as casual occurrences are more properly construed as 'considered acts of cultural politics'. This makes it all the more reasonable to surmise that if the Green Frog service had been put on display at this time, this would have been a deliberate act which would have

been mentioned in the court circular; that contemporary observers, both courtiers and others, would have been aware of it; that some of these observers would have referred to the event in letters, journals or other written records; and that some of these records would have survived. And if they had survived, one can be confident that Voronikhina or Liackhova would have found them.

[19] We may never know exactly why Catherine wanted every piece of the service to bear the image of a frog. She was clearly not averse to them: indulging her weakness for inventing legends, for example, she mischievously adapted the traditional Russian folktale of the frog princess by claiming that the princess had once lived at the palace at Kekerekeksinen (Shvidkovsky 2007:238). It is easier to guess why she wanted the service's frogs to be green, since it is reasonable to suppose that the frogs there were European Marsh Frogs (*Rana ridibunda*). (I am indebted to Professor Lars-Gunnar Larsson of Uppsala University [personal communication] for this information.) This frog, prevalent in Ingria, is water-dwelling and often green-coloured, so it is entirely reasonable that Catherine, having decided she wanted frogs on the service, should direct that they be green.

[20] Although Greig was honoured by Catherine with a number of Russian knighthoods, he did not hold any British knighthood, and the quotation marks around 'Sír' reflect uncertainty about how he should be referred to within Great Britain. In Scotland he is commonly referred to simply as Admiral Samuel Greig.

[21] In December 1775, notwithstanding his earlier confession to her, Catherine gave Aleksei Orlov 5,000 serfs as a reward for the victory at Chesme. (By the time of his death his estate included 30,000 serfs.) She also granted him the honour of being allowed to add the name of the victory to his family name, which thus became Orlov-Chesmenskiy. He was one of the five brothers who, led by his elder brother Grigori Grigorievitch Orlov (1734–1783), were involved in the conspiracy which, in 1762, had resulted in the enforced abdication and subsequent death (alleged murder) of Tsar Peter III and Catherine's accession as Empress. Although she was well disposed towards Aleksei, it was Grigori who was one of her lovers and father of her illegitimate son.

[22] Lepanto is now known as the Gulf of Corinth. The battle of Lepanto has been described as one of the key events of modern history, in that it decisively frustrated further Turkish advance into Europe. In the battle the Turkish fleet was defeated by the Holy League, an alliance of the republics of Venice and Genoa, Savoy, Spain, the Papal States and the Knights of Malta.

[23] Initially there were two squadrons. The first squadron set sail from Kronstadt, the Russian naval base on Kotlin Island in the Gulf of Finland, about 30 km (18 ½ miles) to the west of St Petersburg, early in August 1769. Sailing via the Baltic Sea, the Kattegat, the Skagerrak and the North Sea, most of its ships reached the Mediterranean by mid-December. I have failed to find out the point of departure of the second squadron, though it is probable that it too set out from somewhere in the Baltic. (There are a number of possibilities, including Kronstadt and several other Russian naval bases on or close to the Gulf of Finland.) Having set sail in October 1769, the second squadron reached the Mediterranean early in May 1770. In all, in the course of the Russo-Turkish war of 1768–74, five squadrons were sent to the Mediterranean (Anderson 1954:44).

[24] Russia has been described as a victim of the 'tyranny of geography'. Arkhangelsk (Archangel), in the Russian arctic, once Russia's main port, was icebound for half the year. While the creation of St Petersburg had been intended by Peter to provide a better alternative, the vagaries of Russia's relations with Sweden meant that passage of its ships through the Baltic Sea was subject to disruption. And Turkey dominated the Black Sea, which had become known as 'the Ottoman Lake', especially after 1453 when Constantinople had finally fallen to Sultan Mehmet II. (There is a connection between the circumstances of its fall and Russia's adoption of the double-headed eagle as its symbol of empire, but that's an interesting story for another day.) Thus, for centuries, Russia was partly landlocked, lacking permanent access to a warm water port, until her victory in the 1768–74

war led to a massive improvement in her situation. The peace treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, signed by representatives of the two empires on 21 July 1774, (a) transferred ownership of the city and seaport of Azov to Russia, with access to the Black Sea via the Sea of Azov and the Kerch Strait, (b) removed restrictions on passage by her merchant ships across the Black Sea, and (c) gave these ships the right to continue to (and from) the Mediterranean Sea, freely and all year round, via the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmara and the Dardanelles.

[25] Gustavus was not one of Catherine's friends, nor a former lover. He was later assassinated while attending a masked ball. (Verdi's opera *Un Ballo in Maschera* is loosely based on Gustavus's assassination.)

[26] Joseph attended against the wish of his mother, the Austrian empress Maria Theresa. This was not the only time he had travelled under the assumed name of Count Falkenstein.

[27] The custom of commemorating the battle began on its first anniversary, on 24 June 1771, when the College of Admiralty held a grand fête in St Petersburg. All who attended were given a specially minted medal bearing inscriptions praising Aleksei Orlov ('...conqueror and exterminator of the Turkish fleet') and lauding the victory ('It was the happiness and joy of Russia...').

[28] Catherine had secured Stanislas's election as King of Poland in 1764. After his abdication in 1795 he lived in Russia as a pensioner, first of Catherine and then of Paul, until he died there, heavily in debt, in 1798.

[29] Judgments remain divided. Mary Delany's remark was in a letter to her niece on 7 June 1774: 'I am so giddy with looking over such a quantity of crockery ware.' (Dahn 2000, quoting Hall 1862, Vol IV:594-5) The judgment of Lady Grey, who also visited the June 1774 preview, was more favourable: 'The whole together does not make a Shew nor strike you at first with beauty, being only painted with Black Colour heightened with a Purplish cast, but each piece is separately extremely pretty and generally very well executed.' (Young 1995:126, quoting Raeburn 1992:458) And George Williamson, the service's 'rediscoverer' (see pages 16–19 *passim*), was obviously smitten: 'It was not only the most celebrated dinner-service in Europe, but in certain respects it was one of the most beautiful that was ever made'. (1925:228) The opinion of C A Johnson, on the other hand, seems closer to Honey's: 'Modern taste has difficulty in appreciating the artistic significance of this service, which was made in a fairly humble, and dull, earthenware and painted in a dull mulberry colour, apart from one splash of bright green on each piece' (1979:132).

[30] This claim was made in 1991 by Patricia Roosevelt: 'Alexei Orlov-Chesmenskii (hero of the Battle of Chesmé), for instance, was famed not just for the race-track at his Gothic palace, Chesmé, outside St Petersburg, but for summer garden parties to which anyone with "decent dress and a respectable appearance" (as one visitor put it) could come'. (1991:9) As authority for her claim she cites a single source, Dr Robert Lyall (1825:505), who lived for some years in Russia and, in his own words, had 'become familiar with the [Russian] language'. What Lyall actually said, however, is that Alexei Orlov was enormously rich, that close to his house *in Moscow* he had his own race-track where regular horse races were held, and that he held festivals and promenades in summer in his gardens *in Moscow*. In the whole of Lyall's Appendix on the Orlovs there is not a hint that any of the Orlov brothers had ever lived at Chesme Palace or had estates there. A few years later Roosevelt corrected her mistake when an 'adapted version' of the article was published (1995:140).

[31] This was the Dowager Empress Maria Fiodorovna (1847 – 1928). She was the widow of Nicholas's father, Tsar Alexander III.

[32] Voronikhina says that after being brought from Russia, the pieces lent were shown first at Etruria, the firm's chief manufacturing base from 1769 to 1940 in what is now the Staffordshire city of Stoke-on-Trent, before being transferred to London for the jubilee Exhibition (1995:16).

[33] The book's cover price on publication was one pound and five shillings, net. Even allowing for inflation, this seems on the low side for a high quality, expensively produced, large quarto volume which contained 73 plates and was published in a limited edition of only 310 copies. Williamson was Art Editor at Bell's (his publishers): did they perhaps subsidise publication? Other possibilities are that Williamson himself subsidised publication, or that it was assisted by the American financier, banker and art collector, John Pierpont Morgan (1837–1913). Williamson supported Morgan in his collecting and dedicated his later book to him (1925). Williamson says that Morgan asked to have two special copies of the book printed on vellum and to have certain plates in colour (1925:233). The book seems to have been a model of speedy production: its dedication, signed by Williamson, is dated November 1909 and the book was published the next month. I found only one review, in the September 1910 issue of the *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* (Vol 17, No 90, pp 375-6). The reviewer was unenthusiastic, clearly a lover of porcelain with little time for pottery.

[34] This was a happy conjunction, the jubilee Exhibition, with its illustrated catalogue (Wedgwood 1909), and the publication of Williamson's book (1909). The catalogue contained an introductory essay by Arthur Hayden (1868-1946), a prolific writer on antiques and author of the series of 'Chats' books, including *Chats on English China* and *Chats on Old English Earthenware*. Both events had clearly been planned in advance. We know it was only Williamson's request that had persuaded Tsar Nicholas to lend pieces for the Exhibition. Then we find Hayden (Wedgwood 1909:2) welcoming the forthcoming book, while Williamson (1909: xi & 4) refers approvingly to the forthcoming Exhibition. The conjunction continued: the V&A library accessioned Williamson's book on 22 December 1909, and the Exhibition catalogue, a gift from the firm, the very next day.

[35] The possibility of damage to its ceramic collection is a constant worry for the curatorial staff of any great museum, and there is no reason to suppose that the SHM is an exception. Everybody knows that ceramic objects, being brittle, can easily suffer damage in normal use or while being moved. What is less widely appreciated is how easily ceramics can be damaged, even within the peaceful environment of a museum, where they are typically housed in such seemingly safe refuges as locked display cases, or on strong shelves in reserve areas inaccessible to visitors. Hazards that can harm intact pots, or which may disturb previous attempts at conservation, include inappropriate illumination, humidity or ventilation; mould spores, chemicals or other pollutants carried in the atmosphere; fluctuations in ambient temperature; and use of unsuitable materials or methods by former conservators or in the construction of the refuges themselves. Being subjected to vibration, and being knocked or bumped into, are also significant hazards, all the greater when space is limited and pots have to be displayed or stored close to one another or actually in contact. Other things being equal, moreover, earthenware is less robust than porcelain and, as noted above, on-glaze enamel decoration is particularly vulnerable to mechanical damage.

[36] Williamson also contributes here to the uncertainty about the spelling of the French word 'grenouillère' which has infected English sources ever since the 18th century. Which is right, the 'ère' form or the 'ière' form? Williamson continued to use 'ière' (1925:223). According to Voronikhina, Catherine used 'ère' (1995:14), while Liackhova cites James Harris, writing in June 1777, as using 'ière' (1995:208). In the 19th century Eliza Meteyard also went for 'ière' (1866:II:274). The Wedgwood Museum has not been consistent: its former Director, Gaye Blake Roberts, has used 'ère' (Raeburn *et al.* 1995:38) and this form has been used within the Museum, which says in a display caption that the service 'was intended for a Russian palace called La Grenouillère...', but the Museum's own website has used 'ière'. Kelly says that 'English writers have *usually* referred to the palace as La Grenouillère' (my emphasis) (1980:557). Note, however, that *Robert*, the authoritative French dictionary, gives the word as 'grenouillère' and offers not the faintest hint of a possible alternative spelling, so this long-lasting 'War of the Word', like some real wars, may be the result of a mistake.

[37] This lycée, known as the *Imperial Lyceum*, was founded by Tsar Alexander I. In 1844 it was transferred to St Petersburg where it remained in operation until 1917.

[38] Nowadays, when Russian sources refer to them (or to the battle) in English, they usually do so as *Chesme*, though the forms *Chesma*, *Chesmen*, *Chesman* and *Chesmé* are also sometimes used.

[39] Peter Yurievich Sobolev is a one-man wonder who, armed only with his camera and his 'Wandering Camera' website has, since the 1990s, produced a visual history of innumerable places and buildings in and around St Petersburg, echoing the number and variety of the British images on the Green Frog service itself.

[40] Estimates of the number of serfs vary considerably, partly because of the existence of more than one category of unfree Russian peasants. A census in 1719 conducted by Peter the Great found that about 80% of peasants were unfree. By 1857, when there was another census, state peasants, who were nominally free but whose freedom of movement was restricted, accounted for about 37% of the total Russian population and a further 37% were true private serfs.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Matthew S (1954) 'Great Britain and the Russo-Turkish War of 1768–74' *The English Historical Review* Vol 69, No 270, January 1954: 39–58
- Chatenet, Madeleine du (1996) *L'amiral Jean-Baptiste de Traversay: un Français ministre de la Marine des Tsars* (in French) Paris: Éditions Tallandier
- Cross, Anthony G (ed) (1979) *Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth Century: Contacts and Comparisons* Newtonville, Massachusetts: Oriental Research Partners
- Cross, Anthony G (1985) "The Great Patroness of the North: Catherine II's role in fostering Anglo-Russian Cultural Contacts" *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, XVIII
- Cross, Anthony G (1997) *By the Banks of the Neva: Chapters from the Lives and Careers of the British in Eighteenth Century Russia* Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press
- Cross, Anthony G (2001) 'Alexander Baxter, Russia's first Consul-General in London' *Newsletter of the Study Group on Eighteenth Century Russia* Vol 29: 14–21
- Dahn, Jo (2000) 'Mrs Delany and Ceramics in the Objectscape' *Interpreting Ceramics* Vol 1
- Dawson, Aileen (1995) *Masterpieces of Wedgwood* (Revised edition) London: British Museum Press
- Encyclopaedia of St Petersburg* (2003 and continuing) [published first as a book and later online, to mark the 300th anniversary of the founding of the city] St Petersburg: published (in Russian and English) under the general management of the Likhachev Foundation
- Georgi, I G (1794) *Description of the Russian Imperial Capital St Petersburg and the sights of note in its environs* (in Russian) St Petersburg
- Hall, Augusta (Lady Llanover) (ed) (1861 & 1862) *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs Delany:...* (Volumes 1–5) London: Richard Bentley
- Hayden, Arthur – see Wedgwood (1909)
- Honey, W B (1948) *Wedgwood Ware* London: Faber & Faber
- Johnson, C A (1979) 'Wedgwood and Bentley's "Frog" Service for Catherine the Great' – in Cross (1979): 123–133
- Kelly, Alison (1980) 'Wedgwood's Catherine Services' *Burlington Magazine* Vol 122, No 929, August 1980: 554–562
- Liachhova, Lydia (1995) 'The Frog Service in Russia' – in Young 1995: 207–212
- Lyall, Robert (1825) 'History of the Orlof Family': Appendix V [pages 498–516] – in Vol 2 of *Travels in Russia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Georgia* (two volumes) Edinburgh: W Blackwood; and London: T Cadell

- Meteyard, Eliza (1865 & 1866) *The Life of Josiah Wedgwood, from his private correspondence and family papers...* (two volumes) London: Hurst and Blackett
- Munro, George E (2008) *The Most Intentional City: St Petersburg in the reign of Catherine the Great* Madison and Teaneck, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press
- Newfield, Gabriel (2009) 'The Green Frog service: its life in Russia' *Impressions* No 6 (Special Issue), February 2009 London: The Wedgwood Society (of Great Britain)
- Norman, Geraldine (1997) *The Hermitage: The Biography of a Great Museum* London: Jonathan Cape
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford DNB)* (online 2004 and continuing) Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Raeburn, Michael (1992) 'Wedgwood and Bentley's Green Frog Service outside Russia' *Antiques* Vol 141, March 1992: 450-59
- Raeburn, Michael, Ludmila Voronikhina & Andrew Nurnberg (eds) (1995) (Raeburn *et al.* 1995) *The Green Frog Service: Wedgwood & Bentley's Imperial Russian Service* London: Cacklegoose Press, in association with the State Hermitage, St Petersburg
- Raeburn, Michael (1995a) 'Catherine the Great and the image of Britain' – in Raeburn *et al.* (1995): 42–56
- Reilly, Robin (1989) *Wedgwood* (two volumes) London: Macmillan
- Reilly, Robin (1995) *Wedgwood: The New Illustrated Dictionary* Woodbridge: Antique Collectors' Club
- Roosevelt, Priscilla R (1991) 'Emerald Thrones and Living Statues: Theater and Theatricality on the Russian estate' *Russian Review* Vol 50, No 1, January 1991: 1–23
- Roosevelt, Priscilla R (1995) *Life on the Russian Country Estate: A Social and Cultural History* New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Scott, Hamish M (2004) 'Charles Schaw Cathcart, 9th Lord Cathcart, 1721–1776' – in *Oxford DNB*
- Shvidkovsky, Dmitri (1996) *The Empress and the Architect: British Architecture and Gardens at the Court of Catherine the Great* New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Shvidkovsky, Dmitri (2007) *Russian Architecture and the West* New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Suslov, Vitali (1994) *The State Hermitage: Masterpieces from the Museum's Collections: European Art, Russian Art and Culture* (two volumes) London: Booth-Clibborn Editions
- Svetlov, Matvei (1782) *The Sights of Note at Chesme Palace, situated on the Moscow Road seven versts from St Petersburg* (in Russian) St Petersburg
- Tarlé, Yevgeni (1945) *The Battle of Chesme and the first Russian Expedition to the Archipelago, 1769–74* (in Russian) Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR
- Viltchkovsky, Sergei (1910) *Tsarskoe Selo* (in Russian) Tsarskoe Selo: Palace Administration
- Voronikhina, Ludmila (1962) *The Service with the Green Frog* (in Russian) Leningrad [now St Petersburg]: State Hermitage Museum
- Voronikhina, Ludmila (1995) 'The Green Frog Service and its History in Russia' – in Raeburn *et al.* (1995): 9–16
- Warner, Richard H (2004) 'Sir Samuel Greig, 1735–1788' – in *Oxford DNB*
- Wedgwood (1909) *Catalogue of Wedgwood Exhibition held at 11 Conduit Street, London, W. December 1909* [with introductory essay by Arthur Hayden] [Place of publication not given]: Josiah Wedgwood & Sons, Ltd
- Wedgwood (2010) 'The Catherine Service' on the firm's website: *Official Wedgwood Site*, under heading 'About Wedgwood - Heritage Products'
- Williamson, George C (1909) *The Imperial Russian Dinner Service: a story of a famous work by Josiah Wedgwood* London: George Bell and Sons

Williamson, George C (1925) *Stories of an Expert* London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd
Williamson, George C (1925a) 'The Russian Dinner Service' – in Williamson (1925): 218–237
Woolfe, John, James Gandon and Matthias Darly (1771) *Vitruvius Britannicus; or, The British Architect: containing.....* (Volume 5) London: [the authors]
Young, Hilary (ed) (1995) *The Genius of Wedgwood* London

Appendix 1 – How to find Chesme Palace and Chesme church in St Petersburg today

Both lie in what is now Greater St Petersburg, approximately 8½ km (5½ miles) due south of the Hermitage. Close to one another, they are situated towards the north of the Moskovskiy rayon (Moscow District), between Moskovskiy prospekt (Moscow Avenue) to the west, and prospekt Yuriya Gagarina (Yury Gagarin Avenue) to the east; just north of Moskovskaya ploshchad (Moscow Square). Moskovskiy prospekt is a section of the great M10 road which runs south all the way from the border with Finland via St Petersburg to Moscow. The nearest Metro stations are Moskovskaya (Moscow) and Park Pobedy (Victory Park).

The palace's address is ulitsa Gastello 15 (15 Gastello Street). It is generally referred to in English as Chesme (or Chesmenskiy) Palace. It is harder to find than the church, being now totally embedded within the State University of Aerospace Instrumentation (SUAI). Searchers are advised to ask directions to the State University, or to the palace itself, and then look out for the triangular palace's distinctive central tower, or one of its turrets, all of which are visible from outside the University's perimeter (see Figures 24–29 on pages 20–22 above). It is not open to visitors.

The church's address is ulitsa Lensoveta 12 (12 Lensoveta Street). It is generally referred to in English as Chesme church, or the Church of St John the Baptist at Chesme Palace. It is impossible to miss it, standing by itself with no nearby buildings, its entire outer surface covered with vertical white ribs against a pink background, looking like a gigantic piece of *patisserie*. It is open to visitors.



1825



1830

Appendix 2 – Some main unanswered questions

When did Catherine first think of building the palace where the service was to be located? [see pages 4–7 *passim* and Note 16 on page 26]

When did Catherine first think of commissioning the service? [see page 7]

Why did Catherine want every piece of the service to bear the image of a frog? [see pages 4 & 9 and Note 19 on page 27]

What happened to the service between its arrival in Russia in 1774 and its transfer to the new palace, presumably soon after construction was completed in 1777? [see page 9 and Note 18 on pages 26 & 27]

How was the transfer effected? [see page 9]

What did the interior of the palace look like in the 18th century? There are written descriptions, but are there any surviving paintings, engravings or (later) photographs of the interior? If they exist, where are they? Can they be seen? [see page 9]

How many extra pieces were made by the Imperial Porcelain Factory in St Petersburg to augment the service on occasions when the number at table was expected to exceed 50? Were further extra pieces made to allow for breakage? [see pages 14 & 15]

Was publication of George Williamson's book on the service in 1909 subsidised? If so, by whom? [see Note 33 on page 29]

Has a report been prepared assessing the present condition of the service? If so, what does it tell us, and can it be seen? [see pages 18 & 19 and Note 35 on page 29]

When did the admission of veterans to Chesme Palace cease? When were any of them last in residence? [see page 20]

There is also a cluster of questions about the place name Kekerekeksinen. [see page 5]
[They are identified, examined and, at least in part, answered in Appendix 3 below.]

Appendix 3 – Kekerekeksinen: the enigma of an 18th century Ingrian place name

[This Appendix is about the place name Kekerekeksinen as a word, with only passing reference to the place itself. In order to make it largely self-contained, with its own Notes and Bibliography, some material from the main text is repeated in the first section.]

Where it happened

The Green Frog service was commissioned by the Russian Empress Catherine II (‘Catherine the Great’) early in 1773 and, unusually with a service for such a client at that time, was to be made not of porcelain but of earthenware. Every piece of the service was, at her direction, to bear the image of a green frog. From the outset it was her intention that it would be kept and used at a new palace, not yet built, to be located at a place called Kekerekeksinen which consisted chiefly of marshy ground inhabited by frogs. The place lay about 8 ½ km (5 ½ miles) due south of the Winter Palace, itself located in the heart of the still young city of St Petersburg. The city had been established by Tsar Peter I (‘Peter the Great’) in 1703 in the Swedish Baltic province of Ingria, the conquest – more correctly, re-

conquest – of which by Russia had not been completed until the summer of that year. In 1710 Ingria was renamed, and later became the Russian province of St Petersburg.[1]

Numerous published accounts, from the 1770s to the present, claim that in the 18th century the indigenous inhabitants of Ingria were mainly speakers of Finnish, that the place was known to them as *Kekerekeksinen* – henceforth, for brevity and variety, and where judged appropriate, “the ‘K` word” – and that this was the Finnish word for a frog marsh. (To say it, begin by saying each syllable separately: ‘keck-eray-kecks-inn-enn`.) There was a raised mound there, on which stood a long-established wooden building that courtiers, and Catherine herself, sometimes referred to as the *Kekerekeksinskiy* or imperial dacha. The new palace was built, over the period 1774 to 1777, on the same mound. Initially its official name was *Kekerekeksinskiy Palace*, though Catherine spoke of the site, and the palace itself, as *La Grenouillère*, a French name for a marsh or swamp populated by frogs. Later, in 1780, the palace’s name was changed to *Chesme Palace*.

The enigma of the ‘K` word

What makes the word puzzling is that close examination of the seemingly straightforward and uncontested claims about it reveal a very different true situation, both complicated and unresolved. There is no reason to doubt that in the 18th century the Russian court and the local population knew the place as *Kekerekeksinen*. [2] Did the locals speak Finnish? It is safer to say that they spoke one or more of the Baltic-Finnic languages of the Finno-Ugric language family that were in colloquial use in Ingria in the 17th and 18th centuries: Ingrian Finnish; also Izhorian, Vepsian and Votic. [3] And clearly the palace was built on a frog marsh. What is problematic are the associated claims: that *kekerekeksinen* was a Finnish word; and that, while it was indeed the name of the place, it also had a particular meaning, namely ‘frog marsh’. ‘Kekerekeks` sounds very different from *sammakko*, the usual Finnish word for ‘frog’, and from *suo*, the word for ‘marsh’, though the ending ‘-inen` is unmistakably Finnish. [4] The claims are, however, supported by many reputable sources, including the State Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg (henceforth ‘SHM’) and – until 2014, when it became the *V&A Wedgwood Collection* (see [8] below) – the Wedgwood Museum in Staffordshire. The evidence I have found suggests that both claims are at best unsubstantiated and misleading.

I came to this view after consulting several scholars familiar with the Finnic languages. I first approached Jyrki Kalliokoski. [5] Before responding to me he consulted major Finnish reference works and colleagues familiar with the history and meaning of Finnish words. He informed me that none of the latter had come across *kekerekeksinen*. In his opinion, although the word had a Finnish structure, it had no discernible meaning and sounded like a nonsense word. Manja Lehto, who has written extensively on the languages of Ingria, also saw it as a nonsense word, and had found no evidence of it in any of the original languages of the St Petersburg region. [6] We are all familiar with pseudowords, words that have no meaning and appear in no dictionary, but could only belong to a specific language, such as many of the invented words in Lewis Carroll’s ‘English’ poem *Jabberwocky* (itself a pseudoword). [7]

Yet if this is true, why does virtually every published account say, without qualification, that the ‘K` word means ‘frog marsh’? Ludmila Voronikhina of the SHM, for example, cites an old (1777) Russian source, which states that the palace was built ‘... in a place called *Kekerekeksinen*, the Finnish for Frog Marsh` (1995:9). And Lydia Liachhova, also of the SHM: ‘...

Kekerekeksinen being the Finnish...for frog marsh...' (1995:207). Note the terms of the claim, not that the 'K' word meant frog marsh in an unspecified Finnic language but that it did so in Finnish. The same claim is made by many other sources.[8] [9] I suspect that this is an instance of a common phenomenon: once a statement, true or false, appears in print, later writers simply copy it, often using virtually the same words, when it comes from a reputable author or the publication itself is regarded as generally reliable.

Was the 'K' word an onomatopoeia?

If the 'K' word was not a Finnish word meaning frog marsh, what was it? Any credible explanation must acknowledge that there was a frog marsh, that the word was a place name used by the local inhabitants when they referred to it, and that the languages they spoke were definitely Finnic. What else is known? We know that the propensity of people to give names to places is virtually universal among human societies. We know that there are many different kinds of place name, and that some refer to a significant feature of the place that bears the name. We also know that this can be no more than a characteristic sound, such as the rushing of water, the roaring of wind or the sound made by a particular kind of bird or animal that inhabits the place. The latter may be, for instance, the familiar cawing of crows, the howling of wolves, or the croaking of frogs. Place names are sometimes found, onomatopoeic names, that attempt to simulate such sounds. And as with all onomatopoeic words, the constituent elements of these names typically have no prior meaning in the relevant language.

In 1985 Peter Hayden suggested that the place name Kekerekeksinen was an onomatopoeia simulating the sound of frogs croaking: '*kekere-keks-inen, kekere-keks-inen*' (1985:19-20).[10] Without suggesting any direct link, he pointed to a similarity between this sound and the sound attributed to croaking frogs by Aristophanes in his play *The Frogs* (first performed at Athens in or about 405 BCE). A rough English translation of what Aristophanes's frogs repeatedly chant (in Greek, of course) is: *brekekekèx-koàx-koáx, brekekekèx-koàx-koáx*.



Rana ridibunda (European Marsh Frog)
Photographer: Wolfgang Wüster 2004
Copyright © Wolfgang Wüster



Rana ridibunda (European Marsh Frog)
Photographer: Sergius Kuzmin 1999
Copyright © Pensoft Publishers

The testimony of Lars-Gunnar Larsson lends support to Hayden's onomatopoeia hypothesis.[11] He has pointed out that when people represent a sound onomatopoeically, they tend to do so in a way that reflects the sound patterns of their own language. As evidence he draws attention to the different ways in which the croaking of frogs of the same species

is represented in various European languages.[12] Larsson has also pointed out that different frog species make different sounds. What were the frogs at Kekerekeksinen? Larsson, who is interested in the geographical distribution of frog species, suggests that they were almost certainly the European Marsh Frog (*Rana ridibunda*, also known as *Pelophylax ridibundus*), which is known to have been prevalent in Ingria. Members of the species are, as can be seen, generally green. (To see many more photographs of them, go to *Rana ridibunda* online.)

It is reasonable to suppose, moreover, that when the Latin species name 'ridibunda', meaning 'laughing', was assigned in the 1770s, this was because the sound the frogs made was distinctive and resembled the sound of human laughter or chuckling. And if *kekere-keks* is an onomatopoeic representation of this sound, it is hardly surprising that it bears no resemblance to *sammakko*, since the latter, even were it also onomatopoeic, would more likely be simulating the sound made by other frog species commoner further north on the Finnish mainland. Larsson has observed that *kekere-keks* resembles more closely the Hungarian representation, of which he gives two examples, *brekekeks* from a 1788 source, and a contemporary one, *brekeg-rekeg*. Note the difference between the main Finnish representation, from north of the Gulf of Finland – *kurr-kurr-kroak* – and the Hungarian representations. The closer resemblance between *kekere-keks* (Ingria) and *brekeg-rekeg* (Hungary) is more plausibly explained, he suggests, by the fact that *Rana ridibunda* is the main frog species in both places.

An additional comment bearing on Hayden's onomatopoeia hypothesis is provided by Alan Sommerstein in his edition of *The Frogs* (1997). He agrees that Aristophanes was attempting to represent onomatopoeically the sound made by *Rana ridibunda*.

Was Kekerekeksinen an onomatopoeia? My provisional conclusion is that *kekerekeks* was probably an onomatopoeic coinage that attempted to simulate the sound made by the abundant local frogs, and that at some point, by adding *-inen* at the end, a new word, *kekerekeksinen*, came into use, which in turn became the name of the place. There are, however, other possibilities.

Other possible explanations

If the place name Kekerekeksinen was, or came from, an onomatopoeia, how can we account for the emergence of the claim that it was a Finnish word that meant frog marsh? Could it be a word, like 'quark' in nuclear physics, that had lacked a clear or accepted meaning yet later acquired one? Or, a more serious possibility, could the claim have arisen through a misunderstanding between incomers and members of the local population? When people who speak different languages meet, and each has a good command of the other's language, effective communication can take place and the likelihood of communication failure is not much greater than between native speakers of the same language. By contrast, when they have no knowledge of each other's language, the scope for verbal communication of any kind is limited. In between, however, where each has a partial command of the other's language, communication can take place but misunderstandings can readily occur, the more so if each wants it to appear that their mastery of the language of the other is greater than is actually the case, or mistakenly believes this to be so. And the more complicated the topic of verbal exchange the greater the risk, especially if one party has asked questions and has failed to appreciate that they lack a simple answer.

This could have been the situation when Russian or Swedish incomers spoke with the local inhabitants before – perhaps a long time before – the reign of Catherine II. Suppose that the incomers wanted to know about them, and the place, and questioned them. The locals could have been uncertain how much the incomers wanted to know, and would probably have begun by trying to convey basic facts, such as that the place was a frog marsh, and that the whole, including any building on it, was commonly called Kekerekeksinen. One can imagine their finding it somewhat harder to explain that while this word might be taken as Finnish, it did not figure in any Finnic lexicon, that its sound and structure were probably inspired by the croaking of the marsh's frogs – and that they were a Finnic people. Misinterpreting what they had heard, the incomers may have believed they had been told that the place bore the name Kekerekeksinen, which was also the Finnish word for a frog marsh. I do not know if this actually happened, but it could have. And if it did, perhaps more than once, the misunderstanding could then have been repeated, perhaps many times, by the incomers – who were likely to have been seen as of higher status than the locals, and their testimony therefore likely (and wholly undeservedly) to be seen as credible – and in time have become firmly established.

The question remains, can we be sure that Kekerekeksinen was, or was derived from, an onomatopoeia? While this seems the most likely explanation, there are other possibilities. One is that when the local inhabitants referred to Kekerekeksinen, they were using a historic place name which, in a Finnic language once spoken in the area but no longer spoken there, had meant frog marsh. Another is that some of the locals spoke a Finnic language in which the 'K' word meant, or had meant, 'frog marsh'.^[13] Over the centuries there had been major population movements, so either of these guesses could be true, especially as the Finnic languages spoken in Ingria at this period are imperfectly documented. My modest linguistic talents have prevented me from investigating these possibilities myself, since there are no sources accessible to me on the history of the languages of Ingria or on ancient Ingrian place names.^[14] However, Larsson has commented (personal communication) that to the best of his knowledge there are no comprehensive dictionaries of 18th century Ingrian Finnish, and likewise an absence of the other dictionaries that would help in solving the puzzle.^[15] And, as is well known, the fact that a search for something has been unsuccessful at a point in time cannot in itself count as evidence that it does not exist, whether it be the yeti, the Higgs boson, a black swan, the planet Neptune – or merely a strange word. Hence, in spite of the evidence to the contrary provided by Lehto and others (see page 34 above), it is impossible to disprove conclusively the notion that at some time in the past there may have been a local word, somewhat like *kekere-keks*, with the following features: that it had a definite meaning: 'frog' or 'frog marsh'; that it was in use in Ingria during or before the 18th century; and that it was from this word that the marsh eventually got its name.

A further possibility is that the word was indeed onomatopoeic, but that it had been coined as a nonce word by incomers and only later adopted by the local inhabitants. Suppose that when the original wooden building was erected on the frog marsh, courtiers or other incomers had suggested calling the place (or the building itself, as discussed below) something like Kekerekeksinen, deliberately inventing an onomatopoeia, and at the same time giving the word a Finnish twist – the distinctive -inen at the end – to reflect its location, perhaps for the amusement of one of Catherine's predecessors. This is only a

conjecture, but it is in principle testable, since it would be possible to seek evidence on when the wooden building was erected, whether it, or the place, ever had a different name, when the 'K' word was first used, and whether there are any surviving documents of the period, referring to the building or the place, that throw light on whether the 'K' word was first used by incomers and later by the locals, or the other way round.

The conjecture points to yet another possibility. Is the assumption correct, that the frog marsh acquired or already possessed a name, which was later given to the wooden building, or was it the building's name that was given to the marsh? If the latter, this would be an instance of the common phenomenon of a smaller unit giving its name to a larger one, as when a local natural feature or man-made structure gives its name to a village or town, which in turn may give its name to an even larger political or administrative division. Familiar examples are the English counties whose name originated from a special place on a river, stream or other wet area where crossing was – or had been made – possible, convenient and reasonably safe, for people and/or animals, by means of a ford or bridge. And the further English counties whose modern name is derived from an ancient fortress or fort, usually Roman.[16] In Russia we need look no further than St Petersburg itself, where a name given originally to a wooden church and then to a fortress became, within a few years, the name of the imperial capital city and then of the province where the city was located. So we could also investigate the plausible, and in principle testable, hypothesis that the frog marsh acquired its name from the wooden building.

The enigma unravelled?

It is tempting to conclude that Kekerekeksinen was a place name of onomatopoeic origin; that the local inhabitants, speakers of a Finnic language, gave it to the frog marsh; and that, though widely used to refer to the marsh, it had no meaning on its own. Also that, in the circumstances, the word's possessing Finnic features and reflecting the sound made by the frogs that lived there is not surprising. There are, however, other possible explanations that have to be taken seriously, so the solution remains elusive. But it has surely been shown that the unqualified claims with which we began, that the 'K' word is a Finnish word that means 'frog marsh' – or at least once meant 'frog marsh' – are not tenable.[17] Indeed nobody, it seems, has produced evidence that the 'K' word had a definite meaning in any of the languages in use in Ingria in the 18th century.

Notes

[1] Ingria, the land of the Ingrians, was also known as Ingermanland. This was the name by which the region was known to the Swedes, who referred to its ancient Finnic inhabitants as Ingers. In some contexts the names were used interchangeably to refer to the same geographical entity. Ingria was formally ceded to Russia in 1721.

[2] The Russian architectural historian Dmitri Shvidkovsky claims, without citing a source, that in doing so they were using a name that it already possessed in the 17th century, when Ingria was under Swedish dominion (1996:187), Ingria having been Swedish from 1617 to 1703 and at various earlier periods. I suggest, however, that although Finnish is one of Sweden's minority languages, and the form of the name is Finnic, further evidence would be needed to confirm the claim that the name originated during one of these periods of heightened Swedish influence. I am still hoping to find evidence on when the 'K' word was first used as a place name.

[3] The accounts I have found, all from Russian or English sources, say without qualification that they were speakers of Finnish.

[4] Since *-inen* is a Finnish adjective-forming suffix, it is reasonable to surmise that if *kekere-keks* on its own had been a noun that meant 'frog marsh', adding *-inen* would have created a new adjectival form meaning something like 'similar to or resembling a frog marsh'. As for the Finnish word for 'frog', modern dictionaries of standard Finnish give only one word: *sammakko*. My attempts to discover whether there were any others were largely unsuccessful. I found only one, mentioned by Terho Itkonen in his article (1983) on the dialectal history of Finnish and other Finno-Ugric languages. He offers *konnikkainen* as a dialectal word for frog, but without any clear detail on when or where it was in use.

[5] Personal communication (2007) from Professor Kalliokoski, professor of Finnish Language and head of the department of Finnish, Finno-Ugric and Scandinavian Languages at the University of Helsinki (Finland).

[6] Personal communication (2008) from Dr Lehto, then lecturing in Finno-Ugric Languages at the University of Lund (Sweden), and author of *Ingrian Finnish: dialect preservation and change* (Monograph No 23 in the series: *Studia Uralica Upsaliensia*) Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1996. She has also been responsible for the Ingrian section of an ongoing 'Database for endangered Finno-Ugric languages' Corpus Linguistics project, sponsored by the General Linguistics division of the University of Helsinki.

[7] It was first published in full in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking Glass* (1871) and begins:

'Twas brillig and the slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe;
all mimsy were the borogoves, and the mome raths outgrabe.

[8] Anthony Cross 'The palace was called Kekerekeksinskii, deriving from the Finnish word meaning "frog marsh" ...' (1997:266). *Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg* '... built in Kekerekeksinen, meaning "frog marsh" in Finnish, ...' under heading 'Chesme Palace' (2003 and continuing). Peter Hayden 'The green frog device which...derives from the Finnish name for the place, Kekerekeksinen' (1985:19). Tristram Hunt '... Kekerekeksinen being the Finnish for frog mound' (2021:151). C A Johnson '... it was destined for the palace of La Grenouillère (from the Finnish name of the place, Kekerekeksin, "a place of many frogs") ...' (1979:124). Alison Kelly '... the site, which has been known, in Finnish, as Kekerikeksinsk [sic], or frog marsh.' (1980:557). A & V Kennett 'The site of the palace had a Finnish name, Kekerekeksinen, meaning "frog marsh" ...' (1973:76). Dmitri Shvidkovsky 'The spot where the castle stood had been known in Finnish, since before the days of Peter the Great, as Kekerekekshi [sic], or the Marsh of Frogs ...' (1996:187). State Hermitage Museum (St Petersburg) 'La Grenouillère, as Catherine called the palace (translating the Finnish name, meaning "frog marsh", into French) ...' (website: 2006 and continuing, under heading 'The Dinner Set for the Russian Empress: the later history of the Green Frog Service'). Marina Vaizey 'The local Finnish name of the spot ... was "Kekerekeksinen" ... meaning "frog marsh", ...' (2016:51) Wedgwood Museum [England] '... a place called Kekerekeksinen, the Finnish for Frog Marsh.', under several headings, including 'Trade with Russia' (website: 2008 and continuing until 2014 when, its survival threatened, its status and its official name were altered and the original website ceased to exist). Wikipedia: several entries, for which it would be unfair to hold it wholly responsible, such as '... area that was known as kekerekeksinen (Finnish: frog swamp) ...' in entry on Chesme Church.

[9] Ludmila Voronikhina (1995:9) says: 'The explanation is given in the Appendix to the *Kamerfuriersky Zhurnal* (daily journal), 1777, V, St Petersburg, 1881, p.48.' (1995:9). The *Kamer-fur'erskii tseremonial'nyi Zhurnal* (its full title) was a ceremonial register, launched in 1695, giving day-by-day details of court activities. I found that, although the 1777 volume had been reissued in 1881, both

original and reissue were remarkably hard to find, and my many attempts to get access to the relevant page were unsuccessful. For a long time I had been assuming that the explanation mentioned by Voronikhina was an explanation of the origin and meaning of the 'K' word, which was why I thought it essential to track down a copy so that I could see the exact wording. I am indebted to Michael Raeburn (personal communication, 2013) for suggesting that I had misread Voronikhina: that she was actually referring to the explanation for Catherine's choice of a green frog to decorate the service. Raeburn is co-editor and joint author of a superb volume, the only complete and definitive account of the Green Frog service (Raeburn *et al.* 1995)

[10] Personal communications (2007 and 2008) from Peter Hayden, lecturer, writer and garden historian. He is fluent in Russian and has written extensively on Russia and Russian gardens, including *Russian Parks and Gardens* London: Frances Lincoln, 2005.

[11] Personal communications (2008 and 2009) from Professor Larsson, now emeritus and until 2012 professor of Finno-Ugric Languages at Uppsala University (Sweden). He has been general editor of the series *Studia Uralica Upsaliensia*. I am greatly indebted to Larsson for his comments on earlier drafts, for a number of valuable suggestions, and for his advice on what is known and – just as important – what is not known, about language use in Ingria in the 18th century. He also shares with me an interest in frogs. Of particular relevance to the mystery of the 'K' word is his contribution to a *Festschrift* (2008).

[12] Some present day examples (not all Larsson's) of how the sounds made by some common frog species have been represented in some European languages: Bulgarian and Lithuanian: *kva-kva*; Czech: *kvá-kvá*; English: *quack-quack*; Estonian: *krooks-krooks*; Finnish: *kurr-kurr-kroak*; French: *croak-croak*; German: *quak-quak*; Italian: *cra-cra*; Russian: *kva-kat*.

[13] I am not going to enter the continuing and sometimes acrimonious debate about the difference between a language and a dialect. I merely observe that use of the term 'dialect' often goes with ascription of inferior status. The very old Russian claim, for instance, that Ukrainian was a dialect of Russian was undoubtedly a claim that it was 'only' a dialect, not a true language. It seems that some of the Finnish scholars who have defined Ingrian Finnish as a dialect of standard Finnish have based their judgment as much on social and political as on linguistic criteria. In this paper Ingrian Finnish is seen as the main colloquial language of the speech community of Ingrian Finns.

[14] It would be useful to possess a good reading knowledge of Russian, Swedish and Finnish. It would be desirable also to be familiar with the languages spoken in Ingria in the 17th and 18th centuries, though this would be hard to achieve since, as noted above, there were several such languages, they are generally not well-documented, and the position is complicated by dialectal variation.

[15] Dictionaries do exist for a number of the languages that were in use in Ingria during or before the 18th century, when the 'K' word may have originated, but they are not comprehensive historical dictionaries of the kind needed. There are three main reasons for this state of affairs. First, although they contain ancient forms and words, like all dictionaries they are incomplete, since lexicographers can never fully capture a spoken language: there will always be words they have missed and words they have judged insufficiently established to warrant inclusion. Second, there is an inescapable dearth of old written sources in which old words may be found. And third, their compilers, like all of us, are fallible.

[16] Some English examples. 'ford' and 'bridge' counties: Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire; 'fortress' and 'fort' counties: Cheshire; Gloucestershire, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Worcestershire. Also a number of cities and towns, such as: Bradford and Chelmsford; Trowbridge and Uxbridge; Doncaster and Winchester.

[17] I remain convinced that this is true, but have failed dismally to persuade others. In 2009 and 2010 I sent copies of the first version of this Appendix to many key people and organizations, including most of those then named or referred to in the relevant paragraph of the Acknowledgments section above or in the Appendix itself, but the problematic claims about the 'K' word are still being advanced, without qualification, often in the same places.

Bibliography

- Cross, Anthony G (1997) *By the Banks of the Neva: Chapters from the Lives and Careers of the British in 18th Century Russia* Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press
- Encyclopaedia of Saint Petersburg* (2003 and continuing) [published first as a book and later online] St Petersburg: published in Russian and English under the general management of the Likhachev Foundation
- Hayden, Peter (1985) 'British Seats on Imperial Russian Tables' *Garden History* Vol 13, No 1, Spring 1985: 17–32
- Hunt, Tristram (2021) *The Radical Potter: Josiah Wedgwood and the Transformation of Britain* London: Allen Lane (Penguin Random House UK)
- Itkonen, Terho (1983) 'Välikatsaus suomen kielen juuriin' *Virittäjä* (in Finnish) 1983: 190–229
- Johnson C A (1979) 'Wedgwood and Bentley's "Frog" Service for Catherine the Great' (123–133) – in Anthony G Cross (ed) *Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth Century: Contacts and Comparisons* Newtonville, Massachusetts: Oriental Research Partners
- Kelly, Alison (1980) 'Wedgwood's Catherine Services' *Burlington Magazine* Vol 122, No 929, August 1980: 554–562
- Kennett, A & V (1973) *The Palaces of Leningrad* London: Thames & Hudson
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar (2008) 'Om grodors kväkande' ['If frogs croak'] (106–114) in Ulla Börestam, Satu Gröndahl and Boglárka Straszer (eds) *Revitalisera mera! En artikelsamling om den språkliga mångfalden i Norden tillägnad Leena Huss* (Uppsala Multiethnic Papers, No 50) (in Swedish) Uppsala: Uppsala University (Centre for Multiethnic Research)
- Liachova, Lydia (1995) 'The Frog Service in Russia' (207–212) – in Hilary Young (ed) *The Genius of Wedgwood* London: Victoria & Albert Museum
- Raeburn, Michael, Ludmila Voronikhina and Andrew Nurnberg (eds) (1995) (Raeburn *et al.* 1995) *The Green Frog Service: Wedgwood & Bentley's Imperial Russian Service* London: Cacklegoose Press, in association with the State Hermitage, St Petersburg
- Shvidkovsky, Dmitri (1996) *The Empress and the Architect: British Architecture and Gardens at the Court of Catherine the Great* New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Sommerstein, Alan H (ed) (1997) [The] *Frogs* (Classical Texts) by Aristophanes (The Comedies of Aristophanes, Vol 9) Warminster: Aris & Phillips
- Vaizey, Marina (2016) 'Science into Art, Art into Science' *The Tretyakov Gallery Magazine* 2016: No 2
- Voronikhina, Ludmila (1995) 'The Green Frog Service and its History in Russia' (9–16) – in Raeburn *et al.* (1995)

* * * * *

Feedback

I will be grateful to any reader who can –

- help to fill gaps in my account by offering additional non-trivial information or suggesting further plausible speculations or useful lines of enquiry
- suggest others whom I might approach for advice
- draw my attention to any dubious, misleading or factually incorrect statements

Please send comments, enquiries and other messages to the author and publisher:

gabrielnewfield@tiscali.co.uk,

As far as possible all messages will be acknowledged. In the light of comments received and the outcome of further investigation the work may be further revised, so future copies may differ from this one, which was first issued in **May 2022**.

Gabriel Newfield was a university teacher. “I have always had, and have retained, a number of interests outside academic life, including various kinds of voluntary work. In the 1990s I became seriously involved in several new pursuits, including the study and conservation of (mainly British) ceramics and, until recently, long-distance walking. I am now quite old (91) and live in St Albans in Hertfordshire (England).”



1883



1917

Republican coat of arms

In the early 1990s, after the USSR (Soviet Union) fell apart, the Russian Federation restored the two-headed eagle to the Russian coat of arms. Resplendent in gold against a deep red background, it is a new version that can be viewed online without difficulty. It can also be saved and printed, but only, as far as I have been able to find out, on payment of a fee.



Serving dish, painted view, image of green frog in border, in V&A (London)

Copyright © Victoria and Albert Museum

This dish, not part of the service, is shown as an example of what pieces of the service look like. It was made by Wedgwood in the early 1770s, at the same time as the service, but not sent to Russia. The painted view shows the gardens at Sir Francis Dashwood's West Wycombe estate in Buckinghamshire. It was copied from an engraving by William Woollett (1735–1785), which must have been made when the gardens were quite new, as they had only been laid out in the mid-1700s.