ABSTRACT

French tin-glazed earthenware, or faience, is commonly found during excavations in mainland North America, where it is usually identified using morpho-stylistic typologies based on regional styles. Since the 1970s, development of the archaeology of French production sites and of a well-crafted archaeometric methodology has led to a better understanding of the specific technical characteristics of this type of earthenware. Using control samples from faience factory dumps, many traditional attributions have been revised and some historical interpretations have been reviewed. Such advances are particularly important for material culture studies in former French colonial areas.

Introduction

This is not the first time that a researcher with information on a certain number of potters and access to a certain number of objects is faced with the question: “What should be attributed to whom?” Attempting to answer this question is a risky endeavor, in which we now exercise more caution, apparently, than we did in the past. Nonetheless, it has the advantage of giving expression to hypotheses that can always be rejected [Montagut 1992:33].

The type of ceramic known as faience in France, Hispano-Moresque ware in Spain, majolica in Italy, and delftware in Northern Europe is in fact tin-glazed earthenware (Maggetti 2012:44). The body is coated with a thin glass layer opacified by tin oxide particles (SnO₂) (Figure 1).

Ceramic artifacts have yielded a range of information on the technology of their production, the provenance and preparation of raw materials, and the fashions, tastes, and social codes that characterized different periods and different social classes. Therefore, these artifacts can and should be studied as historical documents and socioeconomic markers.

Since the end of World War II, historical archaeology in North America has evolved hand in hand with the development of material culture studies in Europe. In regard to French faience from the 17th and 18th centuries, archaeologists from the United States and Quebec were faced from the outset with a lack of stylistic typologies that would enable them to identify the production sites and temporal span of excavated sherds. While American and Québécois archaeologists devised their own analytical...
tools, specialists in France developed the archaeology of faience production sites along with archaeometric characterization.

These efforts have provided a better understanding of the development of French faience and the technical characteristics of certain factories, thereby enabling many attributions and historical interpretations to be revised. Although North American and French archaeologists have collaborated on several joint initiatives, their approaches have evolved separately for far too long. Today, North American and French researchers should work together to improve our knowledge of French faience production, colonial trade networks, and the socioeconomic organization of the institutions of New France.

The Development of French Faience

Tin-glazed earthenware first came into use in the refined courts of the Islamic Far East (ca. A.D. 700) and then eventually evolved into an object of mass production in Western Europe during the 19th century (Caiger-Smith 1973; Soustiel 1985; Mason and Tite 1997). In France it is thought to have first appeared in Marseilles after being imported from the Islamized West at the turn of the 13th century (Marchesi et al. 1997). At the time, this exogenous product was a luxury item reserved for a wealthy clientele; it was made only occasionally and usually took the form of floor tiles (Figure 3). It coexisted with indigenous high-lead transparent glazed productions (Rosen and Crépin-Leblond 2000; Météreau 2012).

After an initial process of gradual adaptation, the technique was definitively established during the first decades of the 16th century, influenced by Italian Renaissance productions (Rosen 2004). As Italian majolica craftsmen settled in prosperous cities and production became more diversified, French tin-glazed earthenware began to develop in Languedoc, Lyons, and Nevers. Thereafter, faience production followed a technological evolution that reflected the increasing complexity of modern times and that continued until the establishment of industrial society at the end of the 19th century (Rosen 1995).

The city of Nevers can be considered the birthplace of French tin-glazed earthenware production on a scale that was in keeping with the growing economic importance of this type of ceramic. Replacing the original expression terre blanche, the term faience first appeared in Nevers in the early 17th century when the expression vaisselle de Fayence (of the town of Faenza, Italy) was gradually shortened to

Figure 2. Map showing the spread of the tin-glazed earthenware technique from the Islamic East to the Christian West. (Redrawn by Laetitia Météreau from Soustiel 1985.)
the single word faience. The economic success of the Nevers production center led to a propagation of skills during the last decades of the 17th century. Indeed, Nevers craftsmen traveled throughout the realm in order to establish their own workshops or to help start new production centers in cities such as Marseilles, Rouen, and Montpellier (Rosen 2000a:62–73).

While the 17th century can be considered the golden age of French faience, the 18th century was marked by changes that reflect a turning point in the expansion of faience production. The organization of production activities gradually evolved, with workshops giving way to the proto-industrial facilities typical of Colbert’s policy. As shapes and decoration became more diversified, faience...
manufacture multiplied (Figures 4 and 5); more than 100 factories were established during the first half of the 18th century (Rosen 1995:121). New types of faience were also developed, not only to meet new dietary needs (see culinary faience or terre à feu in Rosen [1995:129–132] and related references) but also to counter competition from other ceramics, especially porcelain (see faience with on-glaze decoration or faïence de réverbère, ca. 1748, in Rosen [1995:127–128] and related references).

These developments reflect the increasingly widespread use of faience associated with the socioeconomic transformations that France was experiencing at the time. During this expansion phase (17th–18th centuries), economic incentives increasingly prevailed over artistic motivations—a change that was also in accord with the socioeconomic transformations of modern times. Therefore, after being a luxury product limited to the upper class (early 13th–17th centuries) (Figure 6), French faience became a fashionable item among the bourgeoisie and ultimately a popular consumer product (18th–19th centuries).

The economic recession and crisis caused by the French Revolution (1789) put an end to French faience expansion in the western part of the country and some of the larger centers. Many smaller production units continued to operate in the northeast, however. Even though faience production underwent occasional revivals and endeavored to adapt, decoration slowly degenerated and output declined as this earthenware failed to compete with new types of industrially produced ceramics, such as creamware, manufactured in large and modern factories. During the 19th century, creamware potteries slowly replaced the traditional French faience factories, many of which disappeared after the 1850s (see Maggetti [2007a, 2012] and related references for a detailed study of the technology of French faience from the 17th century to the 19th century [Figure 7] using written sources, wasters, and physico-chemical characterization).

**Identifying French Faience: Methods**

*The Comparative Stylistic Method of the Decorative Arts as a Starting Point (since the Last Third of the 19th Century)*

Although the 1850s correspond to the decline of French faience production, they were also marked by the growth of a new interest in faience as an object of history (Rosen 1995:5–7, 13–15, 175–183, 2009a:42–43). Apart from archival research, the comparative stylistic method, which is...

Figure 7. Wheel throwing. The worker in front is shaping and his colleague behind is turning, (i.e., finishing) the object (Brongniart 1844:plate 45).
closely linked to decorative arts concerns, became the starting point of studies on the origin of French faience products.

Stylistic comparisons were initially based on pieces of known origin and then gradually extended to unidentified products. Very soon, however, this identification process no longer reflected reality, especially when commercial interests and overenthusiastic collectors were involved. Nonetheless, despite the failings of the comparative stylistic method, especially when applied by inexperienced amateurs and journalists, this approach is still widely used with some success by the best experts.

Studies based on this method put emphasis on remarkable pieces while ignoring the range of production as a whole. Reflecting the collections on which they are based, they rely on arbitrary aesthetic choices focusing on masterpieces inspired by the finer arts, such as painting or sculpture (Figure 8). They also reduce French faience to an object of minor interest in art history as a whole, and prevent consideration of other technical and socioeconomic issues.

**A Significant Contribution: North American Archaeological Classifications (since ca. 1970s)**

Due to the development of historical archaeology, North American researchers eventually became interested in French faience, but only after initially focusing on other mass-produced ceramics such as English creamware or pearlware (Waselkov and Walthall 2002:62). Owing to the loss of the French colonies on mainland North America around 1760, researchers took into account only French faience with grand feu decoration and ignored the on-glaze decoration (réverbère) that had just started to appear in the middle of the 18th century.

The comparative stylistic method developed by art historians on the basis of some notable decorated pieces was not appropriate for archaeological sherds found on French colonial sites. Indeed, Canadian and American archaeologists were exposed to fragmentary, common consumer goods, usually with little or no decoration, which is why they had to devise their own analytical tools (for a review see Waselkov and Walthall [2002:62–64]).

The comparative stylistic method developed by art historians on the basis of some notable decorated pieces was not appropriate for archaeological sherds found on French colonial sites. Indeed, Canadian and American archaeologists were exposed to fragmentary, common consumer goods, usually with little or no decoration, which is why they had to devise their own analytical tools (for a review see Waselkov and Walthall [2002:62–64]).

The Canadian and American classifications are quite similar despite their structural differences: both are founded on regional style categories, a common practice in North America. This observation is based on the published works of Nicole Genêt (1980) for the Place-Royale site in Quebec City in Canada and those of Gregory A. Waselkov and John A. Walthall (2002) for sites in Alabama, Louisiana, and Illinois in the United States. Although Waselkov and Walthall’s revised classification tried to incorporate Genêt’s regional styles, both publications are considered standard
references in their own right in North American archaeological studies. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the French references used in both of these works unfortunately include many popular books (such as those published by Massin) that did not reflect the latest advances in research at the time and were perhaps not the most appropriate sources.

While studying an assemblage from French Guiana, Maggy Bernier noticed that several decorative styles did not fit into the regional categories defined by Waselkov and Walthall. She therefore adapted their stylistic typology by creating additional labels (Bernier 2002:108–141). This raises some basic questions about such typologies. What should we do with new decoration types? Should we endlessly create new regional categories? Also, what should we do with tin-glazed earthenware with blue or green background enamel, which is not considered in the existing typologies? Lastly, what should we do with culinary tin-glazed earthenware, which is not brown but white?

The North American typologies can facilitate consistent description. They often prove to be inaccurate, however, when researchers use them to take the next step of ascribing a time and place of production. If we want to address broader research issues, we need a typology more strongly anchored in data from French production sites. It is important to note, however, that French archaeologists and art historians do not use—and are often not familiar with—North American classifications. Moreover, some researchers wrongly continue to associate decoration types with specific production centers, when considerable borrowing and copying is known to have occurred, depending on fashion trends (Rosen 1993b:97–98, 1995:116).

A Wind of Change: The "Archaeology of Faience" in France (since the 1980s)

The “archaeology of faience” emerged in France during the 1980s, when medieval archaeology was developing and practices were evolving (Badet and Jacob 1993). The sherd was no longer regarded as an indicator fossil, but was gradually seen as a source of historical information. The study of French faience was then at the crossroads of four main complementary approaches: methodical and exhaustive archival research, the archaeology of faience manufacture, the archaeology of consumption sites, and the reasoned use of physicochemical characterization of the materials (Rosen 2009a:42–43). What is the contribution of each of these approaches?

Archival research concerns more particularly the localization of faience manufacture and the documentation of structures, tools, raw materials, product distribution, economic markets, and craftsmen (for a detailed discussion see Amouric [1993]). The archaeology of faience manufacture and their waste dumps (Figure 9, Table 1) highlights production organization, manufacturing processes (from raw materials to finished products, along with kiln furniture and trials), and the diversity of products (for a methodological discussion regarding such excavations see Rosen [1993b]). Such an approach allows us to reconstruct a more accurate picture of reality by giving credit where credit is due. Indeed, almost a thousand workshops and factories would have been active at the end of the Ancien Régime, while the current attributions are

Table 1. Production units and waste dumps excavated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>Date (A.D. century)</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancy-le-Franc, fabrique du château</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Biton and Biton 2001; Rosen 2001a:342–351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt, fabrique du Chêne</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>19th–20th</td>
<td>Provence-Côte d'Azur</td>
<td>Kauffmann 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apt, fabrique Esbérard,</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Provence-Côte d'Azur</td>
<td>Kauffmann 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthé</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Pellet 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre, fabrique des Capucins</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avignon, indéterminé</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Provence-Côte d'Azur</td>
<td>Amouric 1991 (quoted by Kauffmann 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfort</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>Richard and Schwien 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergerac</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>Emery 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besançon</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>Humbert and Goy 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châteaurenard</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:322–323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerval</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>early 17th</td>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>Clerval 1995; Anonymous n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognac</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>early 19th</td>
<td>Poitou-Charentes</td>
<td>Vernou 1991:35–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange-le-Bourg</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th-19th</td>
<td>Franche-Comté</td>
<td>Maggetti 2013; Morin 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Charité-sur-Loire</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:140-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Poitou-Charentes</td>
<td>Rosen 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tour d'Aigues</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Provence-Côte d'Azur</td>
<td>Kauffmann 1993:112–115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bois d’Épense/Les Islettes</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Champagne-Ardenne</td>
<td>Rosen 2007; Rosen and Maggetti 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Castellet, Apt</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Provence-Côte d'Azur</td>
<td>Kauffmann and Oggiano-Bitar 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libourne</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>Ducassé 1987, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>early 18th</td>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>Musée historique de Lyon 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marignac-Laspeyres</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>Jolibert 1990; Penent 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meillonnas</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>Rosen 1993a; Rosen 2000b, 2000c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montigny-sous-Perreux</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Delor 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>production units and factory dumps</td>
<td>17th and 18th</td>
<td>Languedoc-Roussillon</td>
<td>Vayssettes and Vallauri 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyen</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Guyot, ongoing works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Périgueux</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>Costes 2012:135, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambergvillers</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>collection of sherds (unpublished work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>Rosen 1995:189 (unpublished analyses by Maurice Picon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Midi-Pyrénées</td>
<td>Penent 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaucluse</td>
<td>production unit</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Direction de la Conservation départementale des musées de la Meuse 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villers-les-Pots</td>
<td>factory dump</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>Ravoire 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
based on only a little more than a hundred names (Rosen 1995:186). As for the archaeology of consumption sites, it emphasizes the spread of production. Regarding French colonial North America, the archaeological collections not only illustrate how colonists lived, but also reflect the economic growth of the colony and the history of international trade networks.

As a consumer good, French faience was subject to the whims of fashion. Consequently, depending on trends, the same shapes and decorations were reproduced from one factory to another, their local treatment being the only distinguishing sign. Attribution and dating of an unidentified production using morpho-stylistic typologies thus remains difficult and uncertain, despite reassessments related to the archaeology of faience manufacture and their dumps. Well-thought-out physicochemical characterization of manufacturing waste from production sites appears to be an efficient tool for helping to resolve these problems (for a methodological review see Rosen [1993a]).

**A Pioneering Advancement: Provenance Studies (since ca. 1990s)**

Since the 1960s, development of provenance studies based on the analysis of major, minor, and trace elements of the ceramic body has not only been related to improvements of geochemical analysis techniques but has also been closely associated with theoretical and methodological advances in archaeology (for a review regarding provenance studies see Tite [2008:225–226] and related references). The latter point explains why the origin of French faience was not reexamined before the 1990s (Rosen 1995:189–192, 2009a:68–72). Thanks to the respective works of Daniel Dufournier, Maurice Picon, and Marino Maggetti, the ceramics research laboratories of Caen, Lyon, and Zurich constitute the major players in this field of study (Table 2).

How does this method assist in the identification process? In other words, how can we link a sherd to a production site? Geochemical analysis of a ceramic body provides a “fingerprint” of its composition. Products made from the same raw materials will be grouped together, while products made from different raw materials will be scattered. Consequently, when there is a match between the geochemical compositions of products from known and unknown sources, this could be interpreted as pointing to a common origin. Conversely, when there is a difference between the geochemical compositions of products from known and unknown sources, this could be interpreted as pointing to different origins. In practice, however, interpretation of this type of information is not that easy. It rests on a complex set of arguments combining analytical and archaeological data (Picon and Le Mière 1987; Rosen 1997, 2009a:71). Only a carefully selected sampling of manufacturing waste from faience factories and waste dumps, along with regional physicochemical characterization programs of production sites, can lead to the identification of relevant reference specimens (Rosen 1993b, 2009a:69).

**The Productions Reexamined**

The varying interests of researchers and museum curators, the vagaries of funding available for such expensive investigations, and the possibility—or not—to sample pieces from collections explain the uneven development of research in this field (Rosen 2001b). Nevertheless, significant advances have been made over the past 20 years, as shown in Table 3.

**Conclusion**

In light of advances in research, the reality of French faience production is much more complex than had been considered previously. Morpho-stylistic types, formerly considered indicative of a given production location, have been shown to have been made in several different locations. Geochemical characterization of wasters from production sites is the best means of ascribing New World archaeological specimens to a specific place and time of production.

Research can now follow three paths to carry on this new approach to faience coming from France. First of all, more robust and well-known geochemical reference groups are needed. Second, the morpho-stylistic typologies should be revised or reestablished on the basis of archaeological data from production sites. Finally, geochemical and morpho-stylistic typologies should be applied to collectors’ pieces and artifacts from consumption sites. Our aim is to help archaeologists interpret our past by providing them with a more reliable identification tool for French faience.
### Table 2. Geochemical reference groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Date (A.D. century)</th>
<th>No of samples</th>
<th>Method of analysis</th>
<th>Laboratory</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancy-le-Franc, faïencerie de la Perreuse</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1789–1803</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:354 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancy-le-Franc, faïencerie du Château</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1766–1807</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:345–346 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre, faïencerie des Capucins</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1798–1824</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:359 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bressieux (Isère), castle (tiles)</td>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>early 17th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Picon 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brou, Bourg-en-Bresse (tiles)</td>
<td>Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>ca. 1530</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>XRF, PIXE</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie; C2RMF, Paris</td>
<td>Picon 2000; Bouquillon 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatel-Gérard, faïencerie de Vauze</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1793–1855</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:369 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatel-Gérard, faïencerie des Cornes</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1825–1870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:366 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevannes, faïencerie de Chevannes</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:378 (mean values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, Chartreuse de Champmol (tiles)</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Picon 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, faïencerie de la Cour des Feuillants</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1724–1789</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, faïencerie de la rue Maison-Rouge</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>17th–18th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, faïencerie de l’Île</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1782–1812</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon, faïencerie de Montmuzard</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle Poitou-Charantes</td>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen, Picon et al. 2009:299, 302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langres-les-Aubes, faïencerie</td>
<td>Champagne-Ardenne</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a:390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Bois d’Epene dit Les Islettes</td>
<td>Champagne-Ardenne</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Maggetti 2007b:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligny-le-Chatel</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Rosen 2001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longecourt-en-Plaine, castle</td>
<td>Bourgogne</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>XRF, PIXE</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie; C2RMF, Paris</td>
<td>Picon 2000; Bouquillon 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunéville and varia, fouilles château de Frescaty (Sce-Chazelles) and varia</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>XRF, MEB</td>
<td>Fribourg University (Switzerland), dept. Geosciences</td>
<td>Rosen and Maggetti 2012:96–103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunéville, château-musée</td>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>XRF, MEB</td>
<td>Fribourg University (Switzerland), dept. Geosciences</td>
<td>Rosen and Maggetti 2012:96–103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meillonnas Rhône-Alpes</td>
<td>18th–19th</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Picon 1993; Rosen 1993a (mean values), 2000b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, atelier Boissier</td>
<td>Languedoc-Roussillon</td>
<td>17th–18th</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Waksman and Thirion-Merle 2012:522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, atelier Collondres</td>
<td>Languedoc-Roussillon</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Waksman and Thirion-Merle 2012:522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier, atelier de la Blanquerie</td>
<td>Languedoc-Roussillon</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>UMR5138/Archéométrie et archéologie</td>
<td>Waksman and Thirion-Merle 2012:522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Productions reexamined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decoration/Style</th>
<th>Original attribution</th>
<th>Revised attribution</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Figure no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>istoriato</em> decoration</td>
<td>Lyons, 1570–1580</td>
<td>Nevers, ca. 1640</td>
<td>Rosen 2009b:161–184</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>à la Bécan</em> style</td>
<td>Saint-Cloud, Lille, Clermont-Ferrand, early 18th century</td>
<td>Nevers, early 18th century</td>
<td>Rosen 2009a:223, 2011:26–31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so-called Moulins rococo polychrome decorations</td>
<td>Moulins, ca. 1750</td>
<td>Nevers, ca. 1750</td>
<td>Rosen 2011:186–187</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manganese rose</td>
<td>Montpellier, 17–18th centuries</td>
<td>Moustiers, 17–18th centuries</td>
<td>Rosen 2006</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varia</td>
<td>Marseille, 17–18th centuries</td>
<td>Montpellier, 17–18th centuries</td>
<td>Waksman and Thirion-Merle 2012:516–523</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varia</td>
<td>Lorraine region, 18–19th centuries</td>
<td>possible to distinguish between apparently similar productions from Le Bois d’Epense known as “Les Islettes,” Saint-Clément, Lunéville</td>
<td>Rosen, Guilbert et al. 2007; Rosen and Maggetti 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Plate with gadroons, diameter 29 cm, French a compendiario decoration (blue, yellow, and orange painting on a white ground), horn of plenty (center) and garland in the way of Faenza (rim), Nevers, around 1660–1680; Nantes, musée du château des Ducs de Bretagne, inv. 949.4.29. (Photo by Arc’Antiq in Rosen 2009b:fig. 10.)

Figure 11. A compendiario decoration from “Tour Goguin” excavations, Nevers: (a) plates with gadroons, garland in the manner of Faenza, around 1620–1640, GI 8-9; (b) eggcup and rim of a plate with gadroons, basic element of the garland in the manner of Faenza used separately and in a vertical position, around 1620–1640, GI 8-9; (c) pitcher, floral decoration, around 1660–1680, GL-GM 1 and 2; (d) stoup with a cherub, around 1660–1680, GL-GM 1 and 2. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2009.)

Figure 12. (Left) A compendiario decoration, Poterat manufacture excavation, Rouen. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2009.)

Figure 13. (Right) A compendiario decoration, Boissier manufacture, Montpellier. Lattes, musée H. Prades, inv. 23268 (Vayssettes and Vallauri 2012:293).

Figure 14. Reattribution to Nevers of a compendiario decorated pieces previously said to be “Le Croisic” (Rosen 2006).
Figure 15. Various shapes with “lambrequin” decorations in blue camaïeu (multiple tints of one color), around 1730–1735, “Tour Goguin” and the Chambre des comptes excavations. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2011.)

Figure 16. Salad bowl, diameter 27 cm, mixed decorations of “lambrequin” (rim) and “à la Béarn” (center) styles in blue camaïeu, around 1730–1735, “Tour Goguin” excavations, GH 4-5. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2011.)

Figure 17. So-called “La Rochelle” decorations, excavations from “La Chambre des comptes,” Nevers, around 1755–1760. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2011.)

Figure 18. Shaving basin, 32 × 27 cm, cottage (center), “chicory flowers” and “fern” (rim), Nevers, around 1755–1760. Pontarlier, Musée municipal, inv. 154. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2011.)
Figure 19. Analyses of Nevers versus La Rochelle (Rosen 2007).
Figure 20. Sherds and collectors’ pieces with decorations so far ascribed to “La Rochelle,” reattributed to Nevers by means of geochemical characterization of the bodies. (Computer graphic by Jean Rosen, 2011.)

Figure 21. Salad bowl, diameter 27 cm, polychrome, rococo scrollwork and wedding pattern, Nevers, around 1760. (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2011.)
3 Montpellier or Moustiers?

Factor Analysis, 18 oxides/elements used

Figure 22. Reattribution to Moustiers of the “manganese rose” decoration previously attributed to Montpellier (Rosen 2006). Polylobed oval dish (sample FAI 180), 38 × 26 cm, grand feu polychrome decorations “à la rose manganese et pensée” (“manganese rose and pansies”), “supposedly from Montpellier,” Moustiers, last third of the 18th century (private collection). (Photo by Jean Rosen, 2006.)
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