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The last issue of the Calendar had cause to celebrate the acquisition of Jocelyn Horner’s Hands of Barbirolli. That this one should mourn her death may serve to underline the special place of artists in the community. They have the great privilege of leaving behind them tangible tribute to the creative process as it worked through their minds and hands. If Jocelyn Horner’s accomplishment as a sculptor remains, as a person her place cannot be filled. Great sympathy goes to her family and indeed all those who benefited so deeply from her friendship. So many will miss her sadly. That she died in office as a member of the Leeds Art Collections Fund committee adds poignancy to her passing but her contribution, in terms of encouragement, personal charm and ever sympathetic advice, to the artistic well-being of Yorkshire spans many years.
Editorial

In the fight for editorial space ceramic acquisitions must be awarded victory this time—due largely to the powers of search possessed by Peter Walton. Even so it is necessary to be selective among the candidates for inclusion. They range from a delightful Chelsea-Derby teapot of about 1780 decorated by Richard Askew with little pink putti flying nonchalantly over the white surface to the avant garde work of Christopher Dresser produced a century later. Clearly to be classified among those objects which no visitor could ignore, even in the magnificent setting of the Drawing Room at Lotherton, is the Derby campana-shaped vase splendidly decorated in gold, rich colours and pictorial incident—a stirring, if apparently indecisive, contest between a serpent and a vulture on one side contrasting strangely with the exotic flowers on the other. Then there is the Copeland Cabaret of about 1860 enriched with superbly painted scenes after Turner. As if this was not tribute enough to the doyen of Victorian high art the ‘designer’ of the service has surrounded the landscapes with lilac and green and golden ribbons. The result shows a robustness of taste which is quite staggering, but remarkably successful. Like the vase this group of ‘art objects’ was not meant to be missed either—in fact the contrary—for it was probably made to show off the virtuosity of the manufacturers at one of the great exhibitions of the period. At Lotherton we seem to be making a corner in classy cabarets—this is the third to be acquired.

From time to time a note of lament has crept into editorials as builders have ravaged Temple Newsam. Always the motives for them coming have been exemplary; to prop up a descending floor, to warm the place up or make it less likely to burn down. In every case too it looked beforehand as though the house would suffer visually if gaining structurally; in most cases, however, the interior actually looked better when the workmen left. Now something new is happening, the builders are in again, but this time with the avowed purpose quite simply, of improvement, one only hopes that the whole process will not go into reverse.

Smithfield—a name that goes back to the 17th century—alias the top floor of the north wing above the saloon, alias the long gallery, is being converted into study quarters. All the reserve collections of ceramics and silver will be set out behind glass, there will be a small lecture room, work rooms and one or two other amenities. At last should be realised one of the major ‘extensions of facilities’ mooted for years now; it will mean that all our teaching functions will be much easier to organise and discharge.

With any luck when the builders finish this project they will be able to go straight on with the great chapel/library scheme now in the final stage of planning. More must be said about this later, but briefly the idea is to restore the library—since the late 1870’s doing service as the chapel—to its 18th century magnificence and to reinstate the chapel on its original site immediately below. A door in the long gallery will give access to it via the already installed fire staircase—which will thus have a double function.

At Lotherton too there is building work to report. Due entirely to the generosity of Lady Gascoigne a complete unit of rooms on the north side of the house has been equipped to provide a study centre for students of costume, work rooms, stores and curatorial offices. These were finished last December and already it is difficult to see how we managed without them. So the
business of developing Lotherton to its full potential as a self contained art museum goes ahead—more quickly than one had ever dared to hope when the house was first opened to the public in 1969.

Some of the recent and present activities of the curatorial team may be of general interest to members of the L.A.C.F. The Keeper of Temple Newsam, Christopher Gilbert, completed a lecture tour in the United States last November. His subject was English furniture and, not unexpectedly, he used as illustrations many of the pieces at Temple Newsam and Lotherton. He served as art-ambassador in some nine centres during his progress, including the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and Colonial Williamsburg. He returned refreshed and armed with new material for the furniture catalogue he is preparing on the Leeds collections. The Director is busy with the exhibition of Treasures from National Trust Houses which he has been asked to prepare for the Palais des Beaux Arts in Brussels this September. This is one of the two major shows—the other is of Modern British Art from the Tate Gallery collections—to be organised as part of the biennial Europalia Festival. The 1973 event is to be devoted to the art of Great Britain. Jacob Simon has been appointed Assistant Keeper at Kenwood. He had a strong field against him so is much to be congratulated on his successful run. When he leaves he will take everyone’s good wishes with him, but also their regrets at seeing the back of his heels. During his eighteen months as trainee-assistant-keeper in Leeds he proved himself capable, promising and a very pleasant colleague. Such a combination of virtues should return high dividends, the only pity is that he could not stay longer to share them with us—perhaps he will spare a thought for Leeds from time to time.

Garniture of Three Vases, Staffordshire Porcelain decorated at Mansfield, possibly by William Billingsley c. 1800, h. 13 in.
When the great diarist, George Vertue visited Leeds in 1742, he considered only two sights worthy of comment. On the vault of the medieval Parish Church, a fresco depicting 'Moses & Aron giving the tables of the Law ... the thunder & lightning rending the Clouds ... expressed ... in Suitable Terror ...' by that 'passionate & sacarstical' painter, Jacques Parmentier (1658–1730), unfortunately long since vanished. Moreover, in a niche on the facade of the Guild or Moot Hall in Briggate, the 'noble magnificent Statue of her Majesty Queen Anne standing in her robes. in white Marble ...', installed in 1713 (Cover) and now in Leeds City Art Gallery (Fig. 1). Although mentioned in early diaries and guidebooks and more recently, in 1947, the subject of a brief article by Katherine Esdaile, the history of this interesting and important statue and its place in English sculpture has never been fully chronicled.

The setting
The idea of incorporating royal statues into the fabric of civic buildings has a long pedigree in England, the famous statue of Queen Elizabeth I, carved by William Kerwin in 1586 for London's Ludgate, in both its placement and icon-like pose, serving as an important source of inspiration.

Statues of Queen Anne, of which there are over a dozen dating from 1705 to 1741 and widely dispersed over the country, were generally intended as statements of civic pride corresponding to some outstanding political event of the Queen's reign—the Whig victory in the election of 1705, the Union of England and Scotland in 1707, the Tory victory in the election of 1710, the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Sometimes they were intended as visual affirmations of the continuity of the Stuart monarchy—DIVAE ANNAE BRITANNIARUM REGINA, inscribed below a statue of the Queen projected for St. Allege at Greenwich; after the Queen's sudden and untimely death in 1714, they came to be associated with a Jacobite and Tory nostalgia for past glories.

The Leeds Statue, belonging to the category of civic pride, was placed on the Moot Hall above the Town's coat-of-arms, which included the fleece, symbol of the woollen trade, 'the very Life of these Parts of England', and the owl, symbol of Minerva, 'Goddess of Learning and Wisdom [and] Inventor of Spinning and Weaving'. It is significant that contemporaries commented on the kinship between the Leeds Statue and the celebrated marble group designed by Sir Christopher Wren and carved by Francis Bird between 1709 and 1711 for the piazza of St Paul's Cathedral, in which the Queen is surrounded by figures representing Britain, Ireland, France and America (Fig. 2): 'Ecce! Insignem Statuam LEODIENSEM (ultra ipsam Paulinam LONDINENSEM) Insunissimae REGINAE ANNAE (Omn i licet Imagine longe Majori)'—'Behold! this LEEDS Statue (distinguished beyond the one at St. Paul's LONDON) of the illustrious QUEEN ANNE (allowed by all to be by far the greater representation)'—reads the original Latin dedication in gilt letters on a black marble tablet below the Statue.

Since it is clear from the history of the Leeds scheme that the Statue, with its dedication, the coat-of-arms and the Moot Hall facade were conceived at the same time and as a unified idea, something must be said about the Hall itself.

The building of a new Hall was under consideration around 1710. The Leeds historian, Ralph Thoresby, noted in his great publication, Ducatus Leodiensis: or,
1. Queen Anne, white marble, 6 feet 6 inches high, formerly on the Moot Hall, Leeds City Art Gallery.

the Topography Of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leeds, 1715, that 'Had the Lady Danby's Proposal been timely embraced, who . . . offered a considerable Sum towards the Building of a new Guildhall upon Pillars and Arches, as proposed by Mr. John Thoresby, we might have boasted of a stately Comitium . . .'. Lady Margaret Danby was the widow of Thomas Danby, first Mayor of Leeds, slain in 1667, and apparently she had provided funds for the building of a Hall to the design of John Thoresby, a Leeds alderman and Ralph's father. Nothing more is known of this abortive design.

Thoresby described the Hall, as finally designed and under construction by August of 1710, as having a 'Front of fine wrought Stone upon Columns and Arches, with rustick Coins [quoins] and Tabling [entablature]', in which 'conveniency is . . . all that is pretended to.' The general composition follows a well-known type, for instance, represented by the Town Hall, 1680, at Abingdon in Berkshire and the now demolished Market Cross, 1704, in the Thursday Market in York. However, there are several individual and noteworthy features on the Leeds building (Cover). The two bays of the front are bracketed by Corinthian pilasters which stretch through two stories and are crowned by an all-embracing triangular pediment and this provided not only a vital sense of monumentality to what was, after all, a conspicuous but modestly-scaled public building, but a suitably impressive setting for the royal statue.

The sculptor
The Leeds Statue is signed and dated on the base CARPENTER FECIT LONDON 1712. (Fig. 1). This unusually detailed but ambiguous information has caused unnecessary confusion as to the identity of the sculptor, for at least two bearing this surname were working in England, indeed, in Yorkshire, in the early eighteenth century.

One was Samuel Carpenter (1660–1713) of York, who was employed as a decorative carver at Castle Howard, in 1705–6, and specialized in modest sepulchral monuments, including the wall tablet to John Thoresby, 1710, in Leeds Parish Church. However, on stylistic grounds alone, he could not have been the author of the Leeds Queen Anne.

Rupert Gunnis identified this sculptor as another Samuel Carpenter, who is said to have been based in London and working between 1712 and 1729 but who can be associated with only two commissions. They are the Leeds Statue of 1712 and a series of lead garden figures for Moulsbridge Hall in Essex, executed in 1729. The Moulsbridge commission, however, is undoubtedly to be associated with yet another sculptor, Andrew Carpenter and, as we shall see, Andrew was also responsible for the Leeds Statue. Samuel Carpenter of London, therefore, appears to be an historically hazy and perhaps even a non-existent sculptor.

The association of the Leeds Queen Anne with Andrew Carpenter, on the other hand, is positively confirmed by an engraving of the Statue published in Ducatus Leodiensis in 1715 (Fig. 3), in which the signature on the base is shown as Andr. Carpenter Londini fecit—'Made by Andrew Carpenter of London'. As Thoresby was so intimately involved with making the Statue, there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of his transcription of the signature; the apparent discrepancy with the existing signature will be considered later.

Andrew Carpenter (c.1677–1737), anglicized from Charpentiere, was presumably of French or Flemish origin. The little that is known about his life and career is supplied by Vertue. He describes the sculptor, in an obituary of 1738, as 'a gross heavy man allways' and 'a Man in his time esteemed for his Skill [who] made many works for Noblemen and others of distinction . . .'. He appears to have had a large output although certainly all his works have not yet been identified. His yard was in Piccadilly, near Hyde Park Corner, and Thoresby, on a visit in 1714, commented on the 'curious workmanship . . . in marble and lead' He was 'most esteemd' for 'Cast Lead figures' for gardens and some of the works vaguely referred to by Vertue and Thoresby undoubtedly can be associated with this very lucrative trade. The most important included statues for the Duke of Chandos's fabulous estate at Cannons, near
Edgware, in 1722, for Castle Howard, in 1723, for Wrest Park in Bedfordshire, between 1725 and 1730—probably his surviving masterpieces in this genre—and Moulsham Hall, in 1730–32.

Carpenter's mature works, particularly his church monuments in marble, show a knowledge of sophisticated and fashionable Continental ideas which bring them close to the mainstream of European sculpture developments. This was largely brought about by his association, probably beginning in 1722, with the Scottish-born, Roman-trained, London-based architect, James Gibbs (1682–1754), whose prolific talents included the designing of church monuments of a type new and influential to England. The achievements of Carpenter's mature years, from 1722, therefore, are reasonably well documented; not so the vital, formative period, from the unknown date of his arrival in England until the early 1720's.

Vertue furnishes two essential facts. ‘Mr. Carpenter Statuary learn't the rudiments of drawing' from Peter Eude, a French painter working in England, about whom very little is known. Furthermore, ‘Mr. Carpenter ... was for some years principal assistant to Mr. Nost Senior ... in Modelling & Carving.'20

John Nost (died 1729) was a Fleming who settled in England around 1678 and by the 1690's had established a national reputation as an excellent sculptor of church monuments and lead garden statues. His special talent lay in the sensitive modelling and gracefully articulated posing of richly draped, life-size, free-standing figures. His practice in the Midlands and the North of England was particularly successful. He worked in Derbyshire, at Chatsworth in 1698 and Melbourne Hall between 1699 and 1705, and in Yorkshire, at York sometime after 1695, Castle Howard between 1703 and 1710, and elsewhere; almost certainly his presence in the county was more extensive than is at present realized.24

Significantly, his earliest recorded Yorkshire commission was for the Monument to Edward, 2nd Viscount Irwin and his wife and infant child, for St Mary's, Whitkirk, near Temple Newsam, an especially memorable achievement. The Temple Newsam correspondence for 1697 mention the delivery and installation of the monument by 'Mr. Nost's man', who may well be identified with Andrew Carpenter. This important commission would have marked both sculptor's introduction to Leeds.

Furthermore, Nost executed at least two statues of Queen Anne: one for the Royal Exchange in London, sometime in the first decade of the eighteenth century; and another, in lead, for Tom Tower at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1705–6, which is certainly the most brilliant of all the surviving statues of the Queen. The possible extent of Carpenter's participation in these two commissions is not known but in his close association with Nost at this crucial time we can see some of the events leading up to the commission in 1710 for the Leeds Statue, which represents Carpenter's first documented achievement as an independent sculptor.

The statue

Although a statue of the Queen was conceived as part of the original design for the new Moot Hall, in 1710, its making was to be postponed: 'In the Front of the Guildhall was left a Nich for a Statue, which was designed (as soon as the public Stock was so far recruited as to procure it) for a Royal one'. However, 'this Defect [was] happily supplied by the noble Generosity of ... Alderman Milner ... who at his proper Cost hath erected a most noble magnificent Statue ...': 'Pie consecratam; Et a GULIELMO MILNER Armigero Prudenti]usticiario, Fidei Subdito, Generoso Civis, Opulentu Mercatore, Penitus Exunctam'—'piously consecrated and erected at the sole expense of WILLIAM MILNER, Prudent Justice of the Peace, Faithful Subject, Generous Citizen, Opulent Merchant';25 Milner (1662–1740) was Mayor of Leeds in 1697, the year of the installation of the Irwin Monument at Whitkirk.

The Queen's Statue was commissioned in 1710 or 1711. Accounts or bills do not appear to have survived but some indication of its cost can be indicated by comparison with Francis Bird's charge of £47.18.6 for his gilt lead Statue of the Queen for Kingston-upon-Thames Guild Hall in 1706. The Leeds Statue was being carved...
in 1712 and Thoresby provides valuable information in his Diary on its progress. On 21 May 1712: 'I omitted in yesterday’s walk, that we went to Mr. Carpenter’s, in Piccadilly, to see the Queen’s statue, in marble, in her Parliament robes, with crown, globe [orb], and sceptre, cousin Milner’s most noble present to the Corporation of Leeds, but not in that forwardness that I hoped, and himself expects.' However, the Statue was completed in 1712, the year inscribed on its base, and was installed on the Moot Hall on 27 May 1713, on which occasion there was ‘great rejoicing . . . and a splendid procession and festival in honour of the queen . . . ’ A month earlier, on 11 April, Anne had signed the Treaty of Utrecht, bringing the bitter war with France to a victorious conclusion. The Queen’s Statue took on an additional meaning. Nor was this a unique occurrence: celebrating this same occasion, a Statue of the Queen, with the inscription ANNE REGINA ANNO PACIFICO 1713 (‘Queen
Anne in the Year of Peace 1713’), was set-up on Winchester Guild Hall.

Thoresby thought so highly of the Leeds Statue and was undoubtedly so proud of his association with its production that he had it engraved for Ducatus Leodiensis (Fig. 3). On 11 May 1714, he ‘walked . . . to Piccadilly, to Mr. Carpenter’s the carver’s, about the draught of the Queen’s statue, which he made for Mr. Milner at Leeds . . .’ The ‘draught’, presumably a drawing by the sculptor, now lost, was then delivered to John Sturt (1658–1730): ‘walked . . . to Mr. Sturt, the engraver’s, about the Queen’s statue . . .’ The choice of Sturt was a deliberate one for he had supplied fine engravings for the English edition, 1707, of Andrea Pozzo’s Perspectiva Pictorium et Architectorum (translated by John James as Rules and Examples of Perspective), which was
dedicated to Queen Anne. Vertue had first met him in 1712 and, as it was Vertue who engraved Thoresby's portrait (after a drawing or painting of 1703 by Parmentier) for the frontispiece of Ducatus Leodiensis, we can take it that Vertue introduced Sturt to Thoresby.

Sturt's engraving is of considerable interest because as well as providing conclusive evidence for an accurate identification of the sculptor, it shows the Statue in its original, undeteriorated condition, prior to successive resittings and 'restorations' between 1825 and 1887. During this period the septre and several tassels were broken off and worn sections were renewed, such as the slab extending from the bridge of the nose to the chin. It has been suggested that parts were 're-chiselled' but the present weathered condition of the surface throughout cannot substantiate this, although it is possible that the signature was recut, thus explaining its discrepancy with the signature shown in Sturt's engraving.

The engraving is further important in showing differences in composition with the executed Statue (with its additions of a necklace and lace sleeve ruffles and the repositioning of the Order of the Garter from the left shoulder to beneath the left breast), which not only confirms that the engraving was based on Carpenter's drawing but suggests that it reflects ideas closer to the sculptor's original conception. In the final stage of design, following accepted practice, the pose, facial details and special decorative features, closely adhered to one of the numerous official portraits of the Queen. The Leeds statue is particularly close to the oil portrait after John Clostermann, now in the National Portrait Gallery, London (Fig. 4), which was also known in a mezzotint engraving by J. Faber Jr. In the Statue (Fig. 5), the delicate, incised decoration on the dress is a conscious imitation of

5. A detail of the torsoe and right arm of the Leeds Queen Anne.
the rich silk damask in the painting and in both the details of the crown, septre, orb and Order of St. George are identical.

Carpenter's ability to competently handle marble on a monumental scale, to convey the sense of stability by emphasising the corpulence of the figure and the obvious delight in portraying opulent, decorative details are qualities of his early work inherited from Nost. Yet, a comparison of closely contemporary works by these two sculptors reveals the younger and less experienced man's generalised, sometimes insensitive and crude modelling of the flesh of the face and arms and his inability to successfully articulate a graceful figure by means of richly and dramatically folded drapery. These are idiosyncrasies still evident, and only nominally refined, in his mature works. Contemporary Leodionians were, perhaps, over zealous and self confident in their praise. Yet, the Statue was rightly celebrated as a reflection of civic pride: when 'Mr. Carpenter of London had perfected this exquisite specimen of his Art, it was viewed by many of the Nobility and Gentry . . .', and it launched him on his national career.

T. F. FRIEDMAN

Abbreviations:


Duc. Leod. (Ralph Thoresby, Ducatus Leodiensis or, the Topography Of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leeds, 1715).


Morrell (J. B. Morrell, York Monuments, nd.).


Whitney (M. Whitney, Sculpture in Britain 1530 to 1830, 1964).


3. For instance, Vertue (see n. 2) and Thoresby (see nos. 8, 12, 19, 31), Ryley, The Leeds Guide, 1806, pp. 63–4; see also material in Leeds Reference Library (Local History).


6. As shown in J. Kip's 1714 engraving of the east front of the church (Bodleian Library, Gough Maps 13).


8. Thoresby commented that the Leeds Statue was 'generally esteemed . . . the best that was ever made, not excepting the most celebrated one in St. Paul's Church-yard' (Duc. Leod., p. 250). For the St. Paul's group, see Wren Society, XIV, frontispiece, pp. iii, 163–4; XV, pp. xxiii, 179; XVI, pp. 127, 156; Vertue, III, 19, 50; Gunnis, pp. 53. It is worth noting that Andrew Carpenter, sculptor of the Leeds Statue, was associated with Bird at St. Paul's in 1717 (Gunnis, p. 83).

9. The dedication is recorded below Sturt's engraving of the Statue published in Duc. Leod., in 1715 (see Fig. 3) and repeated in Taylor, pp. 151–2.

10. p. 15.

11. For the Thoresby family, see Duc. Leod., pp. 57, 202.

12. Thoresby recorded in his Diary (p. 65) on 12 August: 'the foundation of the front of the new Guildhall was now laid, the engines exercised, &c.' In John Cassin's 'A New & Exact Plan of the Town of Leeds', 1725 (Leeds City Museum), the Hall is shown with a variant niche-surround, perhaps accountable by engraver's licence (K. J. Bonser and H. Nichols, 'Printed Maps and Plans of Leeds, 1711–1900', Thorpy Society, XLVII, 1958, No. 10, PI. II).


14. Described on p. 47 and illustrated opposite p. 48 in Duc. Leod. Thoresby records in his Diary (p. 64) on 25 July 1710, York: 'With Mr. Carpenter about the monument for my dearest father; left his picture and a model with him'. Although unsigned, its general composition and details are close to the Monument to Lady Elizabeth Stapleton, 1688, in St Laurence, Snaith, in the West Riding, which is signed 'Samuel Carpenter of York, carver ficto' (Morrell, pp. 39–40, Pl. XXV; Gunnis, p. 82; N. Pevsner, The Buildings of England West Riding of Yorkshire, 1959, p. 483).


16. Payments for the Moulsam statues, dating 1730–32 and including at least three unspecified figures, two lions and a bust of Venus, refer
20. Vertue, III, 111, also records 'Andr. Carpenter Londini fecit—' with reference to the statue.


22. Carpenter supplied lead figures to three houses for which Gibbs was the architect: Cannons, in 1722 (see n. 21), Ditchley in Oxfordshire, in 1722 (T. Friedman, *James Gibbs 1682–1754: the formation of his architectural style*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1971, Appendix S, 8); and Wimpole in Cambridgeshire, in the early 1720's (Architectural Drawings in the Bodleian Library, 1952, No. 18, ill.). He also executed to Gibbs's design the Monument to Montagu Gerrard Drake's parents at Amersham, Buckinghamshire, 1724–8 (*Gunnis*, p. 83). Carpenter's source of inspiration for the Monument to the Earl of Warrington, 1734, at Bowden, Cheshire, was Gibbs's Monument to Katherine Bovey, c. 1724, in Westminster Abbey (*Whitney*, p. 126, Fig. 100), in turn, modelled on G. B. Foggini's *Feroni Monuments*, 1691–93, in SS. Annunziata, Florence (K. Lankheit, *Florentinische Barockplastik*, 1962, Figs. 32–3; T. F. Friedman, *James Gibbs as a Church Designer*, Derby, 1972, Nos. 61–63). Many of Gibbs's monument designs, including the Bovey, were engraved for his publication, *A Book of Architecture*, 1728, Plates 111–135.

23. Vertue, IV, 35.


26. Nost and Carpenter continued to collaborate and to share the same patronage; for instance, Nost worked at Maulsham in 1717 and at Wrest in 1725, Carpenter in 1730–2; both worked at Cannons in 1722.

27. Illustrated in J. Smith and J. Kip, *Nouveau Theatre de la Grande Bretagne*, III, 1724; *Whitney*, pp. 250 n. 61, 251 n. 68.

28. 'Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne', *Oxford Historical Society*, II, 1854, pp. 165, 169. Although the statue is unsigned and the name of the sculptor is unrecorded, the attribution to Nost is convincing on comparison with his lead Perseus, 1700, at Melbourne (see n. 24).

29. Milner lived at Nun Appleton House, near York, formerly the residence of Thomas, Lord Fairfax, immortalized in Andrew Marvel's poem, and was a subscriber to building Holy Trinity, Boar Lane, Leeds, 1721ff, to the design of William Halkpen (R. Thoresby, *Vicaria Leodiensis*, 1724, p. 261, which includes an engraving of the church, and *Dow. Leodi.*, pp. 215–6; *Taylor*, p. 150).

30. Now on the Market Hall (Chamberlain's Accounts, year ending Michelmas 1706, Borough Archives; *Gunnis*, p. 54). Carpenter charged £20 for a lead Hercules for Castle Howard in 1723 (see n. 21).


34. 14 June 1714 (*Diary*, II, p. 222). The engraving is signed 'J. Sturt Sculp'. Sturt was also responsible for the engravings opposite pp. 29, 48 (see *Diary*, II, p. 222).


36. 12 March 1703: 'Sent for by Monsieur Permentier, who obliged me to sit for my picture' (*Letters of Eminent Men*, addressed to *M. Tho. Thoresby* F.R.S., 1832, II, C. ii, 92; D. i, 410). This portrait is lost; the engraving is signed 'G. Vertue Sculptor 1712.'

37. The statue was removed when the Moot Hall was demolished in 1825, resisted on the facade of the new Corn Exchange in Briggate in 1828 (shown in W. Braithwaite's watercolour, in Leeds Reference Library), at which time the dedication tablet was altered to 'This statue of Queen Anne—erected at the cost of Alderman Milner, in the front of the ancient Moot Hall, A.D. 1712; was restored at the expense of the Corporation, and transferred to this site, A.D. 1826; the Moot Hall having been purchased by the Town, and demolished, A.D. 1825;' (Taylor pp. 151–2), removed to the Town Hall cellars when the Exchange was demolished in 1868, and finally resited in the City Art Gallery in 1887, with the following inscription: 'This Statue of Queen Anne—erected at the Moot Hall in Briggate at the expense of Alderman Milner in 1712, restored by the Corporation and transferred to the old Corn Exchange in 1828, and removed to the Town Hall in 1868, was again restored and placed in the Municipal Art Gallery by Sir Frederick Milner Bart. and other members of his family, in remembrance of the Jubilee of our Gracious Queen Victoria, 1887.'


40. Undated (Thomas Bowles, printer), in the National Portrait Gallery files.

In preparing this article, I am grateful for the help of Tim Hudson, Antony Radcliffe and Katherine Longley.
Gillows at Parlington

Parlington Hall, Aberford, was the ancestral home of the Gascoigne family who moved in 1905 to nearby Lotherton Hall; this house, together with its art collection, was given to Leeds Corporation by Sir Alvary and Lady Gascoigne in 1968. The furnishings included an interesting group of pieces made for Parlington by Gillows of Lancaster during the years 1810–12.

Parlington, a large medieval building, extensively remodelled in the 18th and 19th centuries, was finally demolished about fifteen years ago and all that remains are some estate buildings by Carr of York and a spectacular triumphal arch built by Sir Thomas Gascoigne to celebrate the American War of Independence! In 1810 the Parlington estate passed to Richard Oliver Gascoigne who immediately commissioned Gillows to refurbish many of the rooms and, as the firm’s summary cost books disclose, continued to patronise them until his death in 1834, when the estate was divided between his two daughters. The property descended to Colonel F. R. T. T. Gascoigne who, inheriting in 1905, vacated the house, dispersed many of the furnishings at a five day sale on the premises and allowed the building to become derelict. He moved to Lotherton taking some of the furniture and family heirlooms with him. In 1937 the estate passed to his son Sir Alvary who sold more of the furniture at a two day country house sale in 1956—accordingly only a residue of the movables supplied by Gillows have survived.

The original order of furniture for Parlington in 1810 was intended to equip five bed and dressing rooms, the library, dining room and a study. In addition to references in the firm’s own schedules, preserved amongst the Gillow papers now at Westminster City Library, most of the pieces are recorded in an inventory of the house taken in 1843 and many feature in the Parlington sale catalogue of 1905. However, the agent’s marked copy shows that a good proportion of the Gillow lots were ‘bought in’ and evidently installed at Lotherton; some items eventually found their way to Heath Lodge, the Gascoigne’s London home, and have recently been assimilated once again into the art collections at Lotherton. Finally, a few duplicate examples were sold by auction in 1972.

After these vicissitudes the following documented pieces remain: an Imperial dining room table with its table leaf case; a fine port table; two dressing tables; one dressing table glass; a deception table; one pot cupboard; three chamber writing tables of varying size; a glazed bookcase and a pair of caned rosewood chairs of curricule design with brass inlay. There are also three chairs, a chest of drawers and a wardrobe (both with lion-mask handles) which are not noted in any of the ledgers but may, on stylistic grounds, have been supplied by Gillows at a slightly later date.

Details of the goods supplied to R. O. Gascoigne are to be found in the Estimate Books, Account Books and Packing Books amongst the Gillow records. Unfortunately, the firm’s Order Ledgers for the period 1809–12 have disappeared. A summary account book reveals that between October 1810 and December 1813 furnishings to the value of £2931.6.11 were provided and over the next twenty years work totalling £420.18.9 was received. The richly informative Estimate Book (1803–15) is interspersed with drawings of a magnificent mahogany sideboard, six designs for bookcases, a chest of drawers, a double washstand, and a table leaf case. All these pieces pieces were made for Parlington and the
accompanying schedules give a very detailed cost analysis for producing each item, including the name of the man responsible for crafting it. Unfortunately, only the table leaf case entered as ‘a Mahogany Rack or Pedestal for dining-table leaves' and made by Mr. Barrow at a total cost of £5.9.7 is still traceable, although the bookcase with its distinctive lattice pattern glazing (Fig. 2) is closely allied to the sketches. The doors were originally backed by scarlet silk curtains. However, several of the extant pieces correspond to designs associated with other orders during the same months.

The majority of articles in the Lotherton collection are from bedroom suites, they conform to the firm’s standard design type and appear to have been supplied from stock. Gillows Account Book reveals that the repertoire for each bedroom was almost exactly the same, each apartment being supplied with a fourposter bed, dressing table and ‘landscape’ dressing glass, a washstand, two bedsteps (one incorporating a night table, the other fitted as a ‘biddett’), a pair of pot cupboards, an airing horse, at least two japanned chairs, a japanned dressing stool and a chamber writing table. Bedding, china, curtains and window cornices are also listed. A specimen schedule for furnishing one bedroom is printed as an appendix to this article. Of this repertoire the following examples remain: two dressing tables (Fig. 5); a dressing table glass with ivory finials (Fig. 5); one pot cupboard (Fig. 1); and three chamber writing tables (Fig. 6). There is also one deception table (Fig. 3), a form of bedside-table/pot cupboard with drop leaves fitted with a fall front faced as dummy drawers – this was ordered for Mr. Gascoigne’s room.

The principal references to the dining room furniture in the Gascoigne collection are to be found in Gillows Packing Book which mentions the Imperial dining table (Fig. 9), the table leaf case (Fig. 8) and horse-shoe port or ‘sociable’ table (Fig. 7),

1. ‘Round front Pot Cupboard' by Gillows, 1811, ht. 31½ in.
2. Bookcase, made in 1811 by Gillows of Lancaster for Parlington, mahogany with brass lattice, ht. 90 in.
all being despatched in October 1810. The room was also provided with eighteen chairs, a folding screen, two dumb waiters, two butler’s trays, two knife trays and two handsome sideboards.

The identifiable group of furniture reflects Gillows conventional ‘house-style’. Their work was described by a contemporary German visitor as being ‘good and solid, though not of the first class of inventiveness’. The combination of sound craftsmanship with relatively conservative taste evidently had a wide appeal for the firm’s records show that they were supplying large and small consignments of neat mahogany furniture to many customers in northern England and Scotland. The schedules reveal virtually identical models were supplied both to members of the professional classes and wealthy country house owners. Their standard designs apparently changed very slowly, a sketch in the Estimate Book indicates that a five-drawer dressing-table repeating the one illustrated in Fig. 5 was ordered for ‘General Jones’ on 12 March 1806.

Three other houses equipped by Gillows at approximately the same date contain instructive comparative collections: Tatton Park, near Knutsford; Broughton Hall near Skipton and Harewood House. In each case the furniture offers striking analogies, the only difference in uniformity in many instances being the pattern of stamped brass handles and profile of the turned feet. The Tempest family of Broughton patronised the firm over several generations and in 1812 ordered a large consignment of bedroom furniture most of which remains in the house. The complete suites give a useful idea of what the matching items sold from Parlington—bedsteps, biddets and washstands—must have looked like. At Tatton Park, home of the Egerton family, much of the bedroom furniture (apart from beds) is also extant. The rooms were, however, more expensively equipped than at Parlington—more elaborate de luxe models being supplied, for instance many

3. ‘Deception’ Table with fall-front cupboard by Gillows, 1811, ht. 32 in.

4. ‘Carriage’ chair, rosewood with brass inlay, one of a pair supplied by Gillows c. 1812, ht. 35 in.
5. Dressing Table and ‘Landscape’ Dressing Glass by Gillows, 1811; the centre drawer stamped ‘GILLOWS. LANCASTER’, ht. of table 33 in., glass 24½ in.

6. Two Chamber Writing Tables with lidded compartments for writing accessories, by Gillows, 1811, ht. 29 in.
7. Port or 'Sociable' table with trolley for cut-glass decanters, brass rods and baize curtain, by Gillows, 1810, ht. 34.

of the dressing tables have reeded corner colonettes and satinwood instead of japo-
ned chairs stood in the bedrooms. However, other pieces correspond exactly to those supplied to Richard Oliver Gascoigne.

Very little of the furniture at these three houses bears Gillows impressed mark; at Lotherton only the two dressing tables are stamped 'GILLOWS. LANCASTER' (on the top edge of the central drawer). However, some items were 'signed' in pencil by the craftsman responsible for 'making' them. The table leaf cabinet is inscribed on the back 'Barrow' and two dressing tables were signed on the drawer bottoms 'Thom Myers' and 'C Dixon'.

The pair of curricle chairs (Fig. 4) recorded in the large drawing room when the 1843 Parlington inventory was taken, are the only completely undocumented articles. However, they are so similar in design and styling to a pair made by Gillows for Tatton Park in 1812 that their authorship cannot be doubted!
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8. Table Leaf Case (containing spare leaves for the dining table in Fig. 9) by Gillows, 1810 the back inscribed with worman's name 'Barrow', ht. 66 in.

9. Detail of 'Imperial' Dining Table by Gillows, 1810, ht. 28½ in.

4. Leeds Archives Dept: GG/F4/5 (p. 56 records 'Billiard Table, Gillows').
6. The Gillow Records are now at Westminster City Libraries and are available on microfilm at Leeds City Libraries. Furniture for Parlington appears in the following entries:
   ACCOUNT BOOK. 1811–1821. No. 344/156 Reel 84. pp. 53–64, for R. O. Gascoigne Esq., of Parlington, near Aberford, Yorks.
   LEDGER. 1813–1940. No. 344/57. Reel 31. See index under 'Gascoigne'.
8. For relevant pages see note 6.
15. Sold in 1972, see note 5 (Lots 481 & 483).
17. I would like to thank the Archives Department Westminster City Library for permission to quote from the Gillows papers, also Christopher Gilbert and Jacob Simon for their help in the preparation of this article.
APPENDIX


LANCASTER August 7th 1811.
N.1. South Bedroom.

To a handsome four-post Bedstead 6 ft. 6 wide 7 ft. 0 long. Pillars 8 ft. 8 high, turned, through Reeded, and twisted; framed post head, lath bottom, double screwed framed corners, brass wheel castors.

To a sett of Handsome japanned and gilt Trafalgar corners

To an elegant Drapery furniture for Do. Vizt.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
6\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds Ell wide print} & @ 6/6 & 21. 12. 6. \\
120 \text{ yds Ell wide yellow calico to line} & @ 2/8 & 16. 0. 0. \\
16\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds strong white calico} & @ 1/- & 0. 16. 6. \\
132 \text{ yds quality binding} & @ 6d. & 3. 6. 0. \\
46\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds Parisian fringe} & @ 7/6. & 16. 5. 6. \\
\text{Rings tape silk and thread etc.} & & 0. 15. 6. \\
\text{Cutting out and making up} & & 4. 14. 6. \\
\end{array}
\]

\[£18. 7. 0d.\]

To a stout tick bordered and quilted pillowcase.

To a good bordered and quilted stripe linen hair mattress.

To a fine white linen flock mattress bordered and quilted.

To a slip case for do.

\[£63. 9. 0d.\]

To 10\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds strong white binding} @ 2/10

\[£1. 16. 3d.\]

Thread and ? making do.

\[6/6\]

To a supfine bordered and welted Bed and Bolster.

\[£20. 13. 0d.\]

\[\text{filld with the best season and dress’d Feathers (note in the margin 61 lb. best feathers)}\]

To two large white pillows

\[£1. 16. 0d.\]

To a pair supfine Whitney Blankets \[15/4\]

\[£5. 0. 0d.\]

To \frac{1}{4} \text{ pair do} \[17/4\]

\[£1. 15. 0d.\]

To a supfine white counterpane \[16/4\]

\[£5. 5. 0d.\]

To a French Window Curtain to suit the Bed. Vizt. \[5:7 \times 10\times 10\]

\[£20. 10. 5d.\]

\[27\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds Ell wide print} @ 6/6\]

\[8. 18. 9.\]

\[32\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds Ell wide yellow calico to line} @ 2/8\]

\[4. 6. 8.\]

\[9\frac{1}{2} \text{ yds Parisian Fringe @ 7/-}\]

\[3. 4. 9.\]

\[36 \text{ yds quality binding} @ 6d.\]

\[0. 18. 0.\]

\[A \text{ rack pulley 2/- 9 yds line 1/6d.}\]

\[0. 3. 6.\]

\[4 \text{ tassels @ 7/- = 28/- 4 yds ? line 4/-}\]

\[1. 12. 0.\]

\[2 \text{ cloak pins @ 6d. = 1/- 2 brackets 9d = 1/6d.}\]

\[0. 2. 6.\]

\[\text{Rings tape silk and thread.}\]

\[0. 5. 9.\]

\[\text{Cutting out and making up complete.}\]

\[£20. 10. 5d.\]

\[\text{To a window curtain same.}\]

\[\text{To 2 handsome jappand and gilt Trafalgar Cornices.}\]

\[\text{To 2 polished pulley rods and hooks.}\]

\[\text{To a handsome mahogany five drawer dressing table} \{\]

\[\text{3ft 6 long on turned reeded legs and brass socket castors.}\]

\[\text{To a handsome landscape dressing glass to place on do} \}\]

\[\text{with reeded stiles, plate 19\times 15 ins.}\]

\[\text{To a handsome mahogany double Wash Stand with glass to} \}

\[\text{swing at back, turnd Reeded legs and castors.}\]

\[\text{filld up with enamel ware with yellow borders +}\]

\[\text{Decanter Essence Bottle to complete}\]

\[12\frac{1}{2} \text{ gns.}\]

\[\text{To 2 chamber vases to suit the ware}\]

\[\text{To 2 mahogany bedsteps one with Night table the other}\]

\[\text{a Biddett turned reeded legs and sides painted with}\]

\[\text{lozenge cornered beads.}\]

\[\text{To 2 mahogany round front Pot cupboards with rims}\]

\[\text{and on Reeded legs.}\]

\[3 \text{ gns.}\]

\[6. 6. 0.\]

\[\text{To a mahogany three fold airing horse.}\]

\[12/-\]

\[0. 12. 0.\]

\[\text{To 4 neat jappand chairs Argyle with rush seats}\]

\[\text{olive ground}\]

\[\text{ornaments @16/-}\]

\[3. 4. 0.\]

\[\text{To 2 fine do.}\]

\[\text{To 10\frac{1}{2} yds spare Ell wide print (in two pieces)}\]

\[@ 6/6\]

\[3. 8. 3.\]
In 1944 Frank Fulford’s collection of 86 étuis were given to Temple Newsam by his widow and Mrs. Jackson, her daughter. Because it has remained undivided the collection presents a remarkably comprehensive picture of stylistic and technical changes in the eighteenth century, unlike the snuff boxes discussed in the last issue of this Calendar which are only one sixth of the total number he acquired. Although some of his attributions were inaccurate, Fulford’s collecting was based on an instinctive feeling for quality.

The Oxford English Dictionary expresses some doubt about the derivation of the word étui (sometimes spelt etwee): Florio, writing in 1611, uses the form estuife and estuwefe which may possibly derive from the word huswife. Alternatively Havard, whose account in his dictionary is indispensable, suggests that étui may derive, via the French verb estuer, from the Latin studiare, and the idea of protection implicit in this derivation is clearly seen in Diderot’s description of the étui as ‘especie de boîte qui sert à mettre, à porter, et à conserver quelque chose’. ‘Il y a de grands étuis’ he continues ‘pour les chapeaux, les uns de bois et les autres de carton.’ In the Middle Ages étuis were cases designed to protect furniture, jewellery, cutlery and all manner of personal possessions in the nomadic existence of their owners. By the end of the seventeenth century the étuis containing spoons and forks were such common articles in houses that the very word became synonymous with cutlery, and the descriptions of the materials from which the cutlery was made were transferred to the étuis. So ‘un étui d’or’ meant in fact that the spoon and fork inside were gold: the étui itself was probably made of Morocco or Russian leather (roussy), sheepskin or shagreen. In 1697 an inventory of Louis XIV’s belongings enumerates 76 étuis, each with a spoon and fork. Forty-six were shagreen, the rest red morocco; most were made by Le Roy, cutler to the King.

In the eighteenth century étuis became extremely fashionable and Lazare Duvaux supplied Louis XV with ‘un étui de rosette verte, polie, garni de charnières et crochets d’or’ containing a set of gold coffee-spoons. However, the word étui had come to encompass more than sets of cutlery. It included cases fitted with washing things, mathematical and surgical instruments or pencil and writing tablet for memoranda. Unfitted cases, for needles and pins (hitherto called aiguilliers and épingliers), and for toothpicks and earpicks were also known simply as étuis, and it is these that are so well represented in the Fulford collection.

Under laws of 1664 and 1690 gold étuis were taxed as jewellery while leather examples were treated as haberdashery. A sumptuary law passed in 1700 forbade the use of objets de luxe made of gold or silver, but it was left open to those who possessed such objects to keep them if it did not offend their conscience. An early eighteenth century description records their function and some of the decorative techniques used: ‘Les étuis à cure-dents, à aiguilles et à épingles’ wrote Savary de Bruslons in his Dictionnaire Universel de Commerce published between 1723 and 1730: ‘sont des petits cylindres creusés en dedans avec un convexe, dans lesquels on enferme ces petits ustenciles de propreté ou de couture. Il s’en fait d’or, d’argent, ou piqûés de clouds de ces deux métaux, et d’autres encore de bois, d’yvoire ou de carton couvert de cuir’. It is obvious that several decades did nothing to alter their function or appearance for the passage just quoted was repeated word for word by Diderot in his famous Encyclopédie.

Most of the materials mentioned by Savary de Bruslons are represented in the Fulford collection and the earliest étuis,
which are entirely of gold, are approximately contemporary with his description (Fig. 1). Two have chased decoration consisting of strapwork, relieved by scrolled foliage and shell motifs, centering on imaginary scenes or human profiles. The smaller has a ring at the top, probably for a chatelaine. The larger strongly recalls English plasterwork decoration. Neither is marked. Nor is a third étui whose engraved decoration consists of two figures, probably characters from a masque and copied from engravings. The nationality of all three is uncertain but they represent ornament characteristic of the period of transition from late Baroque to early Rococo.

The Rococo style in Paris, the city of its origin, is clearly seen in Fulford's étuis, when only its reflection was visible in his boxes. The most attractive example is the beautiful étui inlaid with gentian flowers in transparent blue, green and yellow basse-taille enamels against an engraved gold background (Fig. 2a); despite having suffered a certain amount of damage it remains technically superb and visually enchanting. It is, however, unmarked although its very close stylistic resemblance to, among other things, an opera-glass at Waddesdon Manor, struck with the date-letter for 1750–1, makes its attribution to Paris likely. Even more unusual is the

The étuis are described from left to right.
1. (a) English or German, c. 1730, h. 7·5 cm
   (b) Perhaps English, c. 1730, h. 9·7 cm
   (c) Perhaps Dutch, c. 1730, h. 8·4 cm
earliest marked Parisian étui in the collection (Fig. 2b). This has a design of ostrich feathers spiralling over almost the entire surface. Details are picked out in white, blue and black enameled flowers fired directly on to the surface of the gold. The étui was made by the Parisian goldsmith Pierre Flament in 1755–6. The marks are almost entirely obliterated by the decoration and so are those on another étui made in Paris in 1767–8. This is decorated in a similar technique, but with a design of strapwork enclosing enameled flowers (Fig. 2c) against a textured background. This is so similar to contemporary brocaded and embroidered silks that the étui might have been made to match a particular example. The same can often be said of snuff boxes. Another étui which is probably French resembles the delicate brocaded silks fashionable during the middle years of the eighteenth century (Fig. 3c). It is made of blonde tortoiseshell inlaid with points of gold, or ‘piqué de clouds’ in the words of Savary de Bruslons.

Rococo étuis were also made in Germany and in England although their debt to the fashionable style was often restricted to the small gold bands with which the hardstone often used for the container was mounted (Fig. 3b). Étuis were undoubtedly popular in England. Steele, writing in 1710 talked of ‘Gold Etuys for Quills, Scissors, Needles, Thimbles.’ Fifty years later Shenstone mentioned ‘The gold etwee, with all its bright inhabitants, shall waste its melting stores.’ A glance at the trade cards of London goldsmiths illustrated by Sir Ambrose Heal confirms that many makers were producing étuis although fitted cases greatly outnumber the others. Of the latter, however, there is a large group which may be English, and one is in the Fulford Collection (Fig. 3a). Made of dark green hardstone it is almost completely covered with a gold cagework of pierced rococo scrolls and other motifs. Rather more elegant and displaying workmanship of superior quality is a moss-agate scent bottle (Fig. 4) whose scrolls are inhabited by squirrels and psuedo-oriental birds of the imaginary species so beloved by the craftsmen responsible for decorating the English rococo interior. The cage-work technique recalls the ‘petit étuit nécessaire en filigranne d’argent’ mentioned by Havard as belonging to a Madame Largillière, the wife of an artist.

The variety of materials used in making étuis is well represented in the Fulford collection. The composition material called ‘vernis’ was one of the commonest and was cheap to produce. One étui in the collection imitates oriental lacquer which was extremely popular (Fig. 5b). The French origin of the table at which the scholar is seated is, however, unmistakable. More often than not, vernis étuis are purely European in inspiration, some following contemporary textiles, others contemporary paintings. Most of those in the collection belong to the later 1760s. Their popularity is demonstrated in the Lost Property column of eighteenth century newspapers which on 8 August 1763, mentioned a vernis étui, decorated on a gold ground with a gold band and tortoiseshell bezel, containing an earpick and a gold quill. With the exception of the contents this description might apply to any one of a half-dozen of Fulford’s étuis. Cases made of enamel also seem to have been popular, more in England probably than on the Continent, although there is one interesting example which may be French or German. Two further étuis, of ivory carved with chinoiserie designs, and of steel inlaid with rococo decoration in coloured golds, may well be English (Fig. 5c). Steel was also used in France.

Amongst the most distinguished étuis at Temple Newsam is an English one (Fig. 7a), probably made about 1770, and it introduces us to the neo-classical style which, following tentative advances in Paris in the 1750s, took the goldsmiths and their patrons by storm in the 1760s. Initial sorties were made with Greek decoration (found on a snuff box of 1763–4 in this collection), and it is a band of Greek meander that features prominently on the étui with floral decoration executed in dark blue transparent basse-taille enamels. Although a number of similarly decorated objects are also probably English (there is a London-made snuff box of 1767–8), their debt to France where the technique of basse-taille enamelling originated is considerable. In the Ashmolean there is a
2. (a) Probably French, c. 1750, h. 9.2 cm  
    (b) Paris 1755-6, maker Pierre Flament (m. 1754-1767), h. 11.9 cm  
    (c) Paris 1767-8, maker’s mark NM, an uncertain difference, h. 8.6 cm

3. (a) English or German, c. 1755, h. 12 cm  
    (b) English, c. 1770, h. 10.4 cm  
    (c) French or Italian, c. 1755, h. 12.9 cm

4. Snuff-bottle, probably English, c. 1755, h. 6.2 cm

5. (a) Perhaps English, c. 1760, h. 11.5 cm  
    (b) Probably French, c. 1765, h. 13.8 cm  
    (c) Probably English, c. 1765, h. 9.4 cm
comparable snuff box bearing Paris marks for 1762–3.\footnote{11}

French neo-classicism is illustrated in almost all its phases by étuis at Temple Newsam. The earliest was made by Nicolas Durier in 1764–5 and in the division of its surface into small panels indicates the way in which the new style was to develop, although the naturalistic flowers in contrasting coloured gold which form bands round the étui are part of the vocabulary of the Rococo (Fig. 8b). These bands are certainly quite different from the formal leaf-tip borders of the 1770s exemplified on another étui by Nicolas Durier, made in 1775–6 (Fig. 8a), and from the stylised small-scale floral bands of the 1780s, illustrated by an étui made in 1785 by Nicolas-Jean-Baptiste Choconain-Delaunay (Fig. 8c). These two étuis demonstrate well the stylistic consistency of the period, for the former has trophies in ribboned oval frames set against a fluted background, while the latter has a horizontally-striped ground with depressed circles, all features which, with their characteristic border patterns, can be found on contemporary snuff boxes and sword hilts. This consistency is not entirely surprising because all three types of object were sometimes made by the same maker. Moreover designs were practically common property: the étui by Choconain-Delaunay is matched by an identical one made two years earlier by another maker.\footnote{12}

All-gold étuis of the type mentioned above were extremely popular in the second half of the eighteenth century. Madame de Pompadour owned an étui à cure-dents, or de couleur\footnote{13}, and the Lost Property column in the newspapers mentions on 24 November 1774 ‘un étui d’or guilloché, contenant des cure-dents et renfermé dans un étui de galuchat vert’. This is interesting for the reference to engine-turning (guilloché) which first appears in the collection on an étui of 1765–6 by N. A. Delions, and to the green shagreen case (étui de galuchat vert) in which the étui was itself kept. Were it not for this one might suspect that the reason all-gold étuis were more widespread than enamelled ones (the Fulford Collection seems to bear this out) was because they could more readily withstand hard wear, to which enamels are highly vulner-

able. Perhaps the reason was after all an economic one.

Nonetheless, étuis with enamel-covered panels were made in Paris in some numbers, particularly during the 1780s, and there are a few in Fulford’s collection. Apart from their enamels they are very similar to the all-gold variety. The most spectacular is that made by Joseph-Etienne Blery in 1785 (Fig. 7c). Well-known as a boxmaker, he also produced sword hilts\footnote{14} and his work is usually distinguished by its brilliant, sometimes dramatically colourful effects. The étui is no exception. The engine-turned panels are covered with translucent blue enamel set with stars and decorative borders in gold leaf, while added colour is given by the floral bands round the étui which are done in blue and green enamels. A very similar étui by the same maker in the Louvre has in addition ‘perles d’opales’ which make it still more spectacular.\footnote{15} This type of étui was copied with great success in other countries, particularly Switzerland, and may have been more common there than in France.

The most individual and distinctive Swiss étuis do not rely so heavily on French prototypes although their design retains a general affinity to the styles current in Paris. Not being systematically marked they are not precisely datable but one of the earliest (Fig. 6a) is enamelled with oval miniatures of figures taken from paintings by Boucher and Greuze framed by floral garlands in dark blue basse-taille enamel: a similar example formerly in the Chester Beatty collection includes bands of simulated pearls\footnote{16} They were probably made about 1775. Of approximately the same date is a most beautiful Swiss étui enamelled with landscape vignettes in sepia monochrome (Fig. 6b). The oval frames are crisply enamelled in blue and white, while a rich, translucent red covers the outer bands. This crispness is characteristic of Swiss étuis, as two early-nineteenth century examples, both with counterparts in the Victoria & Albert Museum\footnote{17} show (Fig. 6c and d). In their flattened octagonal form they follow post-Revolutionary French designs but they are enamelled almost all over, whereas French examples have thin metal and sparse decoration. Havard notes

\footnote{11}{11} French neo-classicism is illustrated in almost all its phases by étuis at Temple Newsam. The earliest was made by Nicolas Durier in 1764–5 and in the division of its surface into small panels indicates the way in which the new style was to develop, although the naturalistic flowers in contrasting coloured gold which form bands round the étui are part of the vocabulary of the Rococo (Fig. 8b). These bands are certainly quite different from the formal leaf-tip borders of the 1770s exemplified on another étui by Nicolas Durier, made in 1775–6 (Fig. 8a), and from the stylised small-scale floral bands of the 1780s, illustrated by an étui made in 1785 by Nicolas-Jean-Baptiste Choconain-Delaunay (Fig. 8c). These two étuis demonstrate well the stylistic consistency of the period, for the former has trophies in ribboned oval frames set against a fluted background, while the latter has a horizontally-striped ground with depressed circles, all features which, with their characteristic border patterns, can be found on contemporary snuff boxes and sword hilts. This consistency is not entirely surprising because all three types of object were sometimes made by the same maker. Moreover designs were practically common property: the étui by Choconain-Delaunay is matched by an identical one made two years earlier by another maker.

\footnote{12}{12} All-gold étuis of the type mentioned above were extremely popular in the second half of the eighteenth century. Madame de Pompadour owned an étui à cure-dents, or de couleur, and the Lost Property column in the newspapers mentions on 24 November 1774 ‘un étui d’or guilloché, contenant des cure-dents et renfermé dans un étui de galuchat vert’. This is interesting for the reference to engine-turning (guilloché) which first appears in the collection on an étui of 1765–6 by N. A. Delions, and to the green shagreen case (étui de galuchat vert) in which the étui was itself kept. Were it not for this one might suspect that the reason all-gold étuis were more widespread than enamelled ones (the Fulford Collection seems to bear this out) was because they could more readily withstand hard wear, to which enamels are highly vulner-

\footnote{13}{13} All-gold étuis of the type mentioned above were extremely popular in the second half of the eighteenth century. Madame de Pompadour owned an étui à cure-dents, or de couleur, and the Lost Property column in the newspapers mentions on 24 November 1774 ‘un étui d’or guilloché, contenant des cure-dents et renfermé dans un étui de galuchat vert’. This is interesting for the reference to engine-turning (guilloché) which first appears in the collection on an étui of 1765–6 by N. A. Delions, and to the green shagreen case (étui de galuchat vert) in which the étui was itself kept. Were it not for this one might suspect that the reason all-gold étuis were more widespread than enamelled ones (the Fulford Collection seems to bear this out) was because they could more readily withstand hard wear, to which enamels are highly vulner-

\footnote{14}{14} Nontheless, étuis with enamel-covered panels were made in Paris in some numbers, particularly during the 1780s, and there are a few in Fulford’s collection. Apart from their enamels they are very similar to the all-gold variety. The most spectacular is that made by Joseph-Etienne Blery in 1785 (Fig. 7c). Well-known as a boxmaker, he also produced sword hilts and his work is usually distinguished by its brilliant, sometimes dramatically colourful effects. The étui is no exception. The engine-turned panels are covered with translucent blue enamel set with stars and decorative borders in gold leaf, while added colour is given by the floral bands round the étui which are done in blue and green enamels. A very similar étui by the same maker in the Louvre has in addition ‘perles d’opales’ which make it still more spectacular. This type of étui was copied with great success in other countries, particularly Switzerland, and may have been more common there than in France.

The most individual and distinctive Swiss étuis do not rely so heavily on French prototypes although their design retains a general affinity to the styles current in Paris. Not being systematically marked they are not precisely datable but one of the earliest (Fig. 6a) is enamelled with oval miniatures of figures taken from paintings by Boucher and Greuze framed by floral garlands in dark blue basse-taille enamel: a similar example formerly in the Chester Beatty collection includes bands of simulated pearls. They were probably made about 1775. Of approximately the same date is a most beautiful Swiss étui enamelled with landscape vignettes in sepia monochrome (Fig. 6b). The oval frames are crisply enamelled in blue and white, while a rich, translucent red covers the outer bands. This crispness is characteristic of Swiss étuis, as two early-nineteenth century examples, both with counterparts in the Victoria & Albert Museum show (Fig. 6c and d). In their flattened octagonal form they follow post-Revolutionary French designs but they are enamelled almost all over, whereas French examples have thin metal and sparse decoration. Havard notes
that étuis of ivory, tortoiseshell, engraved, chased and enamelled silver, of steel and expensive or aromatic wood remained popular until the mid nineteenth century. By then revivals of previous styles were being produced by mechanical methods and the vitality of invention had drained away.

In such a large collection it is inevitable that the nationality of some étuis cannot easily be determined. One which is inset with panels of mother-of-pearl engraved with heraldic emblems may be German!\(^6\)

Another, stylistically of the 1770s, incorporates a French watch movement in the lid but is struck with marks that are not French (Fig. 7b)!\(^8\) The fluting is tooled and filled with unusual brown enamel which recalls a snuff box in the collection: the marks are somewhat similar too. But it is not certain where either was made. Also of uncertain nationality is a gold étui in the form of a fish with an articulated body and naturalistic detail (Fig. 9). The head hinges upwards to reveal the inscription ON EST PRIS TOT OU TARD reserved in gold on white enamel. Such inscriptions rarely if ever occur on objects of French manufacture and the étui is unmarked. It may well be English: the London goldsmith Thomas Clark illustrated a small fish among other items, including étuis, on

---

6. (a) Swiss, c. 1770, maker’s mark probably NK, h. 11 cm  
(b) Swiss, c. 1775, maker’s mark III crowned, h. 11-1 cm  
(c) Swiss, c. 1810, h. 10-5 cm  
(d) Swiss, c. 1810, maker’s mark II over IF, h. 10-8 cm.
the border of his trade card and vinaigrettes of similar form to this étui but lacking its elegance were made at Birmingham in the early nineteenth century. But its prototype was probably Indian or Persian, and it is possible that there was a certain amount of trade in small objects of this kind between Europe and the East. Indeed there is an étui in the collection which, despite its European gold mounts, is probably Indian. It is lined with a fine-grained softwood which is certainly not European, and perhaps Havard implied the import of oriental examples when he talked of ‘bois précieux ou odorant’. Clare le Corbeiller has shown that western ‘toys’ held a great deal of fascination for the Chinese and it is not unlikely that étuis were made in the Far East specifically for the European market.

Who were the makers of gold étuis? In France they were the same goldsmiths and jewellers who made snuff boxes and, sometimes, sword hilts. This also was true in England: William Hunt and Son advertised in their trade card ‘Etwees, Snuff Boxes, Sword Hilts…’ &c. Other makers boasted Tweezer or Etweser cases, instrument and toothpick cases. Almost all the étuis in the Fulford Collection were made to contain needles, pins, toothpicks or earpicks, for which there is ample evidence in the 18th century descriptions. Perhaps there was some distinction between these by size but it seems unlikely, for this varies according to date, a tendency which may indicate, as it does with snuff boxes, the popularity of the pastime with which they are connected. Étuis of the Fulford type are often called sealing wax cases probably because a number have at the bottom coats of arms cut in reverse for sealing. In many instances these coats of arms are contemporary with the étuis (and further research may therefore reveal the identity of the original

7. (a) English, c. 1770, h. 11.3 cm
(b) Continental (watch movement French), c. 1775, h. 12.4 cm
(c) Paris 1785–6, maker Joseph-Étienne Blerzy (m. 1768–1806), h. 12.1 cm

8. (a) Paris 1775–6, maker Nicolas Durier (m. 175888), h. 10.2 cm
(b) Paris 1764–5, maker Nicolas Durier, h. 11.9 cm
(c) Paris 1785–6, maker N.J.B. Choconain-Delaunay (m. 1775–93), h. 10 cm
owners) but there appears to be no mention of sealing wax either in eighteenth or nineteenth century accounts in France or in the detailed advertisements on the trade cards of London goldsmiths. One étui in the collection does, incidentally, contain traces of red and black sealing wax but it is not one that has a coat of arms.

If Frank Fulford’s view that the majority of his étuis were French has proved to be optimistic, it is because scholars today are reluctant to make such an attribution unless an étui (or snuff-box) is fully marked, that is with the maker’s mark, that of the maison-commune and the charge and discharge mark of the sous-fermier. The small gold bands on vernis étuis are usually struck with the discharge mark only, but otherwise the rule is a sound one. The earliest marked Paris étuis in the collection are struck with the first three marks on the outside of the case where they were expertly camouflaged amongst the decoration, which was done afterwards. On étuis of the 1770s and 80s, however, the marks appear inside the lid, concealed in normal circumstances but near enough to the opening to be readable if necessary. This may indicate a change either in the marking procedure, for the marks on the later étuis would have had to be struck while the gold was still in sheet form, or in the way the makers contrived to make the marks visible without interfering with the decoration. The virtual concealment of the three main marks can trap the unwary, but there are compensations. For the makers of Swiss étuis either overlooked or disregarded the marks, merely imitating the discharge mark, struck in full view on the bezel; this can help confirm one’s attributions.

Among the Parisian goldsmiths whose marks appear on étuis in the Fulford collection are some well-known specialists, J. E. Blerzy and N. C. D. Choconain-Delaunay for example, and some, like Pierre Flament, whose names are less familiar. As on the snuff-boxes a number of other marks occur too, notably two countermarks used by the sous-fermier Henri Clavel during his term of office, 1781–9, and one by Jean-François Kalendrin, from 1789. Most of the Paris restricted warranty marks used between 1798 and the present are represented and so are several Dutch duty marks. There are a few marks which have not been identified. A large proportion of the étuis have incised dealers’ stock numbers and price codes which may eventually allow the dealers from whom Fulford acquired them to be identified. No fewer than seventeen came from the same source.

The Fulford collection of étuis is far more than merely a comprehensive coverage of what is after all a specialised subject. It contains many objects of outstanding beauty which can be appreciated in their own right. Perhaps the illustrations will go some way towards filling the gap left by Diderot who concluded his brief (and second-hand) account by saying ‘Les différents espèces d’étuis sont en si grand nombre, qu’il serait impossible de les décrire toutes.’

A. D. P. WELLS-COLE

2. An English edition in 2 volumes was published between 1751 and 1755. Kenneth Snowman illustrated a number of rather dissimilar *étuis* under the name of tooth-pick cases in his *18th century Gold Boxes of Europe*, Pls. 473 & 483.

3. Sachaverell Sitwell, writing in *K. Snowman, op. cit.*, Appendix A, p. 126, says that gentians were not garden flowers in the eighteenth century but were introduced later from the Himalayas.

4. It may not strictly be true that this is the earliest marked Parisian *étui* in the collection, for an enamel example with silver mounts, 4.85/44, is struck on the bezel with what may be with salmon's head discharge mark of Antoine Leschaudel, used 1744-50. The *étui* resembles a snuff box repr. Le Corbeiller, *European and American Snuff Boxes 1730-1830*, Fig. 574. This has French marks of the same date.


6. *Works* (1764), I. 299. This and the previous extract quoted from the O.E.D.

7. Also from Frank Fulford's collection but given with his Chinese scent bottles by Mrs. Fulford and Mrs. Jackson in 1945.

8. See footnote 4.

9° *Leeds Arts Calendar*, No. 71, 1972, p. 14, Fig. 4.


15. Sold at Sotheby's, 17 vi.1963, lot 271.


17. There is a similar chatelaine in the Joan Evans Collection lent to the V & A.

18. The movement was made by Fol of Paris; J. Fol is recorded in *Britten's Old Clocks and Watches and their makers*, 7th Ed. 1956, p. 380, as watchmaker to the King of Poland. His son was watchmaker to Louis XVI. Three snuff boxes in the Ashmolean bear identical marks, R4, R6, H19. The *étui* is perhaps Italian.


22. The largest *étuis* belong to the 1760s; later ones are smaller. Mrs. Delany, commenting in 1769 on the decline of needlework as a pastime in England, wrote 'I fear CARDS usurp the NEEDLE'S Dominon' (letter for Mrs. Daven, 19 October 1769); by 1793 the popular pursuits had become 'dancing, and flirting in London' (John Byng on a visit to Aston Park, in *Torrington Diaries*, Vol. III, p. 221. I am indebted to Karin-M. Walton for these extracts and for a number of other references).

23. The description is frequently met in sale catalogues and was used by Noce and Dreyfus in their catalogue, e.g. no. 118. The only *étui* in the Fulford Collection specifically designed for scaling wax is a Fabergé one, 4.29/44. Two entries in the *Livre-Journal* of Lazare Duvaux are relevant here: no. 1032 'La gravure de ses armes au bout d'un étui d'or' (22 January 1752), and no. 2528 'Avoir remis un bout d'or à un étui et avoir fait regraver les armes...' (10 July 1756). The latter is particularly interesting, for while it refers to replacing the flat gold disk and recutting the coat of arms, it may also suggest that *étuis* were not originally fitted with a disk and were therefore not intended for scaling wax. I am most grateful to Mrs. Le Corbeiller for supplying me with these and other extracts from the *Livre-Journal*, and for a great deal of other help.

24. Except when the marks are inconsistent, as on 4.61/44, which may be an indication of Swiss manufacture.

25. The maker's mark was sometimes repeated on the bezel. The discharge mark was invariably struck there.

26. On one *étui*, however, they are struck half-way up the lid on the inside, 4.26/44.

27. Some of the thirty-nine separate styles of marks must, of course, represent intermediate transactions rather than those by which Fulford acquired the *étuis*. 
A Chest of Drawers by Giles Grendey

It is well known that during the 18th century very few furniture makers labelled their work. An interesting exception to this general rule was Giles Grendey, whose trade labels have been recorded on a scattering of pieces, all of which can be dated on stylistic grounds to c. 1740–50. However, the rarity of these labelled examples suggests that he only practiced this form of advertisement during a relatively short period of his long life (1693–1780).

Documentary evidence of Grendey’s activities is sparse and no pieces unambiguously authenticated by surviving accounts have been identified. The Longford Castle papers\(^1\) contain an isolated entry in the year 1739 to ‘Grenday, Chair-maker £68’; during the 1730’s he received various small sums from Richard Hoare of Barn Elms\(^2\) and between 1746 and 1756 he was paid £207.4.4 for furniture at Stourhead, including £64 for chairs on 29 April 1746\(^3\). The well known set of shell back chairs at Stourhead may, accordingly, be products of his workshop. A triple shell back settee of very similar design was bought for Temple Newsam in 1969\(^4\) and many other closely allied examples are known – plausibly all by the same maker. In support of this theory, R. W. Symonds\(^5\) has recorded several specimens bearing sets of impressed initials on the frames including the stamps ‘T T’ and ‘B R’, the former initials occur on chairs carrying Grendey’s label and he is apparently one of the few makers who allowed journeymen to mark their work. Furthermore, the seat rails of a chair belonging to this ‘family’, recently illustrated by Geoffrey Wills\(^6\), are embellished with carving akin to the enriched apron of a labelled cabinet at Colonial Williamsburg? The evidence is at present too soft to support firm conclusions, but Grendey is precisely the kind of tycoon who could have produced shell back suites in large numbers.

Two versions of Giles Grendey’s trade label are known differing slightly in format and text. The marginally longer variant, which includes the words ‘Tables’ occurs on random items in a vast suite of scarlet japanned furniture (Fig. 3) which he supplied to the Duke of Infantado’s Castle at Lazcano in Northern Spain about 1740\(^8\). Two labelled armchairs and six single chairs (one with a label) from this source were bought for Temple Newsam in 1970. An identical printed label is pasted on the underside of two drawers in a cabinet now at Colonial Williamsburg and also on a mahogany press with cupboard base illustrated in Georgian Cabinet-makers, pl. 51. Edward Joy has noted the existence of a pre-Director style mirror by Giles Grendey in Norway? confirming his participation in the export trade.

The shorter label is found on a resplendent suite of chairs reproduced in Percy Macquoid’s Age of Mahogany, pls. 103, 105 and 107. Inevitably a much larger group of cabinets, tables and chairs have been attributed to Grendey on the evidence of stylistic analogy with the proven items!\(^9\) Now, another, uncommonly interesting specimen has come to light in the collection of Judge Philip Curtis (Fig. 1) bearing the shorter label inside one of the drawers (Fig. 2). In contrast to the other cabinet-work, in which mahogany is the primary timber, this unpretentious chest of drawers\(^11\) is veneered in richly figured walnut with crossbanded drawer fronts. It is fitted with a brushing slide above the middle drawer which could be pulled out for clothes to be laid flat on and brushed—a recurrent feature of Grendey’s designs. It had always been considered a little surprising that, although Grendey was born in 1693 and
presumably completed his apprenticeship about 1715, all his labelled products apparently date from the 1740's; accordingly it is very satisfying to report the existence of this walnut piece, markedly different in character to his previously recorded work, although it is probably not earlier than 1730. The square bracket feet and cornice are slightly restored and the brasses replaced.

CHRISTOPHER GILBERT

2. ibid, p. 47.
4. L.A.C., No. 65 (1969) p. 4, Fig. 2.
6. English Furniture 1550–1760, 1971, p. 229, Fig. 175.
7. A. Heal, London Furniture Makers 1660–1840, 1953, Fig. 24.
11. Purchased from a trade source in Stockport about 1946.

2. Giles Grendey's trade label (shorter version).

3. Giles Grendey's trade label (longer version).
Temple Newsam Boundary Stones

The 6 in Ordnance Survey map of Temple Newsam (Sheet 218) published in 1851, marks a large number of boundary stones on the estate. It would require much antiquarian-research to establish the exact status of each area indicated since, in the past, Temple Newsam embraced a Township, a Manor, a Lordship and there are also Parish and Parliamentary Boundaries to consider.

Open-cast mining in the park during the 1940's obliterated nearly all the alignments, by 1966 only three examples remained, today the figure is one and this solitaire has been lifted and re-set in the stable court. It originally stood beside the coach road to Whitkirk, just beyond the lodges and the rounded top is boldly inscribed 'IC' for Ingram/Colton; there was until recently another from the same series set in undergrowth against the park wall W.S.W. of the house. The illustration shows a handsome stone inscribed 'TA' (Temple Newsam/Austhorpe), lone survivor of a group at Whitkirk until engulfed by a housing estate in 1969.

The longest parade formerly travelled East-West across Dog Kennel Hill, according to oral tradition they bore the letters 'NC' (Newsam Green/Colton). There used to be a spectacular boundary stone embellished with the Irwin Coat of Arms in a hedge bottom near the corner of Bullerthorpe and Newsam lanes, demarcating the line between the Manor of Temple Newsam and the Township of Swillington. There was an epic boundary dispute between the Lowthers of Swillington Hall and the Ingrams which flared for fifty years, agreement being finally reached in 1730. This great lawsuit is fully documented in the Temple Newsam papers and the heraldic flourish was doubtless inspired by the litigation.

The boundaries of the Parish of Whitkirk and Township of Temple Newsam coincide along the West side of Bullerthorpe Lane and are indicated by a high earth bank or ridge. John Ray, the Vicar of Whitkirk, has left a picturesque account of a boundary perambulation undertaken on 14 May 1708 in which he, Lord Irwin together with his Uncle, Steward, Attorney, the local schoolmaster, estate tenants and 26 boys 'beat the bounds' digging sods and reading Gospels at intervals to assert their rights. Their route is carefully described and can be followed on several early 19th century enclosure maps.

The only other local boundary stone is preserved at the Manor House, Whitkirk; it is of triangular section, inscribed: 'THIS STONE STANDS IN JOSEPH POWELL HEDG ROW' and initialled 'J.P.' A stone in the garden of the coach house opposite is also lettered J.P. and the key-stone of one of the nearby barns (demolished 1972) was carved with a Templars Cross, the initials J.P. and the date 1777. The Powells were yeomen farmers living at Whitkirk and a plan amongst the archives shows that Joseph Powell sold a parcel of land to Lady Hertford in 1820, it marks Hedges 'now taken up'.

C.G.G.
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