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ABSTRACT

This research presented here examines the dynamics behind the highly successful dissemination of neo-Palladian architecture in the first half of the eighteenth century in England. A detailed analysis of the lives and architectural commissions of subscribers to all three volumes of Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*, which were published in 1715, 1717 and 1725 respectively, has been carried out and has led to the discovery of new information concerning this phase of architectural history. Such an inclusive approach, which examines both the subscribers and their buildings and designs for gardens within contemporary society and culture, has produced many new connections and relationships. These links, whether architectural, societal, mercantile, political, artistic, regional, or familial, are presented here and their significance for the neo-Palladian style is expounded.

One of the key findings of the thesis centres on the apolitical nature of the style, firmly separating neo-Palladianism from the received view that its success was due solely to the rise of Whiggism. Another major finding challenges the origins of the style in England and the tendency in current historiographical analysis to examine neo-Palladianism purely in relation to the early aristocracy. Research presented here links the style’s burgeoning popularity to the financial conditions of the early eighteenth century and an emergent group of wealthy, risk-taking merchants. This work provides a major revision of the accepted view of the neo-Palladian style and its all-encompassing success in the eighteenth century.
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INTRODUCTION

The re-birth of neo-Palladianism in England in the early eighteenth century did not commence with the efforts and manipulations of Lord Burlington in the 1720s. Neither did it spring from the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury’s call for a new national style in 1712 recommending an architecture ‘founded in truth and nature’ and ‘independent of fancy’. Although both the letter, and Burlington’s campaigning, were important catalysts in shaping the style’s future, neo-Palladianism was already dawning in the English consciousness in the first tentative years of the new century.

The Act of Settlement in 1701, although an Act stemming from religious and monarchical ambitions, was the primary determining factor in turning the English artistic perspective towards Germany and ultimately in inspiring the English neo-Palladian revival of the eighteenth century. In 1700 the Queen’s only surviving child, William Duke of Gloucester, died leaving no direct heir to succeed as king. The Act was passed, therefore, to secure the Protestant succession in England after the death of Queen Anne and, in practice, this meant that the throne would pass to her Protestant Hanoverian kin. Although the Queen lived for another thirteen years, following the passing of the Act, this period was one of subtle change and re-orientation towards Germany. Currying favour with the Elector, the man most likely to become the next King of England, came to be regarded as a necessity by the elite. The result was a stream of visitors from England to the Hanoverian Court during these years with many young men embarking upon Grand Tours in Europe and adding Hanover to their itineraries of planned destinations. Shaftesbury’s letter clearly pointed towards a new national architecture, but did not go so far as to name what form this should take. Perhaps this regrettable omission, unusual for the philosopher’s clear, if sometimes contradictory, style in correspondence, occurred because so many of the English elite, the target audience for the letter, had already seen the new style in Hanover and there was, therefore, no need to be more specific.

The architectural style displayed at the Hanoverian Court was transported back to England in the minds of the English visitors and began to infiltrate the Baroque culture in the homeland; the architectural expression of which was seen to have become stultified, aimless and reminiscent only of past indulgences. The architectural display in Hanover constituted an enthusiastic emulation of Italian Renaissance forms and more specifically, Andrea Palladio’s stylistic legacy which was being resurrected there. 1701 was, therefore, a defining year for England’s religious and monarchical establishment as well as for its architectural future, turning the insular English perspective towards Italy via Germany.
From 1701 England was inextricably influenced by Hanoverian artistic aspirations and it is for this reason that research into the evolution and dissemination of neo-Palladianism, as presented here, starts with this seminal year, not as most studies do, from 1712 when Shaftesbury wrote his letter, from 1714 when George I ascended the throne or from 1715 when Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus* was first published. 1701 was a cultural watershed, beyond which time an eclectic neo-Palladianism evolved, and, arising from the German interpretation of Palladian forms, this style was to dominate England’s architectural output for the next half century. The efforts of the first, pioneering, English neo-Palladians, which are analysed in detail below, were then seized upon, purified and propelled forward by the great evangelising obsessive, Lord Burlington; a propulsion which was primary in disseminating the idiom. The momentum created by Lord Burlington and others in promoting the style was such that neo-Palladianism remained popular for several decades and, with no new convincing interpretation of classical architecture to take its place until the late 1750s, its waning only began in earnest in the 1760s. 1758 saw the return of Robert Adam from his travels in Italy and the dawning of a new age. Adam began the construction of his neo-Classical south façade at Kedleston in Derbyshire just after 1760, and this, combined with the publication of James Stuart and Nicholas Revett’s 1762 *The Antiquities of Athens*, sealed the fate of neo-Palladianism. A new era had been heralded and a more inclusive, more exuberant neo-Classicism superseded neo-Palladianism. For the purposes of this research, the main period for the dissemination and growth of the style is therefore taken to be between the two defining years of 1701 and 1758.

Modern literature concerning neo-Palladianism between these two dates consistently relates the success of the style to the rise of Whiggism in early eighteenth century England. There is perhaps a fundamental flaw regarding the legitimacy of such a limited approach, one which amounts to the formation of a rationale or interpretation of an architectural style in reference to a single influencing factor, at the expense of all others. To interpret any architectural movement in purely political terms, is to limit seriously the level of understanding which can be gained. Any such essay, whilst instructive, could in no way claim to present a comprehensive, contextualised view of the style in question. The strikingly all-encompassing nature of neo-Palladianism, which will be conveyed in the following research, makes it even more important that the style should be examined in its full context, embracing as many of the influencing factors as is possible and including the social, artistic, financial, cultural, intellectual as well as political conditions of the time. The research presented here has adopted this inclusive, contextualised methodology and this has led to a completely different view of neo-Palladianism, one which challenges myths that have grown up unchecked around the style. In this study neo-Palladianism has been considered in the light of the unique conditions that existed in England at
the beginning of the eighteenth century, focusing particularly on the very strong societal links that were then in operation. To date there has been no study linking neo-Palladianism firmly to contemporary society or one which seeks to understand the dynamics of the style as it related to its social context. The approach taken has produced surprising results, high-lighting the absolute necessity of examining neo-Palladianism in this holistic way.

Far greater than allegiance to a single political style, in this case the much vaunted Whiggism, it will be shown how neo-Palladianism transcended political boundaries and petty divisions and appeared as the physical manifestation of a nation struggling towards a unified and established identity. With the turbulent episode of the Glorious Revolution still fresh in the minds of the English populace, and the country’s constitutional future far from certain under the foreign Hanoverians, the stability of ancient Rome held great appeal. History has proved that in times of change and uncertainty there is a strong tendency to antiquarianize by looking back to more settled and idealised eras, and the retrospective outlook in the early eighteenth century was no exception. This turn to ancient Rome by the English elite, as a general guide to life, represented a deeper search for stability and self-justification which, it was considered, could be achieved by imitating the forefathers of ancient Rome. In reproducing an ancient Roman architectural style, neo-Palladianism was entirely suited to this ‘justification through antiquity’ culture. This research makes it clear that the Haut Ton was searching for an intelligent and vindicatory architecture to form the visible figuration of its national identity and, through the solidity of a stylistically unified, built environment, to present the appearance of a settled, secure and enlightened nation.

The 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury’s 1712 rallying call for a new national taste, coincided with a hiatus of anticipation as the nation awaited the new Hanoverian dynasty, whilst remaining uncertain whether the Old Pretender would raise a successful rebellion and re-establish the Stuart line. Shaftesbury’s entreaty suggests that the early eighteenth-century intelligentsia was aware of a lack of national identity and a sense of aimless uncertainty at the end of Anne’s reign. His appeal is indicative of a widely felt need among the upper classes to develop a justifiable architectural style which would reflect the progress of the nation in establishing itself and finding its cultural direction. The fact that the English elite took up so readily the avant-garde Italian Renaissance style being built at the Hanoverian Court once the succession had been established, indicates that, even though George himself was not popular, there was a general willingness to accept the new regime, and all that this encompassed, for the sake of establishing a lasting peace. For Tories and Jacobites such an unresisting, and even excited, acceptance of the new style demonstrates that it was not, at that time, associated solely with Whiggism and George I. On the contrary, Palladian style had been the style of the Stuart Court in the
seventeenth century and, for them, may well have highlighted past glories. Certainly any Whig or Hanoverian association with neo-Palladianism was not sufficient to dissuade ardent Jacobites from taking up the style, as will be demonstrated.

This research differs from foregoing studies, the aim here being to establish an historiography of the style itself. Instead of presenting another study containing detailed architectural exegeses of key neo-Palladian buildings and their settings, the aim of this research is to examine neo-Palladianism as a phenomenon in its contemporary context. The approach taken has been to investigate the patrons of neo-Palladianism, those supporters who were subscribing to the style’s main treatise and, most importantly, who were actually giving form to the style. Detailed research into the lives of, and connections between, the subscribers to all three volumes of Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus* has been carried out and organised into a database. In total there are 1463 subscribers over the three volumes, a figure first identified by Paul Bremman. However, this figure is not particularly useful as there were not 1463 different subscribers, but only 711 key individuals behind the neo-Palladian taste revolution, many individuals subscribing to all three volumes. Of these 711 subscribers, 520 are positively identified in this study and their lives are examined in as much detail as is available or as is considered relevant to neo-Palladianism. Particular attention is paid to the interconnections between subscribers and the network of societal connections which existed at this time. Many of these important links for understanding the style have remained undiscovered or un-remarked upon until now.

The methodology used here enables the net to be cast wide, incorporating all those early eighteenth-century members of the elite whose interest in the architecture was sufficient for them to subscribe to the key book pertaining to the Palladian style. Leoni’s translation of Palladio’s *I Quattro Libri D’ell Architettura*, although appearing after *Vitruvius Britannicus*, was also a seminal neo-Palladian book, influencing the dissemination of the style. Although this research concentrates particularly on *Vitruvius Britannicus*, a brief examination of the subscribers to *Palladio* was considered necessary for completeness. Its subscribers have been checked against those subscribing to Campbell’s volumes and have been found to be similar. An obvious flaw in a methodology which focuses on subscribers to a book or treatise of an architectural style might be the existence of a body of freestanding neo-Palladians who did not subscribe to Campbell’s folios, and who are therefore missing from the analysis. However, as neo-Palladianism was initially an elitest interest, and all but eighteen of the English peers subscribed to at least one volume, it is highly unlikely that such a body of independent, non-subscribing neo-Palladians existed. This theory is then tested in reverse and, during the course of the study, control groups are examined to establish whether there were groups of people...
deliberately avoiding the style. Such a discovery could have been just as informative as analysing the subscribers themselves.

Many differing groups, independent of architectural pursuits per se, have been researched in the course of this work in order to establish the factors influencing neo-Palladianism. Societies or distinct gatherings of people based on common interests, entirely unrelated to architecture and covering all aspects of early eighteenth-century society, such as the Kit-Cat Club, the October Club, the Scriblerus Club, the Tories, Whigs, Patriot Whigs, Jacobites, the Brothers Club, groups in coffee houses, banks, merchant companies such as the East India Company, the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the Royal Society, groups of military personnel as well as literary and artistic circles have been researched to ensure that there was not a strata within the elite which avoided the style. No such group has emerged, neo-Palladianism pervading all kinds of groups across and within the upper classes.

Having identified the main neo-Palladian players, inter-related circles were constructed highlighting the main themes linking them together. These include trade connections among wealthy merchants and adventurers, where it is seen that neo-Palladianism was not the preserve of the aristocracy, but was fully embraced by the mercantile element of society, a group which interacted with the Haut Ton, and was in fact vital to its survival, but which was never fully accepted by it. When examining neo-Palladianism, the historiographic tendency has been to concentrate on the aristocracy, particularly those aristocrats connected to Lord Burlington, which has meant that peripheral groups have been overlooked. Results here demonstrate the importance to the style of these peripheral groupings. Anti-government sentiment also united large groups at the time with the contemporary Tories and Jacobites forming a surprisingly large tranche of subscribers; the core Tories even having their own favoured architect. Importantly, at this distance of time, it is almost impossible to distinguish between eighteenth-century Tories and Jacobites, and this research has shown that many self-proclaimed Tories could well be identified with the legendary eighteenth-century truism that one has only to 'Scratch a Tory to find a Jacobite'. Similarly the convenient, modern day distinction between the Whigs, encompassing Parliamentarians, Republicans, Protestants and even Puritans, and the Tories, incorporating pro-Hanoverians, Royalists and Jacobites alike, was not always this clear-cut in the eighteenth century and is, therefore, unreliable.16

The interconnections between the very early neo-Palladians, such as William Benson and the little-researched John Aislabie, are here assessed thoroughly for their contribution to the dissemination of the style on both regional and national levels. These very early connections and, in some cases, friendships, have proved to be of far greater influence to the beginnings of
the style than either Whiggism or the machinations of Lord Burlington; connections which, had they not existed, raise doubts as to the ability of later neo-Palladians to generate interest in the style. Other themes, not previously explored, are also set out in this study: societal influences such as those arising from the War of Spanish Succession and the consequent military allegiances that existed, as well as role of banking in eighteenth-century England, are also presented below. Such connections, although seemingly unrelated to architectural style, were the mortar binding the society of the time and cannot, therefore, be excluded from a meaningful examination of the popular neo-Palladianism.

This research is also new in its creation of a firm association between architectural history and social history in the study of neo-Palladianism. Investigation into the dynamics of the elite in terms of the social mores of the time, fashionable events and places visited, types of communication and lifestyle, as well as the expectations of great families for making status-elevating marriages are here related to the architectural phenomenon of neo-Palladianism. Early eighteenth-century society and its adopted neo-Palladian architecture are found to be inseparably linked. What has emerged is a completely new and revisionist analysis of the style as a phenomenon. Finally, this study has no specific chapter on Lord Burlington and his circle. Despite his great contribution to neo-Palladianism, the aim of the research was to examine more peripheral areas of the style, which have been overlooked in the past, thereby contributing to new knowledge about the subject, rather than repeating existing scholarship.

---

3 For insights into the early eighteenth-century turning towards Germany see Davis, G.N., German Thought and Culture in England 1700-1770, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1969.
5 For more information on building activities in Hanover at the start of the eighteenth century see Barbara Arciszewska, The Hanoverian Court and the Triumph of Palladio: The role of Palladian architecture in the Political Ascendency of the House of Brunswick-Luneburg in Germany and England c.1700, (published thesis) University of Toronto, 1994.


14 VB1 had 301 subscribers, VB2, 466 and VB3 696 subscribers.


CHAPTER 1

WILLIAM BENSON AND THE ORIGINS OF THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH NEO-PALLADIAN REVIVAL

The history of the eighteenth century neo-Palladian revival in England has long been beset with a strange reluctance among historians to examine the emergence of the style in a truly rigorous manner. This appears to have had its roots in eighteenth-century, anti-Hanoverian propaganda and a mild form of xenophobia that abounded at the time of George I’s accession to the throne.

The trend has developed into a tendency to look only within England, and to some extent Scotland, to explain the birth of the neo-English Palladian revival: a self limiting approach to the subject that is borne out by the much rehearsed, but nevertheless inadequate, and often trite, explanations for the sudden flowering of the style.

The traditional approach has tended to argue that the neo-Palladian revival began somewhere in the middle of the second decade of the eighteenth century when the Whigs regained power and Lord Burlington (VB) began his famous evangelising crusade. This England-centred rationale has been challenged, albeit indirectly, by Barbara Arciszewska.¹ Arciszewska examines the long established but unsatisfactory history of the beginnings of neo-Palladianism in England and sows the seeds for an alternative, more satisfying explanation that allows evidence for the revival almost a decade earlier to take its proper place.

A key fact that has been ignored to date is the strong political connection that England had with Germany in the first decade of the eighteenth century; more specifically England’s connection with the Electorate of Hanover, home of the future George I of England. What began as political and diplomatic influences transferred from Hanover to England eventually and inevitably became cultural and artistic influences too.

To examine these artistic influences, particularly in terms of the neo-Palladian revival, it is first necessary to understand the political relationship between the two powers. It will be seen that the almost paranoid concern for a continuing Protestant succession in England facilitated the transference of architectural ideals, in the form of neo-Palladianism, from the Electorate to England.
RELIGIOUS AND MONARCHICAL CONTEXT IN ENGLAND 1688-1714

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was less of a revolution and more of a deliberately stage-managed event that led to the replacement of King James II with his son-in-law, Prince William of Orange. The protestant William and his wife Mary, the eldest daughter of James II, were invited to lead a rising against James as soon as it became known that James’ second wife, the Catholic Mary of Modena, had given birth to a son. Against the background of the Civil War, ending a mere twenty-eight years previously and still vivid in the mind of the English populace, the Glorious Revolution should be seen as a desperate measure. The severe unrest and lengthy strife caused by the deposition of the former King Charles I and the subsequent Civil War meant that the ousting of another King, this time James II, would only have been considered as a last resort. The fact that William and Mary succeeded in overthrowing James, the rightful Stuart monarch, indicates the high level of anti-Catholic feeling in England at the time. 2 Just as her elder sister Mary before her, the future Queen Anne also deserted her beleaguered father in favour of the Protestant cause.

When Anne succeeded to the throne in 1702, on the death of William III, there were already grave fears for the continuity of the Protestant succession. The desperately sad catalogue of miscarriages, still births and infant deaths that characterised Anne’s tragic experience of motherhood culminated in the death of her seventeenth child, and sole surviving son, the eleven year old Duke of Gloucester in July 1700. This put an end to Anne’s hopes of an heir and to Parliament it meant the end of the protestant Stuart line unless immediate measures were taken.

The lack of a Protestant successor heightened the danger from the strong Jacobite faction in the country and ultimately led to the Act of Settlement being passed in 1701, which ensured that if Anne died with no children, the throne should pass to her Hanoverian cousins, the descendants of James I’s daughter, and the closest Protestant members of the Royal family. 3 The person to whom the throne would pass was the Electress Sophia, grand-daughter of James I.

Sophia was born in exile in 1630, the daughter of the ‘Winter King’, or Frederick V of Bohemia, who lost his Palatinate Kingdom during the Thirty Years War. Sophia’s mother, Elizabeth, daughter of James I of England, was charged by her husband on his death-bed with promoting the interests of their surviving ten children and it is largely due to her efforts that the Palatinate family regained its electoral status. 4 Sophia’s eldest brother, Karl Ludwig, succeeded to the Electorship of the Palatinate in 1648, an event that sealed the family’s long-awaited return to power. As a sister to the Elector, Sophia was an eligible marriage prospect for ruling princes of other Electorates and was duly approached in 1656 by George Wilhelm of Brunswick-
Luneberg, the second son of the ruling Duke of Calenberg. He was accompanied on this mission to win Sophia by Ernst August, his youngest brother and the fourth son of the Duke.

The Brunswick-Lunebergs were a junior branch of the Brunswick line, overshadowed in importance and ancestry by the Brunswick-Wolfenbuttels. This junior status created within the family a driving force for advancement, manifested in later years by ambitious attempts to link the family with ancient aristocratic lines across Europe. One such method of advancing the family was via the philosopher Leibnitz, who was employed in 1685 to produce the *Historia Domus*, a familial history of the Brunswick-Luneburgs, which highlighted the longevity of their aristocratic blood-lines. In the 1650s, however, this desire for family promotion took the more ordinary form of making advantageous connections by marriage and it was against this background that the somewhat reluctant George Wilhelm found himself being pressed to marry. His elder brother, Christian Ludwig, had already been married for three years and George Wilhelm, at thirty-two, was expected to follow suit in the interests of consolidating the family position. Thus it was that in 1656, George Wilhelm formally approached Karl Ludwig of the Palatinate for permission to pay his addresses to Sophia. His secure position as a ruling prince was welcomed by Karl Ludwig and also Sophia, who had for many years rejected suitors on the grounds of their not being ruling princes.

After a short time a marriage contract was signed and the Calenberg brothers journeyed into Italy where George Wilhelm immediately began to regret the approaching loss of his bachelor state. It was not difficult to persuade Ernst August to take his place as bridegroom, thus avoiding bringing dishonour on the Brunswick-Luneberg House, as by all accounts, Ernst August had fallen headlong in love with Sophia who, as his brother’s fiancée, must have seemed entirely unattainable. Thus it was that the jilted and disillusioned Sophia, now aged twenty-eight and well beyond her most marketable years in marriageable terms, accepted the fourth son of a Duke; but not until after Karl Ludwig had negotiated a contract with the Brunswick-Luneburg brothers stating that George Wilhelm should never marry and that, as a consequence, Ernst August would eventually become a ruling prince.

The solution appeared to suit all concerned: George Wilhelm retained his treasured single state, Karl Ludwig achieved a desirable connection for the Palatinate and Ernst August, unusually for someone of his status, married the woman with whom he had fallen in love. Sophia, who considered that Ernst August was marrying her for the financial advantages that such an alliance would bring, happily discovered that he was not indifferent to her and:

> her love and concern from her wedding night onwards were for Ernst August.
The only dissatisfied party was Johann Friedrich, the third son of the Duke of Calenberg, who considered that, as next in line to George Wilhelm, he should have had first refusal of Sophia's hand before Ernst August. The huge success of the marriage however, and the compatibility of the couple, together with Johann Friedrich's own alliance two years later to Benedicte Henriette, also of the Palatinate, make it unlikely that his somewhat peevish complaint persisted.

Sophia and Ernst August's alliance was fruitful in dynastic terms, providing six sons and a daughter to ensure the continuation of the family line. The eldest of the seven children was George Louis who was born in 1660, and, through his father was heir to all the titles and privileges that the House of Brunswick-Luneberg had to offer, including those of hereditary Prince and Electoral Prince of Hanover. But it is not these titles for which George Louis is remembered; arguably his greatest hereditary title came through his mother, Sophia, who after the death of her 11 older brothers and sisters, became heir to the English throne.

Thus it was that from 1701 Hanover's fortunes were inextricably intertwined with those of England and this previously insignificant court in Germany had a crucial part to play in the continuation of Protestant rule in England. As the inevitability of the Hanoverian succession began to pervade even the most xenophobic of English minds, the trickle of visitors to Hanover at the end of the seventeenth century became a positive flow in the early eighteenth century. Germany was a particularly difficult country in which to travel at this time and the notable increase in visitors is testament to the realisation among the English nobility that future power and influence was reliant upon ingratiation with the court at Hanover.

Having grasped this fundamental fact, it was a small step for the ambitious, forward thinking aristocrat to conclude that the focus of flattery in Hanover should be George Louis of Brunswick-Luneburg. He was the ruling Duke of Hanover and the son and heir of the Electress Sophia. Sophia was already seventy-one years old by the time the Act of Settlement was passed in 1701 and it would then have been considered highly unlikely that she would outlive the thirty-six year old Queen Anne to inherit the throne. The obvious conclusion to be drawn was that George Louis would become the next King of England (See Plate 1). In the event Sophia lived to be an remarkable eighty-four years old and was only out-lived by Queen Anne by a single month. Nevertheless the throne, as predicted, moved directly to George Louis.
EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CULTURE AT THE COURT OF HANOVER

The Court of Hanover, as it emerged into the early eighteenth century under George Louis, followed the cultural precedents that had been established at the end of the seventeenth century by his parents, Ernst August and Sophia of the Palatinate. The couple are known to have been involved in architectural projects and landscaping. Indeed, architecture was a key part of a young nobleman’s education and polishing at this time in Germany and certainly Ernst August would have received some training in this field. Several long trips to Italy, including Rome, Florence and Padua, were made by the family in 1669-70, 1671-2, 1680-81, 1685-6, highlighting their interest in Italian culture and arts.

A plethora of reasons existed for these frequent sojourns in Italy: to obtain ancient artefacts, to escape the daily pressures of court life and, not least, for recreation. However, there is a single thread of purpose that is consistently woven into the fabric of each of these tours; a desire on Ernst August’s part to associate the relatively new familial branch of the Brunswick-Luneburgs with the long established aristocratic families of ancient Rome and, in particular, the Guelphs, with whom there was an ancient family connection. In the course of its travels the family often stayed in Renaissance villas and importantly for this research, specifically Venetian villas, including those attributed to Palladio: the Villa Contarini-Camerini and the Villa Foscari in particular (see Plate 2).

Arciszewska argues that this desire for association with ancient Roman families, led to the establishment of a Court in Hanover that was steeped in Venetian culture and, more specifically, the architecture of Andrea Palladio. The extent to which pure Palladianism per se was adopted, as opposed to Venetian architecture, is not always as clear cut as Arciszewska argues and this is a point to which we will return. What is apparent, however, is that many aspects of Venetian culture were indeed emulated at the court of Hanover and that this trend did develop under George Louis’ electorship, as the House of Brunswick-Luneburg continued in its meteoric rise.

As a result of his travels, George Louis would certainly have been familiar with the concept of the villa as a centre of learning, relaxation, contemplation and sensual pleasure; in effect an owner’s retreat from his urban domus. This is indeed how George’s Herrenhausen, the Summer Palace of the Hanoverian Court, was used between May and October each year. Among its many dazzling features were exquisitely intricate landscaped gardens complete with cascades, grottoes, concerts. Italian style Gondola rides were a common entertainment along the illuminated canals that bordered the gardens. Herrenhausen had been built primarily as a retreat by George Louis’ uncle, Johann Friedrich, who stated that Herrenhausen was like:
those venetian villas of the terraferma in which Grandees of San Marco gave splendid feasts for me and my bros [where the brothers are George Wilhelm and Ernst August] 16

Clearly Johann Friedrich was well aware of the symbolism of the villa as an architectural type and its role in the agricultural hinterland as the centre of control, learning and pleasure. The villa tradition, in the manner of one of the villas of the Veneto, was maintained at Herrenhausen and was passed on to the next two ruling dukes, firstly to his brother, Ernst August and later to his brother’s son George Louis. The palace was ‘enlarged and embellished’ 17 by George Louis who employed Giacomo Querini, Ernst August’s Italian architect, whom George Louis retained after his father’s death. 18

Between the years 1680 and 1714 the Court at Hanover became a centre for migrating Venetian Virtuosos including artists, painters, musicians and architects. Venetian architects Lorenzo Bedogni and Guiseppe Arighini were reconstructing a palace in the neighbouring Duchy of Celle in the 1670s and Italian architect Querini held the privileged position of court architect of Hanover between 1667 and 1685. Ernst August retained Querini when he succeeded to the dukedom after the death of his brother and went on to employ the Venetian artist Tommaso Guisti and Louis Remy de La Fosse who, although French, designed in the Venetian style, under the critical aegis of Querini19.

A crucially important aspect in the employment of these Venetian architects, craftsmen and artists, is that there was freedom of movement between the different courts of the Brunswick-Luneburg family within the Hanoverian Electorate, and also outside Hanover with other Electorates. For example, Johann Peter Wachter, the court architect of the Electorate of Palatine which was ruled by the Electress Sophia’s brother, Karl Ludwig, was granted a leave of absence in 1687 to work on architectural plans for Herrenhausen in Hanover. Similarly, Lorenzo Bedogni was concurrently employed in the Duchy of Celle, under Georg Wilhelm, and the Duchy of Hanover, under Ernst August. It appears to have been completely normal for architects to be working on simultaneous commissions issued by various members of the Brunswick-Luneburg family and related German aristocrats. 20

Thus there was an established kinship network and an open, free culture of sharing ideas between the German ruling princes that encouraged the dissemination and growth of ideologies, rationales and styles. This is central to the understanding of how Venetian, and latterly neo-Palladian, architecture became ingrained in German culture. It also means that it was highly
possible that late seventeenth-century and early-eighteenth century visitors to Germany would be exposed to this stylistic phenomenon without necessarily visiting the Hanoverian court.

WILLIAM BENSON IN HANOVER

It is against this background of Venetian culture and the constant freedom of movement between courts that the young William Benson (VB) arrived in Hanover on the first of two visits that were to change the course of architectural history in England. Benson was both architect and owner of the first eighteenth century neo-Palladian building in England. He began constructing Wilbury House, a simple neo-Palladian villa, in 1709 when the rest of polite English society was still extolling the virtues of the Baroque under the leadership of Sir Christopher Wren (VB). Clearly Benson’s preferences for a neo-classicism of simplicity, with clean lines and a lack of gratuitous decoration, did not come from England’s fashionable society but from another place and culture. Once this basic truth has been understood, the influences of the Court of Hanover upon the young Benson become impossible to ignore.

The evidence for Benson’s first trip to Germany is a letter written by Sir Richard Hoare, Benson’s uncle, to his son John Hoare in May 1701 where he states:

Your cousin Billy Benson is gone to Hamburgh and from thence to Sweden

It is highly likely that, whilst in Germany, William Benson made the journey to Hanover, some eighty miles away from Hamburg, to pay homage to Duke George Louis. By 1701 Benson, as a keen young Whig of unusually ambitious aspect, would have been well aware of the impending transfer of the line of succession to Hanover and the importance of this political change to a young man of merchant origins in need of patronage.

There was nothing particularly special about Benson when he arrived at Court: at nineteen years of age he had no title, no great wealth and had done nothing to distinguish himself. It is likely that it was precisely these circumstances that led him into a degree of notoriety later in life and which encouraged him to court George Louis at this time. Benson was in an ideal position to gain the attention of the court, and therefore achieve his ends. His mother was Prussian and consequently he was fluent in German at a time when most Englishmen’s second language was French. Since little is known of this particular visit in 1701 it is unhelpful to speculate for too long on his probable activities and the people he may have met. Suffice it to say that enough is known of Benson’s personality to be certain that he would have made the most of this visit,
laying the foundations for future success and patronage; a theory that is borne out by his second and much longer trip to the Electorate, where he stayed between 1704 and 1706.²⁴

The few anecdotes that have survived indicate that Benson was a driven and ambitious man with the threads of a petty, arrogant and sometimes malicious character running through him. Benson was the son of a merchant, but it is not his commercial activities for which he is remembered, but rather his interest in hydraulics, through which he gained popularity both at home and in Germany. It was his brilliance in this field and his ability to solve technical problems that secured his position with George Louis and ultimately led to him succeeding Christopher Wren in the Office of Works. However, evidence survives to prove that Benson’s engineering brilliance was nothing less than fraudulence and that he cheated his way to power by stealing someone else’s invention. This bold and audacious man appears to have had a compulsive, and ruthless outlook; one in which the end always justified the means. This insight into Benson’s character has been derived from, and can be illustrated by, his early career.

Benson’s first visit to Hanover in 1701 was short, as by 1702 he had returned to Shaftesbury and was creating a well for the town in an outwardly altruistic manner but which was, in reality, an attempt to win the Town’s election.²⁵ It was probably here that Benson developed his interest in water and hydraulics and this, with a carefully applied web of lies, was to bring him to the grateful attention of George Louis in subsequent visits to Hanover after George had become King. Jean Theophilus Desaguliers was the premier hydraulics engineer of his day in England; he recorded in his diary the events surrounding the development of a new water machine, invented by a clergyman, Mr Holland. As a Fellow of the Royal Society and leading inventor of hydraulic equipment Desaguliers would have been well placed to understand Holland’s design and would have been an authority on new inventions of the time. He recalled that:

Mr Holland, being modest to a fault, was often cheated of the Profits as well as the Honour of his Invention... but I will do his memory justice... A Certain Person who wanted to be the chosen Representative for the Town of Shaftesbury, undertook to supply that Town with Water to gain his Election by the Merit and Expence of that Performance; and accordingly got Mr Holland to put up one of his Engines which performed very well... besides he gave himself out as Author and Continuer of the Engine calling it his ‘Water Engine’. He made late majesty and all the ladies and gentlemen that came with the King from Hanover believe this performance to be his and talk’d himself into the Place of the King’s Surveyor to the Board of Works.²⁶
This machine had a unique and previously unseen ‘reverse-lock’ mechanism that allowed water to be pumped at a greater height than had previously been possible (see Plate 3). It would seem that Benson, not content with plagiarising Mr Holland’s design, also poached his technical support for the machine. Irngard Lange-Kothe takes up the tale of Benson’s iniquity by reciting more of Desaguliers’ memoirs and stating that a ‘Mr B’ employed Mr Holland’s smith, a man named Joseph Cleeves, and with his help the machine at Herrenhausen was erected. Desaguliers concurs with this interpretation, if not with Mr Cleves’ Christian name, stating that:

‘Mr B…took away Mr Holland’s Smith and foreman, which is one John Cleve (if not dead still at Herrenhausen) and by this Man the Engine was put up’

Clearly Benson’s early visits to Germany had not been in vain and he realised that George Louis’ interest in fountains and waterworks was his route to recognition. To this end he was more than willing to rob the unknown ‘Mr Holland’ not only of his design but also his staff and rewards. One interesting aspect of Lange-Gothe’s version of events is his inclusion of a description of Benson by Mr Schuster, a contemporary German writer of the time. Schuster described Benson quite categorically as a clergyman. This is clearly wrong and one’s first reaction, therefore, is to dismiss it as such. But this misleading information is, perhaps, a further indication of Benson’s compulsive character; did he, in pretending to be the machine’s inventor, also at times don the mantle of Mr Holland’s identity as clergyman for a while?

In spite of Benson’s pains to please the Elector, the fountain was not a success. Desaguliers again records this debacle in his diary where he wrote that:

When his majesty and whole court came to see the First Trial of this famous fountain and costly Engine, the water, instead of spouting one hundred Feet high, spouted only ten feet

Although the date is not exactly clear, it is known that Benson’s inexpert overseeing of the water fountain’s construction at Herrenhausen occurred sometime after 1716 when he accompanied George to the Electorate during his first return visit to his homeland after being crowned King of England. It is unlikely that this favour would have been conferred upon Benson so early on during George’s reign had there not been some older acquaintance of some standing. It is most likely that this acquaintance was forged during Benson’s second visit to the Electorate sometime between 1704 and 1706. It is even possible that Benson, speaking fluent German, and having a limited skill of his own in hydraulics, was actually employed in some
capacity by George during this visit when major building and landscaping works were being carried out at the palace and garden.30

The evidence for this second trip is a letter from Sophia Charlotte, George Louis’ sister to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, George’s foreign envoy, where she writes that staying with her were:

deux anglais, fort jolis garcons, l’un s’appelle Benson et L’autre Montaigu, neveu de Milord Halifax.31

Although Benson does not appear to have returned to Germany between 1706 and 1716 he was careful to ensure he made an impression during his 1704-1706 visit. The Electress Sophia records that Benson made every effort to ingratiate himself with Madame Kilmansegg, George I’s half sister, whilst he was at court. This was an intelligent and considered move by Benson as it was well known that Madame Kilmansegg could provide a direct channel of communication to George over whom she wielded no little influence. Other English statesman had made this discovery and it is not likely that such a useful source would remain unnoticed or unused by Benson.32 The impression that he made must have remained firmly in the Electress’ mind because, some seven years later, she wrote,

I remember Mr Benson very well, he was very witty and wanted to win over Madame Kilmansegg.33

Clearly Benson believed that wooing George I and his confidantes would prove to be a more fruitful strategy than targeting the Electress, who, although technically next in line to the English throne, was by then already a septagenarian.

However it would appear that by 1713, with Sophia still in robust health, Benson was worried he had targeted the wrong Hanoverian and, in what can only be seen as a clumsy, last minute attempt at brown nosing, sent the Electress a present she was overwhelmed with. She discusses this present in no less than three letters to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar where she wrote,

I am completely obliged to him that he wished to give me so handsome a present as you describe. I think that it is too big to receive for I would not know the means to show my gratitude. However I do not fail to value it in accordance with what it deserves and that he wanted to demonstrate his affection by it. 34

Later, when she has received the present, her tone is almost one of bewilderment.
At last Mr Benson’s present has arrived. One can without exaggeration, call it a large present for it has such a degree of parcels that it must have cost a great deal to transport. There is a local man who can demonstrate how one will be able to make use of such a rare object. I have after many consultations found a room where I think we shall be able to put it. I have only seen a small part of it which is made of black and gold laquer, which seems very beautiful, but the packages are so very large and in so great a quantity that there is only one here, the others are still in Cell and half arrived in Hanover by carriage. When I have seen everything I shall ask you to give my thanks to Mr Benson for as I have already said, one could not give a bigger, more opulent present. I am longing to see the whole entirely and to see whether one will be able to make use of all the packages, of which there are enough to furnish a whole town. 35

The last letter informs the reader that the enormous present is a piece of bespoke furniture, but in Benson’s inimitable style, bespoke for someone and somewhere else. Sophia writes,

I have at last dismissed the man who brought me the very large present from Mr Benson, paying him the expenses incurred in coming here. He was only a carpenter and although I don’t know what to do with the present, because it does not fit into any room, I must however thank him for it. It was made for a room for King William where everything was adjusted for the location. There are people in Hanover who are able to make the same but this one appears to be from the West Indies. 36

It would seem that Benson was also becoming well known in England in 1713 because the Electress begs Bothmar to find out whether her Mr Benson is,

…the same Benson who is at present [advancing in life] as I have seen in the papers? 37

Unfortunately we do not know what the Electress had seen, nor do we know what Von Bothmar’s response may have been to her plea for information. This seven year period in Benson’s life between 1706 and 1713 remains very vague and exactly what the Electress meant when she alluded to Benson’s progress through life remains as much a mystery as does the provenance of the gift he bestowed upon her.

It will be argued that it was whilst in Germany during his second visit travelling around the electorate that Benson became the means by which the prevailing Hanoverian/Venetian architectural style was transmitted to England. We have seen how Benson spared no cost or
effort in making himself amenable to those in power, first by trying to win over Madame Kilmansegg and later in a last minute attempt to woo the Electress. We have also seen how Benson grasped at hydraulics, as a shared interest with George Louis, and used it as a means of furthering himself. It was just such an opportunistic attitude that led him to adopt George's other interests, such as neo-Palladian architecture and thereby to gain a foothold in the forthcoming reign. His later life proved that he was not afraid to be percipient in his taste and that he had exactly the tenacious and obsessive personality needed to drive forward the neo-Palladian style. Neither was he afraid, foolishly as it turned out, to stake his career on his belief in this style and the personal benefits that would result.

In order to establish Benson as being the key vehicle by which Palladian ideals were transferred from Germany to England in the beginning of the eighteenth century it is necessary to examine contemporary Hanoverian architecture and culture. To what would the young Benson have been exposed during his travels? Was this exposure to Hanoverian/Venetian architecture sufficient to influence his choice of style in England for his own house, ahead of established English taste?

**HANOVERIAN ARCHITECTURE (1680-1706)**

**HERRENHAUSEN**

As the richest and most powerful man in the Electorate, George Louis was the leader of the new style, and it is therefore his royal palaces that would have had the most resounding architectural impact on any visitor to court in the first decade of the eighteenth century. The obvious place to begin in assessing what a visitor would have been exposed to in Hanover between 1701 and 1706, when Benson is known to have been in Hanover, is Herrenhausen, the Summer palace. Benson would have been on the ground to see the architectural developments of the palace with his own eyes. It is highly likely that a degree of symbiosis was planned between the landscape and the palace itself and it is eminently possible that Benson's interest and skill with hydraulics made him privy to discussions about the palace architecture, at least with regard to the generalities. This is especially the case given his ability to discuss architecture and other matters in the Court's mother tongue.

Already in existence at Herrenhausen, before the major refurbishment and expansion of the palace itself, was the Galerie building (see plate 4). This was built between 1694 and 1698 at the behest of George Louis' father, possibly by Johann Wachter although there is no definite
proof. This long Orangery is heavily inspired by classical architecture and, indeed, was commissioned immediately after Ernst August’s return from his 1685-86 trip to Italy.

The simple classicism of the gallery, whilst not uniquely Palladian, carries many of the tenets of the Palladian style including regularity, symmetry and lack of ornament. The result is a long, low building of almost fortress-like severity only broken up by the clearly Palladian features such as the Serlian window capped by a triangular pediment which forms the centrepiece of the main structure. However, it appears to be a building of some naivety, in terms of specifically Palladian architecture, and though Palladian features have undeniably been applied to the form, the form itself is not characteristic of a villa of Palladio’s composition. Instead of being constructed from a number of individual, cubic elements arranged to create the whole, the Gallery is constructed of a single solid element.

Despite this stylistic naivety, the Gallery would have been startling in its modernity and contemporary visitors to Herrenhausen cannot have failed to have been struck by its clean lines, imposing stature and overt references to Venetian Renaissance buildings.

Between 1704 and 1706 the actual palace at Herrenhausen was being developed in a similar style as the existing gallery building, although the resultant structure indicates that Palladianism was being used in a more practised and mature manner, an unsurprising development given the elapse of ten years by this stage. The precise nature of the works at Herrenhausen are far from clear because the residenz has been altered on many occasions since its original conversion to a palace in 1638.39 It is, therefore, impossible to interpret precisely what changes were carried out between 1704 and 1706 and how exactly the composition would have appeared to Benson and other contemporary visitors at court.

Despite the difficulties of chronological interpretation the emergent building as adapted by Querini, does display obviously Palladian features (see Plate 5).40 Such features include the almost sole reliance on building form for stylistic expression, the lack of ornamentation, the central pedimented bays as a focal point for the ensemble and the clarity of the hierarchical courtyard layout.

From his subsequent architectural activities it can be demonstrated that William Benson embraced this Palladian idiom. Indeed, as a young and ambitious man, he was able to discern that flattery by imitation, at least in terms of the architectural style he adopted, could be the crucial element that would give him a head start over his English rivals. This, combined with
his supposed brilliance in hydraulics, brought him to the notice of the future King and thus Benson achieved his ends.

GOHRDE

On the death of George Louis’ uncle, Duke George Wilhelm of the Duchy of Celle, in 1705, Celle and Hanover were unified. This brought an extra political strength to George Louis as well as a large increase in land and property. One of the properties that was inherited was the Hunting Lodge at Gohrde. George was a keen huntsman and wasted no time in planning the refurbishment of this lodge. Giacomo Querini was commissioned by George Louis to develop a much more palatial structure in place of that which he had inherited and from the surviving drawing it can be seen that what was built was another Veneto-inspired building with consciously Palladian quotations. The hunting lodge was developed into a three-storey building with an attic above and a central projecting bay of three storeys, capped with a triangular pediment. This prominent axial centrepiece was then flanked with lower wings and numerous classical outbuildings. As with the Herrenhausen Galerie its central ornament is more reminiscent of Palladio’s style than the form itself, although the standard clarity of design and uncluttered elevations are also trademarks of Palladio’s architecture. It is unlikely that Benson, returning to England in 1706, would have seen the completed building but it is highly probable that, with his interest in the style and known travel around the Electorate, he could have seen the Lodge during construction and even seen the plans.

The neo-Palladian architectural activities of George Louis in Hanover, followed immediately by the building of the avant garde Wilbury House in England in the same style, make a strong case for Benson being influenced by George’s architectural preferences. But how far did this influence extend in practical terms? Was Benson merely inspired to build in the Hanoverian style or is there a definitive link between this first English neo-Palladian house and particular Hanoverian buildings or plans? An examination of the available extant evidence, as well as Wilbury House itself, goes some way to explaining precisely the extent of influence Hanoverian architecture had upon this important early villa of the English Neo-palladianian movement.

EXTANT PLANS OF PALLADIAN VILLAS

Arciszewska has analysed three, recently discovered, plans of German Palladian villas which, she argues, point to a Palladian revival within Germany and underline the seriousness with which the House of Brunswick-Luneberg was adopting the style. Parallels are then drawn between these plans and Wilbury House, particularly in relation to a sketch based on the Villa
Emo of 1564 (see Plates 6 and 7). Arciszewska attributes this sketch to Gottfried Laurenz Pictorius, an architect active in Hanover at the beginning of the eighteenth century. However, there is no certainty that this was drawn by Pictorius and consequently no certainty that the design originated in this important first decade of the eighteenth century. It might well have been drawn much later.

Arciszewska continues her argument:

there is little doubt that his [Pictorius’s] project represents a working drawing prepared in association with Corfey’s Hanoverian proposals. 41

Corfey’s ‘project’ is another plan of a Palladian villa that has recently been discovered in the Stadarchiv in Germany (see Plate 8). But, as with the Pictorius sketch, much doubt surrounds its date of origin as well as its originator (which is by no means established as being Corfey) 42 and this would, therefore, seem to be a tenuous conclusion.

Arciszewska goes on to discuss the origins of the Palladian revival in England and accurately points to Benson’s likely involvement in the style. In her argument Wilbury’s design is linked directly with Pictorius’s sketch, even though the sketch may well have been drawn much later than Benson’s visits. Another obstacle in the line of argument, even if the sketch did originate at a time coinciding with Benson’s visits to the Electorate, is that there is absolutely no evidence that he saw it.

Arciszewska goes on to state that the Wilbury Plan (see Plates 9 and 10), as related to the Villa Poiana,

abbreviates the relatively simple tri-partite layout of the model in a manner which does not significantly differ from the transformation of Palladio’s plans attempted by Corfey and especially Pictorius. 43

Whilst analysis of the drawings indicates a certain truth in this argument, this does not, in plan or elevation, prove a link between Pictorius’ sketch and Wilbury House. Though totally unrelated, there is a marked similarity between many Palladian designs because they all stem from the same architectural rationale. If this argument is followed through to its logical conclusion one could state that Inigo Jones’ Queen’s House at Greenwich influenced Wilbury and similarities of form could be found to illustrate the point. Obviously this approach is not
instructive and evidence proving a link between two buildings must be based upon opportunity as well as simply upon the design.

Four miles from Wilbury lies John Webb’s Amesbury Abbey (see Plate 11). This Palladian Revival building provides overwhelming evidence of a link with Wilbury where both the opportunity for influence and design similarities is clear. Amesbury, although designed by John Webb, was at the time of Benson’s lease, thought to have been designed by the famous and celebrated Inigo Jones and is even included in William Kent’s *Designs of Inigo Jones* published in 1727.

Benson took a lease on Amesbury Abbey in 1707 and whilst living there proceeded to design his new villa. Wilbury House as designed and depicted in *Vitruvius Britannicus*, appears to be at odds with itself rather than in harmony. Its heavy roof and rustic basement are tied firmly together by thick quoins at each end of the building surmounted by sturdy chimneys. Visually the villa appears firmly grounded at its edges. However the belvedere and urns on top of the house are at variance with this solidity and give it a central lightness. The overall effect is like a butterfly confined to the collector’s board by two weighty pins.

When viewed in comparison with Amesbury it becomes clear that anyone with good observational skills and a passing interest in architecture could have built Wilbury House. John Harris described Wilbury somewhat bluntly as being merely ‘the upper floor of Amesbury placed upon the ground’ and whilst there is slightly more to the composition than this, there is not enough to suggest any practical influence from any other Palladian building, Hanoverian or otherwise. A close examination of the two buildings shows how easily the plan of Amesbury was adapted to produce the smaller and more compact Wilbury, whilst the external appearance as stated by Harris, is a direct copy of Amesbury.

That the plan of Wilbury is derived from Amesbury is also obvious. The room proportions are very similar, with both villas having a central rectangular hall, marked externally by a prostyle portico and flanked by single, square reception rooms. The staircases are located at the same central position in the house opposite the rectangular halls. However, in the Wilbury plan the stairs have been positioned either side of the central space which now becomes a large reception room. This differs from the Amesbury plan where the central space is wholly given over to the staircase and is recessed creating a u-shaped exterior elevation. It would seem that Benson considered that a better use of space for this central area would be to extend this now empty room beyond the building line, remove the staircase and create another grand reception saloon.
Externally the tri-partite elevation of Amesbury is retained at Wilbury, but this time by a projecting central area, not a recessed one.

In repositioning the staircases Benson has also adapted the closet arrangement at Amesbury. The closet spaces are retained at Wilbury in the same configuration and proportions as at Amesbury, but are largely filled with stairs as opposed to being practical, commodious closets.

The Wilbury design also retains the Amesbury positions for the fireplaces, but the central corridor, so useful for circulation around the property, has been dispensed with in an ill considered manner that one can only assume was regretted by Benson after the event. Benson clearly wanted to create as much grandeur as possible in the small villa within his budget. He achieved this and created a grand reception room at either end of the house instead of the single room at Amesbury, but at the cost of closet space and ease of circulation. Overall Wilbury’s design appears to be one born of enthusiasm and a love of display rather than an eye for the practicalities. For the first neo-Palladian revival building of the eighteenth century however and, according to current knowledge, Benson’s first foray into architecture, is an achievement worthy of note.

It is obvious that Amesbury was Benson’s primary source for Wilbury and this is extremely informative when we return to the original question regarding the nature and extent of influence that Hanoverian/Venetian architecture may have had upon the English neo-Palladian revival at the beginning of the process.

THE INFLUENCE OF HANOVERIAN PALLADIANISM ON BENSON AND THE TRANSFERENCE OF THE STYLE TO ENGLAND

It is far more likely that the extent of influence of the Hanoverian/Venetian style on Benson was limited to his adopting and promoting the style in England, as opposed to his copying any particular Hanoverian building project _per se_. It would appear that Benson was fully alert to the development of neo-Palladianism as the preferred architectural mode under George Louis and the potential that this had for his own promotion. In all probability Benson’s exposure to the grandeur and modernity of the style in Hanover was the key factor in his decision to build his own villa against the prevailing taste in England at this time. Thus the Hanoverian Palladian style acted as a catalyst for the equivalent English revival and its influence in this role should not be underestimated.
However, whilst the available evidence allows this influence upon the course of English architectural history to have been responsible for the choice of style, this is as far as the extant information allows the influence to go. The obvious link with Amesbury and the lack of a proven closer link with any other building, Hanoverian or otherwise, makes it meaningless to attempt to categorically link Wilbury with any particular building or plan from Hanover.

Benson would have returned from Hanover in 1706 well aware of the relationship between the newly adopted Hanoverian Palladianism and the link with the early, Palladio-inspired architecture of Charles I and his court architect Inigo Jones. The choice of neo-Palladianism by George, aside from establishing credible links with the Italian Guelph aristocrats, appears to have been, in part, an attempt at establishing continuity, in visual terms, with the earlier Stuart reign. After two years in the Electorate it is not credible that Benson could have failed to notice the production of the *Historia Domus*, a physical manifestation of the Brunswick-Luneburg’s attempt to establish a stronger ancestry and a legitimate historic right to the English throne through James I. On this basis it is highly likely that, being keen to adopt the style himself, Benson looked to the nearest model of what was at that time considered to be an Inigo Jones building and, with only a few minor changes, quite blatantly copied it.

The name ‘Wilbury’ has been examined and conclusions drawn as to its origin. It has been stated that Wilbury was concocted from the ‘Wil’ in Wilton and the ‘bury’ in Amesbury. This theory, for that is all it is, is now being presented as established fact when there is little evidence to suggest that any connection exists. The only obvious correspondence between Wilbury and Wilton is the coved ceiling of the Double Cube Room reflected in the garden room of Wilbury. But since this coved ceiling also exists in the main apartment at piano nobile level at Amesbury, this alone does not stand as proof of a link between Wilbury with Wilton.

There is an alternative idea however which, with some understanding of Benson’s character perhaps better explains the name chosen for the villa. Wilbury House is located within an area rich in archaeological remains. There is a prehistoric camp located two miles to the west of the house, named in historic maps as Benson’s Folly, now demolished, which seems to have been a frivolous stone tower acting as a viewpoint in the landscape, and which was built on top of an old hill fort one and a half miles to the south east of the main house. These archaeological remains are of interest when it is noted that the suffix ‘bury’ is a common one in Wiltshire and stems from the word ‘burh’ meaning fortified hill fort or camp and which aptly suits the land in which Wilbury Park is located.
The 'Wil' part of the Wilbury is equally easily explained by topographical features in the Park. 'Wil' (or Wylle, Wileo, Wili and Wile) is a 'pre-English river name of uncertain etymology' and literally means 'tricky stream'. Given that Wilbury Park is criss-crossed with ephemeral streams, which Benson attempted to control by all manner of weirs and channels and which are still visible in the landscape, it would seem likely that his assessment of the land upon which Wilbury House is built led him to develop the name Wilbury. This old-sounding name, being strongly linked to the historic Wiltshire landscape, would have had the added appeal of making it appear as if the estate was long established, thus conferring the status of a land-owning gentleman onto Benson and partially disguising the trade origins of his family.

There is no doubt that as a young man, William Benson was influenced by his visits to Hanover and by the Venetian, and sometimes Palladian style being embraced in the Electorate at the time. Benson’s Hanoverian experiences coloured his aesthetic preferences or perhaps, given his relative youth, developed these preferences from the beginning. Either way, the future importance of George Louis, and thus the necessity of courting and flattering him, was not lost on Benson who espoused the style unreservedly. The evidence presented makes it clear that Benson was indeed the key vehicle through which Hanoverian architectural taste was transferred to England in the first decade of the eighteenth century, well in advance of the new monarch himself.

This conclusion is in stark contrast to the well established but unsubstantiated theory concerning the beginnings of the style that attribute Palladianism almost solely to the efforts of Lord Burlington and the Whig party a decade later. Whilst Lord Burlington and the Whigs did adopt neo-Palladianism and promote it for their own political ends, the initial renaissance of the Palladian style in England was a direct result of the monarchical succession, and consequent transfer of power from England to Germany, a decade earlier.

However, in realising the impact that Hanoverian taste had on English architecture at this early stage it is crucial for the accurate disentanglement of the beginnings of the style that this evidence does not lead to speculation or over-reliance on Hanover for its birth. Benson certainly returned from his trip in 1704-06 enthused with the Palladian style and keen to advance himself by means of the same. But there is a distinct lack of any evidence that he either copied what he had seen built in Hanover, in any more than a generic way, or that he brought plans of Hanoverian villas home with him and used them in designing Wilbury. This is confirmed by the indisputable link between Wilbury and Amesbury where Wilbury is a barely disguised copy of the former.
It can be seen then that Wilbury was the first eighteenth-century Palladian revival villa in England, its very existence influenced by factors external to England. Contrary to perpetuated theory, the clarity and freshness of eighteenth-century English neo-Palladianism, which has traditionally and xenophobically been viewed as a purely English development, did not actually have its origins in England. Eighteenth-century English neo-Palladianism was, in fact, merely one strand of a much larger portfolio of artistic style transferred to England as a direct result of the changing line of succession. This conclusion highlights the need for architectural history as a discipline to be more outward looking in terms of the origins of styles and more honest in recognising the limitations of insular theories that have remained unchallenged for too long.
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33 Je me souviens tres bien de Monsieur Benson; il avait beaucoup d’espirit et en voulait a Madame Kilmansec” from a letter written by the Electress to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, 18 August 1711.

34 Je lui suis tout a fait obligeu qu’il me veut donner un si beau present, comme vous le depeignez. Je crois qu’il est trop grand pour le recevoir, car je ne saurais trouver moyen de lui en temoinger ma reconnaissance. Je ne laisse pas d’estimer selon qu’il me mente et lui qu’il a bien voulu me temoinger son affection par la.  Letter written by the Electress to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, 18 August 1711.

35 Enfin le present de Mr Benson est arrive- on le peut sans exaggeration appeler un grand present car il est tant de furieux ballots qu’on dit qu’il couterait furieuse. Il y a un homme aupres pour faire voir, comme on pourra s’en servir d’une chose si rare. J’ai pourtant apres beaucoup de consultations trouve une chambre ou je crois qu’on le pourra mettre. Je n’en ai pu voir qu’un petit morceau, qui est fait d’une lacke or et noir qui parait fort belle, mais les ballots son si furieusement grands et en si grande quantite qu’il n’y en a qu’un ici, les autres sont moitie a Cell et moitie a arrive par chariot a Hanover. Quand J’aurai tout vu je vois prirai d’en faire mes remerciments a Mt Benson, car commej’ai deja dit, on ne pouvait faire un plus grand et plus opulent present. Il me tarde de voir a tout a fait, comme il est fait, et si on pourra l’employer pour avoir tous ses ballots, qu’il ya assez pour meubler toute a ville. Letter from the Electress to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, 18 September 1713.

36 J’ai enfin renvoye l’homme qui m’a apporte le tres grand present de Monsieur Benson en payant les depensesqu’il a faites en venant ici. Ce n’était qu’un menuisier et quoique je ne sac he que faire de ce present, puisqu’il n’est pas proper en aucune chamber, il faut pourtant l’en remericer. Il a ete fait pout un cabinet du roi Guillaume, ou tout etait ajuste pour le lieu. Il est noir et or. Il y a des gens ici qui le peuvent faire le meme, mais ceci parait etre fait aux Indes. Letter from Electress to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, 1 September 1713.

37 Je vous prie me dire si c’est le meme Benson qui est a present avance dans des charges que jai vi dans des gazettes. Letter from Electress to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar, 1 September 1713.
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CHAPTER 2

THE SUBSCRIBERS TO VITRUVIUS BRITANNICUS

At the time of the publication of the first edition of Vitruvius Britannicus in 1715, the architectural atmosphere of the country had become stifling. The fashion for the Baroque in architecture was growing as old as its 83 year old leader, Christopher Wren. Vitruvius Britannicus, and the Palladianism which it promoted, represented a revolution in taste contrasting starkly with the prevailing fashion, a fact that has been cited to account for its instant success. However in 1715, only three high profile eighteenth-century Palladian buildings, namely Wilbury House, Wiltshire; Wanstead House, Essex and the Peckwater Quad, Christ Church College, Oxford had been fully completed and very few of the subscribers to this first volume would have seen them. To most of the 301 subscribers to the first volume, English neo-Palladianism would have been little more than an architectural concept with only a handful of seventeenth-century Palladian Revival examples to illustrate the style. Thus the subscribers, most of whom were also members of the highest ranks of society, signed up almost en masse, to an as yet unbuilt style. This is unusual; most architectural fashions grow exponentially as visual expressions of the new style materialise. Yet this was not the case with eighteenth-century Palladianism; almost from its very conception, and long before it can truly be said to have become fashionable as a built style, it had an unprecedented following.

This phenomenon has never been satisfactorily explained. Reading the subscription lists one obvious answer is that early support for this conceptual style could have come from the influential Duke of Argyll (VB), and his brother the Earl of Islay (VB), in promoting Campbell, a fellow clan member. This would seem likely given the high number of subscribers from the Campbell clan and the fact that Campbell dedicated one of his first new designs to the Duke of Argyll. However, as with much of the early Palladian movement, the obvious does not necessarily indicate the truth and this theory has been disproved by T. P. Connor. An alternative theory is that many of the most influential early subscribers, of whom most were aristocratic, had visited Hanover in the first decade of the eighteenth century, just as William Benson had, in order to curry favour with Elector George. It is likely that they were already familiar with the Palladian style in its built form, as demonstrated in Hanover and elsewhere in Germany, and were ready to accept what they saw as the inevitable change of taste that often accompanies a change in power. It is unlikely that we will ever know the precise sequence of events that led up to this unusually wholesale adoption of an unbuilt style, but this fact alone underlines how much is still to be understood about the early eighteenth-century Palladian movement.
The first edition was sold at a cost of 3 guineas each (4 guineas on Imperial paper) and was distributed to 301 peers, statesman and others within the highest echelons of society.\textsuperscript{4} A second edition was already planned for the October of 1715.\textsuperscript{5} To announce the second edition so precipitously, Campbell must have been certain of success, a fact that is proven by the existence of serious financial investors before the book was ever published.\textsuperscript{6} Campbell was clearly keen to include many more designs for houses belonging to the rich and powerful but had neither the time nor the space to include them in the first volume. It is worth noting that the years between 1715 and 1717, the initial years of the Hanoverian reign, saw many new appointments and honours bestowed by the new King, which in their turn created new patronage targets for Campbell. He would have been aware of the likely possibilities and commissions that new honours could give rise to from the very conception of the first volume, hence his planning a second volume so early on. By 1725 and Campbell's final edition, all but eighteen of the existing peers in England had subscribed to the volumes.\textsuperscript{7} There is no doubt that \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus} was an absolute success; Campbell had managed, with the help of the publishers whose names appear on the title page of the first edition, to take the spark provided by Benson’s early building of Wilbury (representing the transference of the style ahead of the new monarch) and fan it into a blaze.\textsuperscript{8}

To date, a brief mention of the numbers of subscribers to \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus} has been made by Howard Stutchbury,\textsuperscript{9} and a more in depth discussion of these numbers has been provided by Connor.\textsuperscript{10} However, an analysis of the subscribers themselves, this crucial body of Palladian protagonists, has never been attempted. The research carried out here rectifies this omission in the study of eighteenth-century Palladian architecture. By looking at the lives and expectations of the subscribers themselves, as well as the interaction and exchange between them, the dynamics of the style can be examined in a new way, shedding new light on neo-Palladianism.

The very highest ranks of society are to be found gracing the subscription lists of each leather-bound volume. The original binding and style of the book, coupled with its careful dedication to George I, is clear evidence of its intended market among the well connected. It is necessary, at this stage, to look more closely at the notion that the early Palladian style had, from within the ranks of the upper classes, a select and elite following. It would be more accurate to state that almost anyone who was in any way either select or elite in upper class eighteenth-century society subscribed to the volumes. There are several distinct sets of subscribers within the lists that can be discerned and which would benefit from further analysis. These are arbitrary distinctions however, as in reality, this level of society was so highly integrated that once within it, there were few boundaries that could not be crossed. Indeed of the 520 subscribers that have
been positively identified out of a possible 711 there is not one subscriber who stands alone. Every single person who signed up to *Vitruvius Britannicus* was either related to another subscriber, was a member of the same political party or club, was a colleague, friend or correspondent of another. Even where two people were the bitterest of enemies the link is there. What is fundamental here is that the subscribers were known to each other and it will be seen how important this was in shaping the style to be projected.

THE PEERAGE

The first edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus* had support from a large tranche of the aristocracy with not just one patron but many. In fact 34% of the subscribers come from the peerage group. These peers are listed alphabetically and in order of status from dukes to barons. Many peers, such as the second Earl of Nottingham (VB) and the 3rd Earl of Sunderland (VB), held high positions in government and were statesmen as well as simply members of the aristocracy. It was this group which had most ability to promote Colen Campbell and his brand of Palladianism; an ability enhanced by the self-serving habits of the peerage at this time and the tendency to form lasting connections only with other members within the peerage. As John Cannon has stated,

> For most of the eighteenth century there were no more than a hundred or so peers of much influence and though they competed with each other with gusto and often hated each other unashamedly, they did so within the confines of a common inheritance and a common interest.

What is notable in the gentry of this age generally, but even more extraordinary about this particular group of subscribers, is the level of intermarriage occurring at the time. This high level of family integration has been noted by J. Rule when he states that:

> intermarriage within the gentry increased during the Hanoverian period, but this was less a case of outsiders seeking an entrée into the ruling classes than of mutually advantageous bargaining between two different factions of it.

This concentration of power and the purity of blood ties was a social phenomenon that was to have a far-reaching impact upon the development of the Palladian style and occurs over and over again as a factor furthering the dissemination of the architecture.
MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

This second set of subscribers was the most prolific. A large number of MPs subscribed to *Vitruvius Britannicus* and this group included almost as many Tories as Whigs. Tory subscribers accounted for 40% of all positively identified subscribers, an astonishing figure considering the power of the Whigs at the time when each of the three volumes were published. Most MPs were on the edges of the ton but often wielded considerable power at both regional and local level and were usually endowed with a healthy income. It is this set of Palladians who exerted an aesthetic influence in the regions. Those who rose through the political ranks often chose to demonstrate their power and success by providing visual expressions of it within their own constituencies. Such men included Mr John Plumptre (VB), MP for Nottinghamshire, Bishops Castle and St Ives who built Plumptre House in the neo-Palladian style in 1724, as designed by Colen Campbell, and Sir Thomas Robinson (VB), MP for Morpeth, the subscriber responsible for the construction of Rokeby and the Palladian wings of Castle Howard. These expressions of power took the form of the prevailing Palladian fashion in high social circles, and were used as a means of infiltrating high society, furthering political careers and making advantageous marriages.

GERMAN STATESMEN

The number of German peers and advisers who subscribed to Campbell’s book grew from one in the first edition to twenty-one in the last. This growth is an indication of the slow but sure acceptance of George I’s Hanoverian friends and ministers into the upper echelons of English society. It also indicates that these German nationals, such as Baron Bothmar (VB), who knew most of the English aristocracy by reputation through his decade-long correspondence with the Electress Sophia, and Baron Hattorf (VB), Kabinett Secretary to George as Elector, were keen to be part of the revolution in taste occurring in England, due, in no small part, to their own presence in the country. George I left these most trusted German peers in England during the five brief regency periods when he returned for protracted home visits to Germany during his reign. These ministers and members of his entourage thus became deeply entrenched in English Society and government. By 1725 and the publication of the third edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, even George’s Turkish bodyguards, Mustafa de Mistra (VB) and Mehemet (Mohamed) (VB) had subscribed. Both Mehemet and Mustafa entered George’s service very young and remained his faithful bodyservants during their lifetimes. Mehemet rose to be responsible for George’s personal accounts and, although he was eventually ennobled in 1716,
neither he, nor Mustafa held any political power. Their inclusion provides a powerful insight into the all encompassing and pervasive nature of this book in early eighteenth century society.

It is noteworthy that foreign ambassadors residing in London between 1717 and 1725, such as Count Volkra (VB), ambassador from the Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI, Baron Schack (VB), in the Hanoverian diplomatic service and later member of Tsar Peter of Russia's service in London and Count Staremberg, the Austrian negotiator in London, also joined the ranks of subscribers.

**INTELLECTUALS**

The lists of subscribers disclose another group worthy of discussion, highly educated and intelligent members of the upper class. This finding supports the widely held contemporary view that *Vitruvius Britannicus*, and its portrayal of Palladian buildings, was an accurate reflection of the views of the ancients. It was not merely an aesthetically pleasing book to be discussed lightly during the endless round of morning visits or dinner parties so much a part of this society, but was considered to be worthy of academic study by men of superior understanding. The lists include the names of educated men that one would expect to find subscribing to *Vitruvius Britannicus* such as the great book collector Doctor Mead (VB) and Thomas Rawlinson (VB), the famous bibliophile of the age. Renowned antiquaries also grace the lists: men such as Thomas Baker (VB), friend of Archbishop Burnett, Lord Coleraine of Bruce Castle (VB), and Knightley Chetwood (VB), Dean of Gloucester, all well known in their day for their interest and expertise in antiquity. But it is the appeal of the book beyond these men that is most interesting. The list includes learned men with no immediate passion for the antique nor for books themselves. *Vitruvius Britannicus* attracted Sir Samuel Garth (VB), physician and poet, the mathematician William Jones (VB), Sir Hans Sloane (see Plate 12) (VB), botanist and medic, Hugh Chamberlyn (VB), expert in midwifery, and Mr Secretary Molyneux (VB), who besides being a politician was also an astronomer. All these men, and many more besides, belonged to the Royal Society, the centre of scientific learning in England in the eighteenth century. *Vitruvius Britannicus*, and its amateur and inexperienced author, had somehow penetrated this bastion of learning with seemingly no effort at all.

The contemporary perception that the book was of high academic quality is confirmed by the inclusion in the lists of a small sub-group of learned men. John King (VB), the Master of Charterhouse appears in the lists alongside university academics such as Dr Gibson (VB), the Provost of Queen's College. Oxford and Dr King (VB), Principal of St Mary Hall. also at Oxford. Though few subscribers belonged to this sub group, their subscription to *Vitruvius*
Britannicus is highly informative in furthering the understanding of how the style was disseminated. There are indications that these university academics had an influence on the aesthetic leanings of their students, actively encouraging them to support the Palladian style. This can be seen by looking at the influence of one academic, conspicuous by his absence from any of the volumes’ lists. Dean Henry Aldrich, the man responsible for designing the seminal, early neo-Palladian building, the Peckwater Quad at Christ Church, Oxford (c 1706-1714) was prevented from subscribing by his untimely death in 1710. However, his influence in promoting neo-Palladianism appears to have been more far-reaching than has previously been realised. It is highly instructive to note that more than half of all peers, born between 1680 and 1740, who attended Oxford University favoured Christ Church as their chosen Oxford College. This means that Christ Church was the most influential of all Oxford colleges in the first half of the eighteenth century and it was here that neo-Palladianism was being preached and exhibited. Of all the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges attended by subscribers, Christ Church, Oxford, unsurprisingly produced by far the highest number. Of those subscribers whose education can be traced, sixty-seven attended Oxford University with thirty-nine of those at Christ Church alone. Clearly Aldrich’s neo-Palladian building made a lasting impression on those students up at the college during the planning and construction of the Quad. It is also likely that Aldrich, through his high position as Dean at Christ Church, sought to persuade his students of the merits of the neo-Palladian style, a point Giles Worsley has described as Aldrich’s ‘proseletising attitude towards Palladianism’.

Outside Christ Church, the rest of the collegiate community of the city would also have been aware of the stylistic novelty of this Quad, if only because it was so different from the prevailing Baroque.

It is noteworthy that only thirty-one subscribers have been found to have attended colleges at Cambridge University, a result that perhaps reflects the absence of any leading Cambridge University academics from the subscription lists of any of the editions of Vitruvius Britannicus.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

This group of subscribers reveals how an intellectual appreciation of the pages of Vitruvius Britannicus could advance the reader, particularly the redundant military officer, looking for employment. Most of the military men who ordered their copies were of noble rank, as was the Honourable Colonel John Fane (VB), Earl of Westmoreland. Their inclusion in the lists is more to be expected due to their position in life as substantial property owners. There were also those who turned a good start in life into a brilliant career; men such as Sir Richard Temple (VB) whose meteoric rise led him from colonel in 1702 to general and later an elevation to the peerage as Viscount Cobham. Over the course of his career Temple acquired the money he
needed to turn Stowe into one of the most beautiful contemporary gardens in existence, adorned with neo-Palladian buildings. The house also benefited from four neo-Palladian towers and a portico by Vanbrugh (VB) who despite being categorised as a Baroque architect, was equally well-versed in Palladian architecture. Temple's adoption of the prevailing architecture established his taste and virtue, as well as providing a power base from which to conduct his politics.

Of those who were not nobly born, the case is somewhat different. Some found their entrance to society through recognition of service and honours gained in the War of Spanish Succession which ended in 1713. However, continued advancement after 1713, when military favours were at a premium, was more difficult. Adherence to popular taste, in this case a subscription to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, was one way of gaining approval from patrons in a position to advance them. One such subscriber was Colonel John Selwyn (VB) from Matson, Gloucestershire, who rose through the military ranks to be the Duke of Marlborough's (VB) aide de camp before becoming Treasurer of Queen Caroline's pensions in later life. Other subscribers, such as Colonel Tyrell (VB), rose to high position after the cessation of the conflict through patronage, in Tyrell's case via the sponsorship of the Duke of Newcastle (VB). It is likely that this sponsorship was pivotal in enabling Tyrell to employ William Kent for the erection of an octagonal garden building and obelisk at Shotover Park, Oxon during these early years. The social importance of the book and its conveyance of intellectualism and virtue to the subscriber would not have been lost on ambitious soldiers, looking to continue their careers outside the military after 1713.

The lists contain names of the well-known military leaders such as Lord Stanhope of Chevening (see Plate 13) (VB), as well as the little known men of his entourage, his trusted captains Colonel Dormer (VB) and General Wills (VB), who were imprisoned with Stanhope at Briheuga during the last years of the War of Spanish Succession. It would seem that these men were an accepted part of the elite at this time. Other successful Officers were Major General Pepper (VB) and his fellow brothers in arms, General Carpenter (VB), General Cadogan (VB) (also Lord Cadogan), General Evans (VB) and General Stewart. Of the five only General Stewart did not subscribe to *Vitruvius Britannicus* but all were involved in speculative property deals. General Stewart built Hanover Square, and all five generals had addresses there in 1717. Clearly the early eighteenth-century war created advancement opportunities not only for noble military men, but also for those of more humble origins. Those who entered society via military success, rather than by virtue of noble birth, needed to maintain their position and this was, in part, achieved through the virtuous pursuits of fashionable architecture and the favour it secured.
PALLADIAN BUILDINGS

Despite the large number of subscribers to this seminal architectural book, and the great surge of interest in the new style, there were relatively few completely new Palladian buildings built between 1715-1730, the immediate years of influence of Vitruvius Britannicus. However, the quantity of pure, new buildings a style produces is not the only guide to its success. A great many of the subscribers, if they did not fully immerse themselves in the great Palladian sea of the time, certainly played in its shallows. Besides completely new houses there are many examples of alterations and additions to existing ancestral family homes, such as the internal alterations carried out at Raynham Hall, Norfolk, for 2nd Viscount Townsend (VB) by William Kent between 1728-9. Estate buildings were also widely employed to update existing country estates. For example the wooden bridge designed by the Earl of Burlington for the Duke of Grafton's (VB) garden at Euston Park, Suffolk,32 and the stables built at Houghton Hall, Norfolk between 1725-35, possibly by William Kent.33 Many made the token gesture towards adopting Palladianism by improving or altering their estates rather than undertaking the enormous task of rebuilding, a trend that continued well into the eighth decade of the eighteenth century when the influence of Vitruvius Britannicus was still being felt.

Evidence indicates that there were many more Palladian buildings planned than those eventually built, for example the new design for Eaton Hall, Cheshire for Sir Richard Grosvenor (VB)34 and the plans for Ardkinglas House, Argyllshire both by Colen Campbell.35 Whilst the reasons for this are numerous (and common to other architectural styles) the explanation for planned, unbuilt Palladian buildings, often relates to one of two circumstances that can be seen to have occurred on several occasions.

The first was the explosion of the South Sea Bubble, the financial catastrophe brought about in 1721 by the South Sea Company which attempted to curtail the trading activities of its rival companies and inadvertently created a spiralling financial crisis.36 Many of the Company directors and stockholders were bankrupted overnight and those who were not often suffered severe losses in both assets and confidence. The Chancellor of the Exchequer during the critical years of 1718-1721, also a director of the South Sea Company, was John Aislabie (VB) one of the first to fall. He was found guilty of corruption for attempting to hide his interest in stock through his stepson, Edmund Waller (VB), and for attempting to influence Lord Ross in his favour via his brother-in-law. Thomas Vernon, both of whom were also subscribers to Vitruvius Britannicus. Aislabie was duly sent to the Tower and, had it not been for Sir Robert Walpole's
intervention, would have lost everything. By 1723 Aislabie had made a recovery of sorts and was employing Colen Campbell to design a villa for him at Waverley Abbey, although he had owned the land for some years prior to the design for the villa being drawn up.\textsuperscript{37} When the house was completed Aislabie retreated to Yorkshire to create a Palladian water garden at Studley Royal including the Fishing Tabernacles standing sentry at the waterfall (see Plate 14) Studley became a retreat where Aislabie could hide from malicious gossip and the generally held view that

He was a man of good understanding, no ill speaker in Parliament and very capable of business; but dark and of a cunning that rendered him suspected and low in all men’s opinion. His great employments did not even raise any regard to his person. He was so much set upon increasing his fortune, and did that, and to obtain a peerage, which it is said he was promised, but missed, by the troubles he fell into for his south sea transactions… He was so little respected that he fell almost unpitied by anyone.\textsuperscript{38}

Aislabie’s long delay in building the villa at Waverley is explained by the circumstances of the South Sea debacle.

Another unfortunate was Sir Theodore Janssen (VB), also a director of the South Sea Company. He was in the process of constructing a Campbell-designed mansion in Wimbledon in 1720, when disaster struck.\textsuperscript{39} The shell was demolished in 1721, thus robbing Janssen of his means of advancement and posterity of another Palladian house. Another mystery that can at last be viewed in a new light, due to this research is the fate of Culter House, Aberdeenshire, home of Sir Alexander Cummins (VB), a subscriber. It is known that in 1721 both James Gibbs and Alexander Jaffray made designs for the alteration and extension of the house but the ‘outcome is not clear’.\textsuperscript{40} Since the South Sea catastrophe also occurred in 1721 and it is known that Cummings sustained heavy losses, dying in debt some four years later, it is highly unlikely that these planned alterations ever materialised. The Duke of Chandos (VB) also planned a grand palace on the Cavendish-Harley estate in 1719, but lost £300,000\textsuperscript{41} during the South Sea Crisis and was forced to sell land to the north of the estate for speculative development and the building was never constructed.\textsuperscript{42}

Whether directly affected or not, investors had suffered a loss of confidence, and for some, the building of expensive new status symbols had become, at least for the immediate future, out of the question. This financial crisis caused loss of momentum in the growth of the style and thwarted several plans for ambitious Palladian buildings.
The second reason why more Palladian buildings were not brought to fruition was the untimely death of several key early protagonists. The earliest tragic death that perhaps dogged the early development of the style was that of the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury in 1713 who, whilst he never specifically advocated Palladianism, called for a new national taste in architecture. He never lived to see Palladianism reborn in England, but had he lived even a few more years and leant his support to the revival, the beginnings of the style could have been very much more dramatic. Dean Aldrich, as discussed above, was also very influential and one of the earliest Palladian designers and builders in the eighteenth century. His death in 1710 halted his campaign to disseminate knowledge of the style through his position at Christ Church.

Similarly the Earl of Halifax (VB), an early patron of Colen Campbell whom he describes as 'the great Maecenas of our Age', died at the very beginning of the burgeoning style. Halifax had great power in these early years as he was sent to carry the insignia of the Garter to the Elector in Hanover in 1706 and then rose to become a Lord of the Treasury in 1714. He had planned to build a public library in the House of Lords, but died before he was able to execute these plans. Halifax's nephew, Charles (VB), succeeded him as earl, but despite having been in Hanover with William Benson in 1704 and subsequently subscribing to volumes II and III of Vitruvius Britannicus, appears to have taken little practical interest in architecture. A final example of a projected design halted by untimely demise, is the construction work of the proto-Palladian Hampstead Marshall, Berkshire by James Gibbs, abandoned upon the death of Lord Craven (VB).

WHIGGISM, TORYISM AND NEO-PALLADIANISM

Twentieth century architectural historians have expended much rhetoric on this particular aspect of Palladianism, some of it based upon an over-simplistic assumption that Palladianism was the sole remit of the Whigs. There are several reasons why this could never have been the case and an in-depth analysis of the subscribers clarifies the position. These subscribers were the key supporters of the style in its early years and there would have been no neo-Palladian revival without them. Any attempt to explain the political associations of the style must, therefore, take account of the leanings of these powerful subscribers.

An important point to note is that the Palladian style was not a new style born in England in the second decade of the eighteenth century as a result of the Burlington set. As outlined in chapter one the origins of English, eighteenth-century Palladianism begin at least a decade earlier when it came to England via George I. Connor perceived the dangers of linking Whiggism to Palladianism when he demonstrated that the bulk of Campbell's material used for Vitruvius...
Britannicus was produced during Queen Anne’s reign, in the Stuart era and under the Tory administration; Connor states that: ‘It is therefore unwise to seek too close a link between the new Hanoverian dynasty, with its accompanying reinstatement of Whig politicians and the revival of Palladian architecture’. 48

Connor, without the benefit of subsequent research by Arciszewska, was unaware of the fundamental importance of the Hanoverian dynasty to the Palladian revival in this country, but he clearly understood the tenuousness of the often-repeated link between Whiggism and Palladianism.

It is however, the subscribers themselves who provide the clearest evidence that Palladianism was by no means a wholly Whig concept. Analysis of their political leanings indicates that approximately 60% of those whose political tendencies can be traced were indeed Whigs, but that a significant percentage, 40%, were openly Tories. 49 The fact that there were more Whigs than Tories can probably be accounted for due to the ruling party of the time being Whig. The bias towards plates drawn for Whigs in Vitruvius Britannicus is also explained by the business acumen of Colen Campbell: he would only have targeted those patrons likely to commission him, and these men were, for the most part, Whigs benefiting from the recent change in power. However, if neo-Palladianism had been solely a manifestation of Whig power, the Tories of the day, and the often bitter enmity between the two parties, would have prevented these Tories subscribing. Furthermore a great many of those Tories were not moderate in their politics, but were Jacobite extremists willing to risk life and limb to reinstate the Pretender and the Tory regime. Such men included Lord Lansdowne, impeached and imprisoned in the Tower between 1715 and 1717 for Jacobite activities. 50 George Lockhart (VB) a zealous Tory and Jacobite was also imprisoned twice for assisting the Pretender. 51 Yet another is the Earl of Marischal (VB), forced to flee the country and forfeit his estates due to anti-government activities. 52 Similarly the Earl of Mar (VB), who was exiled for life for Jacobitism and disloyalty to the Whig regime, is to be found among the names. He went on to design in the Palladian style for other exiled Jacobites as well as friends in England. 53 Of telling significance is the fact that in 1721, the Earl of Mar designed a palace for the Old Pretender himself that included elements of neo-Palladianism. 54 This is to name but a few Tory subscribers and proves that, contrary to twentieth-century perceptions, Palladianism was not associated solely with Whiggism during its eighteenth-century revival.

To further underline this point it is worth noting that the aforementioned Peckwater Quad, one of the earliest Neo-Palladian buildings in the country, was not designed by a Whig. Dean Aldrich was a Royalist and a Tory, and his building of the Quad, so soon after the Act of
Settlement in 1701, was a monument to the past glories of the Stuart dynasty, not a manifestation of Whig power. Aldrich was not the only Tory at Oxford. The same university that produced this pioneering neo-Palladian signpost to the past had a Jacobite Chancellor during the 1715 rebellion. The Duke of Ormonde (VB) a subscriber to Vitruvius Britannicus, resigned his post when he fled the country that same year, only to be replaced immediately by another high Tory, his brother, the Earl of Arran (VB). Clearly there was no contemporary sense of a paradox that an institution with allegiance to Toryism was building in the neo-Palladian style.

Significantly the Tory subscribers did eventually build, or plan to build, in the Palladian style, just as the rival Whigs. Examples include Sir William Wyndham (VB), a staunch Tory, who remodelled his post-dissolution house at Witham Park into one of neo-Palladian splendour, the design for which can be found in the second volume of Vitruvius Britannicus, and the Tory Lord Lichfield (VB), who built the proto-Palladian Ditchley Park discussed in Chapter 3. Colen Campbell was a shrewd businessman and would not have invested his time targeting Tory patrons at all if Palladianism was solely a Whig preserve.

By analysing the lives, politics and tastes of the subscribers to Vitruvius Britannicus, in conjunction with what was planned and built, strikingly different insights into the neo-Palladian style can be gained. The following chapters look in more depth at the relationships between subscribers and the circles of influence this created for the dissemination of the style. Whilst patronage circles are a part of the analysis, other aspects of eighteenth century life will be shown to have had just as much of an impact on the progress of the style. However before moving on to examine the relationships between the subscribers to Vitruvius Britannicus introduced above, it is necessary to look briefly at another neo-Palladian book published at almost exactly the same time. Although not the main subject of this research, some understanding of its impact and relevance is considered necessary as background to the success of the style.

LEONI’S PALLADIO

Giacomo Leoni’s Palladio, a translation of Andrea Palladio’s I Quattro Libri dell’ Architettura and the first complete edition in English, was published shortly after Campbell’s first volume in 1715. The book was published in five instalments over the next five years, the last being published in 1720. Evidence suggests that Campbell discovered Leoni’s intention to make Palladio’s Quattro Libri accessible for the first time in England and, realising that the availability of such a treatise may radically increase the popularity of Palladianism in England,
ensured that Vitruvius Britannicus was published clearly promoting this style and including several neo-Palladian designs. So threatened were the publishers of Vitruvius Britannicus by the imminent arrival of an English version of I Quattro Libri that this major effort to insert pure Palladian designs into the first volume may even have occurred within the space of two weeks.

By adopting neo-Palladianism Campbell guaranteed the success of his first volume and, by publishing Vitruvius Britannicus just ahead of Leoni’s Palladio, it appeared that it had been he, Campbell, who had ushered in the new style and not Leoni.

What is instantly striking in an analysis of the subscription list of Leoni’s Palladio is that there were so few subscribers to this seminal and momentous book in comparison to the number subscribing to Campbell’s first volume: a volume which was in reality a somewhat random gazetteer of architectural engravings, many of them baroque, with a few neo-Palladian designs thrown in at the last minute for good measure. Whilst Campbell attracted an initial 301 subscribers to his volume, Leoni’s, translation secured only 153. This may well have been the result of two very different advertising strategies. Campbell and his publishing colleagues announced the impending arrival of Vitruvius Britannicus as early as 1 June 1714, with advertisements placed first in the Post Boy and then in the Daily Courant on 25 June that same year, a whole six months ahead of the publication date. Leoni does not appear to have announced the imminent release of his book until 30 April 1715, a mere two weeks before it was due to be completed. This lack of forewarning gave potential subscribers only one occasion to read the advert and barely two weeks to register their interest. Another reason for the, otherwise inexplicably, low support for this key book may have been the timing of its release. It is likely that a subscriber to the forthcoming Vitruvius Britannicus, having registered an interest in the book many months ahead of publication, may have been less inclined to subscribe to Palladio, another expensive architectural book being released at almost exactly the same time.

One could argue, therefore, that direct sales and circulation of Leoni’s book had a limited impact upon the dissemination of neo-Palladianism at this early time, attracting only half the influential patrons that Campbell had managed to secure. Instead, Palladio’s greatest influence was probably related to Campbell’s realisation that such a book was likely to be very influential in establishing Palladianism as the new national architecture, a factor he, Campbell, had not taken into consideration up to that point. Certainly those with a vested share in Vitruvius Britannicus were panicked by the idea of Leoni’s translation and went to extraordinary lengths to establish Vitruvius Britannicus as being neo-Palladian in outlook. The resultant last minute adaptation of Vitruvius Britannicus, an adaptation that was to play a very large part in promoting the neo-Palladian style, was a direct result of the planned publication of Palladio.
*Vitruvius Britannicus* went on to have a great effect upon its own 301 subscribers, disseminating knowledge of the style among the elite and reaching far more members of the upper classes than Leoni’s publication ever did.

In terms of the subscribers themselves, sixty-one of all those who bought a copy of Leoni’s book did not subscribe to Campbell’s first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus*. In the context of the 711 subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, this is a very small group and cannot be said to be indicative of another, separate, group of neo-Palladians. Rivalry between the authors and publishers of the two books does not appear to have extended to the subscribers, and those with a genuine interest in the subject were clearly content to subscribe to both.
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CHAPTER 3

THE TORY NEO-PALLADIANS

Close analysis of the subscription lists of Vitruvius Britannicus reveals a circle of inter-related friends, family and political allies that is unexpected. Contrary to much that has been written concerning the emergence of the neo-Palladian style and its link to Whiggism, it can be seen that this style also had a substantial Tory faction. The members of this political persuasion, far from being isolated by the prevailing politics, were so strongly linked that most of their relationships survived physical and political exile. What is most extraordinary about the members of this Tory circle is that forced removal from positions of power and even forfeiture of estates did not prevent their burgeoning interest in neo-Palladianism from being manifested in some way. The longevity of the relationships within this Tory circle, which will be shown to have aided the dissemination of the neo-Palladian style, was due, in part, to the dramatic failure of the 1715 Rebellion designed to re-establish Stuart rule in England. Those who had supported the Rebellion were either guilty of treason or, at the very least, tainted with Jacobitism, spelling the end of many promising careers. These shared experiences of exile, imprisonment, impoverishment and opposition to the ruling party cemented what may have been, under other circumstances, only temporary friendships.

Aside from politics, this Tory circle of subscribers was united by another common element: the architect James Gibbs (1682-1754). It is unsurprising that these men naturally gravitated towards Gibbs as he too was suffering from the effects of his Tory politics, made worse by his being both a Catholic and a Scot, and subject to the jealous enmity of his rival, Colen Campbell. Gibbs returned to England in 1709 after a six-year training programme in Italy where he had studied both Baroque and Palladian architecture under Carlo Fontana. He was adept at both styles, and indeed his early architecture would indicate that he did not see the need for rigid separation of the two related schools. However, the architectural atmosphere of the country had undergone changes since he had set out for Rome in 1703 for the purposes of taking Holy Orders. During this interval, a concern over the Protestant succession of England and a corresponding anxiety over Catholicism developed, which led to the increasing rejection of all things Baroque. Whilst Palladian architecture in its purest form was not yet widely accepted by 1709, its emergence over the next few crucial years in such pioneering buildings as Wilbury House, Wiltshire, Wanstead House, Essex and the Peckwater Quad at Christ Church College, Oxford, had begun to influence the existing Baroque style. This can be demonstrated by analysing the architecture of the established architects of the day such as Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor.
James Gibbs's most important patrons belonged to this Tory circle, and he was closely associated with them from the early years of his career until well into the 1740s. John Erskine, 11th Earl of Mar (1675-1732) was perhaps his most influential patron, being both friend as well as professional supporter. The friendship between the two men was demonstrated on Gibbs's death in 1754 when he left three houses, all his plate and one thousand pounds to Lord Erskine, 'in gratitude for favours received from his father the late earl of Mar' who had died twenty two years earlier.\(^6\) Mar commissioned him to design a new lodge, in the form of a small villa, for his estate at Alloa, Clackmannanshire, in 1710 and was instrumental in establishing Gibbs as one of the surveyors to the Commissioners for Building Fifty New Churches in 1713.\(^7\) Mar's brilliant career under the Tories, as Privy Councillor and Secretary of State for Scotland, was however, short-lived.\(^8\) He himself began the 1715 Rebellion by raising the Pretender's standard at Braemar and thus took a premature course of action that proved to be 'the most disastrous of all measures for the Jacobite cause'.\(^9\) The Duke of Argyll defeated him at Sherrifmuir and he fled the country in fear of his life. He was attainted for treason, his estates forfeited to the Crown and his great castle at Kildrummy was dismantled by Hanoverian troops; all of which led to the ruin of Scotland's oldest earldom.\(^10\) From this position Mar, or 'Bobbing John' as he had now been named, had little choice but to join the Court of the Pretender where, as with the other courtiers, he was destined to travel fruitlessly across Europe seeking support for their cause.\(^11\) Despite the loss of his estates it would seem that Mar never gave up hope of regaining his property, especially his favourite estate at Alloa for which he drew up endless schemes of refurbishment during his years in exile.\(^12\) Mar became one of the most prolific amateur architects of the age, frequently designing in the style of Palladio. His Palladian designs include a house drawn specifically for the Old Pretender in 1721 with a portico 'in the manner of Palladio's Villa Rotunda', a scheme for the Marquis of Tesse's house at Chatou, that was based upon a Palladian design published a few months earlier in Gibbs's *A Book of Architecture* in 1728, and some more designs for the Old Pretender's Palace in London, drawn between 1721 and 1729 which, although influenced by French architecture, were seen through eyes susceptible to the new English Palladian style, particularly as it is presented in the first three volumes of Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* 1715-1725, to which the Earl subscribed.\(^13\)

The friendship, shared passion for architecture and correspondence between the two Tory circle members, until Mar's death in 1732, make it certain that they would have discussed the growing interest in neo-Palladianism in England. It is highly likely that Mar's adaptation of Gibbs's
design in 1728 mentioned above, is only one of a series of exchanges of ideas between the two architects that affected the rest of the Tory circle and the dissemination of the style as a whole.

Another important Gibbs patron, and a member of the Tory Circle, was the 2nd Earl of Lichfield, son of Sir Edward Henry Lee and Lady Charlotte Fitzroy, the illegitimate daughter of Charles II and Lady Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland. Lichfield was a Tory and a Catholic as well as a confirmed Jacobite and gave Gibbs the free reign that had escaped him to date, the opportunity to build a completely new country house on virgin land in Spelsbury, Oxfordshire.\(^4\) The main block that Gibbs constructed at Spelsbury was a simple, symmetrical, tripartite building, whose form could have been inspired by any one of Palladio’s tripartite villas with which Gibbs was familiar. Ditchley is a key country house as it is a clear manifestation of the emergence of neo-Palladianism in Gibbs’s architecture, and a prototype for many of his successive commissions. Indeed it was about this time that he began to refine his style to a much more conformist, purer neo-Palladianism. Friedman notes that:

In his domestic architecture after 1720 Gibbs often turned to Palladio, as a student Gibbs had visited numerous villas and palazzi in the Vincentine by Palladio, whom he called, ‘the great Restorer of architecture’\(^15\)

As a prototype for Gibbs’s Palladian work, Ditchley seems to have been used as the blueprint for the remodelling of Dawley House, Middlesex, for Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke (VB), which itself became ‘the rallying place of the old in a new world’\(^16\) for the Tory Circle between 1725-1734, a building to which we will return.

Ditchley balances on the cusp of neo-Palladianism, without quite breaking with the Baroque, and represents Gibbs’s moving away from the outmoded style. Whilst it does not comply with Burlington’s puritanical version of neo-Palladianism, Ditchley bears all the hallmarks of the style, most obviously in its simplicity, planning and lack of ostentation.\(^17\) The main body is linked to outlying pavilions by single storey loggias, thus reflecting one of the basic tenets of Palladio’s villa designs. However, it is the three-storey, central element that is most interesting in the context of the Tory circle and Lord Bolingbroke, and it is to this part of the building that Dawley House owed so much.

1700-1716 THE FORMING OF THE TORY CIRCLE

It was during this period that the fortunes of the Tory circle members were forged and their lives interlinked. This short phase saw a rise to the dizzy heights of political success, the catastrophic
loss of position as the Tories fell from power in 1714, desperate attempts to turn the face of fortune by defecting to the Jacobite cause and finally, imprisonment or exile abroad. Henry St John, later Lord Viscount Bolingbroke, was at the epicentre of this Tory circle maintaining decades-long friendships with other circle members including Sir William Wyndham of Orchard Wyndham (VB), the Right Honourable Thomas Coke (VB), amateur architect and owner of Melbourne Hall, Derbyshire, the Earl of Berkeley of Cranford House (VB), Middlesex and Lord Essex (VB) who lived for years at Dawley, Bolingbroke’s estate in Middlesex. Bolingbroke was also a relative of the second Earl of Lichfield of Ditchley Park, Oxfordshire and good friends with the Earl of Strafford of Stainborough Park (VB), Lord Bathurst of Cirencester Park (VB), Lord Lansdowne of Longleat (VB) and, via James Gibbs, was acquainted with the hopelessly exiled Earl of Mar.

St John was a complicated man who seethed with ambition and intrigue, but who inspired great and enduring friendships despite his obvious profligacy and impulsiveness (see Plate 15). He was the despair of his steady parents and made their lives ‘perpetually uneasy by his wildness and heavy drinking’ during his youth, when he seemed set on making a career of pleasure and women. He was sent on the usual Grand Tour for two years visiting Paris, Geneva, Turin, Milan and Rome, returning to England in 1700 to take up a parliamentary post as MP for Wootton Bassett and was soon noticed by Robert Harley. Entry to Parliament, however, did not appear to stem the tide of his debauchery, a characteristic he freely admitted to Swift in 1724, and which continued to find expression until his second marriage in 1722. At some point during this wild youth he became firm friends with Thomas Coke (1675-1727) a similarly profligate young man. Anecdotal evidence of their roistering is demonstrated by the following letter from Bolingbroke to Coke from Whitehall, October 16, 1704, where he writes:

As to whores, dear friend, I am unable to help thee. I have heard of a certain housemaid that is very handsome; if she can be got ready against your arrival, she shall serve for your first meal.

A few days later Bolingbroke writes again ‘Really Tom, you are missed; whoring flags without you’.

Thomas Coke went on to become MP for Derbyshire 1698-1710 and for the ‘rotten Borough of Grampound’ 1710-1714 for the Tory interest. He inherited the mansion and estate of Melbourne in Derbyshire, collected a library of architectural works and drew up many schemes for building. Coke must have been well-known as an amateur architect as he drew plans for the Duke of Marlborough and rebuilt Cranford House for the 3rd Earl of Berkeley in 1722.
Earl of Berkeley, a Vice-Admiral, was a dear friend of Bolingbroke and also a neighbour. Cranford Park was within 15 miles of Dawley, where Bolingbroke was to settle in the 1720s and Berkeley, at times, tenanted a house in the grounds at Dawley from Bolingbroke. An integral member of the Tory Circle, Berkeley was one of Bolingbroke’s most constant friends, visiting him in France during the years of his exile, accepting him as a guest at Cranford Park during the lengthy building works to Dawley, and finally recuperating at Bolingbroke’s French home during a year long illness in 1735.

Cranford House (dem. 1944) was rebuilt by the Earl of Berkeley who lived there 1710-1736. Construction works had been completed by 1722 and the evidence that remains of the building indicates that it was plain and even stark in its design (see Plate 16).

The Royal Commission of Historic Monuments in England record card, consisting of written notes and plans, that was taken shortly before its demolition in 1936 is revealing. The plans show the 1722 core to have been ‘L-shaped’ with a symmetrical, seven-bay façade of three storeys and a central doorway. A pitched roof is partially concealed behind a parapet roof and the attic windows are smaller than those of the ground and first floor, which are of the same depth. It is not a neo-Palladian building, although its starkness and simplicity would have leant the house an air of collusion with the emerging style, if not the whole-hearted embracing of neo-Palladianism beginning to occur at this time (see Plate 17).

A peculiarity of Cranford House was the presence of a pair of large ionic wooden columns in a room that was a pantry at the time of its demolition, ‘as though it was an Entrance Hall or the like’.

This room is the northernmost room of the West façade and, an unlikely location for an entrance hall at this time. J.W. Bloe, who compiled the record card, concludes that given the location of the room at the end of the building, these columns were probably added later. However there is a strong likelihood that this pantry was, indeed, an entrance hall of sorts when first built. The oddity of a hall in this location was repeated at Dawley House, built by Lord Bolingbroke, only three years after the completion of Cranford House where Bolingbroke stayed as Berkeley’s guest during the long building works at Dawley. Analysis of the remaining evidence of Dawley also depicts a main entrance being located, somewhat unusually for the time, at one of the shorter elevations. It would appear that Bolingbroke’s Dawley was influenced by Cranford House, both in its plain aspect and lack of ornament, as it leaned towards the emerging neo-Palladianism and also in terms of room layout.

Christopher Hussey has highlighted more of Cranford’s leanings towards Palladianism and discusses the presence of
a single staircase rising round a solid masonry core that terminates in a large arch 
surmounted by the kind of pagoda top favoured by William Kent,...the whole distantly 
reminiscent of the staircase at Houghton.32

The Tory circle at this time also included, and its members fawned over, Robert Harley, later 1st 
Earl of Oxford (VB). As Secretary of State Harley was superior to Bolingbroke who had 
become Secretary at War in 1703, at the age of twenty-five. As they grew in power, the two 
were ‘were bound by the closest friendship’,33 but their relationship turned sour after 1710, 
soon after the Tory government had formed, largely due to Bolingbroke’s jealousy and 
ambition.34 The split between the two statesmen was sealed when Bolingbroke was elevated to 
a viscountcy, at Harley’s instigation, instead of the earldom he had been expecting. Harley’s 
role within the circle was destined to be short-lived and ended with his death in 1724.

Harley’s involvement in the Tory circle was familial as well as political. In 1709 his daughter 
Abigail married a Tory circle member, Lord Dupplin (VB), later the 7th Earl of Kinnoul1. 
Kinnoull’s seat was Dupplin Castle, Perthshire and in 1720 he commissioned James Smith 
(1645-1731) to draw up plans for its extension. As a result office-wings were added to Dupplin 
Castle and completed by 1725. Although no plans of the wings remain (they were destroyed by 
fire in 1827) the appointment of James Smith, a neo-Palladian architect, believed to have been 
Colen Campbell’s mentor in his early days of architecture in Scotland, once again highlights the 
link between Toryism and neo-Palladianism.35 Kinnoull, along with his fellow Tory circle 
members, also sought the service of James Gibbs who visited Kinnoull at his English estate at 
Brodsworth in 1718. A drawing was made by Gibbs in 1719 for Kinnoull, thought by Terry 
Friedman to have been for this site, although this has not been proven.36 The exiled Earl of Mar 
was married to Kinnoull’s sister and it was probably through Mar that his friend and protégé, 
James Gibbs, became known to Kinnoull; an example of the importance of family connections 
in this phase of architectural history.

Another great friend of Bolingbroke’s was Alexander Pope. He spent a great deal of time with 
Bolingbroke and maintained a correspondence with him throughout his exile, even writing 
poetry about his French chateau, La Source, despite never visiting it.37 For the Tory circle, 
however, it is not Pope’s poetry that is important, but his choice of architect and the location of 
his villa. Pope’s villa at Twickenham was designed by James Gibbs in 1719 and built from 
1720 onwards. Its early appearance is one of symmetrical simplicity with a tripartite plan and 
quoins that Gibbs used in his early proto-Palladian buildings.38 Interestingly these quoins are 
also present at Wilbury House, the first neo-Palladian villa in the country, and were considered
by Campbell to be an important Palladian feature in the early years of his practice.\textsuperscript{39} Pope’s villa was located only a few miles from Dawley House and it is known that Bolingbroke visited Pope at his newly finished grotto from this time onwards, just as modernising works began at Dawley in 1725.\textsuperscript{40} As Pope was an influence on Bolingbroke the man of learning during these early years, it is likely that Pope’s villa was an influence on Bolingbroke the emerging amateur architect.

No analysis of the Tory circle would be complete without discussion of Sir William Wyndham, Bolingbroke’s closest friend. Both men had been educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford, though not simultaneously. Wyndham began his political career in 1710 when he was returned as the Tory MP for Somerset, just as Bolingbroke was riding the crest of the wave in terms of his power and popularity.\textsuperscript{41} It is likely that the nine year age difference between the two was the key to their relationship as Wyndham, along with other aspiring young Tories, became captivated by Bolingbroke when he joined the Bolingbroke-led October Club, the Tory stronghold established to rival the Kit-Cat Club of the Whigs.\textsuperscript{42} A friendship that began as hero worship became so deep and genuine that when Wyndham lost both his wife and daughter in the early 1730s, it was to Bolingbroke’s house at Dawley that he retreated to mourn on both occasions.\textsuperscript{43}

The successes of the Tory party were short-lived however and, with the death of Queen Anne in 1714 and the succession of the Hanoverians, Tory statesmen were mercilessly hounded out of office by the Whigs. This was the turning point that determined the future, both architectural and political, of the whole Circle. Bolingbroke, Harley, Dupplin, Wyndham, Mar, Strafford and Lansdowne all became high profile enemies of the new government almost overnight. On March 27, 1715, Bolingbroke fled the country disguised as a valet, in a little packet boat and, unforgivably as it turned out, allied with the Pretender.\textsuperscript{44} Mar also fled later that year. Wyndham, Harley, Dupplin and Lansdowne were all sent to the tower for treason accused of ‘high crimes and misdemeanours’.\textsuperscript{45} The Tory circle had been forcibly disbanded and, for at least the next two years, Bolingbroke was seen as the ultimate betrayer by his circle friends.\textsuperscript{46}

\textbf{1716-1725 EXILE}

The next phase in the lives of the Tory circle members was one of restlessness, rebuilding and endless hoping. Bolingbroke’s immediate defection to Paris, to the court of the Pretender to seek advancement, occurred just as Sir Robert Walpole moved his impeachment. There has been lengthy speculation about Bolingbroke’s reasons for defecting,\textsuperscript{47} but Isaac Kramnick has summed up the situation succinctly:

\textit{...
....whatever may have been his initial inspiration, Bolingbroke’s Jacobite interlude is really neither that enigmatic nor that surprising. Gentry discontent and resentment were filling the Jacobite ranks with countless recruits seeking a return to the past.\textsuperscript{48}

Bolingbroke was dismissed as the Pretender’s Secretary of State within a year however, probably due to indiscretions with a shared mistress, and the seals passed to the Earl of Mar in 1717 leaving Bolingbroke in an utter dejection of spirit.\textsuperscript{49} It was at this time that he met Marie-Clare de Decamps, the Marquise de Villette, darling of the French court of Louis XIV, with whom he was to spend the rest of his life. His relationship with the Marquise established a pattern in Bolingbroke’s life, and therefore for the rest of the Tory Circle. From 1716 onwards Bolingbroke and his mistress (they did not marry until the death of Bolingbroke’s first wife) travelled around France, living in several different places as political fortunes dictated, never settling and ever restless. The Marquise suffered from chronic ill-health and it may have been this factor that led to the Tory circle convening wherever the Bolingbrokes happened to be.

In 1716, whilst Bolingbroke and the Marquise were setting up home in the Chateau of Marcilly in Nogent-sur-Seine, Marie-Clare’s childhood home, Wyndham, Lansdowne and Harley were imprisoned in the tower. The rift between the impulsive Bolingbroke and his steadfast friends must have seemed irreparable. Later, after their release, and hoping to win back his Jacobite friends who had turned against him, Bolingbroke wrote his famous ‘Letter to Sir William Wyndham’, a masterpiece of advocacy which reinstated the friendships.\textsuperscript{50}

During Bolingbroke’s sojourn with his Marquise in the Chateau of Marcilly, ‘workmen were almost constantly engaged in repairing the ancient structure or making improvements’.\textsuperscript{51} This would appear to be the first time Bolingbroke indulged in actual building, though his interest in architecture, and more specifically neo-Palladian architecture, goes back to at least 1715, when he subscribed to the first volume of Campbell’s \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus}. Perhaps this architectural interest developed when his cousin James Brydges, later Duke of Chandos, began his house at Canons Park, Edgware in 1713, employing James Gibbs from 1716.\textsuperscript{52} Whenever Bolingbroke’s interest began, it was a pursuit that was to provide respite for him during his lifetime of exile, and something to which he turned time and again for intellectual diversion. Having spent much money on Marcilly, by 1719 Bolingbroke and the Marquise found it too large with Bolingbroke specifically branding it ugly, ‘L’architecture de Marcilly est tres peu de chose’.\textsuperscript{53}
It was in the autumn of 1719 that Bolingbroke bought La Source, a small property ‘between a chateau and a maison bourgeoise’ four miles south of Orleans, where the Tory circle would begin to re-form over the next few years. He carried out two years of building work here, staying at Marcilly for the first six months when it became too inconvenient to live at La Source. The house was situated at the source of the River Loiret, a branch of the Loire, and was constructed in 1632 of massive stone ‘among noble seats facing Orleans amid the vineyards’.

From the many letters that were written during this time it is clear that Bolingbroke was building, and indeed thinking, in terms of classical antiquity. As a scholar he influenced Voltaire who often stayed with him at La Source and it is known that, like the later neo-Palladians, Bolingbroke was well-versed in the works of classical antiquity. His letter to Dean Swift sheds some light on his plans to develop La Source along classical lines:

I have in my wood....a more beautiful river than any which flows in Greek or Latin verse. I have a thousand projects about this spring, and among others, one which will employ some marble. Now marble you know makes one think of inscriptions.... Send me some mottos for groves & streams, & fine prospects & retreat, & contempt for grandeur...

His pursuit of these improvements was shared enthusiastically by his much younger half-sister, Henrietta Knight, later Lady Luxborough and always his ‘Dear Child’, from whom he received books on architecture in 1722 whilst at La Source. The Marquise’s letter to the Comte d’Argental of August 1721 describes the major nature of the alterations Bolingbroke had embarked upon. She writes:

We are badly encamped here, in the midst of very dirty and noisy people, but who do not wish to leave us; these are our workmen. We have each, at different corners of the house, a couch; you would share the same fate if you came here. We should welcome you with the greatest pleasure, however, even though you would be uncomfortable.

Apart from alterations to the chateau Bolingbroke turned his thoughts to the garden by constructing a temple above the spring, complete with a sculptured figure of a river god and a tablet inscribed in Latin with a eulogy to himself. There was also a hermitage within the park, but of this there is no information. All that is known of these works is that they were classical and that they served as an introduction to the proto-Palladian works that were executed at Dawley in partnership with James Gibbs. These early forays into architecture are vital in
forming an understanding of the importance of classical antiquity for Bolingbroke and providing an architectural context for the partnership between himself and Gibbs later that decade.

During this period of exile plans were published in the 1717 edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus* for a Palladian building at Witham Park for William Wyndham (see Plate 18).

Though Colen Campbell claimed them as his own they were actually drawn up by Gibbs who was never credited. Although not published until 1717, it is likely that they were drawn before the publication of the first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 1715, when Wyndham was a rising politician. It is unlikely that Gibbs would have been inclined to draw them for Wyndham between 1715 and 1716 (in time for publication of the 1717 edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus*) because Wyndham was still in the Tower until 1716 and, as with all Jacobites of that time, he was not a sound commercial prospect. The most likely situation, therefore, is that Wyndham was planning to build in the Palladian style as early as 1715 with James Gibbs as his architect. It is also equally likely that, due to the closeness of their friendship, Wyndham shared these plans with Bolingbroke just before he fled. Until very recently it was considered that Wyndham’s plans for Witham, which he inherited in 1695, were never built. Witham originated as a Carthusian Monastery in the twelfth century and its location was gradually lost until excavations in the 1920s and 1960s unearthed the remains of the Priory. However it was not until 1993 that remains of the post-dissolution country house built adjacent to the Priory, along with its successor houses, were discovered.

Evidence points to Wyndham having already planned the new house at Witham, and probably begun its construction, by the time he was imprisoned in 1715-1716. The wording of a letter he wrote immediately prior to his release from the Tower in 1716 implies that construction had commenced,

I design to make up as soon as I can the time I have lost in my building, and am therefore going immediately into the Country.

Certainly by 1720 the house was being described as ‘newly built’. By comparing the Gibbs plan that was published in the second edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus* with the earthworks that were discovered in 1993, Robert Wilson-North and Stephen Porter have proved that the Gibbs plan of Witham was actually built. Interestingly Talman, as well as George Clarke of Oxford (VB), both drew up plans for the rebuilding of Witham prior to the Gibbs design finally being settled upon. Clarke was a Tory and close associate of Dean Aldrich, the designer of the early.
Neo-Palladian Peckwater Quad at Christ Church College, Oxford. He was also a friend of Lord Bolingbroke and therefore, by implication, of William Wyndham. His involvement in a design for Witham that is starkly Neo-Palladian locates Clarke within the centre of the Tory circle. In the event however, it was Gibbs’s plan that was selected, a design that embraced Neo-Palladianism but which still adhered to Baroque Monumentalism as shown by its display of the Talman-esque giant pilasters beneath the attic storey. The design for Witham highlights Gibbs’s grasp of both Baroque and Neo-Palladian design and his belief at this stage of his career that the two strands of classicism could be combined. Over the next few years, this view was to give way to fashion however and Gibbs’s designs moved from his unique blend of the two styles towards a Proto-Palladian architecture.

A brief discussion of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, as a member of the Tory circle is required at this point since he was also building at this time. Strafford was an ambassador and diplomat during Queen Anne’s reign and maintained an acquaintance with the Electress Sophia, the future George I’s mother, throughout the first decade of the eighteenth century. The Electress stated in a letter to Baron Bothmar (VB) in 1712 that she did not like ‘Mylord Straffort’, a remark typical of her discernment of imposters who were not truly supportive of the Hanoverians.67 Interestingly Bolingbroke also visited Hanover at this time, a fact not recorded by any of his biographers. His visit is mentioned by the Electress in a letter of 13 September 1712 where she writes to Baron Bothmar that Bolingbroke is there, but that she would not accept his brother as a page.68 The Electress’ instincts did not fail her with either man; within three years of their visits Bolingbroke had fled the country to join the Jacobite cause and Strafford had been impeached for aiding the Pretender.

Strafford acquired the estate of Stainborough in Yorkshire in 1708 at the height of his political success and began making plans to build. It was probably during his time in Germany that he met Johann Bodt, the German architect employed by Strafford in 1710 to design the east wing of Stainborough, in the Franco-Prussian style (see Plate 19). Whilst this wing, in the form of a 180-foot gallery, was Franco-Prussian externally, its interior displayed strong neo-Palladian elements. The difference in style between the exterior and interior illustrates how architecture evolved in the years between 1710, when the shell had been built, and 1725 when the interior was completed. The unfinished state of the interior was highlighted by Campbell in 1715 when he featured the gallery in Vitruvius Britannicus stating that ‘...the noble patron is preparing a curious collection of Painting, Sculpture, and other Decorations’. It remained unfinished until James Gibbs once again featured in the lives of the Tory circle members, this time as commissioned by Strafford in the 1720s.69 Gibbs’s scheme was completed in 1724 with the assistance of his usual group of craftsmen Amiconi, Artari and Bagutti.70 The scheme is not
unusual for its time and displays many of the hallmarks of neo-Palladian interior design. Fortunately for Gibbs, the Baroque exterior designed by Bodt included two large Venetian windows, one at each end of the gallery, which still provide an elegant visual cessation to the length of the room (see Plate 20). Architecturally, these would have been a novelty when designed in 1710 but the grandeur of Bodt’s exterior precludes their being noticed as a principal feature from the outside of the building. From the interior, however, they are the perfect accompaniment to a neo-Palladian scheme. Gibbs complemented these windows with other neo-Palladian elements of some force and strength, notably the bold cornice decorated with Vitruvian scrolls in heavy relief which is itself balanced by a simple dado broken only by the

Great, 9ft. wide, temple fronted, marble chimney pieces with the owner’s crest and coronet in the pediments, the cornices of which support eagles standing on plinths and holding beribboned bay-leaf swags in their beaks (see Plate 21).  

The pediments of the fireplaces are echoed in the doorways leading to and from the gallery which are also pedimented with supporting Corinthian pilasters as door jambs. The impressive length of the gallery is carefully controlled by the tripartite division of the space, effected by the use of two Corinthian screens with marble columns at either end of the room.

Clearly Strafford’s involvement in the Tory circle would have brought him into contact with the emerging proto-Palladian style of the Group and their architect James Gibbs. It appears that this contact with the proto-Palladian Tories affected Strafford’s stylistic choices. His commissioning of James Gibbs for a neo-Palladian interior of what was essentially a Baroque building, demonstrates how his architectural viewpoint had shifted. Stainborough was visited soon after completion by Lord Bathurst, Strafford’s cousin and a fringe member of the Tory circle whose interests lay in the field of garden design. Bathurst proclaimed the gallery ‘a magnificent room now the pillars are up’.

Though little appears to be known of it, Strafford also had a house at Twickenham, which would have given him easy access to Bolingbroke, Pope and the other members of the Tory circle gathered at Dawley from 1725 onwards. Pope and Strafford corresponded during the second decade of the eighteenth century and there is every reason to suppose that Strafford visited Pope’s house just as Bolingbroke is known to have done.

Just as the noble members of the Tory circle were influenced by each other, so too were the craftsmen. The relationship between James Gibbs and Francis Smith of Warwick is well known and has been discussed at length by Terry Friedman and Howard Colvin. Gibbs’s
involvement in the circle gave rise to Smith, a colleague of Gibbs, being employed as the main contractor at Ditchley Park for the Earl of Lichfield. It has even been suggested that Smith was involved in some of the design work at Ditchley, highlighting the esteem with which Gibbs held him and his willingness to be associated with him.\textsuperscript{76} Smith was also involved in rebuilding the west wing of Melbourne Hall for Thomas Coke further demonstrating his intertwinenement in the Tory circle. The lesser-known Robert Bakewell, was another artisan who benefited from the close relationships of the Tory circle during this phase.

Bakewell was a pioneering gatesmith who was commissioned to construct a wrought iron arbour, known as the ‘birdcage’, for Thomas Coke between 1707 and 1711, in the gardens of Melbourne Hall which Coke was re-landscaping before turning his hand to the remodelling of the Hall itself. It is likely that it was through Coke that Bakewell was introduced to the Earl of Strafford and commissioned to create the impressive palisading and iron gates for the front of Stainborough in 1716 for two hundred pounds.\textsuperscript{77} Architectural connections such as these can be said to have characterised the circle at this time.

1725-1738 THE MATURING CIRCLE

The most important event during the next phase of the Tory circle’s history was the construction of Dawley House, near Uxbridge in Middlesex (demolished in 1944) as it represented a focal point close to London, where the members could convene. This was particularly important towards the end of the period when the campaign to undermine Robert Walpole began in earnest. Bolingbroke purchased the estate in September 1725 upon his partial pardon, when it became legal for him to own property in England again.\textsuperscript{78} His exile from the political world he loved remained in force however, and Bolingbroke was excluded from the House of Lords for the rest of his life. It is probable that he heard of Dawley whilst still in France via William Capel, third Earl of Essex, who rented part of the estate from its then owner, the Earl of Tankerville (VB). Essex was a very great friend of the Bolingbroke’s, addressing Lady Bolingbroke as ‘mother’ in reply to her ‘mon fils’,\textsuperscript{79} although he appeared to take little part in the political or architectural side of the circle. Tankerville had completed the remodelling of Dawley in 1722, some three years prior to its sale to Bolingbroke, and had employed Nicholas Dubois (VB) for the purpose. As the translator of Giacomo Leoni’s \textit{The Architecture of Andrea Palladio}, Dubois was well-placed to design in the Palladian style. Interestingly Essex was made godfather to Dubois’ children,\textsuperscript{80} but no suggestion has been made in recent scholarship to explain how the two became acquainted in the first place. This present research suggests that the friendship arose during Dubois’ lengthy employment at Dawley when Essex was renting property there.
Tankerville's newly constructed house at Dawley, the building which Bolingbroke bought, was simple and elegant, and 'Little more than a villa in contemporary terms'.\(^81\) It was a two-storey, seven-bay house with a piano nobile, basement, centrally placed door and parapet concealing a flat roof behind. Not wholly unexpectedly, given that Dubois was the architect, Tankerville's house was already displaying some of the basic motifs of the neo-Palladian style. However, despite its newness, Bolingbroke lost no time in engaging James Gibbs who was by now the *de facto* architect for the Tory Circle.\(^82\) There is no doubt that Bolingbroke's experiments and building works at Marcilly and La Source would have influenced his architectural decisions and informed his discussions with Gibbs about the new mansion. Certainly Bolingbroke's immersion in antiquity during his exile both abroad and when he returned to England, influenced the form of Dawley, which he referred to as his 'Farm'.\(^83\) Dawley served both as a retreat from the political world which had spurned him and as a consuming interest through which he tried to persuade himself and others that seeking political advancement was beneath him. To this end Dawley became a Palladian villa in the truest sense; as a place of pastoral seclusion, a retreat embodying rural and sensual enjoyment and as a centre for philosophical contemplation.

The single greatest stylistic influence on Dawley was Ditchley Park, owned by his relative and fellow Jacobite, Lord Lichfield, who had employed Gibbs only a few years earlier. The similarities between the two buildings have been discussed at length by B. T. White\(^84\) who has drawn together the evidence for Dawley from two sources: a description of Dawley, complete with very rough engravings which was published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1802, and information collated to form an insurance policy dated 19 June, 1753, (see Plates 22 and 23). What is striking about the engravings is that they contradict much of what is known about Tankerville's house, as inherited by Bolingbroke, and also what is known of Bolingbroke himself, as well as the work of Gibbs. The fire insurance policy however, is much more consistent in these areas, its description of the house tallying to a large extent with what is known of Tankerville's earlier house and Bolingbroke's tastes. A brief assessment of the evidence is necessary before an analysis of Bolingbroke's works at Dawley can be made.

Tankerville's Dawley was designed by Dubois, and drawn by the builder, John Jenner who included it in his estate plan of Dawley. Jenner's miniature drawing depicts a single elevation of the new mansion, completed in 1721, which Tankerville had commissioned.\(^85\) This elevation, though sketchy, depicts key features that are absent from the 1802 engravings of Dawley that White has used as evidence for the building's appearance in Bolingbroke's time. It is much more likely that the earlier Jenner plan is accurate as Jenner helped in the building of
the house, whereas the later engravings, published thirty-two years after the demolition of Dawley, were drawn only by a visitor.

Jenner's elevation depicts Tankerville's house (which was to form the main body of Bolingbroke's new mansion) as having a basement and piano nobile. The visitor's engraving shows neither of these typical Palladian features though the rough size and shape of the building appears to be correct. In a similar manner, the visitor has correctly identified the main entrance as being, somewhat unusually, located on one of the shorter elevations, an unusual arrangement for the time, but one with a contemporary precedent at Cranford Hall, Middlesex, the home of Bolingbroke's friend Lord Berkeley and the place where he stayed during the construction of Dawley. However the visitor has depicted this entrance as having a Gothic arch surrounded by classical elements. This is highly unlikely to be an accurate portrayal of Bolingbroke's building given his detestation of the Gothic. For these reasons it is probable that the 1802 engravings of Dawley are only partially accurate. However, they remain useful, especially when consulted in conjunction with the description that accompanies them and the more accurate fire insurance policy.

Having assessed the accuracy of the evidence, what emerges with clarity is that Dawley was based upon Gibbs's Ditchley Park in form, size and layout (see Plate 24). Dawley had a frontage of 135 feet with east and west facades of ninety-two feet, dimensions that are strikingly similar to Ditchley's 139 feet by ninety-five feet, whilst the floor-plan of the two buildings was identical. The external appearance of the two buildings was slightly different though, Ditchley having an attic storey and being finished in stucco whereas Dawley was two storey and was finished in brick. Another difference is the wings, which at Dawley were added onto Tankerville's main block to create the H-plan already in existence at Ditchley. Dawley's wings projected by two bays as opposed to the more harmonious, single bay, projection at Ditchley. One explanation is that, due to the limitations of accommodation imposed on Bolingbroke by Tankerville's existing block, he opted for slightly deeper, more spacious, projecting wings which, when viewed from a distance, would not have altered Gibbs's overall design conception, as embodied at Ditchley. It has been suggested by John Harris that the 1802 sketch of Dawley is indicative of a 'wrap-around' extension being added to surround the earlier Tankerville form. This theory could explain why the Tankerville house, complete with piano nobile, appears in the 1802 sketch with two storeys of equal height. Although remodelling did certainly occur, it seems very unlikely that a house of 1725 would erase what was then a highly fashionable feature, the piano nobile, and return to an older two storey design. Apart from the stylistic preferences of the age, such an alteration of levels across the width of the house would have been very costly to carry out. It is much more likely that, in keeping with the gothic arch
mistake, the artist’s naïve interpretation of Dawley is responsible for inaccurate drawing of the building.

Friedman, without the benefit of White’s recent exegesis of Dawley and Ditchley, has described Dawley as being ‘antique rather than Palladian in its classicism’. In light of the new research carried out by White and the similarities of Dawley to Ditchley, Gibbs’s first conscious move towards the neo-Palladian style, and seen in the context of Bolingbroke’s use of Dawley, his architectural exploits abroad and the activities of the wider Tory circle, Dawley might be more accurately described as ‘Proto-Palladian’. The building works to Dawley were extensive and lasted two years (he was still writing to his sister Henrietta from Cranford in December 1727) all of which time was spent staying at Berkeley’s Cranford Hall, the building designed by their mutual friend and Tory circle member, Thomas Coke in 1727.

In 1724 there were two circle members still in exile: Bolingbroke and Mar. Mar broke with the Court of the Pretender in 1724 without being reconciled to the Hanoverian one. He remained in exile never to return to his native country. Bolingbroke, who had broken with the Jacobites several years earlier, was granted a partial pardon and allowed to re-settle in England though he never again attained a place in government. It was during this phase in the history of the circle that Mar was designing his first completely neo-Palladian building, a country seat for the Marquis de Tesse at Chatou, near St Germain. Interestingly he also designed a house for Lord Falkland, a fellow Jacobite in exile, at Meziere, near Orleans, in 1726. Given Bolingbroke’s ownership of La Source, just outside Orleans, the location of Gibbs’s new commission is not insignificant. During this period Mar also drew up plans for another circle member, Lord Lansdowne, for the alteration of Longleat, Wiltshire, with which he must have been familiar. He planned to re-face the east front with a monumental engaged temple portico ‘in place of that wch was burned down’. This unusual Palladian feature had been developed by Colen Campbell in a design dedicated to Sir Robert Walpole in 1717 and was first used by Gibbs around 1719. Its proposed use for Longleat suggests another exchange of ideas between Mar and his protege, Gibbs. The changes were never carried out although Lansdowne’s stepson, Lord Weymouth, later employed Gibbs at Longleat.

It was during this maturing phase of the Tory circle, 1725-1738, that Catherine Douglas, third Duchess of Queensberry (VB) (d.1777), and one of the most celebrated beauties of the day, was to be found in the company of the Tories at Dawley. She was a frequent visitor to Bolingbroke’s retreat and became firm friends with the Marquise. Lady Bolingbroke called the Duchess ‘Sa Singularite’, a name that reflected her whimsical approach to fashion and compulsion for attention. It is interesting to note that at precisely the time when the Duchess
first joined the circle at Dawley in 1725, she and her husband Charles Douglas, third Duke of Queensberry, acquired the Palladian villa at Amesbury, Wiltshire, by John Webb, which was at the time thought to be the work of Inigo Jones. The Duke's interest in the neo-Palladian style is confirmed by his subscription to the latter two editions of Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus*.

It was also during this phase, in 1737, that Lord Berkeley's younger brother, the Honourable George Berkeley, married Henrietta Howard, Lady Suffolk (VB), of Marble Hill and thus the friendships and acquaintances of the Tory circle began to expand further into non-Tory circles. Lady Suffolk had married the Honourable Charles Howard at a young age before becoming the Countess of Suffolk and a mistress of George II. In 1725 she began the construction of the famous neo-Palladian villa, Marble Hill, at Twickenham. At this time Lady Suffolk was good friends with Lord Bathurst, who had helped her to construct the garden at Marble Hill, and also the Duchess of Queensberry with whom she corresponded. She was a central part of Pope's literary circle and was friends with Lord Bolingbroke. It would be fascinating to know the extent of the influence of the 'Proto-Palladians' of the Tory circle on Marble Hill and vice versa.

William Wyndham's grand remodelling of Witham Park into a villa of Proto-Palladian aspect and bearing many of the hallmarks of the neo-Palladian style as it was emerging at this time was completed by 1720. No doubt Wyndham was always thankful that he had acted so percipliently in its construction as by 1721 he had, like so many others of this time, fallen prey to the South Sea Bubble debacle. This financial reverse, when coupled with finding himself on the side of the losing political party, led Sir William to retire to Orchard Wyndham, his family home, between 1725 and 1738. Indeed Sir William never held office again after his release from the Tower in 1716. Instead, for twenty-five years, Wyndham led the opposition to Sir Robert Walpole's administration. He contented himself with works to the landscape and some minor alterations to Orchard Wyndham that included inserting a large front door and fanlight in the centre of the north front, roofing over the north courtyard and building a taller block to the west. Although simple and reticent, these minor alterations do not compare with the major Proto-Palladian remodelling of Witham only a few years earlier. It would seem that Wyndham's ill-fated political and financial fortunes effectively ended his ideas of Palladian splendour, as manifest at Witham.

During this period Bolingbroke and Wyndham grew even closer and were constantly visiting each other, often staying for several weeks at a time. This was due, in no small part, to the heightened disenchantment they felt towards Robert Walpole's Whig government in the late 1720s. Dawley became the centre for political opposition during this phase and it was here that
Bolingbroke devised *The Craftsman* in 1726, a political magazine designed to undermine Walpole. The magazine led to a concerted effort to oust Sir Robert and drew the Tory circle even closer together. This political circumstance led to increased gatherings at Dawley and provided more opportunities for the exchange of ideas, both political and architectural. Interestingly the building of Dawley and Cranford Hall as well as alterations to Melbourne Hall and Orchard Wyndham, effectively the most productive period in the lifespan of the Tory Circle architecturally, coincided with a period of strong political opposition. As the period drew to a close Bolingbroke, now an old man in contemporary terms, came to be seen as legendary figure by the ‘Boy Patriots’, a rising group of young dissidents (mostly Cobham’s nephews and young friends who had first met at Stowe) and disgruntled Whigs, who temporarily joined the Tory circle. These Whigs included Lord Burlington (VB), the Duke of Bolton (VB), the Duke of Argyll (VB), the Earl of Marchmont (VB) and Viscount Cobham of Stowe (VB). Cobham’s anti-government sentiment, as displayed so clearly in his iconographic additions to the garden at Stowe after his fall from grace in 1732, may well have owed their origins to Bolingbroke’s own display of engraved poetry in the garden of La Source some thirteen years earlier, which detailed his own political exile and disillusionment. This period of political discontent temporarily united some of the key Whigs with the Tory circle thus providing the opportunity for further exchanges of shared Palladian tastes.

**1739-1754 Journey’s End**

The final phase of the Tory circle constituted a somewhat depressing tailing-off of events rather than a glorious and memorable end to what had been a highly organised, political and cultural group that had dominated so much of the early eighteenth century. The natural wastage of men and women who were now entering the winter of their lives certainly hastened the demise of the circle in the 1730s and ultimately was responsible for its extinction. By 1732 the Earls of Lansdowne and Mar had died, Wyndham had lost both his first wife and daughter by 1735 and the Earl of Berkeley was dead by 1736. Furthermore Walpole, Bolingbroke’s arch-enemy, had been overthrown leading to the abandonment of Bolingbroke by the Boy Patriots. However age and death were not solely responsible for the disintegration of the circle. In 1735 Bolingbroke, in his usual impetuous and ill-thought out style, had written a damning article about Robert Walpole that was nothing short of libellous. Whilst this, and many other articles in *The Craftsman*, had had the desired effect of bringing about Walpole’s downfall, Bolingbroke had begun to be viewed as a troublesome maverick by the Boy Patriots who, in the 1740s abandoned him altogether. For the second time in his life Bolingbroke fled to France to join the Marquise and the circle at Dawley was disbanded. He retreated to the chateau of Chantelou, near Amboise in Touraine in the Summer of 1735, accompanied by his friend Lord Berkeley of...
Cranford Hall, whose illness prevented the Bolingbroke's from leaving the 'cold and draughty' Chantelou until the following Spring. Bolingbroke's restlessness seems to have reasserted itself at this time and, after spending a year at the Palace of Fontainbleu, governed by one of the Marquise's stepdaughter's, he moved to Argeville on the outskirts of the Fontainebleu forest where he built a pavilion for his writing in 1736. No records of this pavilion have been traced. Some vestiges of the circle remained as Wyndham, Berkeley and 'Brother Bill,' William Chetwynd (VB), visited him here. During this time of self-inflicted exile Bolingbroke once again turned his back on England and by 1738 had sold the proto-Palladian Dawley, his much loved farm, for twenty-six thousand pounds. 1738 represents the end of Bolingbroke's architectural innovations as he never again built on a large scale but confined his architectural activities to maintaining and restoring the St John properties he inherited upon the death of his father in 1742.

William Wyndham died in 1740 and it is not difficult to imagine the effect that this had on the now elderly Bolingbroke who continued to watch over Wyndham's children for the remainder of his life. When his own father, 'Old Frumps' finally died in 1742 Bolingbroke and the Marquise left France for the last time and retired to Battersea, the family seat, where they engaged in extensive rebuilding works. As the Marquise wrote to Henrietta in 1742,

> When we build it up on one side it falls down on another and the workmen never seem to finish, though we do only what is absolutely necessary to shelter us from the rain.

Bolingbroke's inheritance of the family property did not spur him on to build as it once would have done. As a man of sixty-four he relinquished Lydiard Tregoze, Wiltshire, to his half brother, Jack, to whom the splendid Palladian remodelling was left (see Plate 25). Once so interested in architecture, Bolingbroke appears to posterity as faintly critical of the work, though this is probably due to the bitterness he felt at the cold relationship between himself and Jack that persisted, even after his gift of Lydiard. In a letter to his sister Henrietta in 1744 Bolingbroke wrote,

> I am glad to hear that My Lord St John has done so much at Lydiard. I abandoned it to him that he might restore the family seat, and that by living there decently and hospitably he might restore the family interest too much and too long neglected. He seems pleased with what he has done, and vanity and ostentation may get, in some degree, the better part of another person's advance. tho' it be as exorbitant as I have ever heard of in any.
Analysis of the lives of the subscribers to Vitruvius Britannicus has presented a picture of the emerging neo-Palladian style in England that differs significantly from the established wisdom. It has been demonstrated that the Tories and Jacobites of early eighteenth-century England were serious in their approach to the new style and, had it not been for the straightened circumstances they experienced as a result of political and sometimes physical exile, could have equalled the Whigs in the construction of neo-Palladian buildings. This research shows that the adoption of the neo-Palladian style was by no means a sole activity of the Whigs but that the ability to indulge in the style was often directly related to the opportunities of position and monetary reward, or lack of those, brought about by the political allegiance of the individual.
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CHAPTER 4

JOHN AISLABIE AND A NEW ARCHITECTURE FOR YORKSHIRE

THE EARLY YEARS

The successful introduction of eighteenth century neo-Palladianism to Yorkshire appears to have occurred primarily due to one of the most ambitious men of the early eighteenth century and the existing links he had with other local men of standing and with William Benson (VB), the harbinger of neo-Palladian design in this era. This chapter will demonstrate that it was these societal links, rather than any particular political allegiance, which provided the springboard for the style’s growth in the county. The most important gentleman for the beginnings of neo-Palladianism in Yorkshire, and the man upon whom this circle depended, was John Aislabie (VB), 1670-1742 (see Plate 26).

Born in 1670 he was the fourth son of George Aislabie and his wife Mary, daughter of Sir John Mallory, of Studley Royal. It was probably this union that elevated the Aislabies from relatively wealthy Baltic merchants, to the well established Yorkshire family they had become by the end of the seventeenth century. John Aislabie was the first member of the family to stand for Parliament, relying heavily on the support of his wife’s uncle, Archbishop Sharp, and in 1695 he was returned as Member of Parliament (MP) for Ripon, a position he held until 1702 and then again between 1705-1708. The intervening years were spent representing Northallerton. All that is known of John Aislabie and his career after 1701 indicates that he was a man of dynamic ambition fuelled by an apparently insatiable desire for achievement and power. It is interesting to note that his career as an MP was relatively quiet until tragedy struck his family in January 1700. Aislabie’s daughter and first wife, Anne, the daughter of Sir William Rawlinson, died in a fire at his London house in Red Lion Square in January 1700, his son narrowly escaping from an attic window. There followed a period of political inactivity in Aislabie’s life, during which time he was, perhaps somewhat unfairly, arrested by the Sergeant at Arms for failing to respond to a call to the House. By 1702 however, he had been elected as Mayor of Ripon and had started courting Secretary Harley, a course he was to pursue throughout the first decade of the eighteenth century. A founding member of the October Club, Aislabie’s extreme Toryism led to a commendation by Henry St John, later to become the notorious Jacobite Lord Bolingbroke, for service to Queen Anne. Aislabie’s political allegiances were flexible however and in 1711, at the height of Tory power, he defected to the Whigs under whose auspices his career was to blossom.
Aislabie acquired property synchronously with his increase in status, as if the acquisition of new estates befit a man destined for great achievement. The first estate he acquired was however not planned; Aislabie inherited the estate of Studley Royal through the death of his mother, Mary Mallory, in 1693, just before his political career began. Later, via his second marriage in 1713, he would acquire Hall Barn in Buckinghamshire, which was situated conveniently close to London, although this did not prevent him from purchasing a house in Bolton Street, Mayfair and later No. 12 Grosvenor Square, also in London. In later years, and at the end of his political career, Aislabie constructed a new house at Waverley Abbey, three miles south of Farnham and continued to embellish his estate at Studley Royal by leasing or purchasing adjacent land areas.

Aislabie’s career rose meteorically from the middle of the second decade of the eighteenth century as he was promoted under the Whig regime from Treasurer of the Navy, a post he had obtained in 1714 on the accession of George I, to Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1718, a position which he held as the first commoner ever to do so. For a man of merchant origins this was achievement indeed. It was probably during this period of rapid promotion that he became friends with William Benson, a key protagonist in the early dissemination of Neo-Palladian architecture in Yorkshire.

Benson was also of Baltic merchant stock, his father being a trader of Swedish iron and malt. It is likely, therefore, that the two families, both wealthy through Baltic trade, and both with Yorkshire connections, were acquainted prior to the friendship that sprang up between the two men. Certainly Benson’s grandfather, Robert Benson, was acquainted with Sir John Mallory, Aislabie’s grandfather, from whom he leased the manor of Great Studley for a year in trust, at a peppercorn rent, in 1670. It was perhaps this trade connection, coupled with the circumstance of both being highly successful commoners in a government dominated by the aristocracy, which drew them to each other despite the twelve year age gap. Whatever the circumstances leading to this association initially, the similarity of their characters, in so far as their ruthless greed, ambition and dishonesty is concerned, appears to have cemented the relationship which was such that Benson named one of his sons after Aislabie. It is worth noting that their acquaintance must have begun at least as early as Benson’s marriage to Eleanor Earle in 1707 when a distant kinship was established between the two; Eleanor’s uncle, Giles Earle, was married to Elizabeth Rawlinson, the sister of Aislabie’s first wife, Anne. By 1709 Benson had sold a lease to Aislabie consisting of land at Scotland Yard and highlighting the business relationship between the two merchants at this early time.
As already discussed in this study William Benson built the first eighteenth century neo-Palladian villa in England, Wilbury House in Wiltshire. Benson had risen to power through his fluency in German and his ingratiation with the Electoral Court of Hanover prior to the accession of George I. This former connection and his long stay in Hanover led to a commission in 1716 to construct a water fountain at the Elector's summer retreat of Herrenhausen. From here it seems to have been a relatively easy progression to the prestigious position of Surveyor of the King's Works. In 1718 Benson was appointed to this post and within a week had sacked Nicholas Hawksmoor (VB) from two positions and given them both to his brother Benjamin who, as far as records inform us, was experienced only in matters of trade with Holland. Benson was not alone in his plans to oust the existing Surveyor, the elderly Sir Christopher Wren (VB), from the post, but was assisted by his friend, John Aislabie. This was recorded by a justifiably bitter Nicholas Hawksmoor in 1725, when he stated that:

William B-n Esqr. In extream Need of an employment could find nothing at that time, but ye Office of Workes to fall upon, soe disguising himself as an Architect got himself made Surveyour Generall and also power (assisted by ye worthy gentleman last mentioned) to Destroy the Settlement of ye Office, to Turn out Sr Chrisr. Wren.

One of Benson's first acts as Surveyor was to appoint a Deputy. The post was given to Colen Campbell, a man who would share Benson's neo-Palladian evangelising and who would support him in his single-minded mission to establish the style through whatever means were deemed necessary even if, as it turned out, this required dishonesty. Very little is known of Campbell's early life and his initial relationship with Benson is no exception. Howard Stutchbury has suggested that Campbell was employed by Benson prior to his appointment as Deputy Surveyor in 1718, as the architect for Wilbury House, which he states was of a 'precocity [which] is quite remarkable for the date.' Despite Campbell's own attribution of the house to Benson, Stutchbury goes on to state that it is 'much more credible' that Colen Campbell was responsible for the design of Wilbury. This opinion, published in 1967, was based upon what was then a meagre knowledge of Benson. Subsequent research into Benson's early life presented in this study, demonstrates that Wilbury House was not at all extraordinary for a man of Benson's background and only appears precocious when considered solely in the context of English contemporary architecture, rather than European architecture in the first decade of the eighteenth century. Benson's lengthy exposure to the neo-Palladian style at the Hanoverian Court, coupled with his lease of Amesbury Abbey and consequent intimate knowledge of that building, make it highly unlikely that anyone other than Benson would have produced the design for Wilbury at this early time. Since this new research into Benson's life
demonstrates that he was more than capable of designing a neo-Palladian villa, especially one where much of the design was copied from Amesbury, there is no more reason to assume that Campbell was the architect of Wilbury than there is of any other house, especially since Campbell himself attributes the building to Benson. The idea that Campbell designed Wilbury is further undermined by Campbell’s being ‘scarcely embarked upon his architectural career and, on the evidence of his designing Shawfield in 1711, was still in Scotland when Benson began’. Stutchbury’s conclusion that Campbell was employed by Benson, prior to his appointment in the Office of Works, would therefore be baseless, were it not for a single document stating that, at the time of his appointment as Deputy, Campbell was Benson’s ‘agent’. This is the only evidence establishing a link between the two men prior to 1718 and contributes very little to our understanding of the nature of their relationship. Importantly, this sole piece of evidence provides no information concerning the length of time that Campbell had been Benson’s agent, which could have been as short as a few weeks.

It would seem that Benson’s passion, almost to the point of obsession, for neo-Palladian architecture and his mission to see it established in England in preference to the Baroque style was shared by John Aislabie. If Aislabie’s facilitation of Benson’s promotion had stopped at assisting his friend and ally to the Surveyorship his actions may have been assigned merely to nepotism, as opposed to stemming from a genuine stylistic preference. Over subsequent years, however, Aislabie would prove to be a keen and loyal protagonist of the new style and was connected to the owners of the three key early Palladian buildings constructed in Yorkshire before 1725. He also had indirect links with Lord Burlington’s provincial disciples in Yorkshire, a matter to which we will return.

The first impression of the evidence concerning Aislabie’s involvement in assisting the dissemination of the neo-Palladian style is that it is sparse and that much of it amounts to conjecture. In most cases it cannot be wholly and irrevocably proven that he himself was responsible for introducing Colen Campbell to new patrons, or that his family and friends would not have adopted the style without his influence. However, this is a superficial conclusion and to cease investigating the subject at this point would mean the loss of valuable insight into the dissemination of the style and Aislabie’s important and unmistakeable role in this. Considerable circumstantial evidence indicating Aislabie’s involvement in the style cannot be dismissed. Aislabie’s connections with those indulging in neo-Palladianism include examples of all those with whom he had contact, from family and friends to political and business colleagues, in Yorkshire and further afield. A chronological analysis of these connections reveals that his influence, especially when he is linked to Benson and Campbell, cannot be underestimated.
Aislabie's first known foray into architecture came in 1702 when, as elected Mayor, he took it upon himself to build an obelisk in the market square of Ripon in place of the old market cross, for which task he employed Nicholas Hawksmoor. Following Aislabie's zealous adoption of neo-Palladianism a few years later and his alliance with William Benson in ousting the old architectural regime, no further architectural collaboration with Hawksmoor would be possible. After the building of the obelisk nothing more is known of Aislabie's architectural interest until 1712 when he was appointed as one of the Commissioner's for Building Fifty New Churches, an appointment which may indicate his continued interest in architectural matters after the building of the obelisk and throughout the first decade of the eighteenth century. There is no doubt that in this role, which he held until 1727, Aislabie would have become aware of Campbell who is known to have submitted designs for the churches to the Commissioners in 1712 as well as soliciting the Duke of Buckingham (VB) for a position as Surveyor to the Commission. To date it has been assumed that it was Benson who was most important in encouraging Campbell's early neo-Palladianism, despite the lack of evidence of an early association between them. Extant evidence suggests that it was, in fact, Aislabie who first knew Campbell and encouraged him in neo-Palladianism, and that it was Aislabie who introduced him to Benson. This theory would explain Campbell's overwhelming success in the area of North Yorkshire where Aislabie was most powerful. Evidence for a very early association between Aislabie and Campbell does at least exist, an element that is so far lacking in the assumption that Benson and Campbell had an early connection.

On Christmas Day in 1716 another of Aislabie's properties, this time his Manor House at Studley Royal, burnt to the ground. Aislabie rebuilt the Manor between 1717 and 1720 though this itself was subject to a devastating fire in 1945. The only remaining evidence of Aislabie's new house at Studley Royal consists of black and white photographs of the front elevation and interior published in Country Life in 1931, thus making any useful exegesis of the building impossible (see Plate 27). It is known, however, that the new building was a remodelling of what remained of the previous, burnt out, Manor. The constraints that are always imposed by building on an existing structure and the obvious alterations that took place after Aislabie's remodelling, may, in some part, account for the surprising lack of overt neo-Palladianism in the remaining photographs. That Aislabie's country house was classically inspired is clear and the photographs do still depict a house whose form could have been Palladian in origin (see plate 1). The main (south) elevation has a central, three-bay portico topped by a heavy, stone frieze from which rises a stone pediment. Much of this elevation dates from Aislabie's son William's era and it is impossible to know exactly how closely it follows his father's own remodelling. The three bays are punctuated at first floor level by round headed windows resting on a double string course. To the left of this central element at roof level, and
behind what appears to be a later addition crowned with a parapet wall, is a hipped roof. On the right hand side of the central element the elevation steps back revealing a round headed window matching those in the central element which appears to be part of the eighteenth century remodelling. The hipped roof to the left of the central element is set back from the slightly projecting portico, and is in line with the recessed bay to the right. Thus one reads the front elevation as being of a tri-partite form, with the emphasis on the central, temple-like element. Although derived from a classical plan, the absence of overtly Palladian features and the lack of information about the other elevations means that this building cannot be described as neo-Palladian. Its almost undecided style makes it an anomaly in the pattern of Aislabie’s involvement in early eighteenth century neo-Palladianism. Worsley suggests that William Aislabie’s ‘reeded Gothic columns usually associated with delicate summerhouses’ used to decorate the central portico were intended as a tribute to the ‘monastic charms of Fountains Abbey’, which Aislabie constantly attempted to acquire throughout his life. Whether Campbell’s awaited visit to Studley in 1721 was aimed at addressing the poor quality of Aislabie’s house can only be guessed at. It has been suggested that the South Sea Bubble debacle of 1721 accounts for the rambling, almost unfinished nature of Studley House and it can only be supposed that any plans of Aislabie’s for the house at Studley were frozen on the instant the bubble burst, a situation that was repeated at his property at Waverley.

In the same year Studley Royal Manor House was destroyed another member of this circle, Sir Charles Hotham (VB), commenced the building of his neo-Palladian house in the Eastgate, Beverley (see Plate 28). Hotham was the 4th Baronet of the ‘noble family of Hothams’ whose ancestry can be traced back to the beginning of the fourteenth century and who had a long local tradition of Parliamentary service. Hotham had been intended for ministry but entered the army and became known as one of ‘Queen Anne’s four Colonels’. He was raised to the rank of Brigadier-General under Lord Galway in Spain during which time he became friends with General Carpenter (VB). The Hotham family was connected to the Aislabies in several ways, the first recording of which was when Sir John Hotham, 2nd Baronet (1632-1689) purchased land at South Dalton from the Aislabie family in the mid-seventeenth century. Both Hotham and Aislabie were of a similar age from important local families of high standing and both moved in the same social circles in Yorkshire. In addition Aislabie and Hotham would have been well-known to each other through their political connections, Hotham as MP for Beverley and Aislabie as MP and Mayor of Ripon. Correspondence from Aislabie’s sister, Mary Robinson of Newby Park, to her sons, indicates their friendship with the Hothams, whilst Aislabie’s almost weekly contact with the Robinsons links him firmly into this social network.
Stutchbury has suggested that it was through Aislabie that Hotham was introduced to Campbell and, in light of Aislabie’s early connection to Campbell and his links to other neo-Palladian houses in the county, this is a very likely explanation for Hotham’s unexplained choice of a London-based architect for his house in Yorkshire.47 The house that Hotham was building, New Hotham, was a direct result of a devastating fire that had destroyed the family seat at Scorborough in 1706, whilst Hotham was campaigning in Spain. It is clear that Hotham had been planning the construction of a new family seat in Beverley for three years before building commenced, as is evidenced by his following a ‘policy of property consolidation on both sides of the street known as the Eastgate’.48 K. A. MacMahon states that the house, illustrated in Campbell’s second volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* published in 1717, was designed by Colen Campbell circa 1715, although no evidence has been provided for this date.49 It is entirely possible that Campbell drew the design earlier than this as, by October 1714, Hotham had already paid for the production of 141,000 bricks.50 Stylistically too, the design for the new house indicates a young Campbell whose skills in neo-Palladian design had yet to be honed (see plate 2). Although the New Hotham composition displays many of the tenets of the neo-Palladian style, including the tri-partite division of the main elevation, a stark absence of ornamentation and a high wall to window ratio, the design lacks the harmony of his later work. The outlying pavilions with their hipped, pyramidal roofs, appear weak and ephemeral against the determined, jutting strength of the central block, so much so that it is hard to imagine that they were an integral part of the design and not an afterthought. Despite the planning of the house perhaps as early as 1712/1713, when Hotham had already begun acquiring land for his new building, construction did not commence until 1716, the delay probably being due to the Jacobite rising in 1715 in the North and Hotham’s vital role in quelling the rebellion in Newcastle in partnership with General Carpenter, also a subscriber to *Vitruvius Britannicus*. Hotham’s military career was to connect him with other amateur architects and fellow subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus*: an aspect of this Yorkshire circle which will be addressed below.51

The year 1718 proved to be a crucial one for the Yorkshire circle; when Hotham’s house in Eastgate was well underway, his maternal uncle, William Thompson (VB), also began to build the neo-Palladian Lodge at Ebberston. Thompson had surrendered a long-term lease on a substantial piece of land fronting the Eastgate, which he had been granted by the Beverley Corporation in 1688.52 It was this action that enabled his nephew to take up the lease in his stead and construct the new seat in Beverley and indicates Thompson’s awareness and approval of Hotham’s undertaking. It seems that Thompson not only approved of, but was inspired by, his nephew’s plans as he too commissioned Colen Campbell, this time to design a new lodge at Ebberston, some ten miles outside Beverley. As well as employing the same architect it is
possible that both uncle and nephew used the same craftsmen: MacMahon first noted the similarity between a carving inside Hotham House, now kept at Beverley public library, and a cornice in the parlour at Ebberston Lodge. Already MP for Scarborough, Thompson was promoted to Warden of the Mint in 1718, the year that he began Ebberston. The new lodge would have suited Thompson’s status in Yorkshire and is typical of the increasing dignity with which employment at Westminster came to be considered in the early eighteenth century. Thompson’s growing status did create some tension within the Yorkshire circle however, and an undated and rather disgruntled letter from Sir William Robinson (VB) of Newby Park to his son Metcalfe on 30 May, presumably written in 1718, states that ‘I had thought of offering my services to ye City of York, but since they thought it was more for his Majesty’s service, so have Mr Thompson chosen than myself, I should desist they being the best judges that were so nr the Kings person’. Rivalry such as this between local men of similar social standing may well have been a material consideration in encouraging the building of new houses or the adornment of estates in the neo-Palladian style.

Thompson’s Ebberston Lodge is a small villa, not much more than a pavilion, set within a pleasure garden (see Plate 29). Its diminutive size is evidence that it was not Thompson’s intention to live here permanently, his main residence being at Scampston, three miles outside Beverley. The tiny pavilion, probably used as a formal summerhouse or hunting lodge, is a clear example of a desire for retreat being the catalyst for a new building. This was a common characteristic of eighteenth century Palladian architecture and a continuation of the Renaissance raison d’etre for many of Palladio’s villas which, although having the function of working farms, were also designed as retreats from urban life. The lodge was included by Campbell in his third edition of Vitruvius Britannicus and consists of an elevation and an inscription where he claims his authorship of the design. Campbell describes the lodge as being a “small rustick edifice [which] stands in a fine park, well planted, with a river which forms a cascade and canal 1,200 ft. long, and runs under the loggio in the back front”. Its miniature form consists of a raised piano nobile above a basement storey which, on its southern side, runs beneath a terrace itself approached by flanking steps. On the north elevation is a loggia which was originally intended to be open and from which one can view the formal canal and cascades that flow down the steep dale towards the Lodge. The difficulty of utilising an Italian architectural style for the Yorkshire climate led to the early modification of the loggia which has been enclosed and glazing inserted between the columns. Despite the obvious architectural interest of the lodge, it is in this instance the landscape which provides important evidence for the Yorkshire circle and the interactions between the key characters encouraging the dissemination of the neo-Palladian style.
Much of the pleasure garden at Ebberston has long since disappeared but evidence of the layout has survived in the form of four paintings depicting views of the water garden, currently in the ownership of the eighth Lord Hotham, and first published in *Country Life*. The paintings provide the evidence for two small outlying pavilions that are absent from Campbell's own depiction of the scheme in *Vitruvius Britannicus* as well as presenting detailed information about the gardens. The design made full use of the steeply sloping valley and the stream that originates near the top of the dale. This stream was guided down the side of the valley, directly towards the lodge, through a system of pools and falls that terminated in a long canal. Immediately in front of the lodge the paintings depict the canal falling into another cascade, flanked by two urns. Campbell's description then states that the water ran 'under the Loggio' and, according to the view from the south, re-appeared as a spring bubbling up beyond the courtyard to the south of the lodge. Writing in *Country Life* in 1954, Arthur Oswald adds some confusion to Campbell's simple description of his Ebberston design by referring to an account of the site, dated 1798, which stated that the water was conveyed *round* the house by an aqueduct. A brief analysis of the site and extant evidence proves that this was not the case and is supported by Campbell's own statement that the water flowed beneath the lodge. The formal symmetry of the design would have been seriously impaired if the stream, on an axial course towards the lodge for some half a kilometre, suddenly diverted to one side of the building. In addition to this, the presence of the final cascade of water immediately in front of the lodge and an otherwise unexplained, low arch in the masonry of the basement is indicative of the direction of the watercourse. If there was no intention to direct the water beneath the building, the obvious solution would have been to terminate the canal in front of it, with no need of further cascading or of the archway. However the strongest evidence for the design, which accords both with the four paintings and Campbell's description of Ebberston, is the work of William Benson at his neo-Palladian seat at Wilbury.

Oswald hinted at the possible involvement of Benson in the water garden at Ebberston fifty years ago but was not able to provide the necessary link to establish this as fact. New research undertaken here is now able to present Benson's involvement at Ebberston, albeit perhaps indirectly, as being extremely likely. Very little of the landscape at Wilbury survives although there are several extant structural design features that would bear further investigation. The parkland at Wilbury is overlaid with a system of weirs and bridges, now much overgrown and barely visible, which were used to control the ephemeral streams that still criss-cross the landscape. With Benson's interest and skill in hydraulics, it is not surprising that he indulged in hydrographic experiment at his own estate and evidence of his activity can still be seen in the landscape today. The octagonal garden temple to the North of Wilbury house is most significant and reveals a link between Ebberston and Wilbury. The temple has been over-
restored and is in stark contrast to the decay that has been allowed to continue unhindered in the wider landscape. It dates from the time of Benson’s ownership of the estate and is built on a mound under which is a small Grotto of flint. The Grotto, two and half metres wide, is entered by a flat-arched opening that frames a deep, steeply sided channel. The channel’s regularity is testament to its man-made origin as is its course which culminates a few metres from the Grotto in a small bowl-shaped feature in the landscape as if it once held a very small lake. The ground upon which the Temple and Grotto are built are raised above the main house, and the watercourse, for this is what the channel must have been, has been dug out to prevent the water running down towards the house. It would seem therefore that Benson constructed a short watercourse, which may well have been part of a more extensive scheme, and that disappeared from view by flowing under the temple, an idea that was repeated at the pleasure garden at Ebberston a few years later on a much grander scale.

The rarity of such a design at this early time provides a close link between the gardens of Wilbury and Ebberston; an unsurprising association when the Yorkshire connections between Aislabie, Thompson and Hotham and the architectural connections between Aislabie, Benson and Campbell are considered collectively. The established friendship between Benson and Aislabie, Benson’s own Yorkshire roots and his interest in hydraulics, with skills honed at Herrenhausen, and his position, achieved with help from Aislabie, as Surveyor of the Kings Works, make it inconceivable that he would not have visited his close friend in Yorkshire and, at the very least commented on Aislabie’s water garden at Studley Royal, whose origin has so far not been attributed to any hydrologist of the era. Similarly with Aislabie’s positions at government which kept him in London for most of the year, it is almost certain that Benson would have received his friend at Wilbury. It seems likely that Benson’s use of the temple and its disappearing stream at Wilbury was communicated to Thompson during his commissioning of Ebberston through these established connections. This was perhaps a direct communication between Benson and Thompson, both men having risen to position in government in 1718, or via Benson as introduced by Aislabie, with whom Thompson had an existing Yorkshire association. Yet another possibility is that the idea was transmitted to Thompson through Campbell, who was designing Ebberston at the same time as working under Benson at the Office of Works. It is equally possible that the idea for the design of Ebberston was passed to Thompson through his nephew Hotham, who, as a contemporary of Aislabie and patron of Campbell, would have been well-positioned to know of Benson’s design. It is unlikely that the precise mode of design transference, or the exact lines of communication of the circle in this context, will ever be fully known, but this does not diminish the significance of the link between the gardens.
The year 1718 was a very productive one for Campbell in Yorkshire for, besides Ebberston and continuing to advise on New Hotham, he was commissioned to design the neo-Palladian villa at Newby-on-Swale in North Riding, this time for Aislabie’s brother-in-law, Sir William Robinson (1655-1736), who began building in that same year (see Plate 30). Again, there seems to be no obvious reason why Robinson would choose Campbell were it not for his connection to Aislabie, by now an established patron of the architect and the common link in all the neo-Palladian buildings discussed so far in this circle. It is telling that Aislabie subscribed to the third edition of Vitruvius Britannicus on Robinson’s behalf. It is also significant that the Robinsons and Aislabies were in constant communication with each other throughout their lifetimes, as evidenced by the family correspondence, and that Robinson deferred many matters to Aislabie including those of such importance as his son’s proposed marriage. Sometime soon after 1721 Robinson indicates his reliance upon his brother-in-law in a letter to Metcalfe where he writes that he was

sorry that you did not fully acquaint me with the difficulties and perplexities you lay under, before we parted for you may be sure, I should have been ready, and shall be desirous to, make you as easy as possible, in order to give you contentment, pray unbosome yourself to yr Uncle Aislabie or Cozen Weddell, they being the two best friends, you and I have, and whatever they think proper for me to do on yr behalf.66

Aside from his close family connection to Aislabie, Robinson was deeply involved in Yorkshire life and the existing societal network that existed, with many of the established friendships spanning two or more generations. Robinson’s own acquaintance with William Thomson of Ebberston has been noted. The family was also well known to the Hothams, Mrs Robinson receiving ten pounds and ten shillings from Mrs Hotham, for an unknown reason, on Lady Day in 1715. A letter from Mary Robinson to her son Metcalfe is suggestive of a closer bond between their sons, ‘Dear Mett, It is reported here that yr friend Charles Hotham has complained against him and is to loose his regiment’ whilst a letter from Metcalfe’s brother Thomas to their father, Sir William, as late as 1759 indicates that the friendship continued for decades; ‘Lady Hotham leaves this place on Monday for which we are very sorry’.69

The close nature of the societal connections that characterised the Yorkshire circle would have made it very easy for architectural, or indeed any, ideas to disseminate across the county between like-minded ambitious families and is a key contributing factor in the success of neo-Palladianism in North Yorkshire.
Robinson himself was the son of a Turkey Merchant of York, and was educated at St John’s College, Cambridge, prior to his marriage in 1679 to Mary, the daughter of George Aislabie and sister of John Aislabie. It was probably through Robinson’s influence that Aislabie was returned as MP for Northallerton in 1702, a post Robinson had held between 1689 and 1695.

Robinson went on to become the Sheriff of York between 1689 and 1690, Alderman for York in 1698, Lord Mayor in 1700 and held the position of MP for York for twenty-four years between 1698 and 1722. It is important to stress here that Newby was begun in 1718, as supported by original letters from Sir William to his son Metcalfe on whom he had settled the estate, and not in 1721 as has been erroneously stated by Geoffrey Beard. Stutchbury accepted this dating as do most later architectural historians. This is a crucial point for the chronology of the dissemination of neo-Palladianism in England, in understanding Campbell’s career and in the context of Yorkshire. This earlier date links Newby much more closely with the buildings at New Hotham and Ebberston, all three of which were designed by Campbell and begun in 1718.

Newby’s extant form followed that of New Hotham and Ebberston in that it is tri-partite in conception, its compact central element being linked to outlying pavilions by passages. Newby is, however, not rigidly Palladian in all aspects, but bears a frivolous fanlight above the frieze on the central elevation and a triangular pediment whose entablature is far more ornately decorated than fashion would allow in the next decade of neo-Palladian building (see Plate 31). This detail was possibly designed to counteract the otherwise stern and brooding strength of the central block as it appears from a distance. It is interesting to note that despite Campbell’s proven ability to design in a pure Palladian style, as evidenced by his design of Wanstead in 1713, his three earliest villas in Yorkshire, New Hotham, Ebberston and Newby all retain traces of the Baroque style. New Hotham’s flanking pavilions were adorned with finials serving only to interrupt the clean silhouette which would otherwise have prevailed, whilst Ebberston has been described as ‘far from Palladian’ an impression that must have been gained from its emphatic ornamentation which included a heavy frond-like design on the columns flanking the main entrance and deeply channelled, carved keystones. Campbell’s stylistic uncertainty did not last long however; as early as 1721 he was designing Stourhead, whose overall composition and design simplicity indicates that he had, by that time, consolidated his own Palladian style.

Although obtaining high profile commissions in Yorkshire at the start of his career, Campbell did not practise solely in the North during this time. Through Benson’s influence at the Office of Works he was commissioned by George I, also in 1718, to begin works at Kensington Palace. George spent his Spring months at Kensington and called upon Campbell to design a new suite of three rooms for his pleasure: the Cupola Room, the Privy Chamber and the King’s Drawing Room, which were completed in 1721. These rooms were part of a wider scheme of
improvements to the Palace by Campbell which included the creation of new courtyards and the rationalisation of Wren’s East front. During these works, Aislabie, at the height of his political success, capitalised on his relationship with Campbell and in 1719 employed him to produce an estimate for a new library at his house in Bolton Street, Mayfair. The design of this library, if it was ever drawn up, does not survive but the inclusion of a marble chimney piece in the scheme and the estimated cost of £183, indicate that it was to be a grand affair.

It would seem that Aislabie, despite Campbell’s having secured a number of lucrative commissions by the end of the second decade of the eighteenth century, was still enthusiastically promoting his protege as in 1720, Sir Theodore Janssen, a co-Director with Aislabie in the South Sea Company, began building a Campbell-designed neo-Palladian House in Wimbledon. As discussed above, the South Sea chaos meant that the building was never fully completed and its unfinished shell was pulled down a few years later, leaving Janssen deep in debt and one of the unfortunate subjects of Pope’s moral essay to Allen, Lord Bathurst on the ‘Use of Riches’.78

THE SOUTH SEA BUBBLE

At his point in the chronology of the circle it is necessary to look in more detail at the effect that the South Sea Bubble catastrophe had on John Aislabie and how this affected the progress of the neo-Palladian style. The South Sea Bubble was a ‘speculative mania that gripped Britain and Europe in 1720’. When Britain emerged from the War of Spanish Succession it was left with a very high National Debt which threatened to cripple the economy. The South Sea Company was an ingenious idea that, in effect, privatized some of the government debt. The Spring and early Summer of 1720 saw the stock of the company rise meteorically fuelling an already increasing investment craze. This high level of speculation could not be sustained and in August 1720 the inevitable crash came. Thousands of the relatively well-off and the positively rich were bankrupted and the disaffected clamoured for revenge. A government investigation was unavoidable and when it was launched it uncovered deep-seated corruption within the South Sea Company, King George’s Court, including two of his mistresses, and involving several statesmen. Those tainted by the corruption, however loosely associated, were sacrificed to the country’s ruined masses who were baying for blood.

Aislabie, as one of the Directors of the Company, was investigated and found to have been deeply immersed in shady share dealings and profiteering. The level of his own gain is not known for certain, and, though he categorically denied making any money from the scheme at his trial, he was utterly unable to provide an alternative explanation for his amassed wealth.80
Aislabie’s involvement in the affair can be ascertained from correspondence between Aislabie’s nephews and niece. Metcalfe Robinson, writing to his brother Thomas in Paris on 12 June 1720 states that, ‘we are all very happy and well pleased, Affairs go right at home and abroad. Everybody rich. Ye Chancellor has things as he pleases. My Father is building to his heart’s content’. Anne Robinson also maintained a correspondence with her brother and, in an undated letter, provides insight into Aislabie’s profits from the South Sea Company. The information provided by Anne establishes this letter as being written sometime immediately after the crash in August 1720 but before Aislabie’s imprisonment in July 1721. Anne states that

I hear nothing talked of but the South Sea, it has made a great confusion and noise as your Mississippi did, some people has got prodigious Estates and some are ruin’d. The Chancellor has got a hundred thousand pounds they say and Mr Weddell thirty. I do but desire my father may get a little amongst hands to build his house with, I should then think the South sea a better foundation than the firmest land in ye world. Mr Waller [Aislabie’s step-son] too has got a great deal, say in short everybody has got something.

This artless letter indicates the wealth that Aislabie accumulated through the scheme but gives no warning of the impending wrath of those who had lost out. The first indication is given in a letter from Robinson, written in London, to his son Thomas in Paris on 25 April where he states that ‘I hear Brothe Ayslaby and Sir Wm St Quintin came to town last night from Beaconsfield, Some are very angry, Brother left the Secret Committee.’

The inevitable investigation into the Directors of the Company uncovered a transaction where twenty thousand pounds of stock had been illegally transferred to Aislabie from which he made a profit. He was charged with ‘a most dangerous and infamous corruption’, impeached by Parliament and imprisoned in the Tower in July 1721 putting an end to rumours that he would receive a peerage. Robinson was deeply affected by his brother-in-law’s predicament, so much so that it affected his enjoyment of the new house being constructed at Newby and, in a letter to Thomas in August 1721, he stated that he ‘found the new building far advanced and work executed, I should have been pleas’d with Newby if yr Uncle had not been unjustly oppressed, his second defence before the Lords I had this morning, I think it admirably well done and in due time must have a weight in the two houses’

Aislabie was ordered to repay forfeitures of almost forty-five thousand pounds for the benefit of those who had suffered when the Bubble burst although Aislabie’s son, William, and step-son, Edmund Waller, amassed a fortune both for themselves and on behalf of their father. It is
perhaps not surprising that William Aislabie chose precisely this time to embark upon a protracted Grand Tour, safely out of the country and therefore unavailable for investigation. Aislabie was expelled from Parliament and banned from public office for life whilst his brother-in-law, Thomas Vernon, was temporarily removed from office for trying to influence members of the South Sea Committee in his favour.\(^87\)

Further punishment was meted out through the confiscation of all Aislabie’s estates other than those which had been in his possession prior to 1 October 1718, all except Waverley Abbey, acquired by Aislabie as late as 1720 for ten thousand pounds.\(^88\) The five hundred acre estate of Waverley was protected from expropriation by a manoeuvre which suggests that Aislabie had foreknowledge that the South Sea Company was failing and may mean serious losses for him. This clever stroke amounted to a failure to correctly register his ownership of the Waverley estate with the Chancery of the Rolls. He later claimed that, as the deed of sale had not been enrolled, it was void and could not be removed from his ownership. Despite this not insignificant victory, Aislabie retreated to Studley Royal in 1721 and did not have the effrontery to commence building at Waverley until 1725 when he again employed Campbell for the task. The personal effect that the debacle had on Aislabie seems to have been profound and is reflected in his pitiful letters to his nephew Thomas Robinson in London. The letters make it clear that Thomas was acting secretly on his Uncle’s behalf and was managing his affairs in the immediate aftermath of the Bubble. On 27 September 1723 Aislabie wrote to Tom:

> I thank you for the care you have of my little affairs and am sorry to give you so much trouble in a dirty library and empty towne. How does your friend Horace doe? Will he not let you into the secret of when the King comes? If P Frederick comes with him? Who is to be in and who is to be out?...If you can come honestly by such Secrets pray impart ‘em. Yrs JAislabie.\(^89\)

The end of Aislabie’s political career did not dampen his architectural enthusiasm however. A mere two years after his imprisonment, and whilst still maintaining his exile at Studley Royal, he was directing Thomas in all his affairs whether financial or architectural, as well as maintaining links with a veteran of Benson’s rule over the Office of Works, who lost his position at the time of Benson’s downfall in 1719. Aislabie instructs his nephew on 2 August 1723 as follows:

> I desire you will pay 50 [shillings] to one Mr Sampson that formerly belong’d to the Board of Works and used to draw designs for me; he lives in the Strand. I desire you will send for him and tell him you have orders to pay him 50 [shillings] but get him to
go and look at the end of the garden at Sheppeards House in the new street in Hanover buildings, at a Summer House there in stucco, 4 columns with a pediment over 'em and a Rustick room at each end. You know the place is what you and Willy [William Aislabie] have seen, get him to draw a plan of the upright and ground work and send it downe to us as soon as you can.90

It would be interesting to know whether this piece of architectural poaching, from the speculative development at Hanover Square, was put to good use and perhaps provided inspiration for the Palladian Temple of Piety, built at Studley Royal, in 1740. Still more interesting, had they survived, would be the collection of Mr Sampson's designs drawn up for Aislabie and referred to in his letter. 'Mr Sampson' was George Sampson (VB) who was given the posts of Clerk of the Works at the Tower of London and Somerset House by William Benson in 1718 and who subscribed to the second and third editions of Vitruvius Britannicus. He designed in 'a grand style of Palladian simplicity'.91 This new information about Aislabie's architectural activities demonstrates that although his political influence was at an end, and therefore his ability to evangelise about neo-Palladianism was severely limited, he continued to be actively involved in the burgeoning style, at least in his own endeavours. His isolation at Studley, however, did remove him permanently from the many connections of the London scene and the number of new commissions he may have secured for Campbell and for the progression of the style can only be guessed.

Through his second marriage in 1713 to Judith Vernon, Aislabie acquired the estate of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, in Buckinghamshire. The garden at Hall Barn had been laid out by Judith Vernon's first father-in-law, the poet Edmund Waller, and was a mature garden by the time it came into Aislabie hands. His was a temporary ownership however and as soon as his step-son, Edmund Waller (VB), reached his majority in 1721, Aislabie relinquished the property to him. The proximity of Hall Barn to London was clearly useful to Aislabie and he stayed there often during the years of his Chancellorship, sometimes providing accommodation for various members of the Robinson family, who would have had the opportunity to view Aislabie's improvements to the estate.92 His interest in the landscape from as early as 1712 is proven by his subscription to the John James' new English translation of Le Blond's Theory and Practice of Gardening, an illustrated textbook of Le Notre's formal style. Not content with Waller's original garden, Aislabie set about creating a formal garden, based on the Versailles model and incorporating radiating vistas through groves of trees. As with other formal designs of the period the plan of the garden was determined by existing natural features such as 'Waller's Grove', an area of mature beech woodland, and the stream flowing through it. The axial vistas of the garden were not set symmetrically to complement the house, although Aislabie did align
them with other existing buildings such as the nearby Beaconsfield church, or, where there were no conveniently positioned, pre-existing buildings, constructed new ones to catch the eye.

With the exception of one building, the early eighteenth century structures adorning the landscape at Hall Barn have not been precisely dated and no evidence exists to connect them absolutely with an architect. The one building that can be dated is the Great Room, a Palladian Banqueting House built on the banks of the canal, which was started in 1724 and was designed by Campbell. Given what is known of Aislabie's preference for Campbell and his employment at this estate and indeed all his properties, it seems logical that he was responsible for the other buildings, all of which, apart from the hexagonal Gothic tower, are very much of his œuvre. Whether or not the buildings were designed during Aislabie's tenure of the estate or after Waller had reached his majority is unimportant in this context; it seems certain that, once again, Aislabie was responsible for the appointment of Campbell. Sadly the Banqueting House was the subject of a destructive fire, a common element in the buildings of this circle, and what remains today is only a smaller remodelling of the former building. The original Banqueting House was featured in Vitruvius Britannicus by Campbell as 'this building of my invention' and, measuring forty-five feet by thirty feet, was a grand garden building. The doorway was topped by a semi-circular arch framed between two windows and was situated on the banks of the lake. An undated engraving of the building shows it as having two rusticated rooms at either end of the main reception room in a manner similar to the Banqueting House at Studley Royal. The Temple of Venus is the most visible building in the landscape and is set at the highest point in the central grove of woodland from which the vistas radiate (see Plate 32). It is an open, Ionic rotunda with six columns, an entablature and a frieze decorated with swags. Surmounted by a dome, its interior is decorated with putti and vines and has been described as an 'exquisite building the ceiling of which has outstanding stucco enrichments'. Dipple Drive, a hedged walk, looks towards an obelisk at its end upon which has been carved designs of contemporary tools and a Doric pavilion, now known as the Boathouse, was also built at the Lower Lake and is a simple building comprised of a porch with four columns, a pediment and an entablature with decorated frieze (see plate 33). Aislabie was strongly influenced by the garden at Hall Barn, part of which was the creation of Edmund Waller and part of which was of his and Campbell's creation. Many of the components of Hall Barn were later incorporated into his other garden at Studley Royal, which bears similar stylistic features including the prolific use of Yew hedges, grass walks bordering water bodies and groves of evergreen woodland all littered with neo-Palladian buildings and antique references.

As his stepson grew towards his majority, the impending loss of Hall Barn led Aislabie to begin the search for a new estate within easy reach of London. Unaware as he was that his glittering
career was to be cut short by the South Sea scandal and that he would therefore have little need of an estate close to London, Aislabie began proceedings to purchase the estate of Waverley Abbey, three miles south of Farnham in Hampshire. By the time he had purchased the estate in 1720 however, Aislabie's failure to register the property indicates a sense of the forthcoming catastrophe and the need to dispose of some of his ill-gotten gains. It is likely that he first became aware of Waverley Abbey through his wife Judith whose family was based in Farnham. Judith’s relative, Mary Vernon, the widow of George Coldham of Waverley, sold the property to Aislabie on 13 September 1720 for ten thousand pounds. Interestingly the Waverley estate comprised five hundred acres of low-lying agricultural land surrounding the substantial ruin of a Cistercian Abbey, with the nearby River Wey running through the property. It would seem that Aislabie had a decided preference for ancient sites, perhaps in order to shake off the dust of the city, and more precisely for Cistercian ruins, an obsession that may have grown from his inability to obtain the Cistercian site of Fountains Abbey from his intractable neighbour at Studley. Almost immediately after he purchased the estate Aislabie fell spectacularly from grace and it was not until 1725 that he felt safe enough to begin building, an enterprise that caused him once again to turn to Colen Campbell. Bishop Pococke gives the earliest extant recorded account of the site and in 1754 describes Waverley as belonging to

Mr Ayslaby, who built the house, and made the plantations and other improvements, it was then Mr Child's and now belongs to Mr Hunter…Mr Hunter has added wings to the house. The house is a fine piece of architecture of Campbell’s, on one of Palladio’s designs.

The information presented here supersedes that of Stutchbury who stated that there was no evidence that Campbell had worked on the site, and confirms Timothy Connor’s discovery of an erroneously named drawing in the RIBA Collection in 1982 which proves Campbell’s authorship. An engraving of the house was commissioned in 1737 for Mr Child, the subsequent owner of the estate, and depicts Campbell’s mature villa style (see Plate 34). Only one clear elevation of the building remains but its compositional harmony and confidence is the result of over a decade of designing in the neo-Palladian idiom. Whilst Waverley bears strong similarities to Newby Park in terms of its five-bay frontage with four giant order columns surmounted by a balustrade and triangular pediment, it does not brood over its landscape as Newby does. The engraving of Waverley shows it to have a much finer, shallower, balustrade which is dominated by the pediment and a hipped roofline tapering up to a set of crowning chimneys. The verticality of the chimneys adds finesse to the design and lightens the whole composition. At Newby the heavy roofline and depth of balustrade give the building a squat and solid appearance that is not tempered by the decorative detail within the pediment.
Waverley also had the advantages of a defined piano nobile and a basement, both of which key Palladian elements are missing from the early design at Newby.

Having discussed the obvious similarity between the Waverley villa and Newby Park, it is useful to highlight briefly its similarity to another early Palladian villa, that at Stourhead. Whilst all three buildings are based on Palladio’s Villa Emo at Fanzolo, thus providing one explanation for their similarity, the ownership of Stourhead, by Benson’s nephew, Henry Hoare the Magnificent (VB), should not be overlooked. The connection between Hoare at Stourhead and Aislabie at Waverley is clearly made by Benson and Campbell who were the common denominator in the lives of both men and may well have facilitated the transmission of design ideas between them.

Despite what is now known of Aislabie’s passion for neo-Palladianism, a passion he indulged and encouraged in others from perhaps as early as his meeting with Campbell in 1712, the building of Waverley itself remains a mystery. It is strange that a man so categorically expelled from public office and, for the majority of his exiled life after 1721 working endlessly on his estate at Studley, should decide to pursue a construction project of this size, so far from his home county, when the possibility of re-entering his old political life was non-existent. It would have been more understandable had he invested this creative energy and not inconsiderable expense into a new neo-Palladian house at Studley Royal, the lack of which house the National Trust has termed ‘one of the great mysteries of the estate’. 102

John Aislabie is most famously connected with Studley Royal and it was this property that he consistently developed throughout his life from the date of his inheritance in 1693 until his death in 1742. His major achievement was the water garden, strongly influenced by his tenure of Hall Barn in Beaconsfield and his interest in neo-Palladian architecture and its classical provenance. Most of the works on site were carried out after Aislabie’s retirement in 1721 although, contrary to some suggestions, it is not the case that the water garden came about only after Aislabie lost his position at government. 103 Works to create the garden were well underway during his Chancellorship as reported by Sir William Robinson to Metcalfe: ‘I have been to Studley once, there are great numbers of workmen, the designs magnificent becoming a minister. I have written twice to yr Uncle but have not heard from him’. 104

As Studley’s form developed so too did Aislabie’s ornamentation of the garden. He immersed himself in the ancient world from which he selected various antique references for use in the garden that both reflected and justified his unenviable position. For a commoner with a mercantile background he had scaled the heights of political success only to lose everything
within three years of achieving the position of Chancellor and the resultant disappointment is evident both in the garden and in his family’s treatment of him. The garden buildings had symbolic as well as aesthetic functions: the Temple of Piety, started in 1740, was dedicated to Hercules and probably symbolised Aislabie’s Herculean work in carving out the water garden, whilst the statue of the Dying Gladiator may well have represented his fatal wounding in the amphitheatre of Parliament (see Plate 35). Aislabie’s letter of 30 May 1723 to Colonel Graham of Levens Hall is indicative of his mood and he talks of himself as being ‘an outlaw myself and surrounded by impenetrable obscurity’. The letters between Metcalfe and Thomas Robinson, Aislabie’s nephews, indicate that the depression and frustration which he felt immediately after the Bubble did not leave him in later life. Thomas explains the reason for his delay in visiting Metcalfe in his note of 9 Nov 1730 as follows: ‘I staid a forthnight longer than I intended to see my Uncle and Aunt Aislabie.. I long to be in towne for they are sad company for me. My Uncle is grown very crazy, fat and low-spirited, and besides is now as deaf as yr poor brother.’

By Christmas Thomas had still not left to join Metcalfe and gave the following reason: ‘I staid to keep my Unckle company and to endeavour to chear him up at Bath til this day was forthnight: we parted at Newberry, they went to Farnham and I to Beaconsfield where I stayed three nights with Willy [William Aislabie].’

Despite his depression Aislabie’s interest in neo-Palladian architecture still did not wane. In fact architecturally, the 1730s were among the most productive years for Studley with the addition of the Rustic Bridge, the Banqueting House, the two Fishing Tabernacles and the statues of Bacchus, Galen and the Wrestlers. The Temple of Piety, although not built until 1740, was probably designed in the late 1730s, as was the Gothick Octagon Tower and are, therefore, most unlikely to have been by Campbell, who died in 1729. Campbell’s involvement at the estate has only been firmly established with the stable block which was designed in 1729 and for which a letter in Campbell’s own hand survives. However, his much wider involvement in the estate can be detected in the garden structures themselves, most obviously the Banqueting House.

The Studley Banqueting House (see Plate 36), Fishing Tabernacles (see Plate 37), Newby Park and Ebberston Lodge look like the work of a single architect. All buildings are characterised by the use of an identical feature, one that is not commonly associated with eighteenth century neo-Palladianism. The motif which connects all four buildings is an alternating pattern of rustication on the buildings formed of a distinctive, ‘dripping frond’ or stalactite motif in very heavy relief. It is to be found on the columns flanking both side entrances to Newby Park, (see
Plate 38) on the facades of Ebberston Lodge (see Plate 39) and the Banqueting house at Studley (see Plate 40). It is notable that the Banqueting House and the Lodge at Ebberston are very close in style. The frond motif is also to be found on the two sturdy pillars that mark the weir at Studley, upon which the two neo-Palladian Fishing Tabernacles stand guard to the lake. This particular design element, common to all the estates in the Yorkshire Circle at this early stage of Campbell’s career, suggests that he was experimenting with an architectural signature, something he was to omit from his later, more mature, more starkly neo-Palladian designs.

Campbell’s death in 1729 must have been a blow to Aislabie with whom he had been acquainted for at least seventeen years. Work on the estate at Studley did not cease however, instead Aislabie employed Campbell’s deputy, Roger Morris, with whom he had been working in the last year of Campbell’s life when Campbell himself was too ill to wait upon Aislabie.109 Morris’ relationship with Aislabie may well have extended beyond the grounds of Studley Royal and it has been suggested that one of Aislabie’s London houses, No. 12 Grosvenor Square, mere paces from his friend William Benson’s house in Grosvenor Street, was designed by Morris (c. 1729).110 It is tempting to believe that the Gothic Octagon Tower at Studley, built in 1738, was also designed by Morris and represents his continuing involvement at the estate (see Plate 41). Morris was one of the earliest eighteenth-century architects to deliberately design in the Gothic idiom, constructing the Gothic building of Clearwell Castle in 1727-8. However, Clearwell’s significance is derived ‘not only from its unusually early date, but also from the peculiarly authentic medievalism of its exterior elevations’.111 Aislabie’s Octagon Tower lacks the sobriety that characterises Morris’s Gothic buildings, and sports frivolous and unconvincing Gothic detail as well as classically-derived, round-headed windows, all of which features are too playful and exaggerated to be comfortably attributed to Morris. The presence of the Octagon Tower in a landscape so heavily influenced by the neo-Palladian is even more startling when considered in the context of Aislabie’s life and his ceaseless dedication to the promotion of the classical style. There is a possibility that William Aislabie was instead responsible for this building, during the last years of his father’s life.

Having examined the contribution of the key members of the Yorkshire circle: John Aislabie, William Benson, Colen Campbell, Charles Hotham and William Thompson, it is useful to consider its fringe members who were part of the Yorkshire social network. The Robinson family correspondence indicates that Sir William Strickland (VB), a Vitruvius Britannicus subscriber, was a member of their social circles at the time. The references made to him mention his inclusion in social visits to Castle Howard and are suggestive of his high standing in Yorkshire and his close association with other members of the Yorkshire gentry. Nanny Robinson mentions him to her brother Metcalfe in an undated letter, where she confides that:
'My uncle Aislabie came to fetch us from Castle Howard on fryday, he staid one knight....Yr Wm Strickland was speachless with gout in his tongue and expected to die Every minute'.

The sequence of events of Nanny’s life dates this letter as having been written in the early 1720s. Thankfully Mr Strickland recovered from this bout of illness and went on to live for approximately another fifteen years, during which time he commissioned Lord Burlington to draw up designs for the south and west fronts of Boynton Hall, his seat in the Yorkshire, proving that he was not unaffected by the neo-Palladian buildings being constructed by his Northern neighbours.

Another Yorkshire man to adopt the neo-Palladian style was James Moyser (VB), (1688-1751) the amateur architect. Moyser spent his early life as an officer in one of Hotham’s regiments of the foot. It is not known to which regiment he belonged; Hotham having commanded six regiments within sixteen years. Before retiring to Beverley and a life of architectural design, Moyser had a distinguished military career and was promoted to Colonel of the First Regiment of Footguards as well as serving in Spain under Stanhope, a subscriber to Vitruvius Britannicus, as his Adjutant in 1710. Moyser came from an architectural background, his father John having been heavily involved in the major eighteenth-century restoration of York Minster, not Beverley Minster as has been quoted. Sir Charles Hotham was also closely involved in the restoration and both he and John Moyser were simultaneously invited to wait upon the Archbishop of York on 27 July 1720. Besides this architectural association the two men were connected politically, Hotham succeeding John Moyser as MP for Beverley after 1708. The two men were therefore well-acquainted, and this may have ensured James’s acceptance into Hotham’s regiment.

Colvin states that ‘...although he [John Moyser] subscribed to the third edition of Vitruvius Britannicus in 1725 there is no evidence that he had any architectural skill’. His son James Moyser was, however, an amateur architect building in a plain Palladian style and was most active in the 1730s and 1740s as a second generation neo-Palladian. It is possible that his early acquaintance with Hotham, his father’s associate and his own military sponsor, influenced Moyser’s adoption of the neo-Palladian style. Certainly as a resident of Beverley himself, Moyser would have been aware of Hotham’s very modern house being built in the Eastgate. After his discharge from the army Moyser went on to design Bretton Hall in Yorkshire for his friend Sir William Wentworth in 1730 and Nostell Priory for Sir Rowland Winn in 1737, which is based on Palladio’s Villa Mocenigo and had been planned as early as 1731. Colvin has made the link between Moyser’s plan for Nostell Priory and its similarity to a design for a large country house produced by Colen Campbell which, Colvin suggests, Moyser may have seen.
Given Hotham’s employment of Campbell for his own house and Campbell’s frequent sojourns into North Yorkshire, coupled with the close connection between Moyser and Hotham, it is highly likely that Moyser did indeed see this plan and was himself acquainted with Campbell. Colvin’s conclusion that Moyser did not make a ‘contribution of any importance to English Palladian architecture’ bears out the theory that perhaps he relied a little too heavily on Campbell’s plans. 121

The Yorkshire circle’s interest in early neo-Palladianism was firmly centred on John Aislabie and his connections to Benson and Campbell. It appears to have developed entirely separately from Lord Burlington who was to assume the leadership of the style in the third decade of the eighteenth century. However, the circle did not remain so insular in its later years and by the 1720s there were architectural links with Lord Burlington, who was known to Aislabie as early as 1717 when Aislabie wrote to one of Lord Burlington’s staff seeking a new ‘keeper’ for Studley Royal. 122 James Moyser was also friends with Lord Burlington and visited him at his house in Londesborough, East Riding, with his father. Moyser was also known to Roger Morris, both of whom, along with their friend Lord Burlington, were involved in the design of Kirby Hall, near Ouseburn which was eventually built in 1747. 123

Hotham’s connection with the Moysers was not the only example of his association with fringe members of the Yorkshire circle. In fact Hotham appears to have had more contacts with those on the fringes of the Yorkshire neo-Palladian circle than Robinson, Aislabie, Benson or Thompson which was a direct result of intermarriages between the Hotham family and the Yorkshire gentry. Descended from his grandfather’s second marriage Hotham was on good terms with the Hotham family which had descended from the first marriage and through which branch the title was carried. When the third Baronet died in 1691 the title was passed to the second branch to Sir Charles Hotham. Perhaps in order to unite the two branches of the family he married his cousin Elizabeth’s daughter. Elizabeth Hotham, sister of the 3rd baronet, had been married, aged twelve, to a local landowner, William Gee of Bishop Burton. The product of this marriage was his second-cousin, Bridget Gee, whom he married on 9 September 1690. Intermarriage had occurred between the Gee and Hotham families at least once a generation since the late sixteenth centuries, highlighting the level of interwoveness of these families and Hotham’s repetition of the connection is typical of what was happening in the upper classes at this time. Between the date of the fire at Scarborough in 1705 and the construction of Hotham’s new house in Beverley it is likely that the family moved to Bishop Burton, to the home of Bridget’s ancestors, the Gees, and it was certainly here, in 1707, that she died of cancer whilst Hotham was campaigning in Spain. 124 The Gee family were somewhat prolific in North Yorkshire and were an integral part of provincial high society. Captain Orlando Gee (VB), a
subscriber to the second and third editions of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, was a close friend of Metcalfe Robinson of Newby Hall as Nanny Robinson’s correspondence to ‘Dear Mett’ bears out. Nanny informs him, in an undated letter, that whilst at Castle Howard the previous week, ‘Yr Captain Gee [Orlando] and Miss Talbot have agreed everything and are to be married very soon’. It is not known exactly what relation Orlando was to Hotham although a receipt confirming that Hotham had received the fifty pounds owing to him from Captain Gee and would destroy the appropriate note of hand ‘when he could find it’ indicates that he may have been a junior relative. Certainly Colonel James Gee was a nephew of Sir Charles Hotham and, in the 1730s, benefited from a design for a new house at Bishop Burton drawn up by Lord Burlington. By the 1730s public perception of neo-Palladianism had changed and instead of being viewed as shockingly new, it was seen as the accepted style of taste and virtue. Colonel Gee’s reason for adopting the neo-Palladian style may, therefore, have been solely due to fashion and there is no firm evidence that his Uncle Hotham was influential in his choice, but the closeness of the families at this time in Yorkshire and the high level of interwovenness of their social and familial network, does indicate his likely involvement. The Gees were also heavily intermarried with the Moysers and it appears as if Colonel Gee was no exception. A marriage settlement of 1727 was made between a James Gee and Constantia Moyser in 1727, the timing of the marriage making it likely to have been the Colonel.

Before leaving the subject of Hotham and his connections it is worth drawing attention to his military contacts. As stated above Hotham served under General Carpenter who started his career as a page to Lord Montagu in Paris in 1671 rising to be Supreme Commander of all forces in England during the 1715 Rebellion. Interestingly fellow military man General Stewart presented the site in London for the rebuilding St George’s Church, Hanover Square, and its construction was closely followed by the development of Hanover Square itself, a project which was also led by General Stewart. Four of Stewart’s peers, General Carpenter, General Lord Cadogan, General Evans and General Pepper, all of whom subscribed to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, were residents in the Square in 1717 and, as John Summerson describes the situation, ‘they can hardly have come together in this new suburb by chance’. Although the design of the buildings in Hanover Square cannot be said to be neo-Palladian, the speculative development, supported by the Generals, does indicate that new building was an activity permeating all groups within society at this time. Hotham would have been aware of this development and his wide circle of military associates, including Moyser and Gee, would have brought him into contact with the key building schemes of the day.

Hotham died in 1723 having never lived at his unfinished, Campbell-designed house in Beverley’s Eastgate. The cost of the new house had cost £7,000 and he left debts for his son,
Sir Charles Hotham, 5th Baronet, to manage. More successful on the political stage than his father, Hotham secured the appointment of Groom of the Bedchamber when the Prince of Wales came to the throne as George II in 1727, having made his acquaintance at the Electoral Court of Hanover during his Grand Tour sometime after 1714. Hotham’s new dignity led him to abandon his father’s house in Beverley and relocate to the relatively small house at South Dalton that had been acquired from the Aislabie family at the end of the seventeenth century where he planned to build on a grand scale. The confidently designed neo-Palladian house, intended for the South Dalton estate, has not been positively attributed to a specific architect although Roger Morris has been suggested as the designer. The gardens were started in 1726 but, just as he was having bricks burned in 1739 in order to commence construction, Hotham died suddenly leaving a two-year old son as his heir. Although the house was never built the surviving plans by John Roque which were published in 1737, bear a strong resemblance to Campbell’s villa at Waverley, built in 1725 for John Aislabie (see Plate 42). Both houses are of five bays with the emphasis on the central three bays. At Waverley the central element is articulated with four Ionic columns whereas at Dalton Hall the three bays project forward. Both villas are based on Palladio’s Villa Emo and share the defining Palladian characteristics of a piano nobile with steps rising up to it, a basement story, and a stark simplicity of finish. The rooflines of the buildings favour the steeply rising, tapering form and, where chimneys at Waverley add a vertical lightness to the design, at South Dalton this is accomplished with the addition of a cupola. At South Dalton the architect has abandoned the use of a balustrade altogether and relies solely upon a decorative entablature to define the roofline. Given Campbell’s reputation within the Yorkshire circle and the fact that Hotham’s father was one of Campbell’s earliest patrons, it does seem logical that the fifth Baronet’s new villa was the work of Morris who was employed on the strength of having been Campbell’s deputy.

The garden design at South Dalton, as depicted by Roque, was also of great interest. As Worsley has indicated, the plan clearly demonstrates Hotham’s preference for the Rococo garden as defined by the artinatural outer limits of the garden and the meandering paths. The villa was set at the point where the lawn opened up into a wide swathe narrowing again to an axial viewpoint that cut through the meandering Rococo shapes of the far garden to end in an eye-catcher, the neo-Palladian pavilion, also shown on Roque’s plan. The formality of the garden’s structure, although tempered by the Rococo shapes, is clearly influenced by Robert Castell’s reconstruction of Pliny’s Tusculum villa from Villas of the Ancients Illustrated as published in 1728. The garden design at South Dalton reveals a new awareness by the Yorkshire circle of classical sources and perhaps a slight shift towards a more Plinian interpretation of Palladianism by the late 1730s.
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CHAPTER 5

PIONEERING MERCHANT BANKERS AND THE RISE OF NEO-PALLADIANISM

The end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century saw the initiation and consolidation of the English banking system that still forms the basis of London's financial sector today. The formal organisation of existing independent traders and goldsmiths, who had been active in London for centuries, led to the emergence of a fraternity of rich merchants and bankers at the start of the eighteenth century. The more formal organisation of the financial sector, and the advantages born out of economies of scale, created opportunities for the creation of vast fortunes and the corresponding power that this wealth brought in its wake.

This study will show that those who belonged to the new breed of efficient, wealthy merchants were keen to establish their families in aristocratic circles and participated in upper-class pursuits such as art and architecture. If the merchants themselves did not publicly disdain the trades that had formed the foundation of their wealth and success, they did not always encourage their offspring to follow in their footsteps. Analysis of the early mercantile fraternity highlights a pattern of behaviour where, having attained great wealth, merchants sometimes distanced their sons from trade and attempted to establish them as men of virtue, hence the interest in neo-Palladianism as a gentleman's pursuit. This will be examined below.

The wealth acquired by these merchants was used to build the country seats that they had not been fortunate enough to inherit in what can be seen as an attempt to establish their families as members of the landed classes. A clear circle of merchants, financiers, speculators, traders and commodity brokers emerges from the subscription pages of Vitruvius Britannicus and is testament to the ambition of the mercantile elite to enter the world of art and taste. Subscription to Campbell's volumes and participation in architecture was one means of conferring taste and virtue to one's family. This was often combined with the entry of the merchant family into the aristocracy through intermarriage of their offspring with this class. Such marriages were little more than a financial bargain and entry to established landed families via marriage came at a high price. Where an aristocratic marriage could not be secured, an alliance with a similarly wealthy and aspiring merchant's family was forged.

In order to analyse successfully the early eighteenth-century financial circle and its relationship with the prevailing architectural style, it is necessary to go back to the end of the seventeenth century and to examine briefly the context from which these merchants originated. The modern financial sector, as it is recognised today, originated in a concentration of goldsmiths,
merchants, coin-dealers and jewellers all located in or near to Lombard Street in London at the end of the seventeenth century. This was banking in its nascent phase. Barclays, Coutts, Goslings, Childs and Hoare’s all developed from thriving goldsmithing businesses in this area, a large percentage of which were Quaker owned. It is important to note that at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century approximately twenty-five per cent of London’s financial elite were Quakers\(^1\) with this figure rising to as much as seventy-five per cent in some industries of which the iron industry was one.\(^2\) The relevance of the social composition of London’s mercantile elite and the high proportion of Quaker traders in the City at this time is the effect that the Quaker religion had on the strength of the emerging financial sector. The great success of the emergent banks in the early eighteenth century was largely built upon the trustworthiness of the Quaker financiers.\(^3\) The harshness with which any instance of bankruptcy was dealt with among the Quaker community, considered by them to be the manifestation of the breaking of a bond, created an environment of trust and security among creditors that encouraged investment and gold deposits in the early banks.\(^4\) Thus the financial sector of the early eighteenth century was grounded upon secure and fast-growing banking, largely controlled by Quakers, which provided opportunities for many merchants, whether Quaker or not, to amass vast amounts of wealth in relatively short spaces of time. At a time when most traders were reliant upon melting down household gold and plate whenever extra working capital was required, it was initially only the very rich who could afford banking services. In the early eighteenth century this began to change.

The higher level of organisation and integration occurring in the financial sector in the early eighteenth century coincided with the waning Baroque style and the growing interest in neo-Palladianism. The nature of the mercantile establishment at this time was such that it encouraged the spread of the neo-Palladian style. The merchants studied here were socially ambitious and constantly strived towards advancement and the transference of their families to the aristocracy. However in trade terms, the situation was different. Just as the aristocratic class operated a closed shop in the early eighteenth century, where mutually beneficial transactions occurred within the class, rarely including anyone on the outside, the key players involved in trade also appear to have operated on a protectionist basis. Many of the directors of the Bank of England, which was established in 1694, were also the Directors or major shareholders of the lucrative East India Company, for many years an exclusive monopoly. These same men recur time and again as powerful merchants in positions of financial responsibility or as holders of the greatest number of Bonds from the Joint Stock Companies emerging in the early eighteenth century: companies that included the Mississippi Scheme and the South Sea Company. Corruption, exclusivity and nepotism were fully expected and accepted by-products of trade and finance at this time. For example John Freame, one of the two Quaker co-founders of Barclays
Bank, acted as Banker for the lucrative London Lead Company in the early eighteenth century. Despite being the Company's Banker, Freame openly became one of its Directors in 1729 and no regard was paid to the obvious conflict of interest. This exclusivity appears to have created a situation where self-serving connections, both business-based and familial (and the two are often indistinguishable) were firm and endured for many years.

A clear circle of integrated, wealthy merchants emerges from the subscription pages of Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus*: men who competed in the financial sector and who shared the same architectural taste. The connections between these merchant subscribers and the effect they had on the neo-Palladian style are best examined by considering the lives of the key merchants and their architectural ventures. Of note is the effect that these new and suddenly acquired fortunes sometimes had upon the type of neo-Palladianism selected by the owner of this new money. Among the merchants there appears to have been, on occasion, a *nouveau riche* love of ostentation and grandeur that is not so easily found among the neo-Palladian buildings of true aristocrats, or those with the security of 'old' money. Examples of this phenomenon include Wanstead and Wricklemarsh, the former being vastly over-scaled and the latter, thoroughly ugly and tasteless, but being built well enough to last for centuries. These buildings present themselves as over-reactions to a previous lack of money and also indicate an understanding on behalf of their owners of the ebb and flow of wealth and of the unreliability of the fortunes of trade; an understanding that is perhaps unique to this type of neo-Palladian. The urgency with which these buildings were constructed is an element largely missing from the buildings of aristocracy.

A final point of consideration, to be borne in mind during the analysis of the merchant circle, is their nature as risk-takers. Of necessity merchants travelled much further abroad than did the aristocracy of the early eighteenth century, who mostly confined themselves to Europe during their leisurely Grand Tours. The merchants discussed here travelled to, and often lived for years in, the East Indies and the Americas as well as elsewhere in Europe. They did not keep to the well-travelled routes of the upper classes but on the contrary often risked their lives in pursuit of financial gain and the trade advantages that could be gleaned by those willing to travel further. A cosmopolitan outlook and keen ability to extract advantage from diverse situations characterised these merchants and is reflected in their exploitation of the neo-Palladian style.

Some of the connections which will be highlighted in this study are well rehearsed. It is the intention here to examine new connections and to re-examine those that are already known, within the context of trade. By so doing a different light is shed on the architectural activities of the circle members that enriches the contemporary understanding of neo-Palladianism.
1709-1715 NEO-PALLADIANISM AND COMMERCE: THE BEGINNINGS

The first merchants to be considered are those who began their neo-Palladian buildings prior to the publication of Campbell’s first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus*. Neo-Palladianism achieved overwhelming popularity largely through Campbell’s architectural treatise, as well as Giacomo Leoni’s publication of Palladio’s *Four Books of Architecture* as translated by Nicholas Dubois (VB), but the merchants here under discussion demonstrated their allegiance to the architecture long before it became popular and accepted as the new national taste. In this sense they were pioneer neo-Palladians of the eighteenth century, the trail-blazers for the new taste.

The obvious merchant to begin with is William Benson (VB). As the earliest eighteenth century protagonist of neo-Palladianism and a merchant he is of great importance in the context of trade and the connections he had. Whilst the Benson family’s involvement in trade is well known no importance has, as yet, been placed on the general value of commerce in establishing connections and disseminating the style. William Benson’s involvement with the iron trade linked him with the neo-Palladian protagonist John Aislabie (VB), also the son of an iron trader. As discussed previously in this study both men developed a friendship which is likely to have stemmed from their common trade beginnings and, the connection having been made, they went on to become two of the strongest advocates of the new architecture. Similarly Benson’s influence on the style of Stourhead came directly through the alliance of two successful merchant families seeking to consolidate their societal and financial positions; Henry Hoare of Stourhead (VB) and his marriage to Jane Benson, William’s sister, was mutually beneficial commercially and sprung from the early business connection between Henry Hoare and Benson’s father.

Benson grew up in an environment busy with international travel and extensive European trading links through his father, William Benson the elder, who was an iron trader and also through his mother who was Prussian. His father was a Sheriff of the City of London, a member of the Draper’s Company and also one of the earliest customers of Hoare’s Bank where he opened an account as early as 1687. As a result of this up-bringing Benson would have been fully conversant with the advantages of European connections and the benefits of organised trade. His irrepressible confidence when only a young man and his ability to ingratiate himself at the court of George I in Hanover when he was barely in his twenties are testament to his bi-lingual up-bringing and exposure to the multi-cultural trading world of his
father. Benson’s adoption of neo-Palladianism, in the form of Wilbury House, immediately after his visit to Hanover, is indicative of his outward-looking attitude and instinctive exploitation of opportunities. Perhaps only a merchant, with a merchant’s ability to first identify and then to capitalise on such an opportunity could have built the avant-garde Wilbury as early as 1709.

Benson’s brothers, Benjamin (VB) and Henry were also merchants in Holland. Benjamin is the brother who seems to have adhered most closely to Benson during his career and consequently to have benefited most from Benson’s rise. Both William and Benjamin owned land in Scotland Yard from 1709 onwards, land which included a carpenter’s yard, a wharf and a dock. This may well have been a key location from which the Benson family trade was carried out and consignments of foreign goods unloaded and was known to be ‘the best suited of any at that end of town’. The Scotland Yard property was leased by Benson to the Duke of Chandos (VB) in 1719 and included a piece of land that had previously been leased to John Aislabie. The discovery that Aislabie was leasing land adjacent to, and probably belonging to Benson, in this convenient trading location, strengthens the theory that the two men were well known to each other as merchants, if not partners in some aspects of trade, as well as their being associated through neo-Palladianism. In 1730, when the Duke of Chandos came to renew the lease, he found that he had been cheated of thirteen feet of land and accused both Aislabie and Benson of having instigated the fraudulent transaction through bullying a clerk into recording false measurements. From what is known of both Aislabie and Benson, this would appear to be the most likely explanation for the irregularity.

When the lease was sold to Chandos in 1719 it included two houses ‘new built by Mr Benson himself’. Whilst there is no way of knowing the style of these two buildings, it is telling that a ‘Mr Campbell’ was resident on this plot of land by the time of the lease renewal in 1730. By this date Benson was a well-established patron of Colen Campbell having provided him with an entrance into the Office of Works and several introductions leading to neo-Palladian commissions; it is certainly no surprise to find a ‘Mr Campbell’ living on this site. It seems probable that this Mr Campbell was Colen given that the title page of the 1725 edition of Vitruvius Britannicus states that copies of the book could be bought from his house in Middle Scotland Yard. If this man was not Colen Campbell it is highly likely that it was one of the very large Campbell clan to which Colen belonged.

Daniel Campbell (VB) was one such member of the large Campbell family and another neo-Palladian merchant of this circle. He was born in 1670 and was the second son of Walter Campbell, the Captain of Skipness, Argyllshire. Aged twenty-two Daniel went to New England
and became a successful commodities trader in his own right as well as a ship owner and builder. He settled in Glasgow but built up a large trade in Sweden where he exchanged tobacco for iron ore. As a successful merchant Daniel would have been known to William Benson and vice versa; both men being iron-traders and both having travelled to, and had trade connections with, Stockholm. As with many of the early eighteenth century merchants, Quakers for the most part excluded, Daniel also participated in the slave trade. His close links with the Duke of Argyll (VB) were both financial and political and it was through the Duke’s interest that he became MP for Inverary in the Scottish parliament in 1702 and later went on to become MP for the Glasgow Burghs between 1716 and 1734 where he was known by the epithet ‘Great Daniel’ on account of his great size and wealth. Daniel’s financial involvement with the Duke of Argyll seems to have consisted largely of the Duke taking cash loans and paying interest to his kinsman on these debts.

Daniel bought land to the East of Glasgow in 1711 and began building a fine mansion on the North side of the Irongate, known as Shawfield. A subscriber to all three editions of Vitruvius Britannicus, Daniel Campbell’s Shawfield shows his very early alignment with the turning tide of architectural taste in England at the beginning of the second decade of the eighteenth century and his disaffection with the heavy Baroque style, famously discussed by Anthony Ashley Cooper, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury in his letter to Lord Somers in 1712. Shawfield is included in the second of Campbell’s volumes and is of importance as it was Campbell’s only executed design before he came to London in 1712 (see Plate 43). The building is everything one would expect from an early Campbell design and is tri-partite in its articulation with a projecting three-bay central element, pedimented and surmounted by a smaller hipped roof which is balustraded and flat at its culmination. Its simple eared architrave window surrounds, semi-basement and lack of ornamentation all announce the coming of the new style and were neo-Palladian features that remained popular throughout the duration of the style. The use of heavy, defining quoins to articulate the extremities and different planes of the Shawfield elevations are consistent with its early date in the first evidence of the eighteenth century neo-Palladian revival. In 1725 Shawfield was attacked and burned by the mob in response to Daniel’s support of the unpopular malt tax. Parliament paid him damages of £9,000 but the experience appears to have given him a fear of living on the mainland. By 1727 he had sold the house and had instead bought the Island of Islay off the west coast of Scotland. Wings were added to Shawfield in the 1750s but by 1792 it had been demolished completely.

Daniel Campbell’s close connections with the Duke of Argyll (VB), his commissioning of Colen Campbell for his mansion in Glasgow, his subscription to Vitruvius Britannicus and, importantly, his adoption of neo-Palladianism for his own dwelling all testify to his family
The family relationship between Daniel and Colen is proven via their common relationship with the head of the Clan. Daniel’s familial relationship to the Duke is implied from the Duke’s almost constant indebtedness to him between 1703 and 1712 and the assistance the Duke rendered to his lesser kinsman for political preferment. Colen’s relationship to the Duke of Argyll is clearly stated by him in the first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* where he records that ‘as its my greatest Honour to receive my Blood from his [Argyll’s] August House, I thought I could nowhere so properly consecrate the first Essay of my Invention, as an Eternal Monument of the deepest Respect and Gratitude’. Howard Stutchbury has stated that ‘there is nothing in fact to suggest that Campbell [Colen] enjoyed the particular favour of his more distinguished clansman [Duke of Aygyll]’. It may instead have been Daniel Campbell’s power and influence in the world of trade that was of assistance to the, at this stage, unknown Colen, and may have made up for the Duke of Argyll’s lack of interest. Fresh from commissioning Colen himself, it is certainly possible that Daniel was responsible for the introduction of the former to wealthy merchants in London, where Daniel, despite trading from Scotland, had many connections. This may explain Colen Campbell’s easy and very fast infiltration of the circle of London merchants and may be responsible for his introductions to men such as William Benson and John Aislabie.

Daniel appears to have operated a close mercantile network of his own, frequently trading and corresponding with other London traders from at least 1709. Interestingly very many of his correspondents were also Campbells, including his brother, John Campbell, a leading Edinburgh businessman and subscriber to *Vitruvius Britannicus* as well as being Lord Provost of Edinburgh. His business transactions include those with another John Campbell, a Scottish goldsmith based in the Strand who went on to found Coutts Bank and dealings with the commodity broker, James Campbell, similarly based in London. A series of letters from a Robert Campbell of Stockholm were received by Daniel in 1711 relating to iron, Spanish salt, tobacco, copper and herrings. Another of Daniel’s brothers, Matthew Campbell, was also involved in the family’s trading exploits and corresponded with James Crosse, merchant of Nevis in the Leeward Islands from 1702 onwards. Clearly the Campbell clan travelled far and wide to secure advantageous trade terms and many of its members were heavily involved in nepotistic schemes for the advancement of other members of the clan. There is every reason to suppose that Daniel’s kinsman, the shrewd and opportunistic Colen, could have benefited enormously from the former’s trade connections as did other Campbells. This theory may explain the otherwise inexplicable and almost instant success of an untried architect in a strange city.
Before leaving Daniel Campbell it is worth noting his connection with the famous diamond merchant Governor Pitt (VB). As a trader of foreign commodities Daniel had a natural interest in ships and shipbuilding. He himself commanded the ship ‘Adventure’ in 1694\textsuperscript{32} and had ships constructed for him in Boston from which location he was also shipping linen back to England.\textsuperscript{33} The ship ‘Neptune’, which was captained by a Dugald Campbell and had a plethora of other Campbells working as her crew, may well have been owned by Daniel who used it to ship marble from Livorno in 1710, perhaps for the house at Shawfield he was planning with Colen’s assistance.\textsuperscript{34} The Neptune links Daniel Campbell with Governor Pitt of Jamaica, another subscriber to Vitruvius Britannicus and a merchant who will be discussed below. The Neptune had previously been used on longer journeys to the East and carried at least one letter from Governor Pitt from his base at Fort St George, India, to his wife in 1700.\textsuperscript{35}

Besides Benson’s Wilbury House, begun soon after 1709, and Daniel Campbell’s Shawfield begun in 1711, the other key pioneer eighteenth century neo-Palladian building of this very early phase in the history of the style was Wanstead House, Middlesex, begun in 1713 (see plate 2). Wilbury and Shawfield were constructed by merchants who were as daring as they were entrepreneurial. Add to this list of characteristics the traits of tyranny and brilliance and we have the third merchant owner in this trilogy of the first eighteenth century neo-Palladian buildings in England. Sir Josiah Child (1630-1699), although not a subscriber to Vitruvius Britannicus, is worthy of discussion by virtue of being the founder of the great Palladian estate at Wanstead, which his son Sir Richard (VB) went on to build. Child made his fortune largely through trade with the East Indies and invested his fortune in landed assets, a typical response of wealthy merchants to newly acquired fortunes at the time. Child bought the estate of Wanstead in 1667 and it was described by a visiting John Evelyn in 1683. Evelyn’s diary entry makes it clear that Child’s conversion of liquid assets to landed property was a noted trend of the time. He states:

> 16 March. I went to see Sir J Child’s prodigious cost in planting walnut trees about his seate and making fish-ponds, many miles in circuit, in Epping Forest, in a barren spot, as afterwards these suddenly moneyed men for the most part seate themselves.\textsuperscript{36}

Child was not a member of the great banking family of the same name, famously associated with Osterley Park, but gained all his wealth from wholesale commodity transfers, firstly trading independently from Portsmouth as Victualler to the Navy. Latterly and most particularly Child grew rich through his involvement in the East India Company as Director between 1677-1684, Deputy Governor between 1684-1686 and again from 1688-1690, and finally as Governor where he ruled the company despotically and almost continuously from
1681 until his death in 1699.37 His brother, Sir John Child, was Captain-General of the Company’s forces and also Deputy Governor of Bombay (1681-1689), thus giving Sir Josiah even greater control of the Company’s assets.38 Interestingly, although there are no known connections between the Childs of Wanstead and Quaker financiers of the time, Dennis Keeling’s analysis of the eighteenth century book collection at Wanstead shows that it contained a seventeenth century copy of a book entitled *Narrative of God’s Providence to us, the Oppressed People called Quakers* and William Penn’s *Just Rebuke to Twenty-one Divines, for their Abusive Epistle to the Quakers* written in 1674. Keeling finds this discovery a ‘surprising’ inclusion in a book collection of this era.39 Given the high number of Quakers involved in City trade or finance at the time of Sir Josiah’s ascendancy, it is not improbable to suggest that part of the reason for his success as a merchant may have been due to connections with the Quaker community to which he himself may once have belonged.

The Wanstead estate passed to his son Sir Richard Child (1680-1750) who inherited a substantial part of his father’s wealth and continued laying out the park. As early as 1713 Richard Child, who was a subscriber to all three editions of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, employed Colen Campbell to design and build a new house at Wanstead, which, had it been built according to the original plans, would have rivalled Blenheim Palace in size.40 The connection between Richard Child and Colen Campbell may have been made through Daniel Campbell’s trade connections, which were extensive and which would have brought him into contact with the circle of merchants trading with the East Indies, and more particularly the East India Company which had been run by old Sir Josiah. The connection may also have been made through William Benson, Colen Campbell’s patron, whose name was linked to the Childs via the land in Scotland Yard that was leased to the Duke of Chandos in 1719.41

Wanstead was rebuilt on the site of a medieval manor house (see Plate 44) which was pulled down in 1714 to make way for the new mansion. Sir Richard’s early selection of neo-Palladianism, and the whole-hearted manner in which he embraced the new style, demonstrates his desire to be at the forefront of the new artistic movement. It also indicates that he was aware of architectural developments and the mood of change in the country. Wanstead was a pioneer Palladian country house whose importance as a harbinger for the new modernism cannot be underestimated. Its footprint measured an enormous 260 feet by 70 feet and was designed as a central block with two lateral wings and gargantuan twin staircases on each side (see Plates 45 and 46).42 The central block had a portico of six Corinthian columns and a double flight of steps flanking the portico and leading to the house, its *piano nobile* giving commanding views of the formal park. Its enormous size and scale amounted to a vulgar display of wealth and a building so monumental as to have lost much of the attraction of Palladio’s smaller original buildings.
Ironically Wanstead's enormous scale, designed to convey the power and establishment of the Child family, became one of the contributing factors leading to its demolition in 1822. When the family's financial situation was reversed by the extravagance of William Pole Wellesley, the nephew of the Duke of Wellington, who had married Catherine Tylney in 1812, Wanstead was revealed as an unaffordable white elephant which could not be sold on in one piece.

The landscaping works referred to by John Evelyn were part of Sir Josiah's much wider plan to divert the River Roding to form a system of ornamental ponds for the great formal garden he was laying out with George London. The gardens, had they been completed, would have vied with Versailles in size and formal splendour and incorporated great sheets of water. However the formal geometry did not endure and by 1736 John Rocque's survey of Wanstead shows some astonishing changes to the formal rigidity of the garden; the incorporation of the meandering shapes of the new landscape style, the ‘artinatural’. Sir Richard himself does not appear to have taken a great interest in trade but pursued a career in politics becoming MP for Maldon 1708-1710, for Essex 1710-22 and again between 1727 and 1734. He also rose through the ranks of the aristocracy purchasing the title of Viscount Castlemain in 1718 and becoming Earl Tylney in 1732, thus distancing himself from the source of his wealth. Sir Richard’s rise typifies the development of many of the merchant families in the early eighteenth century and research here shows the existence of a strong pattern: the sons of successful merchants lived as country gentlemen or members of the aristocracy, investing much of their fathers’ fortunes in acquiring artistic taste and being at the forefront of architectural developments. This aspect of the merchants’ rise through society will be further discussed below.

John Aislabie was another merchant neo-Palladian whose architectural preferences were closely linked to those of his trading partners and competitors. Without re-examining his architectural achievements in detail, discussed above, it is worth reviewing him in light of his trade connections. Aislabie’s trade link with William Benson has been explored and it is highly likely that he was also known to Daniel Campbell, both of whom had a main source of commerce in the Baltic region. Aislabie’s early contact with Colen Campbell may have come through the former’s trading connection with Daniel Campbell of Shawfield. Although Aislabie quickly rose through the ranks politically he continued to be involved in commerce long after he had made his fortune, thus maintaining his early connections with other merchant neo-Palladians. His continued involvement in trade throughout his lifetime is demonstrated by a list of ships in service to the East India Company in the early eighteenth century. The list reveals the names of the ships and the number of journeys they undertook to the East Indies before their ultimate decommissioning. One such ship was called ‘The Aislabie’, and was in use for four journeys between 1720 and 1730. Voyages to the East Indies could take well over a year each way and
carried cargoes which included spices, porcelain, muslins and precious stones. These ships were owned by the wealthiest share-holders of the East India Company who wished to engage in trade, a situation which indicates that Aislabie was a large and powerful stake-holder in the company. Such distant voyages were extremely precarious both financially and for the lives of the crew, however the successful voyage yielded vast profits for the ship's owner and any partners.\textsuperscript{48} It would seem that Aislabie, in keeping with the rest of his risky and often nefarious commercial dealings, considered these ventures to be worthwhile.

Aislabie's involvement in the East India Company brought him into contact with many other merchants capitalizing on trade with the East Indies as well as the most powerful of the Company's men, the Directors and Governors such as Josiah Child. The list of ships' names, all bearing the names or titles of their owners or their respective properties, gives a clear picture of the most wealthy and influential men trading through the East India Company at this time, many of whom were subscribers to \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus} and some of whom went on to build in the neo-Palladian style. Apart from the ship the 'Aislabie' already discussed, the list includes vessels called the 'Josiah', sponsored by the Childs of Wanstead, the 'Tankerville' sponsored by the Earl of Tankerville of Dawley House; the 'Swallowfield' sponsored by Governor Pitt of Swallowfield; the 'Decker', sponsored by Matthew Decker, neo-Palladian merchant of Richmond Green and the 'Stanhope' named after the Earl.\textsuperscript{49} These men were all involved in the early days of the evolving neo-Palladian style and it can now be seen that they were connected to each other, not always primarily through family or political connections but sometimes more importantly, through trade ventures.

What characterises these early neo-Palladian merchants, Benson, Aislabie, Child and Daniel Campbell is a genuine interest in the style. Their early adoption of it, in the face of the much more popular Baroque style, was particularly important for the establishment of neo-Palladianism as it provided examples of the new style in built form. Later merchants, discussed below, adopted the style as it was becoming \textit{de rigueur} and they exploited it for their own ends. However the early merchants demonstrated an obvious interest in neo-Palladianism for its own sake.

\textbf{1717-1728 TRADE, WEALTH AND SOCIAL CLIMBING}

This section considers the merchants who, whilst they were still early adopters of the neo-Palladian style, cannot be considered to have been the earliest pioneers of the new taste, but began their buildings after the neo-Palladian publications of 1715 which encouraged the growth of the style.
Henry Hoare I (VB) was one of these merchants and started the construction of the neo-Palladian Stourhead House in Wiltshire in 1717 (see Plate 47). Stourhead House has been frequently studied and analysed over the years due to its early rendition of the neo-Palladian style as well as the classical gardens created to surround it. Whilst it would be fruitless to re-examine the much examined aspects of the family and estate here, it is useful to look again at the family in light of their city links and connections with other merchants through Hoare's Bank. The connection between William Benson, owner of Wilbury House, and Henry Hoare I as brothers-in-law has often been noted. However this family association did not originate through these two men in the early eighteenth century but stems back to the time of their respective fathers and possibly before that generation. William Benson's father, also William Benson, had an account with Hoare's Bank, then directed by Henry Hoare I's father, Richard Hoare, as early as 1687. At the end of the seventeenth century business was booming for Hoare's Bank which employed many apprentices and journeymen, the windows of the bank displaying 'gold and silver, plate, jewellery and precious stones'. The ledgers at Hoare's provide an interesting link with Quakerism, just as Sir Josiah Child's book collection at Wanstead sheds light on his links with the religion. Besides William Benson's early account with Hoare's there are other accounts which include the Hoares of Ireland, existing from the 1680s. One of these Irish Hoares was Joseph Hoare, merchant of Cork, who became a Quaker in the early eighteenth century. His son Samuel, also a merchant and in all probability a Quaker, moved to London in 1744 to trade there. Thus Quakerism was in the Irish branch of the wider Hoare family, and could well have contributed to the early success of the London bank.

It would seem that along with the Hoares, Benson the elder's mercantile activities were also very lucrative at this time and necessitated the services of a goldsmith. It is likely that it was the association between Richard Hoare and William Benson the elder, a relationship which was born of business convenience, which formed the basis for a much fuller integration of the two families in the early eighteenth century. From this point the relationship between the Hoares and the Bensons, particularly the influence that William Benson of Wilbury is likely to have had on his brother-in-law's choice of neo-Palladianism at Stourhead is well known. Benson's 'Palladianizing' influence on the Hoares was not limited to Henry Hoare I however; it is probable that he also encouraged his nephew, Henry Hoare II, to adopt the new architecture as his own taste, a taste that crystallised when Hoare II bought and lived in the neo-Palladian Wilbury. Thus it can be seen that pure trade connections between the families as early as the 1680s eventually acted as the catalyst for the dissemination of the neo-Palladian style.
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Given the relationship between the Hoares and the evangelising William Benson, the early
embracement of neo-Palladianism at Stourhead is perhaps unsurprising especially when viewed
in the context of the unique position that the Hoares held in London society at this time. As one
of the three key banks serving the financial needs of the richest merchants in England, as well as
the aristocracy, the Hoares were almost uniquely placed to know the business of their wealthy
clients. This situation was assisted by the investments that the bank itself made, most of which
were in a variety of securities including East India stock, South Sea stock, tea warrants and bank
stock. Thus for the Hoares the business of the bank was deeply intertwined with the
commercial interests of the most wealthy of the day. Hoare I and II would have known about
the building activities of the bank’s richest customers and many other confidential details of
their lives, through the deposit and withdrawal of sums of money. Any substantial new building
projects, requiring the removal of large sums from the bank, would have been brought to the
attention of the Hoares. In this respect it is interesting to note that both John Aislabie and Sir
Richard Child of Wanstead, had accounts at Hoare’s bank from 1710. As bankers to the elite
traders of the time, the Hoares’ would have had a very broad circle of personally known city
acquaintances and would thus have been aware of prevailing societal moods and changes in
taste almost before they happened. Hoare I capitalised upon his position as a banker and went
on to become Tory MP for the City of London between 1709 and 1713, was elected as Lord
Mayor of London in 1712 and became a director of the South Sea Company in 1713 until
1716. Henry Hoare I’s almost total coverage of the political and financial sectors in the city,
coupled with his family link to William Benson, through whom it is probable that he was
introduced to Colen Campbell, made Hoare a prime candidate for the early adoption of neo-
Palladianism.

Another prime candidate was Sir Matthew Decker (VB) (1679-1749), a subscriber to Vitruvius
Britannicus and another merchant who was well integrated with the financial sector of the early
eighteenth century and whose wealth also led him to socialize with London’s upper classes.
Born in Amsterdam he fled to London to avoid persecution and set up as a merchant in 1702.
He became a director of the East India Company in 1713, a position he held until 1743. In this
position he would have been directly acquainted with the other key merchant neo-Palladians
including Sir Gregory Page III (through his brother Ambrose and father who were also
directors), Sir Richard Child and John Aislabie. It is likely that the architectural taste of this
merchant’s circle would have influenced his late adoption of the style. During Decker’s time as
one of the directors, and in keeping with the other directors and large traders, he sponsored a
ship, the ‘Decker’, to sail to the East Indies on two separate voyages thus indicating his large
wealth. Decker was well known in the city as an avid supporter of the doctrines of free trade

107
and an author on this subject. Created a baronet by George I in 1716, he progressed to a career in politics and in 1729 became a Tory MP for Bishop’s Castle and the High Sheriff of Surrey.

It is not known precisely when Decker’s interest in neo-Palladian architecture developed but perhaps, in common with the other later merchant neo-Palladians of this circle, it was when he realised the usefulness of the style for self-promotion. It may also have been when his daughter Catherine married the sixth Viscount Fitzwilliam whose sister was married to the famously Palladian 9th Earl of Pembroke (VB). Decker’s use of the style appears to be limited to a single occasion: he entertained King George I at his mansion on Richmond Green and it was there that he had a special room built for his royal guest by the well known virtuoso Sir Andrew Fountaine (VB). The choice of Fountaine as architect demonstrates Decker’s desire to be associated with the architect Earl of Pembroke and the ‘modern Vitruvius’, Lord Burlington (VB), both of whom were connected to Fountaine as was formally recognised by Robert Morris in his Essay in Defense of Ancient Architecture published in 1728, where the three men were described as ‘the principal Practitioners and preservers’ of ‘Ancient Architecture’. Although the style of Decker’s extension, which Walpole called, ‘a large ugly room... 36 feet long, 24 high & 24 wide’ cannot categorically be confirmed by any documentary evidence, there are circumstances which make it exceedingly likely that it was neo-Palladian. Firstly, the choice of an architect so closely associated with the style is a clear indication of Decker’s architectural preferences. Further evidence is provided by the visit that Decker made to Fountaine’s own house of Narford Hall, Norfolk in 1728. His diary entry immediately following this visit confirms Decker’s stylistic choices for his new room at Richmond for George I; at least for the interior. In his diary Decker compares Narford’s new Palladian library and kitchen wing, with his own new room at Richmond; both of which Fountaine designed. Narford’s library and kitchen wing has been described by Parissien et al as ‘a surprisingly sophisticated piece of work, and testifies to the advanced Palladian taste of Andrew Fountaine’. Decker wrote that this same library wing was painted and gilded ‘as our room’, a comment which implies a strong similarity between the two building projects. Decker’s visit to Narford also provides a date for the room at Richmond which must have been built and finished by the time of the visit in 1728 for the comparison between the two buildings to have been made. Decker’s close association with the other merchant neo-Palladians discussed in this chapter makes it even more likely that the style he adopted for his own building works at Richmond was neo-Palladian. It should also be borne in mind that the room was built specifically for the entertainment of George I, who had himself only recently commissioned Campbell and Kent to carry out alterations at Kensington Palace, thus strengthening the likelihood that Decker’s extension was neo-Palladian.
Sir Matthew Decker also had a passion for gardening, which was fed, at least in part, by his ability to obtain exotic and rare plants through his trade with the East Indies. John Macky records the extensive gardens he saw at Richmond during his *Journey through England* in 1723. He writes that:

> The longest, largest and highest Hedge of Holly I ever saw, is in this garden with several other hedges of Ever-Greens, Visto’s cut through Woods, Grottos with Fountains, a fine Canal running up from the River, his Duckery, which is an oval Pond brick’d round, and his pretty Summer-house by it to drink a Bottle, his Store Houses, which are always kept at an equal heat for his Citrons and other Indian Plants, with Gardeners brought from foreign Countries to manage them, are very curious and entertaining. The house is also very large a-la modern and neatly furnished after the Dutch way.\(^70\)

Another description of the same year was written by Richard Bradley who was also struck by the exotic flora:

> Tis not long since I was eye-witness to several fruited Pine Apples at Sir Matthew Decker’s at Richmond. About Forty in number, some ripening and others in a promising condition...and some were as large as any I have seen brought from the West Indies\(^71\)

Decker was far from alone in his interest in gardening; in fact all the merchants discussed here who experimented with neo-Palladianism at the start of the eighteenth century created a designed and often magnificent landscape within which to set their dwellings. A brief discussion of these gardens is useful at this point.

**GARDENS OF THE MERCHANT NEO-PALLADIANS**

The merchant circle is of special importance in terms of early eighteenth-century landscape design as it demonstrates the entire spectrum of designs considered to be appropriate as settings for neo-Palladian buildings. Within the neo-Palladian period, starting in the first decade of the eighteenth century with Wilbury and continuing into the 1750s, the precise nature of a garden’s design was determined only by the time it was laid out. As discussed previously landscape design over the first fifty years of the century evolved in a manner that simply did not reflect the corresponding architectural style. Stylistically, landscape design did not experience a denouement: there was no arrival at a firm design and consequently no ensuing tyranny over style. As a result there is no such thing as a single neo-Palladian garden style; only a loose,
three-stage categorisation of neo-Palladian garden types as suggested in the Introduction. This circle is able to demonstrate all three garden types, selected by the merchants as being appropriate to their neo-Palladian houses. As will be seen, it is the precise date that the garden was commenced, within the forty year dominance of neo-Palladianism, which dictated the exact form of the garden. The landscape at Wanstead was started by Sir Josiah Child in 1667 and the structure of the gardens included the use of large sheets of water, rides and avenues synonymous with this very formal period of garden design. Between 1706-1713, Sir Richard Child continued his father’s work employing George London to expand the Franco-Dutch formalism of the estate, creating parterres, two canals, a bowling green, large Orangery and Banqueting House as well as areas of wilderness, all of which features belonged to the late seventeenth century style of gardening. Clearly Child was creating what he considered to be the appropriate landscape for the pioneer neo-Palladian house he commenced in 1714. The debasement of the Baroque in architecture had not tainted its associated style of gardening, the form of which survived to be the first garden style associated with neo-Palladianism.

Very soon after London had completed his works however, great changes took place at Wanstead as the formal parterres and canal immediately next to the house were replaced with a lawn, itself linked to the house by a terrace. By the 1720s a single basin of water had replaced two seventeenth century semi-circular basins and by 1735 the Rocque map depicts meandering walks through a wood. These changes represent the changing taste in landscape and highlight a general move away from the intricate formalism of London and Wise towards a simplified formality. This simplified formality became the second garden type to be associated with neo-Palladian architecture and was also employed at Studley Royal by John Aislabie where geometric shapes and lengthy canals cut through the surrounding wildernesses. There were no parterres or flowers planted at Studley, just the unadorned skeleton of a formal garden softened by trees, waterfalls, reflective pools and swathes of lawn. Sir Gregory Page (VB) repeated this style at his newly built neo-Palladian Wrinklemarsh, at Blackheath, where he also created a landscape of simplified formalism, based upon the straight rides and avenues of London and Wise but with lawns between, not planting. The layout of the grounds at Wrinklemarsh, which were created between 1723 and 1724 has been described by Sir John Clerk of Penicuik as follows:

The Gardens are very rural and of a new Taste consisting of only a few Gravel walks with large squares and slopes of green turf, few or no Evergreen Trees or shrubs.

Page’s formal setting for Wrinklemarsh was described by Campbell in *Vitruvius Britannicus* as.
very pleasant, being in the center of the park on a rising ground, and commanding several extensive views particularly from the North front over the country of Kent, and from the south and east over Shooter's Hill and Eltham. There is a basin of water on the north front and another on the south front. 

John Rocque's map of Wrinklemarsh, Blackheath and Kidbrooke of 1746 adds to the understanding of Wrinklemarsh's setting and shows that it was centred on a double, and in places triple, lined avenue of trees that extended from both the north and south fronts of the great mansion.

Neo-Palladian architecture had stripped away the exuberance of the Baroque to leave a stark and unadorned classicism and in the same way garden design appeared to absorb some of this approach; the pioneering design at the famous Wrinklemarsh, exhibited so close to London, heralding a new era in landscape style. This simplification of a previous formality seems to have begun some time after 1715, with landscapes such as Wanstead and Ebberston Lodge in Yorkshire, and gathered momentum so that new neo-Palladian houses in the 1720s were commonly set within simplified formal landscapes. No areas of planting or parterres adorn the neo-Palladian landscapes of Studley, Wrinklemarsh or Ebberston; these are gardens which reflected the unadorned, minimal neo-Palladian approach to classicism in architecture.

By the end of the neo-Palladian period when the oppression of rigid forms was beginning to give way to neo-classicism, Henry Hoare II demonstrated the third landscape type associated with the neo-Palladian architectural period. An Arcadia, as opposed to either the previous formalism of London and Wise, or the later, simplified formalism associated with the neo-Palladianism, was not considered to be in any way out of place. Instead the Arcadian landscape style, at Stourhead and elsewhere, resulted from a natural progression in the understanding of classicism as the century wore on, and was based upon a desire to create a garden that was as accurate in its revival of classical principles as was possible. Neo-Palladians had grown up since the early days of Wanstead and Stourhead House and were now confident to explore classical ideas outside the bounds of Palladio's legacy. In gardening terms this new, freer, interpretation of style manifested itself in natural forms, with open, sweeping vistas rather than those confined between columns of trees, and surprising, eye-catching garden buildings artfully disposed on hillsides or lakes rather than predictably appearing at the end of linear pathways.

The landscape at Wilbury House will have been conspicuous by its absence from the foregoing and, as the setting for the first neo-Palladian country house, is of great importance in any discussion of neo-Palladian garden style. Wilbury is the exception to the general rule that timing
was the key determining factor in the choice of neo-Palladian garden type in this period. Very little of the designed garden survives in this ancient Wiltshire landscape but there is enough evidence to provoke questions about what Benson was really doing here. Developing his landscape concurrently with Child at Wanstead, Benson, just as with architecture, was experimenting with an avant garde style. Although a poorly preserved landscape, Benson’s obsession with hydraulics is evident from the briefest of site surveys. A system of channels and weirs with accompanied bridges and sluices is still apparent in the parkland surrounding the house. This structured water system was established within a landscape divided by two long straight drives, the markings of which are visible on the ground from the first floor looking down on the parkland below. One of these drives leads from the house, across an expanse of rough grass, to the road and the other, shorter drive, leads uphill to an octagonal temple placed above what may have been a cold bath.

Tim Mowl has analysed the garden at Wilbury and found that it contains the basic elements of an Arcadia, the landscape aesthetic which was to complement the end of the neo-Palladian architectural phase. Wilbury is unusual in that it did not follow the contemporary formalism associated with London and Wise that was highly fashionable in the first decade of the eighteenth century, as displayed by Child at Wanstead. As early as 1709 Benson was experimenting with eye-catching temples in the landscape, including Benson’s tower, set high upon a hill, to the north which is now demolished. Benson’s use of a basic formal structure of waterways and avenues at Wilbury appears to have been punctuated by what must have seemed at the time to be flights of fancy, but which would now be termed Arcadian experiments. In so doing Benson anticipated the major garden developments that were to unfold over the next forty years and presented a very early template in garden design for anyone clever enough to see it.

All the merchants in this circle appear to have been just as concerned with landscape parks as they were with grand neo-Palladian houses. A description of Sir Gregory Page’s neo-Palladian garden at Wricklemarsh has been presented above but can be seen in context after a return to the man and his neo-Palladian mansion, a key building in this circle and in the neo-Palladian movement. Page was a merchant who epitomized many of the traits and characteristics to be found among the nouveau riche merchants of his era. He was in fact Gregory Page III and followed a grandfather and father of the same name both of whom had been highly successful merchants in their day; Page II also progressing to a career in politics. The first Gregory Page (1621-1693) was a ship owner and merchant of Wapping. He was also a director of the East India Company whilst it was under the Governorship of Josiah Child of Wanstead and an Alderman for the City of London. His son, Gregory Page II, was a peer of Richard Child, the son of Josiah Child and the builder of Wanstead and both men would have been well aware of
each other through their respective fathers’ roles in the East India Company. Page II followed his father’s commercial interests and was a ship owner in his own right as well as the assistant to Sir Charles Eyres, who went on to become the first President of Bengal in 1699. It was this Page who first brought his family to Greenwich in 1699 and who developed good social and trade connections through his mercantile activities with both China and the East Indies. Like his father before, he became a director of the East India Company in 1709 and Chairman in 1716 until his death in 1720. This Page was one of the first investors in South Sea Stock when the scheme was floated in 1711. Whilst Page II is not noted for his involvement in the arts and is not known to have been a supporter of neo-Palladianism, his son most certainly was. Gregory Page III (1689-1775) became the head of the family in 1720 and, already very rich in his own right, became exceedingly wealthy when he inherited his father’s fortune. Page III was not on the Board of Directors of the South Sea Company and thus, when the inevitable crash came, he was permitted to retain his extensive profits, unlike his brother Ambrose, who was forced to declare his assets and pay the profits back under the South Sea Sufferers Act of 1721. That Page III was not a director of the Company seems to sum up his business capabilities in many ways. Whilst he participated in share dealing he did not distinguish himself in any commercial sense as his father and grandfather had done before him. As Neil Rhind has stated, ‘despite the advantages of money and title, Sir Gregory Page III seems to have done little of great note’. When compared with his progressive and ambitious predecessors, he appears to have been an under-achiever in the commercial sense. It is possible that it was precisely this kind of comparison that caused him to retreat into serious depression in his middle years.²⁷

Although not distinguished as a merchant Page III was well-connected in the mercantile fraternity through his family: connections he must have relied upon in his role as financial speculator, from which he benefited greatly. It seems that Page’s real interests lay in the property arena as immediately after 1720 he began what can only be described as a frenzy of property buying, suggesting that his father’s death marked his freedom from parental disapproval in this matter and indicating the increase in his personal wealth. Page, already the owner of land in Wapping, Greenwich and Crayford, went on to add to his portfolio land in Seething Lane in the city, the Westcombe estate near Blackheath, the estates of Lord Bathurst at Milton Bryant and Battlesden, both in Bedfordshire, and, in later years, land at Kidbrooke, Well Hall and Eltham in South-East London. Rhind has stated that Page was one of the major landowners in the home counties in the 1720s.²⁹ Of most relevance to this research was his purchase of the estate of Wricklemarsh on Blackheath in 1722. This was owned by the widowed Lady Morden whose husband, Sir John, had been on the Board of Directors of the South Sea Company and who was also a merchant in the Turkey Company. It is highly likely that Page became aware of the impending disposal of the estate through his involvement in the
South Sea Company and his family’s circle of merchant acquaintances. Lady Morden died in 1721 but the complications of her will meant that Page was not able to take full possession of Wricklemarsh until 1723. The estate had first been advertised in the *Daily Courant* on 7 September 1721, on a sixty-one year lease for £2,500 premium and a rent of £100 a year. This did not come to fruition however as, later that year, it was sold freehold to Page for the sum of £9,000; a figure that included the mansion house, a twenty-two acre park and 271 acres of agricultural land. Page has been described as ‘the richest commoner in England’ and was on good terms with most of London’s high society, including the King. He would have required a large country house to support this position and, as soon as he had taken possession of the old Morden Mansion in September 1723, he demolished it and began to build in earnest.

The completed Wricklemarsh was demolished in 1783 and is therefore only available for analysis today through contemporary engravings and paintings. It achieved a degree of notoriety in its day due to its size and grandeur and the speed with which it was erected. The contemporary written descriptions of it that survive are evidence of a general consensus that the building was above all striking and stunning in the first impression it made upon its viewers, rather than being an architectural masterpiece. Defoe describes the mansion as being ‘one of the finest seats not only in this country but in England’, whilst John Brushe draws attention to another description of the house by Vertue who stated that ‘in my poor judgement of all the houses I have seen, it has the best and finest noble idea, neither too great, not too small, both within and without the compleatest I saw and indeed a model for others’. Henry Dryden was of the same mind as Vertue and wrote about the ‘princely majesty of his [Page’s] residence; his park and domesticks surpassed everything in point of grandeur that had been exhibited by a citizen of London since the days of...Sir Thomas Gresham’. When viewing the engravings of Wricklemarsh (see Plates 48 and 49) however one wonders how this building could have merited such effusive praise. That it was large, grand and shockingly new in its neo-Palladian style is not in question; to suggest however that it was one of the finest houses in England at that time and worthy to be used as a model for others must surely be outright flattery of this very wealthy man whose character was not strong, as will be demonstrated below.

The house was designed for Page in stark neo-Palladian style by John James and was as unimaginative as it was heavy and stolid in its appearance. The channelled basement storey of the south front is overly deep, competing with the building’s *piano nobile* for prominence, a competition it wins when the house is viewed square on. This great, almost fortified strength of the basement is accentuated by the wide portico that casts the central three bays of the *piano nobile* into shadow, precisely where this centrepiece of the building should be prominent in order to balance the very weighty end bays of the elevation. Based in part, surely, on the
Queen's House at Greenwich which Page would have seen every day as a boy who grew up in that village, it lacks the finesse and elegance that characterise Inigo Jones’ masterpiece of simplicity. If the contemporary descriptions of the building were not solely due to flattery, perhaps part of the wonder and fascination with Wricklemarsh can be explained by the incredible speed with which it was built.

Contemporary newspaper reports claim that Page built his mansion and covered it within eleven months at a cost of between £90,000 and £120,000. Brushe has confirmed these reports in his discussion of the tax assessments for the estate and the payments which rose suddenly in an extremely short space of time. For a house of this size, such a construction time is astonishing but may be partly due to the architect chosen for the task. As stated, John James (VB) was selected to design Wricklemarsh, a choice that has been described by Rhind as 'curious' on the basis that Page could have afforded the leading architects of the day, men such as Colen Campbell, James Gibbs or Lord Burlington. His choice of architect is not at all odd however when Page's roots are considered as Rhind goes on to accede. Page's father, Gregory II, had moved the family to Greenwich in 1699, where, as a leading family in Greenwich society, they would have been aware of John James of Greenwich (VB), who was employed as Store-Keeper and assistant Clerk of the Works at Greenwich to Nicholas Hawksmoor. James’ status was elevated in 1711 when he became Master Carpenter to St Pauls’ Cathedral and again in 1715 when he became Assistant Surveyor to Sir Christopher Wren. In 1718 James went on to become Joint Clerk of the Works with Hawksmoor, remaining in charge of Greenwich Hospital until his death. This local connection between James and Page, and the convenience of having James, based in Greenwich, so close to the site at Blackheath, make James a very sensible choice for Page and explains the lack of delay in the building’s construction. Sally Jeffery highlights the probability of an even stronger connection between Page and James which was made by the nineteenth-century Greenwich antiquarian, Henry Richardson, who attributes Paynesfield House, Maze Hill, the house built by Page's father in 1699, to John James. It may also be that Page III’s choice of James was influenced by the timescales within which he wanted to have completed his mansion: better known architects such as Campbell and Gibbs would probably never have been able to comply with Page’s rapid schedule for the construction of the mansion.

John James expressed his views on architecture in a letter to the Duke of Buckingham in 1711 where he stated:

that I may once in my life have an Opportunity of Shewing that the beauties of Architecture may consist with the greatest plainness of the Structure and that Estimates
of Cost may be made with as much exactness as was required by the Grecians. The first of these has scarce ever been hit by the Tramontani unless by our famous Mr Inigo Jones, and the latter is so little understood by us that no small number of Noble as well as private persons have been led into an Expense which has proved the ruin of their Estates and Family... Our publick works my Lord have escaped no better than ye private; the prodigious charge of them has almost discouraged any Attempts this way, and our neglect of Proportion is so visible that not only the Italians but the French who take great Liberty this way themselves, charge us but too justly with disregard to that which no Decoration can be a just Equivalent for.  

James' architectural preferences were extraordinary and even outspoken for the time, especially considering his position working under the decidedly Baroque Nicholas Hawksmoor. James' reference to the simplicity of Inigo Jones' Palladian revival style at this very early date, a year before Shaftesbury's pamphlet, which is generally considered to herald the new taste for simpler architecture, shows that James was already fully conversant with Jones' Palladianism, probably through his knowledge of the Queen's House at Greenwich. His interest in Palladian architecture is also borne out by his subscription to all three volumes of Vitruvius Britannicus. It seems that in commissioning James to design Wricklemarsh sometime between 1721 and 1722 Page was allowing him to give full flight to his neo-Palladian interests which had been stifled under his apprenticeship to Hawksmoor.

Page's choice of neo-Palladianism reflects his desire to enter fully the realms of the upper classes whilst his life bears all the hallmarks of the fate that befell wealthy merchants' sons at the start of the eighteenth century. Page was neither a true aristocrat, nor even the progeny of a member of the landed classes. Instead he originated from much more humble, merchant origins which would always have been despised by true aristocrats, regardless of how many gentlemanly qualities he had gained or the wealth he had acquired. Yet neither was Page truly a merchant. The very success of both his grandfather and father distanced Page III from the need to participate in mercantile activities and, whilst he maintained the family's connections with the merchant classes, he is not noted for any great entrepreneurial activity. He therefore had the luxury of being able to indulge in the gentlemanly pursuits of the upper classes, including neo-Palladian architecture and art collecting, without quite being a member of this class. A few years after the construction of Wricklemarsh Page begun a series of unsuccessful attempts to take his own life, a course of action that appears to have been derived from boredom and an identity crisis. The diary entry of the 1st Earl of Egmont (1683-1748) who lived at the nearby Charlton House is worth quoting in full and starts on Saturday 27 March 1736:
This day I heard that last Thursday Sir G P my neighbour at Blackheath hanged himself but was cut down while still warm and recovered so as to walk about his room... I believe it was for want of knowing how to employ his time, for he was thoroughly neglected in his education by his father, which made him avoid company; and being alone he knew no way to amuse himself but by walking out of one room into another and ordering the dust to be swept from corners, grates to be scoured, his shirts pleated and the like. It could not I think be apprehension of want, for his father left him so much money that in the year 1721 he had £24,000, nor was he covetous till of late years, since he built his fine house at Blackheath, which they say cost him £150,000. The building of such a house... his generosities to sufferers by fire; his marriage of a lady without a farthing portion etc..are no signs of a covetous temper...Neither had he reason to be jealous of his wife, who behaved in all things to his humour without reproach. It is safer to believe that melancholy, blood and tediousness for life prevailed upon him to commit this action. ‘Tis said he attempted this twice before. Some say the reduction of interest on East India bonds to three per cent, of which he had the value of £100,000...concurred to fix him in this attempt.

Egmont’s diary entry for Sunday 28 March goes on to relate another suicide attempt two days after he hanged himself: ‘went in the evening to chapel. This day I heard Sir Gregory determined not to live had shot himself’. Fortunately Sir Gregory survived the shooting and he went on to live until 1775. He is an extreme example of the confusion that seems to have dogged the lives of the merchant’s sons, some of whom went on to become second wave Palladians, but who were neither true merchants, nor fully integrated members of the upper classes.

Wricklemarsh was an important building for neo-Palladianism as a style both for wealthy merchants looking for a style to embrace in the establishment of their family seats and for later neo-Palladian country houses. Wricklemarsh follows the Wanstead genre in that it was the result of a new fortune inherited by a man who seems to have been unprepared for wealth on this scale; certainly his father had not seen the need to educate Page sufficiently for him to be able to disburse his fortune with confidence in his own taste and virtue, leading him, in later life, to avoid the company he had courted as a young man. Page’s adoption of the neo-Palladian style makes it clear that he recognised the advantages that this style could bestow upon those who adopted it: advantages that would convey to the on-looker the learned and virtuous state of mind of the style’s sponsor. Brushe has stated that Wricklemarsh needs to be restored to its ‘rightful place in the history of the Anglo-Palladian great house’ and speculates that it was only
James' loyalty to Christopher Wren and the early demolition of the house that prevented its being accepted as a 'house which was to be as influential as Campbell's Wanstead'.

Certainly Wricklemarsh was widely known and its construction would have been followed with interest by Page's merchant acquaintances. It is likely that James won several commissions within the merchant circle as a direct result of the patronage relationship between himself and Page. James would have become better known after the great contemporary acclaim with which Wricklemarsh's completion was greeted although, surprisingly, he is not known to have designed another truly neo-Palladian building, contenting himself with the increasing use of Palladian motifs in future commissions. The Greenwich architect seems to have been a favourite of the great early eighteenth-century merchants, working with Governor Pitt at Swallowfield, and being well known by William Benson, John Aislabie, Sir James Bateman of Shobden Court (VB), Sir Gilbert Heathcote (VB) and James Johnston (VB), the last three of whom were directors of the South Sea Company. James' infiltration of the merchant circle is highlighted by his selection in 1726 to oversee the building works of the new East India Company Headquarters in Leadenhall Street which, although he was not responsible for the design, were built in a functional, plain neo-Palladian style.

John James was also employed by Thomas 'Governor' Pitt (VB), the famous diamond merchant, at his house in Swallowfield from 1718-1724. The building Pitt bought in 1718 was essentially a William Talman (VB) house built by Lord Clarendon in the 1690s. James' roles at Pitt's estate included those of Surveyor, Architect and Landscape Gardener, although the roles were not considered separately at that time. From the correspondence between Governor Pitt and his son Robert it would seem that James' earliest involvement at Swallowfield was 1718. On 19 August that year Governor Pitt wrote to his son that 'I went on Thursday to Swallowfield; Colonel Otway [Governor of Jamaica] and Mr James were with me...We ordered many alterations which will I fear put me to vast expense...The house has been made much more cheerfuller by the cutting down of trees'. James' work consisted of remodelling the interior of the house, for which no records survive, making additions to the west of the house, building a stables and extending a service wing. He also built coach-houses, stables and farm buildings on the estate. The Governor's external works, consisted of a formally designed landscape, the construction of a five-arched bridge and a walled garden which were both built in 1722 as indicated by the date stones bearing the initials 'TP' for Thomas Pitt (see Plates 50 and 51). A bathing house or bagnio, now demolished, completed James' garden buildings at Swallowfield and was built in 1724. The creation of formal canals, basons and a cascade, were also part of James' brief. Evidence of the canals is still extant in the landscape and the
formal nature of the overall design confirms the style of the garden as being based on the formalism of London and Wise (see Plate 52).

James’ construction of the neo-Palladian Wricklemarsh, concurrent with his employment at Swallowfield, could have led to the cross-fertilisation of design ideas between the two houses, although this does not seem to have occurred, externally at any rate. Pitt knew the Page family well, years before Wricklemarsh had been started, again through the machinations of trade. Despite this association with both Page and the other neo-Palladian merchants however, no evidence survives to place the great alterations at Swallowfield, which amounted to £19,000 by 1723, within the realms of neo-Palladianism. In fact what remains of the building indicates that any similarity between the pioneer Palladian building of Wricklemarsh and Swallowfield is limited, externally at least, to a consciously selected plain classical style. Swallowfield today is composed of the 1690s Talman core which forms the central element to the building and which was substantially altered in the 1820s, and James’ work of between 1718 and 1724 which comprises the extensions to the west as discussed; their plain brick classical style matching the five-arched bridge, also by James and devoid of all decoration barring a stone sundial (see Plates 53 and 54). What remains at Swallowfield is almost transitory in style, being neither Baroque nor neo-Palladian but favouring a stark, plain classicism similar to Bolingbroke’s remodelling of the proto-Palladian Dawley discussed above.

The Governor’s links with the other merchants of this circle meant that he had knowledge of the great neo-Palladian houses being built by his peers, at least one of which was being constructed by the son of his arch-enemy, Sir Josiah Child. Pitt took part in highly risky privateering and preyed on French ships in the East Indies. As a young man of twenty-one he secured his passage to the East Indies as an employee of the East India Company where, upon arrival in 1674, he abandoned the Company and established himself as an Interloper or free trader, defying the trading monopoly of the East India Company. One of Pitt’s severest critics and personal enemies was Sir Josiah Child of Wanstead, a director of the Company from as early as 1677. The despotic Child, who has been described as a ‘subtle, smug, self-seeking and self-righteous London speculator [who was] pitiless of the many victims whose ruin had made him the richest man of his day’, missed no opportunity to try and put an end to Pitt’s adventures, ordering his arrest on several occasions. Pitt ignored the many injunctions against him however and slipped through the fingers of the authorities on nearly every occasion. By 1688 he had been admitted to the freedom of the East India Company, whose members appear to have realised that if he could not be beaten he should join them. The company cleverly marshalled Pitt’s great mercantile prowess and appointed him as the Governor of Fort St George, Madras, in 1697 which led to an extremely successful trading period for the Company. This act called
down the wrath of the aging Josiah Child who responded by describing the appointment as ‘the worst I ever knew them [East India Company] to do was lately in the sending of that roughling immoral man Mr____ to India last year, which everybody knows I was against’.\textsuperscript{105}

Although a patent loathing existed between the two traders they were nonetheless well acquainted through their mercantile activities and Pitt would have been fully cognisant of Sir Richard Child’s continuing architectural and landscaping activities at Wanstead, including the latter’s employment of Mr Holland to build a water engine in the park. John Theophilus Desaguliers, the premier water engineer of the time, records this Mr Holland as being the same man who was cheated by William Benson when he stole his engine design and passed it off as his own for George I’s Herrenhausen cascade.\textsuperscript{106} Early neo-Palladian experimentation with hydraulics in the landscape was not unusual and it is clear that Sir Richard Child was one of those indulging in such pursuits with the aim of creating water cascades and fountains for the formal landscape that formed the all important backdrop to Wanstead House.

The Pitt papers prove that Governor Pitt followed in Child’s footsteps, and when the diamond merchant eventually settled back in England in 1718, he also employed Mr Holland for the garden at Swallowfield. This is recorded in a letter from Robert Pitt, writing from the other family property of Boconnoc in Cornwall, to his father on 25 August 1720 where he writes

\begin{quote}
I’ll endeavour to get Messrs James and Holland with mee, and in everything I am capable off, wee’l concert such things as may answer ye purposes effectually for wch you design ‘em\textsuperscript{107};
\end{quote}

The letter implies that Pitt himself had a hand in designing the garden, a fact that speaks clearly through his other letters. This interest in the landscape is something Pitt shared with John Aislabie, the merchant neo-Palladian responsible for the creation of Studley Royal. Pitt and Aislabie would have been known to each through the East India Company and also through both being Commissioners for the Building of Fifty New Churches.\textsuperscript{108} Pitt continued to employ both James and Holland for at least the next six years at Swallowfield, as demonstrated by another letter written by Robert Pitt to his father 7 September 1726 where he writes,

\begin{quote}
as far as ye canal at Swallowfield, I think its widening is very great improvement and when tis full of water (it was when I was there) it kept clean, will be very fine. I was not able to walk into ye [?] ye day, being very tender in my feate but I will look into ye management of that and everything else as well as I can when I go thither Tuesday next, where I expect Mr James and Mr Holland will not fail to meet me.\textsuperscript{109}
\end{quote}
Jeffery highlights the many occasions in the correspondence subsequent to this letter, where Pitt discusses his ‘engine’ or his ‘project’. Her conclusion is that ‘presumably the project was some kind of machine to pump water’ and that ‘details of the machine have yet to come to light’. The research here has shown exactly what kind of machine this was, the reverse-lock pumping machine that could create fountains and cascades, and also shows how the early neo-Palladians, including the merchants Sir Richard Child, William Benson and Governor Pitt, were taking advantage of the technology. Whilst Pitt was not building in the neo-Palladian style, at least externally, at Swallowfield, it certainly appears that he was designing a formal landscape, pursuant to the style of London and Wise, which was the preferred style used by other merchants in creating a setting for their early neo-Palladian/proto-Palladian houses. Pitt’s close connections with the other merchant neo-Palladians, his subscription to Vitruvius Britannicus, as well as his use of the newest hydraulics technology, used in gardens specifically created to surround the neo-Palladian or proto-Palladian houses of the era, seems at odds with the weak plain classical style he adopted for his stables and service wing.

An additional piece of circumstantial evidence relating to Pitt and his likely architectural preferences concerns Chevening House, Kent. In his recent article Andor Gomme presents the case for Chevening as having been designed by Inigo Jones concluding that, ‘if Chevening is not Jonesian, it is certainly Palladian’ and then returning to H. A. Tipping’s conclusion that ‘there cannot be the smallest doubt that Inigo Jones was the designer, as there was certainly no-one else in England at that time who could have done it’. Gomme also discusses the work carried out to the house by Thomas Fort soon after 1717 when it became the property of Lord Stanhope. In the context of this early eighteenth-century work Gomme concludes that,

If Badeslade’s drawing may be taken as a rough idea of what Chevening looked like directly after Fort’s work there, it seems reasonable to suppose that he and Stanhope together were influenced by Campbell’s ‘Palladianized’ version of a house whose overall form the latter wanted, for reasons of architectural politics, to record in his book [Vitruvius Britannicus].

Chevening and its style are relevant to Pitt because Stanhope married Pitt’s daughter Lucy in 1712 and, unlike the turbulent relationships he had with his other children, Pitt remained close to Lucy throughout his life, becoming firm friends with his son-in-law, Lord Stanhope. Stanhope was instrumental in obtaining posts in government for Pitt’s three sons and in particular attempting to advance Pitt’s rather hopeless eldest son Robert. The correspondence between the father and son-in-law highlights the respect that Pitt had for Stanhope as a
successful military man and, latterly, as a politician as well. Both men were staunch Whigs and the latter, in an attempt to assist his new and powerful son-in-law, rushed down to Blandford in Dorset to raise an army against the 1715 rebellion.\textsuperscript{115} It is highly likely that Pitt, who had always wanted to establish what he called a ‘county family’\textsuperscript{116} would have been influenced by his son-in-law’s architectural choices, a circumstance that is perhaps indicated by both men subscribing to the last two volumes of \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus}, the 1717 volume of which contains the plates of Chevening House.\textsuperscript{117} That the Governor was familiar with the palladianised Chevening is made clear by his close relationship with his daughter and son-in-law and the fact that he himself employed James to survey additions to the house at Chevening in 1721, presumably as a favour to Lucy after the untimely death of Stanhope that same year.\textsuperscript{118} It is interesting to note that Stanhope also had one of Holland’s engines in use at Chevening, indicating that he too was making use of hydraulics in the garden to complement his neo-Palladian alterations to the house.\textsuperscript{119}

A final point of interest relating to Pitt’s likely stylistic preference is to be found in his will and his early correspondence. As early as 1703 Pitt was corresponding with the 8th Earl of Pembroke (VB) of Wilton House in Wiltshire, and after the Governor’s death in 1726, it was discovered that the Earl had been named as an executor of his will.\textsuperscript{120} The correspondence between the two men is not detailed but relates to the election in Old Sarum where Pitt was a Whig MP on the interest of the Earl in 1690 and re-elected in 1710, 1714 and 1715.\textsuperscript{121} On one occasion, in September 1703, Pitt writes to his son from Fort St George, informing him that ‘...My Lord Pembroke gives you his interest’\textsuperscript{122} Clearly the Earl was writing to Pitt in India and Pitt had recently received a letter. That Pitt was also writing to Pembroke from Fort St George is demonstrated by another letter to Robert Pitt, written 28 December 1708, where he writes ‘I have here enclosed an answer to my Lord Pembrook ... which pray you deliver ’em...’\textsuperscript{123} At the very least this political association suggests a general acquaintance with the Earl and, as a local MP, also with his Palladian house at Wilton and his Palladian son, the 9\textsuperscript{th} Earl. The Swallowfield stable, bridge and service wing’s rather watery simple classical style does not fit well with what is known of Thomas Pitt and the connections he had, from which one might assume that, if he had to make an architectural choice, that he would decide for neo-Palladianism. Whilst clearly a supporter of the new style, which his subscription to \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus} indicates, the choices Pitt made at Swallowfield are not those of an avid neo-Palladian: perhaps a situation that reflects his being a sexagenarian when he commenced building works and his characteristic parsimony.\textsuperscript{124}
SECOND-WAVE NEO-PALLADIAN MERCHANTS

A common element in the lives of the merchants discussed above, as well as other merchants who subscribed to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, but did little themselves to further the style, is the adoption of the neo-Palladianism by their sons and grandsons. This is not an unexpected phenomenon given that the style had become more universally popular by the 1730s and 1740s, but is a recurring pattern in the lives of successful merchants and, as such, merits further examination.

As discussed Sir Josiah Child’s son, Sir Richard Child, went on to build the pioneering neo-Palladian Wanstead House whilst Gregory Page II’s son did the same at Wricklemarsh. Although these two merchants were first wave neo-Palladians in that they were part of the first flush of the style, Page and Child highlight how the sons of wealthy financiers were at liberty to enter the arts in a way that their fathers could not. However, this is to put the case lightly. More than just being at liberty to follow the arts often the sons of merchants were strongly encouraged to follow gentlemanly pursuits; their cultural education being seen as the means by which the family could enter the hallowed portals of the upper classes. In some cases the sons were deliberately excluded from the trade of their fathers and set aside for a greater destiny. Whilst this situation advanced the progress of neo-Palladianism in some circumstances, it had the potential to create a confusion of identity for the sons.

Sir James Bateman, (1660-1718) subscriber to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, director of the East India Company, Sub-Governor of the South Sea Company, director of the Bank of England, Alderman and Lord Mayor of London as well as being a great friend of Governor Pitt, provides the first example of a successful merchant whose son was given every opportunity to rise to great heights due to his father’s fortune. Bateman inherited Shobdon Court in Herefordshire in 1705 and, although a subscriber to the first two volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, did not himself advance the cause of neo-Palladianism. Campbell’s inclusion of Shobdon in his second volume may indicate an expectation on his part that Bateman would make a useful patron if he could be persuaded to commence the remodelling of the building in the new idiom. Both Bateman’s sons were educated as gentlemen, his second son, also Sir James, subscribed to all three volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus*. Bateman’s first son, William, became an MP for Leominster and married Lady Anne Spencer, the daughter of the 3rd Earl of Sunderland (VB) in 1720. He was later raised to the peerage by George I who initially made him an Irish peer in 1725 to avoid making him a Knight of the Bath stating ‘I can make him a Lord but I cannot make him a gentleman’.

This attitude is indicative of the level of actual integration that, despite great wealth and a good education, merchants’ sons managed to achieve in reality. It
was William, as Viscount Bateman I, who built Shobdon Court upon his inheritance of the estate in 1718. Shobdon displays not the least part of the neo-Palladian style externally and it was only once the first Viscount had absconded to the continent after accusations of homosexuality were made against him that the second Viscount, his son John, could begin. It was John who employed Henry Flitcroft to remodel the interior of Shobdon in the neo-Palladian style in 1744.

Another merchant whose wealth gave rise to a second wave neo-Palladian country house was John Monckton of Hodroyd (VB), subscriber to the third volume of Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*. Monckton was Lord of Trade between 1706 and 1713 and MP for Clitheroe 1734-1747. He was created Viscount Galway in 1727 and bought the estate of Serlby in Nottinghamshire that same year. An original member of the Dilettanti Society, Galway razed the village and parish church of Farworth to the ground in order to make way for a formal garden and also laid the foundations of a new house at Serlby. It was his son however, the second Viscount Galway, who eventually built in the neo-Palladian style at the estate selecting James Paine for the task. The house is tri-partite with each block being topped by a large pediment spanning the whole width of the building. The two side pavilions appear to be sinking into the ground under the weight of the pediment, which is not supported by columns. In contrast to this effect, the middle bays of the central pavilion, topped with a separate pediment, seem to be bursting through the lower pediment, giving the appearance of a seed forcing its way upwards out of its casing. Although simple and stark, the heavy handed approach to the design removes any claims it may have had to elegance. Serlby has not been dated exactly but it is likely that it was started sometime in the late 1740s or early 1750s.

A brief return to Stourhead shows that Henry Hoare II was also highly educated and expected to pursue classical tastes, following in his father’s footsteps at the estate after he died in 1725. It seems that Henry Hoare I wished his son to be kept out of trade, destined instead for a life of gentlemanly pursuits without the burden of having to work for a living. As G A Clay has discussed, Henry I left all his property to his eldest son Henry II, simply providing a payout to his second son Richard and thereby indicating that he meant his eldest son to be a landed country gentleman. This was not an uncommon situation, given the tradition of primogeniture but when coupled with a lengthy period of leisure enjoyed by Hoare II, as well as Hoare I’s will, sheds light on the father’s intentions for the son. Hoare I’s will left instructions for the extrication of his entire share of the business from the bank; in effect his death was to signal the end of his own family’s involvement in Hoare’s bank. Hoare II complied with his father’s desires for a while and lived the life of a country gentleman at his estate in Quarley, Hampshire. This life of ease was short-lived however. Clay describes an undefined crisis befalling the bank.
during this period of Hoare II’s leisure which, he suggests, was directly related to the withdrawal of three-quarters of the bank’s funds by Hoare I. Whatever the cause of the crisis, it was enough to bring about Hoare II’s entrance into commerce, despite his father’s wishes to the contrary. He acquired a strong taste for finance and became a pillar of the Bank, ruling it as unchallenged senior partner for over thirty years. Hoare II’s willingness to embrace his father’s world is summed up in his own words to his nephew Richard in 1755 where he stated that…..’[The Bank] ought to be the first and last of all our thoughts and the chief happy business and employment of our whole lives. I with gratitude must allow I have always found it so…”

Hoare II himself is perhaps the only one of the merchants sons to have been able to successfully and contentedly tread the line between being a merchant as well as a country gentleman. Throughout his life Hoare II continued to adorn his estate with neo-classical buildings and references to ancient Rome. Guided by his own education and his Uncle Benson’s taste Hoare employed the Burlingtonian designer Henry Flitcroft (VB) to create neo-Classical garden buildings.

Interestingly Hoare II did not appear to have viewed the creation of an Arcadian landscape, complete with antique garden buildings, as being in any way inappropriate in its role as the surrounding environment to the obviously neo-Palladian Stourhead house. Twentieth century attempts to arbitrarily define and codify the classical style of the eighteenth century were not paralleled by anything similar at the time. The evolving revival of classicism which occurred throughout the eighteenth century begun with the Baroque, moving through phases of different classical emphases, including neo-Palladianism and into what is now termed the neo-Classical revival of the mid century. This was a single process however, and can be seen as a constant striving, over the course of the century, to portray an accurate ancient architecture. By the time Hoare II began the remodelling of the landscape at Stourhead, c1733, his classical education, coupled with the aesthetic mood, equipped him to move beyond the neo-Palladian interpretation of classical architecture, towards what he clearly perceived was a more accurate emulation of the classical ideal. Twenty years earlier the neo-Palladian interpretation of classical architecture had led to the creation of Stourhead house by his father and it is important to note that there is no evidence of a conscious turning away from such an interpretation or the proactive selection of a different style. The creation of the Arcadian landscape with its antique buildings simply represents Hoare’s classical thinking and demonstrates how the vision of correct classical architecture had progressed.
Hoare's confidence was such that he, with the help of classically-trained architects, was able to move beyond Palladio's representation of classical Roman architecture and develop his own.\textsuperscript{134} His use of the Burlingtonian Flitcroft to explore ancient architecture makes it clear that his search for greater authenticity was in no way an abandonment of neo-Palladianism, merely a natural and progressive step in the continuing search for a true and harmonious architecture. Hoare's arcadia and antique garden buildings therefore build upon the existing neo-Palladianism of the estate.

Philip Ayres has discussed Hoare's contemplation of the distance between 'the Gentleman' and 'the Vulgar' as being one of his 'principal pleasures'.\textsuperscript{135} Hoare's mercantile background and the influence of his own father in trying to remove him from trade, would have fed his desire to be considered learned and virtuous. It was therefore crucial to Hoare that he discovered and adhered to the true principles of ancient architecture. If he was to develop a reputation for virtuosity by association with the ancients, as depicted in his landscape and buildings, it was of paramount importance that his interpretation of this classicism was correct. It was perhaps this concern for accuracy that led to Hoare being one of the earliest to further the search for a truly neo-Classical architecture both beyond the bounds of rigid neo-Palladianism and incorporating it.

The better organisation and consolidation of financial and mercantile activities in the early eighteenth century created an integrated circle of wealthy merchants. Traditionally studies of eighteenth century architectural style have focussed on the aristocracy and landed gentry as being the social group facilitating the growth or decline of a type of architecture. Research here has shown that, for neo-Palladianism in its early years, the integrated social network of merchants, traders and brokers was of even greater importance than the aristocratic circle of the time. The first three true neo-Palladian houses of the early eighteenth century were Wilbury, Shawfield and Wanstead, all three of which were commissioned and built by merchants. In their eagerness to join the ranks of the upper classes, these merchants were prepared to be stylistically \textit{avant garde}. The great contribution made to neo-Palladianism by these financiers was their willingness to support the style, and crucially to provide built examples of it, when it was in its fledgling stage. The built examples became famous for their very newness of design and would have attracted publicity thus helping to disseminate the style and its ideals.

After 1715 when Campbell had published volume one of \textit{Vitruvius Britannicus} and Giacomo Leoni's \textit{Four Books of Architecture} had also been published, neo-Palladianism became more well-known. The merchants' buildings were then available as eighteenth century interpretations of Palladio's work to be used as templates for interested aesthetes to use in the design of new
buildings. The neo-Palladian merchants of the later years including Page, Decker and Hoare should be viewed much less as pioneers of the new style with a genuine passion for its tenets and much more as men willing to exploit an opportunity for self-advancement when it arose. As a style neo-Palladianism was an intrinsic part of the ‘justification by antiquity’ phenomenon raging through early eighteenth century England. It was imbued with cultural values such as taste, learnedness and virtue, and these values, which use of the style implied, reflected well on the user. The later merchants who subscribed to the style used it as a means of self-advancement. Among the mercantile fraternity an especially strong ambition for family establishment and gentrification begs the question whether these later merchants chose the style for its own sake at all or entirely for what it could bring to them.
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CHAPTER 6

THE HAUT TON, NEO-PALLADIANISM AND THE 4TH EARL OF CHESTERFIELD

It was perhaps at Dawley, the hub of Bolingbroke’s Tory circle, where the eccentric and stunningly beautiful Catherine Hyde, 3rd Duchess of Queensberry (1700-1777) first became friends with the poet and playwright John Gay (1685-1732).¹ The Duchess appears to have been an extreme character with little regard for the rules of society; she once wore an apron to a full dress ball and was nicknamed ‘the milkmaid’ for her shocking disrespect for fashion.² With a lack of concern for prevailing social mores the Duchess was an ideal friend for a rising artist of Gay’s then relatively uncelebrated status and, whatever the circumstances of their meeting, she became the warmest ally and most influential patroness Gay was ever to have. Her persistence on his behalf established the poet as a prominent figure in high society. Their friendship endured and, after losses sustained through speculating on the South Sea scheme followed by a serious illness and a failure to secure a profitable enough sinecure at court, Gay was invited to live with the Duke and Duchess of Queensberry at Amesbury Abbey in Wiltshire.³ This ducal seat was designed by John Webb a short time before the Restoration in 1660 but, at the time of Gay’s residence, which commenced in 1727, it was thought to have been the work of the Palladian Inigo Jones, the architectural hero of the age.⁴ It was here, in the landscape of Amesbury, and more precisely within a romantic, pedimented grotto centred on a diamond-shaped lawn within woodland, that Gay pursued Jonathan Swift’s suggestion of writing a ‘Newgate Pastoral’ and The Beggar’s Opera was conceived.⁵

The play was to become one of the key social and political satires of the decade, lampooning the behaviour of the court and aristocracy, and barely disguising an attack on Sir Robert Walpole. At this distance of time it is impossible to tell how much of Gay’s commentary on society and its political leaders was influenced by the neo-Palladian architecture that he experienced whilst writing the play at Amesbury, an aesthetic that was imbued with all the aspects of strict virtuosity which classicism could inspire in the eighteenth century. However the fact that he wrote at Amesbury what was at that time the most successful play ever to be performed on the English stage, does highlight the role that neo-Palladianism could, and did have, as a background to contemporary events and behaviour in society. The style did not stand alone as a separate entity but, perhaps more than any other architectural aesthetic in that century, formed an integral part of the philosophy and social culture of the time. Neo-Palladian style was inseparably intertwined with early-eighteenth century societal values and it is impossible to discern which had more influence on the other. The great value of society in this age has not been examined in any detail in this respect and thus part of the historical context.

¹ Fry, C. A. 2006, Chapter 6

² Fry, C. A. 2006, Chapter 6

³ Fry, C. A. 2006, Chapter 6
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⁵ Fry, C. A. 2006, Chapter 6
within which neo-Palladianism developed, has, to date, been missing from analyses of this architectural period. The objective here is to examine society, its patterns and grand events as catalysts in establishing networks and fostering relationships which facilitated the dissemination of neo-Palladian architectural ideas.

CHESTERFIELD'S EARLY CAREER

'The Modes of the Court so common are grown,
That a true friend can hardly be met;
Friendship for interest is but a loan,
Which they let out for what they can get.'

Philip Dormer Stanhope, styled Lord Stanhope until 1726 when he became the 4th Earl of Chesterfield, (VB), (1694-1773) had numerous connections and an all-pervading involvement in the ton of this era. He was a leading figure of the haut ton and this fact, coupled with the late-flowering example of neo-Palladianism at his own London home, Chesterfield House, makes him a useful vehicle through which to assess the importance of society to the style. He was also at the forefront of the arts in society and knew John Gay well enough to be chosen as a pall-bearer at his funeral in 1732. An examination of the Earl’s life, focussing on those times where he was most involved in society and its architecture, will demonstrate the connections and social contacts that were useful in the dissemination of neo-Palladianism.

Chesterfield has always been one of the most discussed figures of the eighteenth century both during his own lifetime and since the first publication of his letters to his son by his daughter-in-law, Mrs Eugenia Stanhope, in 1774. His controversial advice to his offspring has been defended as well as maligned over the years and his letters described as teaching ‘the morals of a whore and the manners of a dancing master’. It is not the intention here to discuss the morality of his correspondence but instead to allow it to inform this research regarding the role of society in the eighteenth century and the effect it had on neo-Palladianism. Chesterfield’s letters demonstrate the great contemporary value placed upon virtue, appropriate learning and compliance with social etiquette; a value that is crucial to our understanding of the flourishing of neo-Palladianism. The letters to his son, as well as the extant correspondence to Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk, (VB), and others, provide a valuable insight into the interaction between architecture and society as well as Chesterfield the man.

As a child Chesterfield was removed from the care of his unhappily married parents and sent to live with his grandmother, Lady Halifax, in London. His disinterested father jeered at his son in
letters to his friends and once responded to Dr Atterbury’s offer to visit the eight year old Chesterfield on his father’s behalf in 1703 in the following vein:

I am very much obliged to you, for the service you offer to do for me at St James; but in that undertaking I really do think you will only lose your time and to no purpose; for I expect nothing from the gentleman that is there, but to see him bred up an ignorant, worthless, amorous fop.9

Chesterfield was also disadvantaged by his physical appearance. He was an unattractive man with a large head and bad teeth (see Plate 55). His small stature led him to comment at the end of his life that ‘I have wished myself taller a thousand times, but to no purpose, for all the Stanhopes are but a size of dwarfs’.10 His lack of paternal care, which amounted to bullying, when combined with his physical shortcomings led to an obsession with deportment, manners and achieving social acceptability both for himself and his son.11 An example of the severe constraints which Chesterfield imposed upon himself, and later his offspring, in his attempts to appear rational and educated, and therefore socially acceptable, can be seen in his attitude towards laughter. Although living in an age where suspicion was cast on enthusiasm Chesterfield’s advice to his son still presents itself as extreme;

Having mentioned laughing I must particularly warn you against it: and I could heartily wish that you may be seen often to smile, but never heard to laugh while you live. Frequent and loud laughter is the characteristic of folly and ill manners... In my mind there is nothing so illiberal, and so ill bred, as audible laughter... I am neither of a melancholy nor a cynical disposition; and am as willing; and as apt to be pleased as anyone, but I am sure that, since I have had the full use of my reason, nobody has ever heard me laugh.12

Chesterfield was related through his father to James Stanhope, the 1st Earl of Stanhope of Chevening in Kent, (VB), (1673-1721) (see Plate 13).13 The two men were only second cousins with a gap of twenty-one years between them, but, with a shrewdness which was to typify his career, Chesterfield took full advantage of the connection with his older cousin to launch himself into politics. A brave and brilliant statesman, Stanhope was revered after his death by Chesterfield for being ‘as able and honest a minister as ever served the crown...he had the happiness of his country so much at heart that he neglected his own’.14 Other contemporary descriptions of Stanhope include those by the French statesman Guillaume Dubois, who called him ‘un philosophe’ and Speaker Onslow who referred to him as ‘the best scholar perhaps of any gentleman of his time’.15 Stanhope had a dazzling military career throughout Europe which
ended in a disastrous capture at Brihuega, Spain, during the War of Spanish Succession. His correspondence during his two year imprisonment bears witness to history's reports of his integrity and greatness as a statesman. On 21 February 1711 Stanhope wrote from his prison in Valladolid to Sir John Cropley, secretary to the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, stating that

I am sensible how much you will have been concerned at our misfortune both for the public and for my sake I did everything I thought for the best; fortune hath crushed me and I know no remedy but patience. I am sensible how I shall be arraigned in England but I assure you it is not half so mortifying to me as the consequences to the public....Pray my hearty service to my Lord Shaftesbury, if I continue long a prisoner, which is not unlikely I shall grow a Philosopher having no other comfort but books, but even those are not to be found here...I believe I have done with the public for my lifetime.

In this last prediction he was wrong however and, after his release in 1712 and subsequent efforts to secure the Hanoverian Succession, was rewarded with the post of Secretary of State and Leader of the House of Commons by George I, four days before his arrival in England in 1714. In this position of power Stanhope assisted his younger cousin to his first employment as MP for St Germans, Cornwall, and as Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales in 1715. Just as Chesterfield's early political success can be attributed to the efforts of his magnanimous cousin, it is also probable that his adoption of neo-Palladianism can be laid, quite literally, at Stanhope's door. In 1748 Chesterfield begun building Chesterfield House in the neo-Palladian style but prior to this he was, due to the company he chose to associate with, party to numerous neo-Palladian projects throughout his lifetime. The first of these, and perhaps the project that alerted him to the virtues of the style, and its potential usefulness for an ambitious statesman, was the neo-Palladian work carried out by his cousin at Chevening.

Stanhope acquired the estate in 1717 believing it to have been the work of Inigo Jones. In the same year Stanhope and his wife Lucy Pitt, daughter of the merchant 'Diamond Pitt' of Swallowfield, employed Thomas Fort to carry out extensive, neo-Palladian works which included the addition of two pedimented wings to the north-west and north-east of the main block, attached by sweeping quadrants. A formal garden was planned and the windows of the house were updated from seventeenth century croisées casements to sashes, in line with the eighteenth century idea of neo-Palladianism. The design was included by Colen Campbell in his second volume of Vitruvius Britannicus and knowledge of this may have played a part in influencing Stanhope’s architectural choices. Work was already underway in 1717, the year that Stanhope became Viscount Mahon, and his interest in architecture was no secret. This is
borne out by a letter Stanhope received as early as 5 October 1717 which was already referring to his architectural knowledge. The letter, written by Lord Molesworth, places great value on Stanhope’s architectural opinion though Molesworth’s flattery does reveal an agenda based partly upon the Earl’s great influence at court. Stanhope’s remarkable early adoption of neo-Palladianism is often over-shadowed in accounts of his life by his military and political greatness. Due to the importance of Stanhope’s early neo-Palladian changes and additions to Chevening, a building which has been described by Andor Gomme as ‘one of the most remarkable and important buildings in the history of English domestic architecture’, it is worth quoting the letter in full:

Tho’ Your Lp has a world of business as a Treasurer you must at a convenient time afford an hour or 2, to give us leave to appeal to you as a Virtuoso. Sgn. Galilei (whose skill and tast in Architecture far excels any persons who has yet bin in Britain) had drawn so noble a design for a Royal Pallace at Whitehall, that I dare promise (without fearing my discretion should be called into question) you will when you see it think it worth showing to ye king: And which is more, a project is formed to execute this design by raising money by the Sale of ye Savoy Mewes and other useless as well as Ugly buildings without any monstrous additional charge to ye crown or ye Publick.

I hope ye state of affaires will afford you the leisure to unbend yr mind a little & if so that yr Lp will appoint such a convenient time either in town or at yr Villa wherein mr Hewett [Sir Thomas Hewett] my eldest Son [John Molesworth, British Envoy to the Tuscan Court 1710-1714] Sign. Galilei and (if you can engage him) Sir George Markham (ase of the new Junta for Architecture) should wait upon you. You shall see not only the design for Whitehall but severall others of Pallaces and churches which I am sure will please and divert out of your good Gusto.

Stanhope’s being consulted by the self-styled ‘Junta for Architecture’, a small pressure group that was actively turning away from the extravagance of the Baroque towards the development of a simpler style, lends weight to the theory that his changes at Chevening were a conscious move towards neo-Palladianism. The chain of events that led to Stanhope’s early and advanced interest in this style of architecture, an aesthetic that was shortly to become synonymous with good taste, is unknown. It is notable however that he shared a close friendship with Anthony Ashley Cooper, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, and further research may yet confirm a more specific call towards neo-Palladianism than has so far been attributed to the Philosopher.
In light of Stanhope’s sponsorship of his younger kinsman at Court, and Chesterfield’s timely return to England from Paris in 1717 when works were underway at Chevening, it is impossible that Chesterfield remained ignorant of what would have been strikingly modern architectural improvements at that estate.\(^31\) It is just as impossible that a man of Chesterfield’s ambition could have remained unaware of the value of association with correct taste in architecture or indeed any other of the arts. Chesterfield himself was to advise his son to ‘Know then, that … learning, honour and virtue are absolutely necessary to gain you the esteem and admiration of mankind’.\(^32\) The Earl’s great attention to image and to the manners of society was a character trait that informed all his decisions and, as a man obsessed with self-presentation and advancement, he could no more ignore the social rituals of age than the arts and philosophy which informed them. It is likely therefore that Chesterfield’s architectural preferences, which were eventually manifested in his large mansion at Mayfair, were formed at this early stage when he saw his influential relative adopt the style.

**AMBITION AND ARCHITECTURE**

As Chesterfield’s career progressed he became a leading member of several social and familial circles experimenting with neo-Palladianism. Already related to the ‘noble Maecenas of Arts’, Lord Burlington,\(^33\) through the marriage of his intemperate cousin Dorothy Savile to him in 1721, Chesterfield’s own sister, Gertrude, went on to marry Sir Charles Hotham, 5th bt., in 1724. Hotham’s father, Sir Charles Hotham, 4th bt., had built one of the earliest neo-Palladian villas in England, New Hotham House in Beverley, Yorkshire, which was designed in 1716 by Colen Campbell and published in *Vitruvius Britannicus*, volume two. This early neo-Palladian project by his father made an impact upon Sir Charles Hotham and, although this early Campbell house did not meet the younger Hotham’s requirements, he went on to design a much more ambitious neo-Palladian house at South Dalton in the 1730s.\(^34\) It is most likely that Hotham and Chesterfield knew each other via their Yorkshire connections, both descending from good county families. This acquaintance would have been furthered in London through the positions that they held at court: both were members of the Prince of Wales’ retinue, Chesterfield as a Gentleman of the Bedchamber and Hotham as a friend of the Prince and then as Groom of the Bedchamber.\(^35\) Gertrude’s marriage to Hotham in 1724 would have been a suitable alliance for both families and the progressive neo-Palladian taste of the Hothams, now members of his own clan, would not have escaped Chesterfield’s notice.\(^36\)

Throughout the second decade of the eighteenth century Chesterfield was making the social connections essential for his future career at Court. Very early in his professional life he was forced, as were all courtiers, to decide either for the King or for the Prince of Wales. The
irrevocable rift between father and son came in 1716 and called for clear allegiances on the part of all those at Court. As Chesterfield was already a member of the Prince’s household, he supported this scion of the Royal Family, paying court not only to the Prince but also to his mistress, Henrietta Howard (see Plate 56). With a shrewdness that was to characterise his entire political career Chesterfield befriended Mrs Howard, the future Countess of Suffolk and, as their correspondence bears out, a strong friendship was firmly established between the two which endured for their lifetimes. This bond was cemented after Mrs Howard was finally abandoned by George II in 1734 and retired from court marrying Lord Berkeley’s (VB) younger brother, George Berkeley, in 1737, a man with whom Chesterfield had been a close friend since their days at Trinity College, Cambridge. Chesterfield became a key member of the eighteenth-century intelligentsia which Mrs Howard gathered around her at her neo-Palladian villa on the Thames.

During Mrs Howard’s period of ascendancy at George II’s court, and with an eye to her future, she commenced the building of the overtly neo-Palladian Marble Hill, so called after a similarly named parcel of land on the estate which she acquired (see Plate 57). Building started in 1724, under the watchful eye of Roger Morris (VB) and Lord Herbert, later 9th Earl of Pembroke, and was complete by around 1729, where it became the focus for Henrietta’s personal court; a centre for the wits of the age, the aesthetes, the politicians and those seeking her influence with George II. Lord Herbert was closely associated with the young architect Roger Morris who probably started out as an assistant to Colen Campbell. Herbert was involved in several seminal neo-Palladian buildings including White Lodge at Richmond, the Palladian bridge at Wilton, and Wimbledon House in Surrey. Despite his involvement in these projects it is not known exactly how the nobleman participated in these early schemes. As Giles Worsley has stated ‘No authenticated drawings by him [Herbert] survive and he worked so closely with Roger Morris that his own architectural identity is blurred’.

The architecture of Marble Hill has been much analysed in the past due to its importance as the first neo-Palladian building whose construction was both sanctioned and financially aided by the royal purse. It is not the aim here to repeat such an analysis but instead to consider the importance of the villa as providing a neo-Palladian environment for those at the pinnacle of intelligent society. Marble Hill became a social hub assisting the dissemination of ideas in several fields including philosophy, the arts, politics and not least neo-Palladianism. Lord Burlington and the Earl of Pembroke, two prominent noblemen campaigning to palladianise England, were both frequent visitors to Marble Hill as were Alexander Pope, John Gay, Dean Swift, Dr Arbuthnot (VB), and Lord Chesterfield. Such was the nature of these gatherings that Pope and Gay resided at Marble Hill even when Mrs Howard was at court. Gay was in
residence at the villa in 1726, immediately prior to his flight to Amesbury to write *The Beggar's Opera* so that he was completely steeped in the atmosphere of neo-Palladianism before an intense period of creativity. A joint letter by Pope and Gay from this time illustrates how at home the poets were at Marble Hill:

> We think your hall the most delightful room in the world, except that where you are. If it was not for you we would forswear all courts; and really it is the most mortifying thing in nature, that we can neither get into the court to live with you, nor get you out into the country to live with us. So we will take up with what we can that belongs to you and make ourselves as happy as we can in your house. 

These often very lengthy gatherings or 'house-parties' of the *literati* and *luminati* were an extremely important part of the social structure within which the aristocracy operated in the early eighteenth century. The social hub at nearby Dawley House at Uxbridge, which pivoted on the great statesman Lord Bolingbroke, was a similar gathering of minds, this time for the Tories, of which Pope and Gay were also a part. The fact that Marble Hill was neo-Palladian indicates that the style was considered to be the very height of modernity and progression; the correct and appropriate context within which these powerful social interactions could take place.

In the early 1720s Chesterfield moved further up the political ladder. He became Captain of the Gentlemen Pensioners in 1723 only to be stripped of his position after refusing Walpole's offer of a Knighthood of the Bath in 1725 and roundly criticising all those who had accepted the honour. There then followed a dry period in his career and a difficult time of residence at his family seat in Bretby, Yorkshire waiting for his father to die. During these months away from court Chesterfield maintained a steady, and under the circumstances often amusing, correspondence with Henrietta Howard. On 23 October 1725 he wrote to her from Bretby stating that:

> How long he will continue so I can't tell, but this I am sure of that if it be much longer, I shall be the maddest of the two; this place being the seat of horror and despair... were I inclined to a religious melancholy I would fancy myself in Hell, but not having the happiness of being yet quite out of my senses, I fancy, what is worse than either, which is, that I am just where I am, in the old mansion seat of the family and that too, not alone.
Chesterfield did not return to London until the end of January the following year when he finally inherited the title of 4th Earl and went on to obtain the post of Lord of the Bedchamber in 1727.49

At about the time that Marble Hill was being completed Chesterfield gained his first serious political post as Ambassador to The Hague; his mission to persuade the Dutch to agree to the Treaties of Seville and Vienna.50 The Earl’s actions upon arriving in The Hague in 1728, which was then only a village surrounded by forests, indicate that he was ready for a period of intense pleasure.51 He launched himself into society there, drinking wildly and losing a fortune at gambling; behaviour which endeared him to the locals making him an extremely popular figure, but which he himself later condemned.52 The Earl had taken a modest house in The Hague but his lavish entertaining soon outstripped its ability to accommodate his requirements and he commenced his first architectural project, the building of a ballroom. Writing to Henrietta Howard in an undated letter he outlines his project, conversationally mentioning that:

The next remarkable thing here, is, that I am at present over head in ears, in mortar, and that I am building a room of 50 foot long, and 34 broad; whether these are the right proportions or no, I must submitt to you and Lord Herbert, who I hope will both be so good as to give me your Sentiments upon it. It will, I am sure have five great faults, which are five great windows, each of em bigg enough to lett in intolerable light, however such as it is, it will be [?] upon his Majesty’s Birth-day next...53

A second letter of 26 July 1729 to Mrs Howard indicates that the extension was somewhat grander than Chesterfield had alluded to in his earlier communication, although he protests, rather too strenuously, against this:

I assure you, you need not be alarmed by what Lord Albemarle and Mrs Macartney are pleas’d to call my Magnificence; for it is nothing like it, and only what is basely necessary, and as for the expense I should be very sorry to be a gainer by this or any other employment that the King may ever think fitt to give me.54

Chesterfield’s first letter is interesting in that, despite his self-deprecating manner, he clearly had a basic understanding of neo-Palladian architecture and the small window-to-wall ratio that the style commanded. A further letter to his son makes it clear that this architectural knowledge was far from basic. In reality, the Earl’s command of the style was so thorough that he could even use it as an analogy for instruction in social etiquette. The following lecture, for this is what it amounts to, indicates the great extent to which correct architecture was considered to be
a model for correct social behaviour and presentation, where each was expected to reflect the other:

I daresay you know already enough of Architecture to know that the Tuscan is the strongest and most solid of all the orders; but, at the same time, it is the coarsest and clumsiest of them. Its solidity does very extremely for the foundation and base floor of a Great Edifice; but if the whole building be Tuscan, it will attract no eyes; people will take it for granted, that the finishing and furnishing cannot be worth seeing, where the front is so unadorned and clumsy. But if, upon the solid Tuscan foundation, the Doric, the Ionic, and the Corinthian orders rise gradually with all their beauty, proportions, and ornaments, the fabric seizes the most incurious eye, and stops the most careless passenger, who solicits admission as a favour, nay, often purchases it. Just so it will fare with your little fabric, which at present, I fear, has more of the Tuscan than the Corinthian Order. You must absolutely change the whole front, or nobody will knock at the door. The several parts which must compose this new front, are elegant, easy, natural, superior good breeding; an engaging address, genteel motions, an insinuating softness in your looks, words and actions, a spruce lively air, fashionable dress; and all the glitter that a young fellow should have.

Given Chesterfield’s grasp of the subject, another letter to his son which, rather spitefully demeans Lord Burlington’s detailed knowledge of neo-Palladianism, seems at the outset to be unexpected. His correspondence of 17 October 1749 is as follows:

You may soon be acquainted with the considerable parts of Civil Architecture, and for the minute and mechanical parts of it, leave them to masons, bricklayers and Lord Burlington, who, to a certain extent, lessened himself by knowing them too well.

This belittling of Lord Burlington could be explained by yet another letter from Chesterfield to his poor, beleaguered son on 22 February 1748, which makes no apology for the view that:

One should never seem wiser, nor more learned, than the people you are with. Wear your learning, like your watch, in a private pocket; and do not pull it out and strike it, merely to show that you have one.

It seems therefore that Chesterfield may have considered his cousin’s architectural prowess to represent un-gentlemanly exhibitionism and a vulgar display of knowledge. Whilst this theory does explain the disdainful letter. it is probable that Chesterfield also considered his cousin to
be something of a bore, hovering just beneath his respect, and was certainly not to be applied to for advice. This attitude stands out in the correspondence between Chesterfield and Mrs Howard. Having asked Mrs Howard to look at the plans for his building in The Hague and to relay her own opinion and that of Lord Herbert to him, a strange episode occurs in their correspondence. Mrs Howard writes back to his request stating that:

Lord Herbert has been so ill that I could not consult him about the Proportions of yr Architecture, if you will promise to follow strictly the advice given I will endeavour to procure Lord Burlington’s.\(^{58}\)

A somewhat tongue in cheek comment, this suggests that Mrs Howard expected Chesterfield to disregard any advice from his cousin, an interpretation that is borne out by Chesterfield’s complete failure to acknowledge this offer to procure Burlington’s advice in his next letter. An omission such as this almost amounts to a social solecism in view of the eighteenth-century tendency towards sycophancy in correspondence and highlights Chesterfield’s unwillingness to avail himself of Lord Burlington’s expertise.\(^{59}\) Later communication hints at Mrs Howard and Chesterfield being in league together, making mischief and poking fun at the Burlingtons behind their backs. Certainly Chesterfield’s letter to Mrs Howard during a stay in Bath in 1734 openly sniggers at Lady Burlington reporting that ‘The Countess of B---, in the absence of her Royale Highness, held a circle at Hayes where she lost a favourite snuffbox, but unfortunately kept her temper’.\(^{60}\)

The openness of Chesterfield’s relationship with Mrs Howard, both in terms of sharing architectural ideas and in-jokes, as signified by the letters above, was an anomaly in the Earl’s life. What must have commenced as an acquaintance, fostered by Chesterfield for political gain, did evolve into what appears to have been a genuine understanding, albeit one that was threaded through with policy. Chesterfield had a loathing of most women, considering them to ‘have in general, but one object, which is their beauty; upon which, scarce any flattery is too gross for them’.\(^{61}\) His womanising in The Hague is a testament to this disrespect as is his callous treatment of his cherished illegitimate son’s mother, Mlle Elisabeth de Bouchet, whom he seduced despite her belonging to a French Huguenot family of good standing. To the Earl, as long as affairs were discreet and one did not allow them to interfere with polite society or ambition, womanising seems to have been just one more part of acceptable behaviour for a man of rank. Several anguished letters from Mlle Bouchet to the Earl survive. The following undated tirade is a typical example of her correspondence:
how insufferable, how intolerable, what can you mean by saying I may, if I will give
you moments at home, do you remember what happen'd? Can you think it profitable
ever to see me alone again, and were I mad enough once to venture it do you really love
me so little to suffer it? No! That can never be all pleasure is over for me, and the very
little that ever did pass never never must nor can happen again. Our lips must never
join more.62

Mlle Bouchet’s letter to Chesterfield is hardly distinguishable from Gay’s fictional verses in
*The Beggar’s Opera* where he draws attention to the plight of compromised women through
Lucy Lockitt’s words to Macheath:

> You base Man, you....how can you look me in the Face after what hath passed between
us? See here perfidious wretch, how I am forc’d to bear the Load of Infamy you have
laid upon me. O Macheath! Thou hast robb’d me of my Quiet.63

The Earl returned to England from The Hague in 1732 bringing the unfortunate Mlle Bouchet
with him so that she could give birth to their son in London. Having disgraced her, he refused
to marry her, launching himself instead back into the London society of which he was so much
a part and marrying in the following year the plain, illegitimate and aging daughter of George I,
Melusina, Countess of Walsingham, purely for her money.64

The years during which Chesterfield was on ambassadorial duty in The Hague, between 1728-
1732, were important ones for neo-Palladianism. By 1729 the building of Marble Hill, as
sanctioned by the King, was complete, acting as a guiding beacon in the bewildering landscape
of architectural style. By 1730 neo-Palladianism was firmly established in the Office of Works
and had attracted the following, and in some cases discipleship, of those with any claim to
virtuosity, politeness or education. The groundwork laid by the first neo-Palladians, Benson,
Aislabie, Hotham, Campbell and Page had begun to bear fruit. These very early efforts to
establish the style were laid down in the first two decades of the century but were boosted
enormously in the 1720s by the might of Lord Burlington, Lord Herbert and their respective
coteries. Sir Thomas Robinson, (VB) amateur architect, professional socialite and a friend of
Chesterfield, was among those great contemporary figures in society with a passion for neo-
Palladianism. He will be returned to below.

The 1720s and 1730s were not just important years for neo-Palladianism; they were also
important in terms of social progress and change, the context of which is important as a
causative factor in the success of neo-Palladianism. Ronald Paulson describes this time of flux
and development as the ‘denouement of the Augustan Age’, a time which saw the production of Gay’s *Beggar’s Opera*, Henry Fielding’s first play, *Love in Several Masques*, Pope’s *Dunciad* and William Hogarth’s satirical, social commentary made under the guise of his print of opening night at *The Beggar’s Opera* and bearing the same name. It seems that a heightened awareness of, and cynicism towards, politics and power was entering society and manifesting itself in a new willingness to satirise contemporary life. The level of intelligent criticism among the public was rising.

In 1728, the year that Chesterfield was planning to leave the country for Holland, the Duchess of Queensbury was persuading John Rich to stage the production of *The Beggar’s Opera* at Lincoln’s Inn Fields after it had been turned down by Colley Cibber at Drury Lane, probably because of its dangerous anti-Walpole sentiment. The play was the first of new genre of theatre, invented by Gay, and which came to be known as a Ballad Opera. Rather than the inaccessible Italian Operas, Gay’s new Ballad Opera transposed modern, everyday songs into verses of wit and humour, mercilessly attacking the establishment. Rich considered the play to be a significant risk and only agreed to stage it subject to the Duchess paying for any shortfall should it turn out to be a flop. In reality the play was so successful that it gave rise to the legendary jape that it had made ‘Rich gay and Gay rich’. An important point here is that the impact of theatre on society at this time was far-reaching. In an age where journalism was mainly limited to pamphlets and satirical magazines, with newspapers carrying a very limited readership, theatre was vastly influential in reaching all sections of society from the aristocracy to the masses. Among the upper classes an evening’s entertainment at the theatre was almost compulsory as James Macky’s careless reference to it bears out; ‘After the play the best company generally go to Tom’s or Will’s Coffee-houses...where there is the playing of Picket, and the best conversation til Midnight.’

Everyone who was anyone in *haut ton* attended *The Beggar’s Opera* in its first, highly unusual, unbroken run of sixty-two days, despite the very obvious attacks on the upper class. The play is liberally scattered with parody and verses that strike at the top tier of society, lines such as:

‘When you censure the Age,  
Be cautious and sage,  
Lest the courtiers offended should be,  
If you mention Vice or Bribe  
‘Tis so pat to all the Tribe,  
Each cries... That was levell’d at me’
and Gay’s pointed attack on those in royal circles where his unfaithful villain MacHeath, the highwayman, cries out to Polly Peachum:

Is there any power, any Force could tear me from thee? You might sooner tear a Pension out of the hands of a Courtier.69

William Hogarth (1696-1764), the consummate satirist of the period, first captured the opening night of The Beggar’s Opera in 1728 and then in at least four more editions of his painting, successive versions becoming more barbed and impertinent as time wore on. The paintings depict the audience, which included key society figures of the day, sitting in boxes on the stage, next to the play. The images are a true portrayal of plays at this time and are indicative of the much more interactive experience of theatre in the eighteenth century. However, Hogarth was also commenting on the irony of these powerful members of the audience, physically seated alongside the players on the same stage, who could easily have featured in the play themselves. Since The Beggar’s Opera is a commentary on social injustice, immorality and the open criminal behaviour of those in government and in positions of power, Hogarth’s paintings were scandalous. Just as Gay had made his views very clear, with scurrilous verses such as ‘If business cannot be carried on without murder, what would you have a Gentleman do?’, Hogarth left no doubt over his intentions. 70 In the satirist’s 1729 version of the painting there appears, above the stage, suspended from the curtains over both players and audience, the motto ‘Veluti in Speculum’ or ‘even as in a mirror’. At least two of the playgoers depicted in Hogarth’s scene of opening night were involved in shaping the fabric of early eighteenth-century society and both were neo-Palladians. These men were Sir Thomas Robinson and Charles Paulet, the 3rd Duke of Bolton.

‘LONG SIR THOMAS’

Let us drink and sport today
Ours is not tomorrow
Love with Youth flies swift away
Age is nought but sorrow
Dance and Sing
Time’s on the wing
Life never knows the return of Spring.71

Robinson was a prolific socialite as well as an amateur architect. He would have been instantly and easily recognisable in Hogarth’s Beggar’s Opera, 1729, as the man standing on the left of
the stage at the apex of the clustered group of spectators (see Plate 58). His superior height is depicted by Hogarth and it was that feature together with his long facial characteristics that earned him the nickname of ‘long Sir Thomas’ (see Plate 59). At the time that Hogarth was painting his 1729 portrayal of the play, Robinson was either involved in finalising the design of his new family home of Rokeby, Yorkshire or, as is more likely, had already commenced its rebuilding. It is probable that his marriage in 1728 to the widowed Elizabeth, Lady Lechmere, the third daughter of the 3rd Earl of Carlisle, and the dowry this would have brought, was a catalyst for the commencement of the project. The neo-Palladian villa created by Robinson was completed in 1731, the year that he was elevated to a baronetcy, as evidenced by a letter Robinson wrote to his father-in-law, at Castle Howard. He proudly wrote that:

My house in Yorkse is now entirely fitted up to be warm and convenient for my family, and with the wings makes a regular front of 146 feet to the Park, and to the North and South courts for Offices. My Chief expense has been in Palladian doors and windows, which I am told have good effect, and in building a stable for 15 horses as a wing to the house, which makes the regularity, and occasions so large a front as I have mentioned. There is now nothing wanting for our reception but to put up the furniture, which is ready there for that end.

Howard Colvin has stated that Rokeby’s basic form and pyramidal roof is ‘probably suggested by Marble Hill’ an observation which suggests the likelihood of Robinson’s having visited that pioneering building on at least one occasion. Given Robinson’s friendship with Chesterfield and his involvement with high society it would be strange if he had not. Robinson was a committed and enthusiastic neo-Palladian and Rokeby was but one of the neo-Palladian architectural enterprises that he was to undertake in his lifetime. So convinced was he of the need to adopt this new and tasteful architecture that he had an undignified row with Sir John Vanbrugh, both men spitting and swearing at each other on the lawns at Castle Howard, over the Baroque design for that country house, a building which wasn’t even Robinson’s. He was still building in the neo-Palladian idiom as late as 1759 when he completed an austere, and frankly aesthetically unsuitable, neo-Palladian extension which was to form Castle Howard’s West wing. However it is not the objective here to provide an architectural exegesis of the neo-Palladian buildings Robinson designed or built but to consider the importance and role of this amateur architect within society in disseminating the style.

In 1737 Robinson acquired the lease to a house in Whitehall and it seems that, in 1738, he added a large room to the rear, with a vaulted ceiling, for entertaining. The form of Robinson’s ball room was largely dictated by the cramped proportions of the plot in which it was built and
was not overtly neo-Palladian although it did incorporate some neo-Palladian features such as Serlian windows and a sparse undecorated appearance. Robinson’s extension is strongly reminiscent of Chesterfield’s ballroom extension in The Hague ten years earlier, of which no clear details remain. Already a key figure in high society, the death of Robinson’s wife in 1739 signalled the beginning of an even more excessive and lavish lifestyle of entertaining. In what appears to posterity to be a means of coping with grief, Robinson dedicated himself to creating a world of pleasure and luxury for people of power and fashion. Within two years of Elizabeth’s death he had held three grand balls gaining him the reputation of being the Petronius of the age and an arbiter of elegance but ruining himself into the bargain. By 1742 Robinson the man of pleasure was forced to flee to Barbados. He went under the auspices of gaining the position of Governor of that island, but in reality it was to escape his debts.

This period in Robinson’s career, his building of Rokeby and his London houses, his contacts and connections, including his relationship with Lord Burlington would have been recorded in the long correspondence between Robinson and Chesterfield. There is no doubt that their shared passion both for architecture and high society, would have formed at least some of the content of their enduring correspondence which was written with a mind to posthumous publication. This cache of letters is lost however, due to the actions of Robinson’s overbearing younger brother, Richard Robinson, the Archbishop of Armagh. Robinson had entrusted the correspondence with Chesterfield to his illegitimate daughter for publication after his death but his brother acquired them and they were destroyed. Thus the friendship between Chesterfield and Robinson, and their influence on the dissemination of neo-Palladianism, must be reconstructed by looking at the society they shared and the few anecdotes that do survive from this time.

The loss of these letters means there is little documentary evidence remaining of the friendship between the two, apart from several bound volumes of dry political letters relating to Robinson’s time in Vienna in the 1740s. These are full of tense instruction, as well as numerical coding that has long-since been indecipherable, so that there is little room for news or the usual eighteenth-century pleasantries. Surviving anecdotal evidence of their connection demonstrates an ease and humour between the two men. On one occasion Chesterfield was heard to comment that Thomas Ripley’s columns on the Admiralty building were ‘in the Robinsonian order’, an oblique reference to his friend’s towering height, and another example of how architecture was never far from Chesterfield’s thoughts.

In the year that Robinson departed from England to take up his post in Barbados, Ranelagh Gardens, or ‘Runnylow’ as it was pronounced, was opened. There is no modern day equivalent
to these pleasure gardens, of which London was home to hundreds of varying standards and sizes in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{86} Vauxhall Gardens were the most fashionable of these pleasure parks until the opening of its rival Ranelagh in Chelsea, where the air was cleaner, and which quickly became the more fashionable of the two. In the same way that theatre was open to all sectors of society, so too was Ranelagh, an arrangement recorded by Horace Walpole on 29 June 1744 when he wrote that ‘the company is universal; there is from His Grace of Grafton down to the children out of the Foundling Hospital’.\textsuperscript{87} Many descriptions of the gardens survive but the contemporary accounts by Walpole encapsulate the novelty and wonder that this grand meeting place, devoted to society and its pleasure, engendered among its subscribers (see Plate 60). Walpole first writes to his friend Horace Mann about the gardens immediately after they opened on 22 April 1742 stating that:

\begin{quote}
Two nights ago Ranelagh Gardens were opened at Chelsea; the Prince, Princess, and Duke, and much nobility, and much mob besides were there. There is a vast amphitheatre, finely gilt, painted and illuminated, into which everybody that loves eating, drinking, swearing and crowding, is admitted for twelve pence.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

In 1744 Walpole’s letter to Henry Conway illustrates the very great success of Ranelagh as both a place to be seen and as a regular event on the contemporary social calendar, stating that:

\begin{quote}
Every night I constantly go to Ranelagh, which has totally beaten Vauxhall. Nobody goes anywhere else, everybody goes there....you can’t set your foot without treading on a Prince of Wales or a Duke of Cumberland.\textsuperscript{89}
\end{quote}

Ranelagh was also home to balls and masquerades which had been made highly fashionable by the very ugly Swiss entertainer, John James Heidegger, 1659-1749, (VB), whose genius for entertaining London was second to none.\textsuperscript{90} These masqued balls were the subject of enormous controversy; newspaper journalists condemned them for the improper behaviour they encouraged whilst the papers themselves both advertised them and sold the tickets.\textsuperscript{91} It is as if the very forced existence that society was living at this time demanded a release from its recreated classical perfection, with its mock, ancient built environment and replica republican philosophy. The masquerade, with the degree of anonymity it afforded, provided an outlet that even the most respected members of high society participated in. Henry Fielding’s satirical poem of 1728, \textit{The Masquerade}, sums up the licentious disregard for convention displayed at these events:

\begin{quote}
Here in one confusion herl’d
\end{quote}
Seem all the nations of the world
Cardinals, quakers, judges dance;
Grim Turks are coy, and nuns advance,
Grave churchmen here at hazard play
So for his ugliness more fell,
Was H-d-g-r toss'd out of hell,
And in return by Satan made,
First Minister of the Masquerade.92

Heidegger was the acknowledged Grand Master of these Venetian entertainments: George I made him Master of the Revels and he was responsible for the organisation of a calendar of masquerades or ridottos, as they came to be called, to be held regularly at the Haymarket. Heidegger’s entertainments were only surpassed by his ugliness: Chesterfield once refused to pay his tailor, Mr Jolly, until he could find a man uglier than himself. The following morning Mr Jolly induced Heidegger to call with him at one of the Earl’s levees and promptly received his money.93 Despite the hitherto unknown splendour and extravagance he introduced to the social scene, Heidegger did not hold the monopoly on such events.94 Ranelagh Gardens were not slow in providing the pleasure society craved and, in 1749, Walpole wrote about a ball he had attended at the gardens on 1 May:

When you entered you found the whole garden filled with masks and spread with tents, which remained all night very commodely. In one quarter was a maypole dressed with garlands and people dancing round it to a tabor and pipe and rustic music, all masked... some like huntsmen with French horns, some like peasants and a troupe of harlequins and scaramouches in the little open temple on the mount. On the canal was a sort of gondola adorned with flags and streamers and filled with music rowing about. All around the outside of the amphitheatre was illuminated and shops filled with Dresden china...the amphitheatre was illuminated and in the middle was a circular bower composed of all kinds of firs in tubs, from 20 to 30 feet high; under them orange trees, with small lamps set in each orange, and below them all sorts of the finest auriculas in pots and festoons of natural flowers hanging from tree to tree. There were booths for tea and wine, gaming tables, and dancing and about 2000 persons. In short it pleased me more than anything I ever saw.95

When Robinson returned to London in 1747 with his coffers refilled through a lucrative second marriage, but without his wife who preferred to stay in Barbados with her title but without her husband, he re-entered society on a grand scale.96 He was a shareholder in the Ranelagh
venture and became the Director of Entertainments at the Gardens, even building himself a house in nearby Prospect Place, so he could be close to his work. In this role Robinson again donned the mantle of amusing London, also giving breakfasts and lunches to society at his own house. One can only wonder what the appearance of the classical, but not neo-Palladian, amphitheatre would have looked like had Robinson been in London during its design and construction (see plates 8 and 9). As Entertainment Director, Robinson’s tall, willowy frame would often have been seen walking round and round the amphitheatre, in company with the rest of the nobility and no doubt in conversation with Chesterfield. That Chesterfield often frequented Ranelagh has been recorded by Walpole who stated in 1744 that ‘My Lord Chesterfield is so fond of it [Ranelagh] that he says he has ordered all his letters to be directed thither.'

Robinson was an extremely important champion for neo-Palladianism, building visible examples of it in the provinces and discussing architectural minutiae with Lord Burlington. His building projects included Rokeby, as well as its pure neo-Palladian chapel, the austere Castle Howard extension, the buildings and extensions in Whitehall which, though severely limited by the proportions of the site, still incorporated many neo-Palladian features. These architectural projects alone made Robinson a key disseminator of the style but it was his passion for neo-Palladianism combined with his prominent, self-appointed role as entertainer of the ton that made him so important to its success. As a man known to all of London, whose taste was considered to be exquisite, it follows that his architectural preferences would also have been noted, especially in an age where the arts were so intertwined with society. Robinson’s friendship with Chesterfield was also influential and it is likely that it was Robinson who recommended Isaac Ware to his friend in the design of the neo-Palladian Chesterfield House in 1748. This resulting architectural composition demonstrated that, though the Earl was a keen neo-Palladian, he was a man of eclectic taste where his London residence was concerned and this will be considered below. The longevity of both these men, Robinson living until he was seventy-seven and Chesterfield until he was seventy-nine was also a factor influencing the extended duration of the neo-Palladian revival, despite Chesterfield’s eclectic taste. Both men built relatively late examples of the style: Chesterfield beginning the construction of his house, which shared his name, in 1748 and showing it to the world at a house-warming party as late as 1752, whilst Robinson did not commence the construction of the west wing at Castle Howard until 1753. The influence in society that Chesterfield and Robinson retained, well into the 1750s for the former and 1770s for the latter, would have contributed to this extended period of Palladian dominance in architecture. They can be seen to have aided its continuance as a fashionable option long after Lord Burlington and most of the first generation neo-Palladians had died.
THE DUKE OF BOLTON, ‘ABSOLUTELY A FOOL AND A ROGUE’

*Gamesters and Highwaymen are generally very good to their whores, but they are very devils to their wives.*  

The second man included in Hogarth’s painting of The Beggar's Opera who also adopted the neo-Palladian style was Charles Paulet, 3rd Duke of Bolton, (VB), (1685-1754). Bolton and Robinson will be eternally associated as fellow members of the elite due to this painting and would have been selected by Hogarth precisely because of their prominence in society. Bolton is instantly recognisable in the 1729 version of the painting seated on the right hand side of the stage gazing at Lavinia Fenton who played the part of Polly Peachum in the play (see Plate 58). Polly’s arm is outstretched towards the Duke, who can be seen holding a small book and following the words of the play with an adoring expression on his face. According to an undying legend the Duke was immediately smitten with Polly on hearing her first rendition of ‘Oh Ponder Well...’. There must be some truth in this story because after attending every night of the play, the Duke removed Lavinia from the stage to be his mistress. This was the greatest and most successful role she ever played remaining Bolton’s mistress for twenty-three years and bearing him three sons. After this time, and within one month of his first wife’s death, Bolton married Lavinia and she became the second duchess (see Plate 61).

In terms of his architectural preferences history presents Bolton as a mystery with his adoption of the style apparently having occurred in a vacuum. Despite his being a leading member of the aristocracy there are no recorded examples of his showing any real sign of interest in art of any kind. Instead the evidence that does exist portrays him as being an unenlightened, boorish man, addicted to hunting with hounds and to have had an aversion to learning and morals, especially where he encountered it in women. Lady Stuart wrote that he was ‘a handsome, agreeable libertine’ whilst Lord Hervey labelled him ‘absolutely a fool and a rogue’. The Royal Register describes him more fully stating that;

> No man was ever more indebted to rank and title than this nobleman; for no man stood more in need of the consequence which is derived from them. Weak and whimsical, but persuaded, like many other good mistaken people of the same kind, that he possessed the opposite qualities, he naturally became no infrequent subject of mirth, raillery and cajolment.

Bolton had married the much sought-after and virtuous Lady Anne Vaughn, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Carberry, for her dowry in 1713. The speed with which he was formally separated from
her after the death of his father, the 2nd Duke, (VB), in 1722, makes it likely that he was forced into the alliance. According to Lady Mary Wortley Montague the Duchess had been reared in strict solitude ‘by a saint-like governess; crammed with virtue and good qualities’. Her unsuitability as a partner for this gauche and churlish Duke can be clearly shown by the fact that one of the most educated and virtuous men of the age, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, was also her suitor for a time and he described her as being:

’in every respect that very person I had ever fram’d a picture of from my imagination when I wished the best for my happiness in such a circumstance. I had heard her character before, and her education, her every circumstance besides suited exactly…’

Bolton however, unable to appreciate these qualities as Shaftesbury did, expressed his distaste for his bride a few short weeks after their union. Any value for virtue that Bolton may have learned from the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury during their travels on the continent together in 1704 seems to have been forgotten by the Duke in his quest for pleasure. Gay’s Beggar’s Opera was the cause of the final separation between the Duke and Duchess of Bolton through the introduction of Lavinia to the Duke. This is somewhat ironic given Gay’s insights on contemporary marriage within the aristocracy and showed an uncanny foresight predicting the fate that was to befall the first Duchess. In the play Mrs Peachum addresses Polly as follows:

If you must be married, could you introduce no body into our Family but a Highwayman? Why, thou foolish Jade, thou will be as ill-used, and as much neglected, as if thou hadst married a Lord!

Before 1720 Bolton, who was at this time styled Marquess of Winchester, employed James Gibbs to undertake works to all the Bolton properties. Since the 2nd Duke was still alive in 1720 this was presumably at the command of his father. Gibbs records the commission in his manuscript account of the works stating that he ‘made a great many drawings for a new house to be built [at Hackwood], as likewise a larger design for a building to be erected at Abbotstone…but the finances failing there was neither of them executed.’ Gibbs did build a house for the Duke however, at Cannam Heath, near Kingsclere, only 12 miles from Hackwood Park, and for which plans but no elevations survive (see Plates 62 and 63). Richard Haslam has stated that it is not known why this house was built, it being so close to Hackwood; perhaps the answer is simply that he was avoiding his virtuous Duchess. The extant plans for Cannam Heath, although classical to a degree, provide very little evidence that the 3rd Duke was a neo-Palladian: his taste for the style seems to have evolved later, after the death of his father, with Gibbs’ designs for numerous neo-Palladian garden buildings to adorn Bridgeman’s
Spring Wood at Hackwood. Though the Duke may have chosen to live at his Cannam Heath House, he did maintain an interest in Hackwood as his family seat on state occasions and would thus have maintained control over its architectural embellishment. At some point in the 1720s George I visited the 3rd Duke at Hackwood and presented him with a fine lead equestrian statue of himself which Bolton established on the parterre on the south side of the house.118

Another extant plan 'For ye Duke of Bolton' survives in Gibbs' *Book of Architecture* and presents itself as an austere, symmetrical block devoid of any ornamentation save for alternating triangular and segmental pediments above the windows (see Plate 64).119 The design is much more obviously neo-Palladian than the proto-Palladian Ditchley built by the same architect in 1720, and shows that, by the time the design for Bolton was drawn up, Gibbs had made the decisive move towards the purer forms of neo-Palladianism. The plan probably dates from the late 1720s and is perhaps a design for Hackwood House or Abbotstone.

The 3rd Duke's adoption of neo-Palladianism can be seen in the follies and garden buildings he commissioned for Spring Wood, the jewel in the crown of the entire estate. Several of these are illustrated in Gibbs' *Book of Architecture*, 1728, and include 'A circular building in the form of a Temple'120 with a large dome, surmounted by a finial and with Doric peristyle; a pair of simple pavilions with pediments known as the Cubs, just large enough to provide shelter and juxtaposed in a manner which creates the illusion of a series of arches; the pedimented and rather squat Menagerie, once housing aquatic birds but last inhabited by the pheasant keeper (see plate 14); and the French House with its over-sized dome, rather in the manner of Burlington's Chiswick. The Cubs and Menagerie still survive and are laid out on a formal swathe of grass cut into the wildness of the wood and adorned by a long pool, not quite long enough to be termed a canal. These buildings are considered to have been built between 1725 and 1730 to complement the third remodelling to the wood by Charles Bridgeman.121

There is no clear evidence of any particular neo-Palladian influence on Bolton; nor does he seem to have been engaged in contemporary architectural circles in any way other than through his involvement in *haut ton* and its fashions. From what is known of the Duke it is likely that he commissioned Gibbs to provide him with modern and fashionable additions to the estate and, given that the neo-Palladian style was at this time reaching the heights of its popularity, this was the idiom that Gibbs selected. The inability to link Bolton into the neo-Palladian circles of the time in any more than the most superficial way is something of an anti-climax. However it illustrates the point about neo-Palladianism and its dissemination perfectly. By the mid 1720s the style was gaining a momentum of its own and the adoption of it was not always a by-product of architectural intellectualising or a craving for antique association. In some cases,
and Hackwood appears to be one of these, the style was employed for the simple reason that it had become fashionable.

The Duke of Bolton, although not an integral member of the early eighteenth-century architectural circles, was a follower of neo-Palladianism and was known to Chesterfield, associating with the intelligentsia from time to time. Both men had been appointed as Gentlemen of the Bedchamber to the Prince of Wales: Bolton in 1714 and Chesterfield in 1715. Apart from this role however the two men did not associate closely until 1733 when Walpole attempted to introduce the Excise Bill. Opposition to this bill was so strong that Walpole was eventually forced to abandon it, but not before he had vengefully removed much of the Opposition from their posts. Among those who lost power were Bolton, Sir Richard Temple, Viscount Cobham of Stowe, Lord Burlington, and Chesterfield who lost his position as Lord Steward of the King’s Household and went on to lead the Opposition in the Lords in 1732-1733. Chesterfield’s letter from Scarborough to Henrietta Howard on 17 August 1733 shows how deeply involved in the Opposition he was. At this point the Earl became a leading member of yet another societal hub, this time a political gathering of like-minded aristocrats whose headquarters was at Stowe. Chesterfield wrote:

I leave this place (thank God) tomorrow and go to Cobham’s for five or six days where I shall diligently look for a certain Gusto that I hear’d so much talked of there…

Whilst Bolton’s commitment to neo-Palladianism was at best limited, Chesterfield’s late example of the style, built in spite of the far more liberal interpretations of neo-classicism which were emerging, highlights his dedication to the neo-Palladian aesthetic. The Earl’s involvement with neo-Palladian enthusiasts in the 1720s, via his family connections and the Marble Hill clique and later in the 1730s and 1740s with members of the Opposition, would have strengthened his stylistic convictions. Certainly visits to Stowe, where classical architecture and in some cases neo-Palladianism, were being used by Cobham specifically to display the merits of Patriot Whiggism, as opposed to Caesarean Whiggism, would have influenced Chesterfield.

CHESTERFIELD, THE LATTER YEARS

After a highly successful Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland the Earl retired from public office in 1748 having lost influence in the world of politics. He immediately escaped to Bath for a month planning to ‘enjoy in quiet the liberty which I have acquired by the resignation of the seals’ and it was at this point, at his leisure, that Chesterfield turned to neo-Palladianism for himself.
He employed Isaac Ware, the architect responsible for his friend Robinson's drawings of the neo-Palladian Rokeby, to assist him with the task and set about constructing a monument worthy of his learning and status: Chesterfield House. The exterior of the house, now demolished, was as chaste as it was austere and as bland as it was urbane. Nothing of its external appearance provided a clue to its interior and the *joie de vivre* within. Chesterfield, to the *chagrin* of Ware, presented the elite with a building whose façade was of neo-Palladian austerity whilst half of its internal rooms danced and swirled with the French Rococo. Roger White has called the decoration the 'finest and most authentic evocation of French Rococo models that England produced in this period', an interior which must have shocked the upper classes when they were invited to the grand house-warming of 1752.\(^{126}\) Despite the earl's obvious francophilia and his adoption of the flamboyant Rococo for some of his rooms, he still adhered to a safe and uninspiring neo-Palladian design for the exterior and most of his reception rooms. Similarly Robinson, at this time constructing the neo-Palladian west wing extension to Castle Howard, felt unable to break with this style and explore the new interpretations of classicism which were emerging. The late, convinced display of neo-Palladianism by these two key figures in society shows how fixed the style had become as an appropriate background for the elite.

The correctness, virtuosity and politeness with which neo-Palladianism had been imbued by society in the early eighteenth century had survived well into the 1750s. By this time the style had come to symbolize personal restraint, ancient association and all the characteristics which society had learnt to value. However it had also become fashionable in society for its own sake, not purely for what it represented to the intellectuals. Neo-Palladianism was a part of the social fabric of the time just as it was representative of political standpoints or the virtuosity of the user. Its wide dissemination and popularity was as much a result of the operation of eighteenth-century society with its expansive, web-like connections, gatherings of the intelligentsia, balls and garden parties, as it was for its iconographic representation of ancient civilisation and all its facets.

Chesterfield's life spanned the same years of influence as the style, and his death in 1773 when he quipped that 'if he was dying by inches thank God he was not as long as Robinson' mirrored the death of neo-Palladianism as the leading style of the nation.\(^{127}\)
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CHAPTER 7

ADDITIONAL CIRCLES OF INFLUENCE DISSEMINATING THE PALLADIAN STYLE

SIR ROBERT WALPOLE AND HIS CIRCLE

Sir Robert Walpole (VB) (1676-1745) is one of the most interesting early eighteenth-century neo-Palladians due to his ability to influence the architectural choices of others whilst at the same time himself being influenced. A man of great shrewdness and skill, he understood the correlation between the adoption of a reigning king’s artistic style, in this case neo-Palladianism, and an increase in social and political power. It is highly doubtful whether Walpole would ever have become a patron of the style had he not seen the architectural leanings of George I and the Hanoverian retinue that arrived in England in 1714.

As discussed above, the first decade and a half of the eighteenth century was witness to what could be termed an aristocratic pilgrimage. A flow of upper class tourists, contending with notoriously difficult travelling conditions, made their way from England across Europe to Germany in order to pay homage to the Elector George, who was widely expected to become the next King of England.1 There is no firm evidence to prove that Walpole ever made this journey to visit George in his Electorate, but if he had, he would have seen for himself the architectural preferences of the future King of England. As it transpired it was of little consequence whether or not Walpole saw these Venetian-style buildings in Germany because George’s choice of neo-Palladianism, as the style of his House, was known in England long before he himself arrived in the country to claim his crown.

Ragnhild Hatton’s biography, when read in combination with the work of Barbara Arciszewska, convincingly counters the entrenched and xenophobic view of George I that has been repeated and reproduced since his time as King.2 It has been clearly demonstrated that both George I, and later George II and his Queen, Caroline of Anspach, were not the philistine foreigners that English history has portrayed, but that they were serious patrons of the arts with a keen interest in Palladio’s architecture. Details of George I’s main building interests in Hanover have been catalogued above and include the 200 foot long Galerie in the gardens of Herrenhausen, a building which incorporates many strictly correct neo-Palladian details, as well as his neo-Palladian stables at the Hunting Palace of Gohdre.
On occasion a question mark has hovered over what appears to have been the very sudden subscription to, and support for, *Vitruvius Britannicus* in 1715; the inexplicable, and apparently instantaneous adoption of neo-Palladianism with no forewarning. This seemingly very sudden conversion to the style by members of England's elite, as represented by the subscription to Campbell's folio, does give the appearance of having been a definable event rather than part of a process. However, subscription to *Vitruvius Britannicus* was merely the first measurable manifestation of a change in architectural taste that had been increasing for a number of years.

The knowledge of George's preference for Venetian Renaissance architecture, and in particular the work of Palladio, was gleaned by English aristocrats on their pilgrimage to Hanover in the years leading up to the succession in 1714. Though the support for the style may appear to have been sudden, those in power in England in the early eighteenth century were in fact fully aware of the turning tide of aesthetics and the way in which architecture was likely to develop should the Elector accede to the throne of England. It is pertinent that the man considered to be the harbinger of the new style, Anthony Ashley Cooper, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, was himself a visitor to Hanover in 1703 as a young man. A letter from the Koningen Sophie Charlotte, George's half-sister, to Hans Caspar Von Bothmar (VB), foreign envoy and later a subscriber to Campbell's folio himself, of 4 September 1703 records that:

> La conversation de plusiers anglais y contribue beaucoup, quoique la plupart n'ont de merite que la nouveaute. Je crois que l'on ne peu pas dire la meme chose de ceux que vous voyez a la Haue. Du moins Milord Chafboury [Shaftesbury] etait tres joli garcons.

It could be argued that the new style Shaftesbury had called for in 1711 was to remain unnamed and unspecific for the simple reason that it was obvious to the stream of aristocrats who had been visiting Hanover since 1702 exactly what form this style would take.

However George's reason for adopting neo-Palladianism was far from a simple matter of taste. It reflected his earnest desire to increase the association between his family, the Brunswick-Luneburgs, and the ancient, aristocratic family line from which they had descended, the Venetian Guelphs. This association was symbolised through the German Court's adoption of Venetian Renaissance architecture which amounted to a carefully crafted act of spin; a campaign commenced by George's father, Ernst August and designed to strengthen the ancestral origins of his House, adding legitimacy to his claim to become the 9th Electoral state in the German Empire. Any additional prestige that could be attached to George's family could also serve to lend authority to his parallel claim to the English throne.
For the purposes of English neo-Palladianism in the eighteenth century however, George’s reasons for adopting the style are somewhat irrelevant. What is important is the fact that he was giving physical form to the style, both in England and in Hanover, thus influencing those closest to him who were vying for position and power in his government. For Walpole, an ambitious man seeking promotion, neo-Palladianism as the King’s preferred style was just another weapon in his armoury, and was perhaps only of significance to him as a means to an end rather than for any intrinsic aesthetic value the style may have had. Certainly assessments of Walpole’s character leave the researcher with the sense that he would have rebuilt Houghton as a Gothic cathedral if it could have aided his advance.  

Walpole’s connection with neo-Palladianism is first made evident through the second edition of *Vitruvius Britannicus* where Campbell dedicated a design to Walpole, claiming it as his own. Campbell was not averse to claiming other architects’ work for himself and it is by no means certain that he was the author of the design. Given that Walpole employed James Gibbs and William Kent as well as Campbell at Houghton, cleverly making use of all three rivals’ talents between 1722 and 1735, it seems entirely possible that Campbell’s original plan of the great house in 1717 was not actually his, as he claimed.  

It is also likely that, as closest aid to the King, Walpole was privy to the King’s architectural ambitions both for England and Hanover.  

It was only in 1724 that George I sanctioned the construction of the first English royal neo-Palladian building, the small but perfectly proportioned Marble Hill at Twickenham, for his son’s mistress, Henrietta Howard, later Countess of Suffolk (VB) (see Plate 65). There could be no firmer indication of George’s support for his chosen neo-Palladian style than funding such a high-profile, landmark building from the royal purse. The King went on to consolidate his aesthetic position in 1727 with the construction of the neo-Palladian White Lodge in Richmond Park, another representation of his taste (see Plate 66). Both White Lodge and Marble Hill were designed as neo-Palladian villas in the truest sense being five bays wide and of a 1/3/1 arrangement, the central bays of which are surmounted by a pediment. Both buildings are three bays deep, with a piano nobile, rusticated basements and both have with Palladian details. Interestingly White Lodge was started by George I specifically for Walpole, who had by this
time made himself indispensable to the King and needed a London residence to match his status. Walpole spent a great deal of time sourcing furnishings for his new London home demonstrating the level of importance he attached to adorning his villa with correct works of art appropriate to its neo-Palladian style and the image he was attempting to convey.

Walpole’s wholehearted adoption of his master’s style went on to influence the choices of men to whom he himself was in the role of master. By the mid 1720s his political power was as unsurpassed as his talent for nepotism and bribery. At every stage and level of government Walpole advanced members of his own family, allies and old school friends, so much so that his reign has been termed the ‘Robinocracy’. His intimate knowledge of the royal taste as well as his ability to advance those he was interested in would have had a far-reaching effect on his subordinates and their stylistic preferences. There is not the scope here to analyse Walpole’s circle in any depth, but his relationship with the 2nd Lord Townshend of Raynham, Norfolk, (VB), (1674-1738) serves to give an example of his role, albeit a passive one, in disseminating the style.

Walpole’s sister Dorothy (1686-1726) married Lord Townshend in 1713. Sir Robert and Dorothy’s father was Colonel Robert Walpole and had been Townshend’s guardian in childhood making the connection between the two families strong and lasting. Walpole and Townshend shared the closest friendship, political as well as personal, until 1730 when, due to what Walpole considered to be the dangerous political actions of his brother-in-law, the two became bitter enemies. Before this rift occurred however, Townshend began the alteration of his seventeenth-century country seat at Raynham, using William Kent, Walpole’s architect, to carry out the works in the neo-Palladian style. Kent had recently completed works to Kensington Palace, which had been commissioned by George I and which, therefore, made him an eminently suitable and fashionable choice for Raynham. More relevant in Townshend’s selection of Kent was that he would have had ample opportunity to see him working at his brother-in-law’s house at Houghton. The family association between the two statesmen from Norfolk, as well as Walpole’s ability to promote his friend and brother-in-law’s political career, inspired Townshend to execute alterations to Raynham in what can be seen as an attempt to emulate the neo-Palladian grandeur of Houghton. Kent, who worked at Raynham during the years 1728-9, was responsible for the neo-Palladian north wing of the house, encompassing the fine neo-Palladian Marble Hall, as well as the fine white and gold state dining room, divided by a screen copied from the Roman arch of Severus.

Walpole’s relationship with Townshend influenced his brother-in-law’s architectural choices and is just one example of the Prime Minister’s influence in disseminating neo-Palladianism
within his circle at this time and within the regions. Other neo-Palladians, both within
Walpole’s immediate circle and on the fringes of it were also affected by his power and taste.
One of those associates was Hugh Cholmondeley, 1st Earl of Cholmondeley (VB) for whom
Campbell had prepared designs in the second and third editions of *Vitruvius Britannicus*.
Wapole and the first Earl became directly related when Cholmondeley’s brother, George, later
3rd Earl of Cholmondeley, was married to Walpole’s daughter, Mary. The Prime Minister was
also interlinked with the Burlington circle, which will be considered below, through the King’s
employment of the Earl of Pembroke and Roger Morris in the design of White Lodge for
Walpole. It should be remembered however that any influence Walpole bore in furthering the
style was a direct result of his closeness to the King and his own adoption of the King’s
aesthetic, rather than any pioneering artistic efforts of his own.

**LORD BURLINGTON AND HIS DISCIPLES**

A conscious decision has been taken in this study to concentrate on areas of neo-Palladianism
that are under-researched, particularly during the early days of the style. As a result there has
been no discussion concerning Lord Burlington (1694-1753) and his influence on the furthering
of the eighteenth-century neo-Palladian revival. It is considered that Lord Burlington and his
somewhat suffocating approach to the style has been thoroughly researched and adequately
discussed in previous work. However, whilst a re-writing of the known facts surrounding
Burlington would add nothing to the understanding of this architectural phenomenon, no
investigation into the dissemination of neo-Palladianism could present an accurate reflection of
the style’s history without a consideration of the importance of Burlington. For this reason and
for completeness, Lord Burlington is briefly discussed below in relation to his own neo-
Palladian disciples and his inter-connections with other circles (see Plate 67).

What is immediately striking in an assessment of Burlington’s architectural life is his ready
friendship with, and connection to, men originating from every level of society. As long as neo-
Palladianism was at the head of the agenda Burlington appears to have been as content in the
company of the lowliest joiner or mason as he was with architects, painters and poets through to
the greatest aristocrats of the time. In his blinkered but passionate quest to establish the style he
seems not to have regarded what was considered to be one of the great social solecisms of the
time, fraternising with members of other societal groups. Burlington was criticised for
humbling his elevated status through having acquired an in-depth knowledge of architecture
which, in 4th Earl of Chesterfield’s (1694-1773) eyes, amounted to the same indignity as if he
had taken up a profession. For a man of rank, an earl no less, this was a situation that
Chesterfield considered should have been as unacceptable as it was unnecessary.
Despite this snub, Burlington was very much a member of the upper echelons of society and a key player in the aristocracy taking part in all aspects of haut ton life. Burlington was closely connected to other peers including the 9th Earl of Pembroke of Wilton (1693-1751), the ‘Architect Earl’, as well as the 2nd Duke of Grafton (VB), (1683-1757), for whom he designed a wooden bridge for the estate at Euston Park in 1732. Through his alliance in 1721 with Lady Dorothy Savile, daughter of 2nd Marquess of Halifax, Burlington became a cousin by marriage to his critic, the 4th Earl of Chesterfield, whilst Lord Shelburne (VB), (1675-1751) of Temple Wycombe and the 6th Earl of Thanet (Vb), (d.1729) were his brothers-in-law. Other friends included the 7th Earl of Lincoln of Weybridge for whom he designed a neo-Palladian villa; Sir Thomas Robinson (1700-1777) who relied upon Burlington for assistance in the construction of the overtly neo-Palladian Rokeby in Yorkshire; the Hon. Richard Arundell (VB), (1696-1758) of Burlington’s native Yorkshire, who incidentally was also the 9th Earl of Pembroke’s step-brother, and the powerful Thomas Coke of Holkham (VB) (1697-1759), later the Earl of Leicester. Within these elevated circles Burlington was also a regular visitor to Marble Hill where he would have met with his cousin, Chesterfield, as well as the cream of the intelligentsia that gathered around Henrietta Howard, George II’s mistress. Burlington was consulted by his fellow peers in all matters architectural and is known to have given design advice to the Duke of Richmond (VB), (d.1723) and others who were on the fringes of his circle but who were not convinced neo-Palladians. In summary, anyone of any consequence in the 1720s was well-known to Lord Burlington and vice versa.

Further down the social scale Burlington was no less closely associated with the important literary figures of the age including John Gay, Alexander Pope and Dean Swift. These friendships were not at all unusual for the time but, on the contrary, were considered to be highly fashionable connections and were often cultivated for this reason alone. However, Lord Burlington differed from his aristocratic contemporaries in that he did not limit his friendships with the lower orders to men who were fashionable wits or poets, but also developed relationships with unfashionable men of the lower orders with little or no cachet. In 1720s he was on close terms with several relatively unknown provincial architects from commoner families; men who would not achieve any level of fame until at least ten years later, if at all. Burlington allowed companionship and amity to grow between himself and men such as Colonel John Moyser (VB), (1688-1751) who was a second wave neo-Palladian, largely designing in the 1730s and 1740s, and who was responsible for a neo-Palladian design for Nostell Priory. Colvin describes Moyser, seven years Burlington’s senior, as one of the Earl’s disciples and indeed this seems to have been the effect that Burlington had in his role as promoter of the style. Even Moyser’s father, John (c.1660-1738) a subscriber to Vitruvius
Britannicus, who had taken a leading part in the repair of Beverly Minster, was also on friendly terms with Burlington, despite demonstrating no particular empathy for neo-Palladianism himself.30 Similarly Robert Benson (VB) (1676-1731), the son of a successful and wealthy Yorkshire lawyer who displayed a strong interest in architecture was closely associated with Burlington, their names being forever linked together as noble experts in architecture.31 In his self-appointed role as Merciless Refiner of the early eighteenth-century classical style, Burlington does not seem to have baulked at being connected with anyone as long as he was able to disseminate his brand of Palladian architecture. The rarity of such a tolerance for, and even cordiality towards, the lower orders at this time can be demonstrated by the sarcasm among the aristocracy that was provoked upon Robert Benson’s elevation to the peerage in 1731. This elevation of a common attorney’s offspring to the elite caused Lord Berkeley of Stratton (VB) to comment that ‘every year the House of Lords receives some great blow’.32

Burlington’s obsession for pure neo-Palladianism, which in reality was a somewhat neurotic infatuation with his own interpretation of Palladianism, also had implications for the very heart of the architectural establishment. Not content with evangelising among his own peer group and then allowing taste and fashion to take their course, Burlington was responsible for the almost complete change of personnel that occurred in the Office of the Kings Works after the dismissal of Sir Christopher Wren in 1718. The Office of Works had already been infiltrated once by the neo-Palladian pioneer William Benson due, in part, to the efforts of his friend and ally, John Aislabie.33 However this early attempt to purify architectural style from the inside was cut short by Benson’s disgrace in July 1719 and Aislabie’s banishment after the South Sea Bubble debacle of 1721.34 Nevertheless this infiltration of the Office of Works by Benson pointed the way for Burlington who, following in Benson’s footsteps, proceeded to take command of royal building projects by installing his own disciples in the Office of Works. This campaign, which endured over two decades, amounted to a determined take-over of the eighteenth-century architectural power-house and only served to consolidate Burlington’s position as the ‘Apollo of the Arts’.35

Burlington first openly used his position to influence the key positions in the Office of Works in 1722 when he assisted in undermining Sir James Thornhill’s (1675-1734) role as Sergeant Painter in favour of his protégé William Kent (1685-1748).36 He was similarly influential in securing the positions of Labourer in Trust at White Lodge, Richmond and Windsor for Daniel Garrett (d.1753) who later became his architectural assistant. Isaac Ware (1704-1766) also benefited from Burlington’s patronage and went from chimney sweep, when Burlington first discovered him, to become Secretary to the Board of Works in 1736. Another Burlingtonian to be found in the Office of Works was the neo-Palladian Stephen Wright (d.1780) who was
Kent’s assistant and who rose through the ranks from Clerk of Works at Hampton Court to become Deputy Surveyor by 1758. Henry Flitcroft (VB), (1697-1769) also received special attention during his years as a journeyman carpenter after falling off a scaffold at Burlington House. He was subsequently employed by Burlington as a personal draughtsman and architectural assistant before going on to become Master Carpenter in 1746 and finally Comptroller in 1758, all under the guiding hand of his patron.  

Burlington was not one of the pioneering neo-Palladians of the eighteenth century but built upon the early and fragile foundations of the style which had been laid by Benson and Aislabie and their respective circles. Burlington’s overall contribution to the dissemination of the style was the sheer number of people he knew and influenced and the strengthening effect he was able to bring to the movement when it was still in its fledgling state. Notwithstanding his own designs and the willingness with which Burlington would give architectural advice to anyone in any social class, he would be of interest to neo-Palladianism purely for the number of protégés he was able to raise into positions of power. These protégés were then beholden to him and became the vehicle through which he was able to control the nation’s architectural direction for more than two decades.

The Earl was linked into most of the key neo-Palladian circles that have been researched in the foregoing chapters and the following explains the interconnections. John Harris has convincingly suggested that Colen Campbell was Burlington’s first architectural mentor. If this was indeed the case, and it seems likely given the association between the two men in the early days at Burlington House, Burlington would have had links to William Benson through Campbell and would have been well-aware of Benson’s infiltration of the Office of Works. Benson’s forceful arrival at this architectural centre represented the first wave of an attack on the architectural establishment and, although ill-prepared and doomed to failure, this first pre-emptive strike did create sufficient turmoil to allow Burlington’s expansionist neo-Palladian cult to grow a few years later. In fact, Benson’s spectacular rise and even more dramatic fall may have informed Burlington’s own infiltration tactics, which were far more stealthy and insidious.

Burlington was also involved in the Tory circle of neo-Palladians, many of whom were Jacobite exiles. It has been suggested by Jane Clark that Burlington was a Jacobite himself and, although no concrete evidence exists to support this theory, it is certainly a strong possibility, given his family’s staunch support of the Pretender. Whether Burlington was a Stuart sympathiser or not, he did indeed have links with the Tory circle, mainly through his good friend, the poet Alexander Pope, who was an integral member of Bolingbroke’s Tory clique. Burlington was also well-known to James Gibbs, the key architect to the Tories, who was the first architect.
selected by Burlington to assist in the re-modelling of Burlington House in 1716. Although Burlington’s desire for architectural purism quickly outgrew the more eclectic Gibbs, it is noteworthy that this architect was the Earl’s first choice.

Burlington was also a key member of the Yorkshire architectural coterie that developed in the early eighteenth century. As previously discussed he was on congenial terms with the Yorkshire family, the Moysers, as well as Sir Thomas Robinson and Robert Benson, who later became Lord Bingley of Bramham, and seems to have had a very informal relationship with other local neighbours with architectural interests. James Lees-Milne reports an occasion when the Earl returned to his house to find General Wade, for whom Burlington designed a neo-Palladian town house, and the Stricklands waiting to dine with him. Burlington’s architectural reputation and input into new Yorkshire building projects would have been cemented after the construction of the 1732 Yorkshire Assembly Rooms and would have acted as a civic beacon calling all Yorkshire county families to recognise neo-Palladianism as the new national style.

**SCOTTISH CONNECTIONS**

Of the circles of interconnections that have not formed a major part of the research presented in previous chapters the circle that has the potential to shed most light on our understanding of neo-Palladianism is perhaps the one which is concerned with Scotland. Colen Campbell himself was a junior member of the huge Campbell clan, headed by John Campbell, 2nd Duke of Argyll, (VB), (1678-1743). Argyll was associated with the famous neo-Palladians Lord Herbert (VB), and his architect Roger Morris (VB) in a friendship that has been described as one in which its participants were ‘inseparable’. Argyll commissioned Roger Morris to design and construct Adderbury House, Oxfordshire, which was built between 1731 and 1744. In 1725 Gibbs had drawn up a design for Adderbury for a recessed portico and garden buildings. These were never executed however, probably due to the alternative scheme provided by Roger Morris. Gibbs’ designs for the Duke were not always superseded by those of other architects however and a successful, proto-Palladian scheme by Gibbs was carried out at another Argyll property, that of Sudbrooke in Petersham, Surrey between 1715 and 1719.

The Campbell clan was a vast network of kin; a circle of connections in its own right pervading many levels of society in Scotland and England, from merchants and sea captains to dukes. A brief scan through the subscription lists of the three volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus* is
indication enough of the strength of the Campbell family, where support for the architectural treatise from other members of the clan is of mafia-like proportions. A detailed investigation into Campbell's clan may well yield dividends in the understanding of the style's dissemination, both in England and Scotland, and may shed much needed light on the author of *Vitruvius Britannicus* and his beginnings as an architect. Howard Colvin's useful work on the connections between Campbell and James Smith (c.1645-1731), the Scottish architect, indicate that Campbell was, in some sense, Smith's student and perhaps explains his otherwise inexplicable transition from lawyer to architect in the early years of his career. Although the thesis presented here is that neo-Palladianism emanated chiefly from Germany via George I's Venetian-Hanoverian architectural style and more specifically his neo-Palladian building projects, the strength of the clan links and influences may well explain Colen Campbell's early success in London as a relatively untired architect.

The clan system with its very high level of intermarriage operated with perhaps an even greater level of exclusivity than the peerage itself, with one branch of the Campbell clan commonly allying with another as well as with other, mainly Scottish, aristocratic families. An example of this is the 1st Earl of Breadlabane (1635-1716) of the Glenorchy branch of Campbells who married Lady Mary Campbell, daughter of Archibald, Marquis of Argyll in 1678, and a member of the main Campbell branch. Other family connections and alliances within the Scottish aristocracy at this time included that between the 3rd Earl of Loudon (VB), (d.1731) and the 2nd Earl of Stair, (VB), (1673-1747) both of whom subscribed to Campbell's folio. Loudon's mother was the very beautiful Eleanor, daughter of the 2nd Earl of Loudon and widow of the 1st Viscount Primrose who married the Earl of Stair in 1714. Eleanor was forced into marriage with the Earl of Stair who, after a refusal from her, concealed himself in her bedroom thus tarnishing her reputation and leaving her no option but to marry him. Despite these unorthodox beginnings, the family alliance between the earldoms of Loudon and Stair was again strengthened when Loudon went on to marry Stair's daughter who was also his mother's new step daughter, Margaret Dalrymple. Loudon was associated with the prolific amateur architect, the Earl of Mar, who often designed in the neo-Palladian idiom in the 1720s. In 1710 both men, as joint Secretaries of State for Scotland, employed James Gibbs to remodel their houses in the Privy Gardens at Whitehall. Loudon was also a nephew of the 2nd Duke of Argyll and the Earl of Islay, later 3rd Duke of Argyll, and obtained the position of Extraordinary Lord of Sessions through the influence of Archibald, 1st Duke of Argyll.

Other close links with the Campbell fraternity included Duncan and John Forbes, the famous Scottish politicians, the Brodies of Lethen, the Campbells of Cawdor and the Campbells of Ardglass, the latter two coming from junior branches of the main family. All were
subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus* and all maintained close friendships with the Duke of Argyll, in the main following his political and stylistic lead. Daniel Campbell, a merchant trader, was also an important member of the family for neo-Palladianism, giving Colen Campbell what was probably his first commission as an architect in Scotland in 1711. Campbell designed the early neo-Palladian villa of Shawfield for Daniel on the north side of the Irongate in Glasgow. Daniel Campbell (VB) was closely associated with the Argyll upon whose interest he became MP for Inverary in the Scottish Parliament in 1702 and later MP for the Glasgow Burghs between 1716 and 1734.\(^5^7\)

In previous chapters it has been seen how architectural preferences were often easily transmitted through family links and friendships. It would, therefore, be interesting to know what effect the extremely close clan mentality had on the dissemination of neo-Palladianism. This effect is likely to have been all the greater due to the much higher level of protectionism within the Scottish aristocracy after the almost universally hated Act of Union between Scotland and England, was passed in 1708.

Of the outstanding circles not researched in depth in the preceding chapters, it is considered that the three circles briefly discussed above, consisting of the coteries surrounding Sir Robert Walpole, the Earl of Burlington and the Campbell clan are likely to be the most informative in shedding light on the style. Remaining connections discovered between subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus*, although of interest, are likely to yield less in terms of understanding the style. For the sake of completeness these connections include the small circle centred upon Lady Elizabeth Germain, (VB) whose family links with Berkeleys of Cranford Park made her the sister-in-law of Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk, with whom she corresponded. Another circle of acquaintance is that which focuses on the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough (VB) and their supporters, including the Earls of Pembroke, Godolphin (VB) and Clare (VB) as well as the Duke of Montagu. Although both the circles surrounding Lady Elizabeth Germain and the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough consist of some subscribers to Campbell's folios, the connections within the coteries are of a fragmentary nature with, at times only tenuous circumstances linking them. For his reason, they are not thought to be of great interest to the dissemination of neo-Palladianism and have not been included in the detailed research.

---

3 Discussions at the 18th Century Villas Conference, January 2006.
4 It should also be remembered that the first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* contained relatively little neo-Palladian propaganda, but was largely a folio celebrating existing architecture and pointing the way for the future. The number of neo-Palladian designs increased substantially in the next two volumes.
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CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this research is to investigate the dissemination of neo-Palladianism holistically and inclusively, approaching the style not as a stand-alone aesthetic, but as an integral part of early eighteenth-century culture and affairs. Extending the field around this well-researched period of architectural history, and looking beyond a purely building by building approach, has led to some surprising discoveries. The results have raised some serious challenges to the accepted views associated with neo-Palladianism, explaining more fully why it was disseminated with such speed and acceptance.

The established wisdom surrounding the style has been largely based upon two, if not wholly erroneous, then certainly misleading, points of view: that Lord Burlington was the pioneering dynamo behind the eighteenth-century neo-Palladian revival, and that the rise in interest in the style was due to the Whig party assuming power and manipulating of the style for its own political ends. When these assumptions are seriously challenged and empirical evidence assessed, a quite different picture emerges. The new evidence presented here radically alters the traditional view of neo-Palladianism and a more accurate analysis of the style and its dissemination becomes clear.

This study demonstrates that neither Lord Burlington nor the aristocracy led the neo-Palladian revolution. The real pioneers of the style included risk-taking merchants, a group of self-made men or their sons, who quickly formed a rank of wealthy *nouveau-riche* in society who wanted to establish landed estates. Men such as William Benson, John Aislabie, Sir Richard Child, Sir Gregory Page, Sir Matthew Decker, and Henry Hoare I all rose rapidly through the ranks to positions of power and accumulated vast fortunes via speculative, and sometimes dubious, business activities. It was these men who pioneered the style by constructing the first eighteenth-century built examples of it in the sylvan and political landscapes. These merchants were not alone in their early deployment of neo-Palladian architecture. They were in company with a group of politically ambitious men from Yorkshire including the MPs William Robinson, Sir Charles Hotham and William Thompson. Indeed these three, as well as Benson, Hoare I and Child, had all constructed credible, neo-Palladian buildings before Lord Burlington had even returned to Italy for his second, and this time architecturally focused, Grand Tour in 1719.

Whilst it is true that members of the aristocracy were quick to adopt this new aesthetic, showing their support for the style through subscription to Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*, they were not the initial instigators of the style in any tangible, built form.
The second assumption, one that has become part of the established historiography of the style, is that neo-Palladianism was the tool of the Whigs. This is a perception which can only be flawed in its failure to address the whole political picture. The style was certainly manipulated to promote the political ends of the Whig party, but it was also adopted, with equal fervour, by the Tories. There were almost as many Tory subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus* as there were self-pronounced Whigs. The slight bias towards Whiggism in the subscription lists can be explained by the fact that the Whigs were in power at the time of publication of all three volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, and that there was an eighteenth-century tendency to declare for the party in power, despite one's true sentiments. The discovery that genuine interest in neo-Palladian architecture transcended political division in the early eighteenth century is an important one. It has been one of the main routes to a deeper understanding of neo-Palladianism than has been possible before, explaining both its immense popularity and its longevity.

Neo-Palladianism, despite the apparent strictness in its elemental and proportional relationships, was, in fact, malleable, adaptable and accommodating in its eclecticism. It could be related to and used to represent almost any political position or philosophical stance through association with the Ancients and their writings. Sir Robert Walpole constructed neo-Palladian Houghton Hall at the height of his influence to demonstrate his learning and virtue. He used neo-Palladianism to justify his position of power and wealth and commissioned statues of himself based on Cicero. Lord Cobham of Stowe used the same architectural style to mock Walpole’s regime, demonstrating that he, Cobham, was a Patriot Whig rather than a Caesarean Whig. Similarly the Jacobite Earl of Mar, at the opposite end of the political spectrum, designed several palaces for the Pretender in the neo-Palladian idiom. The choice of style for the palaces was a deliberate allusion to the glory of the past Stuart reigns and the true monarchy based on the mores of the Roman Senate and people. Another example is the Tory exile, Lord Bolingbroke, who constructed his house at Dawley in a simple proto-Palladian style whilst identifying himself with the Roman Republican Cato, who had sacrificed himself for the love of his country. Thus neo-Palladianism could be adapted to portray and justify almost any political stance. Far from being a liability, this lack of a firm association with any one political position was an enormous strength and the key to its lasting success. As a style it can be seen to have had a symbiotic relationship with society, both developing from society and its obsession with ancient Rome and, at the same time, informing and serving this society.

But what exactly was neo-Palladian architecture and what did neo-Palladians think that they were trying to achieve by building in the style? This issue is often side-stepped in contemporary studies on the subject, which tend to concentrate on a myopic analysis of individual neo-
Palladian buildings rather than the rationale of the whole, admittedly complicated, style.\textsuperscript{5} Richard Hewlings has recently explored the possibility of a more appropriate description for the style, but has been unable to provide a more suitable label for this eclectic body of work.\textsuperscript{6} This attempt at labelling is a mistake. The neo-Palladian period was a phase of feverish, architectural experimentation, with multiple borrowings of classical features from the whole range of Renaissance and Antique architecture. It represented a seemingly restless search for correct form and cannot, therefore, be labelled in any meaningful way. The reason why an all-encompassing, intellectually satisfying, nomenclature for the style remains elusive is that it was not a specific architectural style at all in any strictest sense. Rather neo-Palladianism was merely an expression of neo-Classicism in its early, exploratory phase; a nascent, formative stage. Neo-Palladianism was, in fact, simply the unresolved fore-runner to the more cohesive and easily demonstrative aesthetic of neo-Classicism.

Neo-Palladianism, for want of an alternative terminology, had much in common with other fledgling philosophical and cultural ideas from history where gaps in knowledge and theoretical uncertainty served only to increase the fervour that was felt for the idea. The lack of information about Antique architecture and the limited travel options in the early part of the century meant that there was little certainty over the precise nature of classical forms. As the cult of self-justification through the association of oneself with Antiquity took hold at this time, there was a need for an accurate classical architecture to represent visually the nation’s obsession with self-expression and validation through Ancient association.\textsuperscript{7} In the very early part of the century the work of Andrea Palladio, as published in \textit{I Quattro Libri}, was one of the few accessible forms of both Antique and sixteenth-century classical architecture and, in lieu of other classical sources, was seized upon avidly. However, neo-Palladianism provides the clearest indication that it was not Palladio’s work \textit{per se} that was important to the revivalists. Just as Palladio himself borrowed widely from Serlio, Bramante and Alberti, so extant buildings from the English neo-Palladian period are just as likely to incorporate features associated with these Renaissance architects as well as subsequent Palladian disciples such as Scamozzi, Jones and Webb. Examples of this eclectic borrowing include Wilbury House, which is largely based upon Webb’s Amesbury, Holkham Hall, whose towers were directly taken from Scamozzi’s Antique Villa, and Lord Burlington’s Assembly Rooms in York, which were based upon Palladio’s reconstruction of Vitruvius’ Egyptian Hall.\textsuperscript{8} This very eclecticism demonstrates that it was never the general intention in the early eighteenth century to emulate Palladio’s style doggedly and unthinkingly, but to use his work alongside other sources where they existed, as a means of reviving a truly Antique architecture.
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When Robert Adam returned from Rome in 1758, laden with fresh ideas for a more scholarly and archaeologically coherent neo-Classical style, neo-Palladianism was seen for what it was: the manifestation of an early, experimental pursuit of a nebulous classical style. Neo-Palladianism was quite rightly passed over by classical enthusiasts in the face of a better and truer interpretation of Ancient architecture, and neo-Classicism, as we now know it, was launched. Just as the trickle of English visitors to the mock-Venetian court at Hanover in the early eighteenth century had given birth to English neo-Palladianism, so improvements in travel in the mid century, and the progression of stylistic ideas, made the neo-Palladian style redundant and out-dated, to be superseded by Adam’s version of neo-Classicism.

This research has approached neo-Palladianism in an inclusive way, looking at the architecture within the context of early eighteenth-century culture and especially in relation to the society from which it developed. The plethora of links and connections within a close-knit elite that have been discovered and presented here have cast a very different light on the style and serve to demonstrate how much more meaningful it is to examine neo-Palladianism within its context, especially given the cult of self-justification through the association of oneself with Antiquity that abounded at this time.

---

## APPENDIX 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of St Albans</strong>, (Beauchler, Charles) 1670-1726. S of Charles II by Nell Gwynn. M Lady Diana Vere, celebrated beauty, sole heiress of Aubrey de Vere, 20th and last Earl of Oxford. Probably a Whig since, in 1712 when Tory ministry triumphed, he was sacked from post as Captain of the band of pensioners only to be reinstated by George I. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Argyll</strong>, 2nd Earl, (Campbell, John). 1678-1743. Eton and Glasgow Universities. Studied law in Utrecht. GT in Italy 1712. Military career and suc. to dukedom in 1703. Fought with Marlborough (VB) to uphold Protestant succession. Argyll hated Marlborough, a mystery. Tory, but not opposed to Hanoverian reign. Given posts when George I came to the throne. Campbell and Gibbs did designs for him. Would have known J. Armstrong (VB). Bro. to Earl of Islay (VB) and Earl of Loudoun (VB). Uncle was Hon. John Campbell (VB). His Sis., Lady Anne Campbell, M Earl of Bute. (VB). Head of Campbell clan to which Colen Campbell belonged. Argyll was in Italy in 1712 as was Lord Herbert (VB), they were intimate friends. Argyll an enthusiastic Palladian. Lived within 15 miles of Bolingbroke (VB) at Dawley, Shrewsbury (VB), Rochester (VB), Berkeley (VB), Richard Hill (VB), Carleton (VB) and Orrery (VB). Built Adderbury c1722 and Sudbrooke, 1726-28, both by Gibbs. Banked at Hoares from 1710. [DNB, Hoare and Co. Ltd, 1955; B.T White, The History of Dawley, 2002.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marquis of Annandale</strong>, (Johnstone, James) d. 1730. Sis. Henrietta married Charles Hope, Earl of Hopeton (VB). Made Earl in 1703. [DNB, under Fa., William’s, entry.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Albemarle</strong>, (Keppel, Arnold Joost Van) 1669-1718. Came to England with William of Orange as his constant companion. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tally Court 1710-d.</strong> Banked at Hoares from 1714. [Hoare and Co Ltd, 1955; RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hon. Richard Arundel,</strong> 1696-1758. S of John Arundell, 2nd Baron Arundell of Trerice, by 2nd W Barbara, D of Sir Thomas Slingsby, widow of Sir Richard Mauleverer of Allerton Mauleverer. She M 3) 1708, Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke. Of Allerton Mauleverer, Yorks. M, 1732, Lady Frances Manners, D of John Manners MP 2nd Duke of Rutland. MP Knaresborough 1720 and 1758. He was lifelong friend of Earl of Burlington whose architectural tastes he shared and who made him an executor and trustee. A bosom friend of Henry Pelham, both M Ds of Duke of Rutland, and on intimate terms with Duke of Newcastle. A page to Q. Anne, returned by Burlington for Knaresborough, Walpole took him up and invited him to Houghton, to consult him on architecture. By the 50s he was a reigning favourite at court. He lived at 34 Gt. Burlington St, land leased for speculative development by Lord Burlington. His house here was designed by Colen Campbell for him. Gen. Wade also lived in this St. and when he d, Arundel bought his house. He inherited Earl of Warwick’s estate via Earl of Warwick’s Mo. who was a friend of Lady Pembroke. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Joseph Addison,</strong> 1672-1719. Born at father’s rectory, Milston, nr. Amesbury, Wilts. Charterhouse and Queens College, Ox. M Countess of Warwick in 1716. MP Malmesbury 1709. Scholar who excelled at Latin poems. Essayist, Poet and Statesman. Lost office with fall of Whigs. Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax was his patron. Lord Somers (VB) obtained pension for him. A sincere Christian, looked upon Catholicism with contempt akin to Shaftesbury. Member of Kit-Cat Club. By patronage of Goldolphin (VB) rose to be politician and literary buff. Friend of Swift. Stepson was the dissolute Earl of Warwick (VB). House in Chelsea. Addison became Sunderland’s friend (Sunderland visitor to Shaftesbury’s house ‘Little Chelsea’). Secretary of State in 1717, poor health and retired 1718. His Bro, Gulston Addison, was ‘Governor’ Addison of Fort St George after Governor Pitt in 1710. Addison therefore connected to E I Co. and trade. [DNB; Lady Russell, Swallowfield and its Owners.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Anderson, Gentleman waiter to the Signet in Edinburgh. [VB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Arbuthnot, 1667-1735. Physician and mathematician. Fellow of Royal Soc. and wit., Q.Anne’s favourite. Owned a house in Cork St but lived at St James’ Palace so easily available to Q. Anne. Close to Mashams. Member of the dining club of St John’s, formed 1711, and later called Brothers Club. Attacked the Whigs, friend of Pope and Gay. [Victoria Glendinning, Jonathan Swift, 1998.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Col. John Armstrong</strong>, 1674-1742. M Anne Priscilla, D of Major</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Aislabie, 1670-1742.</strong> 4th S of George Aislabie, Registrar to the ABP of York by Mary, D of Sir John Mallory from whom she inherited Studley Royal in 1666. Aislabie inherited estate at Studley Royal, Yorks in 1696. Educ. at Mr Tomlinson's, York, St John’s College, Camb., 1687 and Trinity Hall, Cambs., 1692. M 1) Anne, (d. 1700) D of Sir William Rawlinson, 1S, 2 Ds. Anne was Sis. of Elizabeth, who was M to Giles Earle, Benson’s uncle-in-law. Benson may have met Aislabie through his W’s family. Aislabie’s Sis. (Mary) was M to Sir William Robinson (VB) 2) Judith, D of Sir Thomas Vernon, London merchant and MP, widow of Stephen Waller. Her S Edmund Waller (Aislabie’s Stepson) M Mary, D of Aislabie. His W Judith’s Bro. was Thomas Vernon who was expelled from House of Commons for trying to influence Gen. Ross in Favour of Aislabie in South Sea crisis. Statesman and politician. MP for Ripon 1695-1702, Northallerton 1702-05, Ripon 1705-08. Lord of the Admiralty 1710-1714. Treasurer of the Navy 1714-18, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1718-21. Involved in building and designing Palladian buildings and water garden at Studley. Began a Tory but left them at height of their power to join Whigs, gained respect for him with Whigs. Adhered to Sunderland after split, resigned in 1721 after South Sea Bubble, but not before he had secured reversion of the great Exchequer for his S, William. Aislabie was found guilty of corruption over S. Sea Bubble and sent to Tower. Walpole stood by him and saved him his assets. Unpopular man. His S William M Elizabeth, D of Earl and Countess of Exeter (VB). Knew Sir Theodore Janssen (VB) also Director of South Sea Co. Aislabie had a neo-Palladian house designed for him at Waverly Abbey, Farnham, Surrey. Good friends with Benson, Aislabie helped to get him to office in 1718. [DNB; RS; Fry., C, Spanning the Political Divide, in Garden History, Vol. 31:2, 2003.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Buckingham</strong>, His D M Lord Herbert (VB), later 9th Earl of Pembroke, 'architect earl', so likely he visited Wilton, Wilts connection. Banked at Hoare’s from 1714. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Broadalbin</strong>, (Breadalbane), 1st Earl (Campbell, John). 1635-1716. From Glenochry branch of Campbells, only S of Sir John Campbell, 10th Laird of Glenochry and Lady Mary Graham, D of William, Earl of Stratham. M 1) 1657, Lady Mary Rich, D of Henry Holland, 2 Ss, Duncan, Lord Ormelie, passed over in succession and John, Lord Glenochry. 2nd Earl 1662-1752. 2) Lady Mary Campbell, D of Archibald, Marquis of Argyll. Had 1 S (by a 3rd W), Colin Campbell of Armaddie. Became Earl in 1681 (of Breadalbane and Holland). Most powerful man in highlands after Duke of Argyll. Very greedy. Withdrew support from Pretender just in time to avoid inquiry. The subscriber in VB2 and VB3 was this Earl’s S. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Broadalbin,</strong> (Breadalbane) 2nd Earl (Campbell, John) 1662-1752. Known as 'Old Rag'. S of 1st Earl. M Henrietta, 2nd D of Sir Edward Villiers, Knight, Sis. of 1st Earl of Jersey and Elizabeth, Countess of Orkney (William III's mistress). Had 1 S, Lord Glenorchy (VB) who became 3rd Earl of Breadalbane. Related to John Campbell of Calder (VB). [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Balmerinoch,</strong> (Master Balmerino) of Jacobite persuasion and a Lord of the highlands, knew Mar (VB). [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baron Bothmar,</strong> (Hans, Johann Kaspar Von) 1656-1732. Built Palladian palace in Germany. Successively Hanoverian courtier and diplomat. Gentleman in Waiting (Hofjunker) to Sophia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron Bernstorff, (Andreas Gottlieb Von) 1649-1726. In Celle service since 1699, Chancellor to George Wilhelm of Celle and minister from 1705 to George. Retired 1723. More powerful than Bothmar as he would argue with George. A skilled diplomat with wide circle of correspondents incl. Earl of Portland in William III s confidence. [Hatton, R., George I, 2001.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Berkeley of Stratton, 3rd Earl. S of 1st Lord Berkeley of Stratton, (John Berkeley) d.1678 and Christiana Riccard, D of wealthy London merchant in East India Co. On 1st Earl’s d. title passed to his three sons in turn, this Lord was 3rd earl. Built Cranford House Middx., very plain, early George style but some elevations Vanbrughian. Dem. 1944. Thomas Coke of Melbourne (VB) Hall, was probable architect. Lived within 15 miles of Bolingbroke (VB) with whom he was friends and sometimes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenanted house in park at Dawley. Friends with Argyll (VB), Richard Hill (VB), Rochester (VB), Shrewsbury (VB), Orrier (VB) and Carleton (VB). Banked at Hoare's from 1718. [Hoare and Co. Ltd.,1955.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Belhaven</strong>, d. 1732. An advocate. Succeeded to 3rd baronetcy after Bro. drowned on his way to Barbados as new Governor off coast of Lizard, Cornwall. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bruce</strong>, Of Tottenham Court, Wilts. M Lord Burlington’s Sis. (Lady Juliana). She was his 2nd W. His first W was Lord Burlington’s (and Lady Juliana’s) aunt. Good friends with Thomas Coke (VB) and Lord Stair (VB) and Lord Essex (VB) on GT 1717-18. Banked at Hoare’s from 1704. [Hoare and Co. Ltd.,1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hon. James Brudenell</strong>, 1687-1746 2nd S of Francis, Lord Brudenell. MP 1713-46. Lord of Trade 1730-d. M Susan Burton. His Bro. George, 1685-1732, was ES of Francis Lord Brudenell and suc. gd/Fa as 3rd Earl of Cardigan and M Lady Elizabeth Bruce, D of 2nd Earl of Ailesbury. Both Bros. (catholics) visited Italy with tutor and older cousin, Duke of Shrewbury, who was already in Rome. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir James Bateman</strong>, elder. 1660-1718. Flemish immigrant of</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Bateman, the younger. d.1758. 2nd S of above. M Anne, D of Sir Robert Chaplin. Bought manor of Alford, Lincs. Alterations to interior of Shobden Court in 1746 by Flitcroft but by his Bro. William, 1st Visc. Bateman. After 1719, also owned land in Erith and Tooting. MP Carlisle 1722-27. This subscriber was in VB 1 and VB2 as plain James Bateman. In VB3 he is entered as Sir James Bateman although there is no record of him ever becoming a ‘Sir’.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Bennet, fl.1693-1724. Also Bt. of Grubet, MP. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Benson, William’s Bro. appointed Clerk of Works in place of Hawksmoor and Secretary to the Board of Works. He was a merchant in Holland. (Colvin, The History of the Kings Works, Vol. V, 1976.)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bridgeman, Garden Designer.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Blackerby. Batty Langly lived next door to him in Parliament Stairs and built him an ornamental garden temple. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Francis Bickerton</strong></td>
<td>Of York. Worked with Francis Smith of Warwick. Worked on Mansion House, York, 1725-7 and Wentworth Woodhouse, Yorks. A person of his name was Clerk of Works at Richmond 1749-54 and at the Queen’s House, Greenwich, 1754-1768.</td>
<td>[Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Blake Senior</strong></td>
<td>Solicitor and forerunner of the eminent firm of Tylee and Co. Banked at Hoare’s from 1708.</td>
<td>[Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rt. Hon. William Blathwayt</strong></td>
<td>(Secretary Blathwayt) 1649?-1717. Of Dyrham Park, Glos. by Talman, completed in 1698 and in VB.</td>
<td>Politician. Stationed in Stockholm and Copenhagen. MP Bath 1693-1710. Strong Whig, retired in 1710 and died at Dyrham in 1717. Numerous letters to and from him are preserved at Dyrham Park and in British Museum and Bodleian.</td>
<td>[DNB.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir John Brownlow</strong></td>
<td>1690-1754. S of Sir William Brownlow and Dorothy, D of Sir Richard Mason of Sutton. Of Humby, and Belton, Lincs. M 1) 1712. Eleanor (d.1730) and D of his Uncle, Sir John Brownlow of Belton Lincs. 2) 1732, Elizabeth, D of William Cartwright of Marnum, Botts. Lord Tyrconnel in 1718.</td>
<td>Knight of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bath</strong> in 1725. Attended private meetings at Walpole’s house. His D Elizabeth M Lord Guildford (VB). In VB3 as Viscount Tyrconnel which he attained in 1718. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Bowls</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1696. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Baird</strong>, In 1724 he rebuilt the Kilbarchan Church of Renfrewshire Master Mason of Govan, nr. Glasgow. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Bailey</strong>, Of Jerviswood. Had new wings added to Mellerstain, Berwickshire by William Dam in 1725-9 (leading society architect of the day who was influenced by Vanbrugh). D married Lord Binning. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Basket</strong>, d.1742. Printer to His Majesty. Printed bibles and had a monopoly after buying rights from others. Banked at Hoare’s from 1698. [Hoare and Co. Ltd. 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Francis Bird</strong>, “statuary” 1667-1731. Went to Brussels at 11 yrs old to study sculpting and then Rome. Student of Grinling Gibbons and Cibber. Sculptor. Bird secured favour of Wren and worked at St Paul’s. Not a good sculptor by all accounts. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Beale, Carpenter. fl.1721. Joiner. Chicheley Hall, Bucks. Did Staircase assisted by Thomas Baxter and Mr Illison.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Badslade, (Badeslade) Land Surveyor.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bligh, S of Thomas Bligh of Rathmore. Of Rathmore, County Meath. M, 1713, Theodosia, D of Edward Lord Clarendon (3rd Earl). Q. Anne gave Theodosia £10k on her marriage. Lady Theodosia came into fortune when her Bro., the Jacobite Lord Cornbury, d. in 1713. Became Baron Clifton of Rathmore in 1721 (but still noted as John Bligh in VB2 whilst in VB3 he is included twice, as John Bligh and as Lord Darnly, an honour he received in 1725. Possible that in VB3 John Bligh and Lord Darnly are 2 separate people, perhaps his S?). [Lady Russell, Swallowfield and its Owners, 1901.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Clare, 4th Earl (Holles, Thomas Pelham). Later Duke of Newcastle, 1693-1768. Educ. Westminster School and Clare Hall, Camb. M, 1717, Lady Henrietta, D of Francis, 2nd Earl of Godolphin (VB), and grand-daughter of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough (VB). Added name Holles to his name when suc. Uncle, John, 3rd Earl of Clare, in 1711. Cr. Earl of Clare in 1714 under George I. By the 2nd marriage of his Bro. in law Charles, 2nd Visc. Townshend (VB) to Dorothy Walpole (Sis. of Robert Walpole) the Earl of Clare was brought into close contact with Walpole himself. Marriage connected him with Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland (VB) gave him enormous political influence. Banked at Hoare’s from 1714. By VB2 and VB3 he is entered as the Duke of Newcastle. [Hoare and co., Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Howard by Robinson 1753. Banked at Hoare’s from 1695. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Cardigan</strong>, 4th Earl. Set of unbound drawings for a house in Dover Street for this Earl. Unknown whether executed. One Earl of Cardigan banked at Hoare’s from 1704. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Cadogan</strong>, 1st Earl (William Cadogan) 1675-1726. ES of Henry Cadogan. Design for him in ‘palatial style’ in VB. M 1) Margaretta, D of William Munter (Cllr of Court at Holland) 2 Ds 1) Lady Sarah, M to 2nd Lord Richmond 2) Lady Margaretta, M Count Bentinck, 2nd S of Earl of Portland (VB). William Cadogan served under William III and attracted notice of Marlborough. On special duty in Hamburg. Received Queen’s bounty after Blenheim. Special missions in Hanover and Vienna 1705. MP Woodstock. 1715 Governor of IOW. General, 1718 elevated to Earlom. 1722 commissioner of Chelsea Hospital. One of the Lord Justices when King abroad. Buried in Westminster Chapel. Nephew was Thomas Pendergrast (VB). Fellow generals were Gen. Evans (VB), Major Gen. Pepper (VB) Gen. Carpenter, Hon. Col. Charles Cadogan (VB) and Gen. Stewart who built Hanover Sq. All these men were living in Hanover Sq. in 1717. All were Whigs. In VB2 he is styled Lord Cadogan. [DNB; John Summerson, Georgian London, 1945.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Coventry</strong>, 5th Earl. (William)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Clare</strong>, 4th Earl (Holles, Thomas Pelham), later Duke of Newcastle, 1693-1768. Educ. Westminster School + Clare Hall, Cambs. M, 1717, Lady Henrietta, D of Francis, 2nd Earl of Godolphin (VB), and grand-daughter of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough (VB). Added name Holles to his name when suc. Uncle in 1711 (John 3rd Earl of Clare). Cr. Earl of Clare in 1714 under George I. By the 2nd marriage of his Bro. in law Charles, 2nd Visc. Townshend (VB) to Dorothy Walpole (Sis. of Robert Walpole) the Earl of Clare was brought into close contact with Walpole himself. Marriage connected him with Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland (VB) gave him enormous political influence. Banked at Hoare’s from 1714. By VB2 and VB3 he is entered as the Duke of Newcastle. [Hoare and co., Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Carleton</strong>, (Henry Boyle). Of Middleton Park, Middleton Stoney, Oxon, c1715, by Vanbrugh but destroyed by fire in 1755. Lived within 15 miles of Bolingbroke at Dawley, Berkeley, Ortery, Shrewsbury, Richard Hill, Argyll and Rochester. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lady Cairnes</strong>, Probably the W of Sir Alexander Cairnes, 1st Bt. and MP (d.1732). [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Conway</strong>, Of Newmarket, Ragley in Warks. and Sandywell Park where he added wings in 1720/1730. Works at Ragley 1748-1755 by Gibbs. Conway was cousin to Sir Edward Seymour at Maiden Bradley, Wilts (VB). They are similar buildings and it is likely that Conway sent his architect, Roger Hurlbutt, to his cousin. Banked at Hoare’s from 1706. [Hoare and Co., 1955; Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Coleraine</strong>, 3rd Baron, (Hare, Henry) 1693-1749. Seat at Bruce Castle, Tottenham High Cross, nr. London, also at Langbrough, Wilts. Carried out substantial alterations to Bruce Castle incl. new stair identical to Chevening, Kent. for Earl of Stanhope (VB) by Nicholas Dubois. Likely that some work at</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Castle due to Dubois. Educ. Corpus Christi College, Oxford,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[where his tutor M his sister Lydia]. M but separated early and by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740s had formed connection with Rose Duplessis and had 1 D Henryetta. Antiquary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suc. to title in 1708. Visited Italy 3 times and collected drawings of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antiquities, buildings and pictures. Toured in England with William Stukeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.1765) and Horace Walpole. Bequeathed pictures and drawings of buildings to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Soc. of Antiquaries. Collected a huge library. [DNB; GG Journal, 2003.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Coningsby, (Coningsby, Thomas) 1656?-1729. Bought Crown Manor of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leominster in 1692 and owned Hampton Crt, Herefordshire which was altered by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colen Campbell (in VB). M 1) 1674-5, Barbara Gorges. Had 3 Ds and 3 Ss, 2) April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698, Lady Frances Jones, D of Richard, Earl of Ranelagh. Had one S, choked to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death on cherrystone aged 2, and 2 Ds. D Margaret M Michael Newton (VB). MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1679 for Leominster, Herefordshire 1710 and then from 1715 til elevation to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peerage in 1719. Ardent supporter of the Glorious Revolution in 1688. Resisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobite cause with zeal, prominent Whig. Fought duel with Lord Chandos (VB).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost seat with Tory resurgence c1711 but back in favour at George I's accession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour in Herefordshire. Sent to tower in 1721 for libelling Lord Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Parker. Banked at Hoare's from 1692. By VB3 he was Earl Coningsby. [Hoare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Ltd., 1955; DNB; C J Robinson, A History of the Mansions and Manors of Hereford, 1873.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Carmichael, 3rd Earl. 1701-1767. Of Hyndford. S of James, 2nd Earl and</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Maitland, only D of John, 5th Earl of Lauderdale. M 1) Elizabeth, ED of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiral Sir Clowdsley Shovell and widow of 1st Lord Romney, 2) Jean, D of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Lanarkshire. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Carpenter, (George Carpenter). M, 1693, Hon. Alice Margetson, D of William,</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Visc. Charlemont, and widow of James Margetson. Lieut. Gen. of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire. Began as Page to Lord Montagu in Paris in 1671. 1705 Brigadier,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710 Gen. Lieut. Resolved to maintain protestant succession. During 1715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebellion was Supreme Commander of all forces in England, Governor of Menorca.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Whitchurch, Hants. In 1714. Buried at Ousleby, Hants. Assisted in the '15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by his good friend Charles Hotham (VB). [DNB; Stutchbury, Colen Campbell, 1967;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling, A.M.W., The Hothams, 1918.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Chetwynd, (John, 2nd Visc.) d.1767. 2nd S of John Chetwynd of Ridge in</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs. Lived at Ingestre Manor. Likely educ. at Westminster School and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch College, Ox. as his Bro. went to both. Receiver Gen. of Duchy of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster. Niece M Hon. John Talbot, S of Lord Chancellor Talbot. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Campbell of Aberuchill, d.1754. 2nd Bt. Aberuchill.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Richard Child</strong>, 1680-1750. Ygst S of Sir Josiah Child who bought Wanstead in 1673. Child rebuilt Wanstead on large scale. A Tory til 1715 when he changed to Whigs. Design for him for Wanstead in VB1 and VB3 by Campbell. Also had a house in Hanover Sq. His fa., Sir Josiah, was Director of E. I. Co. in 1677 and for a time ruled the Co. absolutely. Sir Josiah bought Wanstead in 1673 and on his d. his S, also Josiah, leased it to his half Bro. Sir Richard. Richard suc. to the title in 1704 on d. of his half Bro. Became Visc. Castlemain (an Irish peerage he purchased) in 1718 and Earl Tylney in 1731. Richard M Dorothea and when she inherited the Tylney estates in Rotherwick he took name of Tylney and got earldom in Tylney name. Had 5 children. ES died of small pox in 1734; 2nd S John (1712-1784) suc. to title but lived mostly exiled in Italy as gay; D Emma M Sir Robert Lang MP. MP for Maldon 1708-1710, Essex 1710-1722, and 1727-34. Banked at Hoare’s from 1710. Died in Aix-en-Provence. (Not related to Childs of Osterley—the bankers). In VB3 he is entered as Lord Castlemain. [D.F Keeling, Wanstead House, 1994; Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Duncan Campbell of Lochnell</strong>, 1682-1765. M 1) Lady Isabella Mackenzie, D of 3rd Earl of Seaforth, 2) Margaret, D of Daniel Campbell of Shawfield (VB). VB3 has 2 ‘Sir Duncan Campbells’ Not clear in VB1&amp;2 (with only 1 Sir Duncan C) whether it’s this Campbell (of Lochnell) or another not identified. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y?</td>
<td>Y?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir James Campbell of Abruchill</strong>, 2nd Bt., d.1754. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Robert Child (Knight)</strong>, 1674-1721. ES of Sir Francis Child (1642-1713) of Osterley. Built mansion in Fulham (East End House) on E. side of Parson’s Green and bought Osterley in 1711. Whig. Jeweller to the King til 1697 and lent government much money. In 1702 Master of Goldsmith’s co., and original commissioner for Greenwich Hospital of which he was a great benefactor. Sir Robert was one of 12 Bros. and 3 Sis. Died unm. in 1721 and was first Child to live at Osterley in 1720. Suc. by younger Bro., Sir Francis Child (1684?-1740), who was more successful than Fa., becoming Director of E. I. Co. 1718-1719, 1721-1725, 1726-1730, 1731-1735. Tory MP. and head of Child’s Bank, 1722 master of Goldsmith’s co., MP for City of London in 1727 etc. In 1726 Sir Francis the younger bought Northall. now part of Osterley estate and d. in 1740 unm. [D.F. Keeling,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Robert Child (Knight),</strong> (Subscriber for VB3 a different Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Child as Sir Robert (above) died in 1721. Maybe a S.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sir James Campbell of Ardkinglass, 1665-1752. 1st S of Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Campbell of Ardkinglass. M 1) Margaret, D of Adam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, 2) Anne. MP Scotland 1707-8, Agyllshire, 1708-34,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirlingshire 1734-41. Belonged to a junior branch of Duke of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll’s family, to whom he was attached. Known as ‘Argyll’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creature’. A friend of Aislabie (VB) as voted against move to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confiscate Aislabie’s land after South Sea Bubble. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sir James Cuningham, c1685-1747. S of Sir David Cuningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Isabella, D of James Dalrymple. Descended from earls of Glencaim.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP for Linlithgowshire 1715-1722. On Argyll’s side. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sir Thomas Cross(e), 1st Bt. 1663-1738. S of Thomas Crosse of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margarets, Westminster by Mary, Sis. of John Lockwood. Of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, under Dr Busby. M Jane, D of Patrick Lambe of Stoke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poges, Bucks. Suc. Fa in 1682. Director South Sea co. 1721-4. Family were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brewers. Tory. MP for Westminster 1701, 1702-5,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710-22. His only S was John Crosse (1700-1762) of Westminster,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who went to Westminster School, ChristChurch College, Ox., and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelled in Italy. [RS; Ingamells, Dictionary of British and Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travellers in Italy, 1997.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sir James Carmichael, Probably James Carmichael of Hailes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House, Colinton, for which there survives a plan by Sir James Clerk</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik). [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Sir Alexander Cummins, c1670-1725. S of Alexander Cummins (Cumming) by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen, D of James Allardice of Kincardine. Of Culter, Aberdeen. In 1721 Gibbs</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Alexander Jaffray made plans for alteration and extension of Culter House,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire for him. M 1) Elizabeth (d. 1709), D of Sir Alexander Swinton,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mersington. 2) 1710, Elizabeth, D of William Dennis of Puckelechurch, Glos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Aberdeenshire 1709-22. A Tory under Q. Anne but often voted for Whigs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loser in South Sea scheme and died in debt. Suc. Fa. 1715. [RS; Colvin 1995.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D of Sir John Newton, 3rd Bt. of Barrs Court, Bitton, Glos. GT 1717/18 and</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends with Lord Stair (VB), Bruce (VB) and Essex (VB). M Lady Margaret Tufton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufton, 6th Earl of Thanet. She became <em>suo jure</em> Baroness of Clifford 1734.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suc. Fa 1707, Baron Lovel in 1728 and Earl of Leicester 1744. Walpole’s chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral manager for Norfolk in 20s. By VB3 he was Earl of Leicester. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Hon. Colonel Charles Cadogan, 1691-1776. M a D of Hans Sloane (VB) which</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>began connection of Cadogans in Chelsea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Campbell, (Col.) 1680-1745. 3rd S of James, 2nd Earl of Loudoun by Lady Mary Montgomerie, D of Hugh, 7th Earl of Eglinton. Of Rowallan, Ayrshire. M 1) Lady Jean Boyle, D of 1st Earl of Glasgow. His nephew was 3rd Earl of Loudoun. Military service from Blenheim to Fonteroy. His Bros. were Lord Loudon and Lord Islay. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Thomas Cornwallis, 1663-1731. 4th S of Charles, 2nd Lord Cornwallis by Margaret Playsted. 1676 he and Bro. William were at Corpus Christi, Camb., under tutorship of Mr Lane. M 1) Jane (widow of Col. Vernam) 2) Anne, D of Sir Hugh Owen. Commissioner of lotteries (he founded national lottery). [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Churchill, d. 1745. S of Charles Churchill, 1656-1714, who was Bro. to 1st Duke of Marlborough. This Charles was therefore nephew to Duke of Marlborough (VB). Lieut-Gen. in 1739, Governor of Chelsea in 1720-22. MP for Castle Rising, Norfolk for 30 years, under Walpole’s influence. Had a natural son Charles by Mrs Oldfield the celebrated actress. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Caesar, 1673-1741, MP, Treasurer of the Navy, Jacobite. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Cranenburgh, (Kreienberg, Christoph Friedrich). Hanoverian resident in London 1710-14. He assisted Bothmar in the London Embassy before 1714. Cranenburgh, Bothmar, Bernstorff, Melusina and Sophia Charlotte all accepted money from Brydges, later Duke of Chandos (VB), for creation of an Earldom for his Fa. who became Earl of Carnarvon which then passed to Brydges. [Hatton, R., George I, 2001.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archibald Campbell, 1691-1756. Ecclesiastical historian. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Campbell esq, 1671-1753. Estate of Shawfield. Glasgow merchant and MP 1707. Design for him in VB2 for Shawfield by Campbell, according to Stutchbury, he was Campbell’s 1st and only commission in Scotland that we are aware of. [Stutchbury, Colen Campbell, 1967, Shawfield papers, National Archives.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt Hon Compton, Spencer, 1673?-1743. S of 3rd Earl of</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton and 2nd wife Mary, D and heiress of Baptist, 3rd Visc. Campden. Speaker of the House of commons. Campbell built him Compton Place, Eastbourne 1726-7. Educ. Trinity College, Ox. as commoner. MP Eye from 1698 and for next 6 parliaments. Abandoned Tory principles early and became Whig. 1714 he was unanimously elected as speaker, post he held til parliament dissolved in 1727. From 1722-1730 held lucrative post of Paymaster General. George I had intended that Compton be PM but Walpole got this due to popularity. Cr. Baron Wilmington in 1727 and eventually became PM on Walpole’s overthrow in 1742. Member of Kit Kat Club. Uncle was Edward Nicholas (VB) a Tory and member of October Club. His nephew was Duke of Dorset (VB). Later Earl of Wilmington. He was an associate of 1st Earl of Stanhope (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hon. Colonel James St Claire, 1688-1762. 12th Baron St Clair. Later became a Gen. and corresponded with Sir John Clerk of Penicuik. [National Archives catalogue.] | N | N | Y |

| Hon. Colonel Charles Cathcart, 8th Baron Cathcart, 1686-1740. [National Archives catalogue] | N | N | Y |

| Sir Thomas Clargis, Probably related to Sir Thomas Clargis, 3rd Bt., d.1782 who travelled in Italy in late 18th C. Not his father though as Sir Thomas Clargis 3rd Bt. inherited title from gd/Fa which means his father was not a ‘Sir’ and VB subscriber was a ‘Sir’. [Ingamells, J., Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1997.] | N | Y | Y |


| George Clarke, 1661-1736. Friends with Aldrich at Oxford, mild Tory. Friends with Bolingbroke. Banked at Hoare’s from 1698. Christchurch Dean and Chapter also had a/c at Hoare’s from 1711. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.] | Y | Y | Y |

| R. Cresswell, Probably the Richard Cresswell who was in Genoa in 1716 and Naples 1718. [Ingamells, 1997, p.254] | Y | Y | Y |


<p>|  | Y | Y | Y |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Churchill, Master carpenter to His Majesty, in Office of works. S-in-law of Matthew Banckes (d.1706) eminent master carpenter of the age of Wren. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cooper, Admitted as Member of the ‘Company of Carpenters, Tylers and Brickmakers’ on 29 June 1727, also probably an architect. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lockhart of Carnwath, Ardent Jacobite. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coke of Norfolk Street, Coke helped Bolingbroke (VB) design aspects for Dawley. Became Lord Lovell. Great friend of Bolingbroke’s, drinking and womanising together in youth. Banked at Hoare’s from 1698. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; Douglas Harkness, Bolingbroke, 1937.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Courthope, Merchant, Possibly related to the Peter Courthope who was wainscoting the staircase at Ditchley for Lichfield in 1726. [Gomme, Andor, Architects and Craftsmen at Ditchley, Architectural History, Vol. 32, 1989.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colen Campbell of St James, 1676-1729. Architect and Scot. Designed Wanstead 1715-20, demolished 1822; Rolls house in Chancery Lane 1717-18; Mereworth, Kent 1723; Drumlanrig Castle, Dumfriesshire and others. Architect to POW in 1725, Surveyor of the works at Greenwich Hospital, d. in residence at Whitehall 1729. No issue. His widow d. in 1738. His own house was 76 and 78 Brook Street, Whitehall. He trained in law before switching to architecture. Owned 31 Gt Burlington St. but always leased it, never lived there. In 1726 he also took a house on the Grosvenor estate. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Clements Bookseller, Of Oxford. Possibly Mr Clements who banked at Hoare’s from 1695. [Hoare and Co. Ltd, 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Derby</strong>, 11th Earl. Daniel Garrett, d.1753, one of Lord Burlington’s protégés, produced designs for Lord Derby. [Colvin,1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Denbigh</strong>, William Fielding, 5th Earl, 1697-1755. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Denbigh</strong>, One of his houses was Newnham Paddox, Warks. which Lancelot Brown remodelled in 1753-5. In Hanover in 1706. His D M Duke of Kingston. Banked at Hoare’s from 1707. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; Colvin, 995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Dundonald</strong>, (Cochrane, Thomas) 7th S of William Cochrane of Ochiltree and Lady Mary Bruce, D of Alexander. 2nd Earl of Kincardine. Seat was Wester Stanley, Renfrew. M 1) 1st cousin Elizabeth, d. 1743, D of James Ker of Morriestoun, Berwick 2) 1744, Jean, D of Archibald Stuart of Torrence, Lanark. Earl in 1758. MP Renfrewshire 1722-27. Follower of Argyll and post in Menorca probably due to Argyll. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marquis of Dorchester</strong>, Also 1st Duke and 5th Earl of Kingston.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s College, Cambs. M a D of the 1st Earl of Denbigh in 1687 (Lady Mary Fielding). One of the Earls of Denbigh subscribed to VB (not lady Mary’s Fa. or Bro. as both dead in 17th century. Could have been her nephew 3rd Earl?). His D was the famous Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Became Marquis of Dorchester in 1708. Staunche Whig and member of the Kit-Cat Club. Prominent leader of the fashionable world. He was Dep. Lieut. of Wilts. in 1701 and Custos Rotulorum of Wilts. from 1706-1712. In VB2 and VB3 as Duke of Kingston. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Darnly</strong>, This is probably John Bligh who became Lord Darnly in 1725 though VB3 has entries for both John Bligh and Lord Darnly.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bishop of St Davids</strong>, (Richard Smalbroke), Bishop between 1723-1730. Treasurer of LLandaff, translated to Lichfield and Coventry.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Darnley</strong>, ----Bligh, 2nd Earl. Father of John Bligh, 3rd Earl, 1719-81. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir James Dalrymple</strong>, fl. 1714. 2nd S of Sir James Dalrymple. Of Stair, afterwards 1st Visc. Stair, by Margaret, D of James Ross of Balniel. 3 times married. Scottish Antiquary, a man of great learning, one of best antiquaries of his time. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir David Dalrymple, d.1721. Of Hailes, Haddington. (James Dalrymple (VB) his S?). [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Dodd of Lincoln’s Inn, A Mr Ralph Dodd banked with Hoare’s from 1702. [Hoare’s and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. by widowed mother against church and state. MP Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707-08, Dumfries Burghs 1727-34. Was zealous in support of Hanover and against</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebellion, helped Argyll. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs Dolben</strong>, Probably Anne Dolben, W of Sir Gilbert Dolben,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685-1722, who cherished scholarly tastes. Dryden mentions in the postscript</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to his translation of the Aeneid that Dolben made him a ‘noble present of all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the commentaries of these editions in Latin’. Her husband Gilbert Dolben knew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1915.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord of the Admiralty. Banked at Hoare’s from 1694. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Darby</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1700. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Francis Delaval</strong>, 1692-1752. S of Edward Delaval of S. Dissington, MP by</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary, D of Sir Francis Blake MP of Ford Castle and widow of Ralph Ord of West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord Northumbria. Main seat at Ford Castle. Also built Seaton Delavel. M, 1724,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suc. to maternal gd/Fa Sir Francis Blake in 1718 and assumed name of Blake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaval. Suc. Uncle to Seaton Delaval (Vanburgh) in 1723, Fa. at Dissington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 1744 and Sarah Apreece, (Mo. in law) at Doddington in 1749. His Uncle wrote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of him in 1723 “I don’t know any young gentleman so well liked and so generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esteemed.” Cost of continuing building Seaton Delavel was enormous but he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished what his Uncle started and then ironically died due to a fall on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steps there. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Dinely</strong>, In Padua 1716. [Ingamells, 1997, p.302]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Dunoyer</strong>, Bookfeller. Could have been partly behind VB</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venture with Campbell. He ran the shop of David Mortier at the sign of Erasmus’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head in Exeter exchange in the strand from 1711-1720s. Knew about print trade,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engraving and draughting.[Harris, E., <em>British Architectural Books and Writers</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capt. Nicholas Dubois</strong>, c1665-1735. In 1720s he worked for Lord Burlington.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719-20 built Dawley House for Lord Tankerville (VB). Designed Stanmer Park for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pelham 1722-27. Colvin says not a convinced Palladian but he was involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as he worked for Lord Burlington. Served in British army under Q. Anne, 1709-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Engineer for Marlborough, translator of Leoni’s “The architecture of Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladio”. An architect of French birth. In 1718 entered into partnership with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessandro Galilei. 1719 Master Mason in Office of Works. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr William Dickenson</strong>, c1671-1725. Presumed to be S of Wiliam</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson, Chief Clerk of Kings Works, 1660-1702. Clerk of Works at Greenwich Palace, Surveyor of the College of Westminster Abbey. Wren's deputy. 1711 appointed with Hawksmoor as one of Commissioners to the 50 new churches. A baroque architect. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Dundas</strong>, 1690-1762. S of George Dundas of Dundas and 2nd W Margaret, D of Robert Hay of Monkton, Ayr. of Dundas, Linlithgow. Educ. as an advocate 1715. M 1718, Alison, D of Gen. James Bruce of Kennet, Clackmannanshire. Land was at Dundas, held since 12th C. MP Linlithgow, 1722-27, 1741-43. He was backed by Lord Hopetoun who was attached to Duke of Roxburgh. Suc. Fa. in 1706. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Exeter</strong>, 8th Earl, (John). Of Burghley House, Northants. Employed George Portwood to do repairs there in 1720s. Also paid him to take down steeple at Pickworth, Rutland in 1723 and refront the George Hotel, Stamford in 1724. Earl and Countess of Exeter linked to Aislabie (VB), 5th Earl’s D was Elizabeth Aislabie, W of William Aislabie, John Aislabie’s S. Banked at Hoare’s from 1713. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; Colvin, 1995; DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir John Evelyn</strong>, d.1763. M Anne, D of Edward Boscawen, MP and Sis. of Hugh Boscawen, 1st Visc. Falmouth. 1st Bt. MP. Commissioner of the customs. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Evans</strong>, friends with Lord Cadogan (VB), Major Gen. Pepper (VB) and Gen. Carpenter. All generals were living in Hanover Sq in 1717. Another, Gen Steward built Hanover Sq. All Whigs. [John Summerson, Georgian London, 1945: DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R Edgecomb</strong>, S of Sir Richard Edgecomb, MP of St Edgcomb and Cotehele by Lady Anne Montagu, D of 1st Earl of Sandwich. Intimate with Walpole. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William Emmett of Bromley</strong>, Owned drawings of Whitehall which Campbell obtained from him. Owner of other architectural drawings. [DNB]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Findlator and Seafield.</strong> (James Ogilvy) 1664-1730. Lord Chancellor of Scotland. Educ. for law. Suc. to title in 1711. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Fitzwilliam,</strong> S of Richard Fitzwilliam and Frances Shelley. His S, also Richard, M Catherine Decker, D of Sir Matthew Decker, (VB). They lived at Matthew Decker’s House on Richmond Green. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Foley,</strong> 2nd Lord. Of Witley Court, Worcs. Flitcroft designed porch there. Also owned Foley House in Portland Place, built 1754-1762, dem. 1815. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Finch,</strong> later 8th Earl of Winchelsea. Banked at Hoare’s from 1716. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Compart Fytech</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1707. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.].</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry Fermor</strong>, d.1746. 1st S of James Fermor of Tusmore and Somerton, Oxon. 1733 in Florence and had been in Rome. Travelled to Padua and Venice. [Ingamells, 1997, p.352].</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian Fairfax</strong>, the younger 1676-1748. Trinity College, Cambs. 1693. Scholar. Collected valuable library and gallery of pictures in house at Panton Sq. Sold all to Mr Child of Osterley Park, Middx. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Alexander Fort</strong>, Master Joiner in the Works during Talman’s Comptrollership. S, Thomas Fort, designed Sunbury, Surrey, a villa body linked by quadrant colonnades with office wings based on Palladio’s Villa Mocenigo c1712. [Stutchbury, Colen Campbell, 1967.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Grafton</strong>, 2nd Duke (Fitzroy, Charles). 1683-1757. S of Henry Fitzroy, 1st Duke and 2nd S of Charles II and Barbara Villiers (later Duchess of Cleveland and Countess of Castlemaine). Of Euston Hall, with Palladian temple by Kent and Wakefield Lodge, Northants, by Kent c1748-50. M Isabella, heiress and D of Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington when only 5 yrs old. Also remodelled Euston Hall, Suffolk 1750-56. Lady Burlington was infatuated with him and they were lovers. Lord Burlington (VB) designed a wooden, Palladian bridge for him. His uncle was Lord Lichfield of Ditchley Park (VB) and he was also related to Lord Bolingbroke (VB). Repairs done to Wakefield Place in 1759 by Matthew Brettingham. Duke and Duchess banked at Hoare’s from 1695. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; DNB under son’s entry; James Lees-Milne, Earls of Creation, 1962.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Became 2nd Duke in 1716, friends with King of Prussia. [DNB.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Grantham, (Nassau d’Auverquerque, Henry) 1675-1754.</strong> Banked at Hoares from 1717. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Baron Goerts, (Gortz) (Friedrich Wilhelm Von) 1647-1728.</strong> B in Hesse, first in Holstein Service, then 1686 at George’s suggestion entered Hanoverian service. Diplomat and financial expert. Chief minister in Hanover after 1714. [Hatton, R., George I, 2001.]**</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Guildford, 2nd Lord 1673-1729. S of Francis North, 1st Lord Guildford and Francis Pope, D of Thomas Pope, Earl of Down. M 1) Elizabeth (d 1699) D of Fulk, Lord Brooke and 2) Alice Brownlow, D of Sir John Brownlow (VB). Guildford patronised Robert Brettingham whom he met in Rome. Also had a London property. Used surveyor Thomas Dubisson (d.1775) who was involved in building of Hanover Square and who worked with Nicholas Dubois. [Colvin, 1995.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Glenorchy, (Campbell, John) 1696-1782. S of John, 2nd Earl of Broadalbin (VB) and Henrietta. Christchurch, Ox. M 1) Lady Amabelle Grey, ED of Henry, Duke of Kent (d. 1727) 2) Arabella, D of Sir John Pershall, had 2 Ss and 1D. Invested with order of Bath in 1725. Ambassador to Russia 1731, 1727 + 1734 MP for Saltash, Devon. 1752 became 3rd Earl. d.at Holyrood. [DNB.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lady Elizabeth Germain, (Betty) 1680-1769. 2nd D of Charles, 2nd Earl of Berkeley. Of Drayton, N. Hants. Known for marrying beneath her to Sir John Germain, as his 2nd W, called ‘Lady Betty’. M in 1706 had 3 children, all died young. On deathbed Germain wished property (if Betty had no more children) to pass to ygr. S of Lionel, Duke of Dorset (VB) who had M Elizabeth, D of Lieut. Gen. Walter Philip Colyear, his dear friend in Dutch service (ie pass estate to his friend’s D and her issue). Lady Betty left estate and 20K to Lord George Sackville, Duke of Dorset’s 3rd S who assumed name Germain. She had a house in St James Sq, London. Elder Sis. M Thomas Chamber of Hanworth who had 2 Ds. Parents died young and Lady Betty cared for children. Elder niece M Lord Vere, ygr niece M Lord Temple. Lady Betty’s great niece, Lady Mary Buccleugh, M Lord Charles Spencer, Bro. of 3rd Duke of Marlborough (VB). She was Sis.-in-law to Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk (VB) of Marble Hill via her Bro. 3rd Earl of Berkeley (VB), Bolingbroke’s friend. Also friends with Thomas Coke (VB). [DNB; C.L. April 14 1928.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr John Gibson.</strong> Provost at Queen’s College, Oxford 1717-1730.**</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sir Samuel Garth, 1661-1719. Physician to aristocracy. Poet. Wrote verses throughout life. In 1715 wrote ‘Claremont’ a poem on Lord Clare’s villa. Also wrote in verse a dedication of Ovid’s ‘Art of Love’ to Lord Burlington (VB). Lived in Covent Garden. Knew Pope. Known to be a Whig without being an active politician. [DNB.]

Sir Richard Grosvenor, 4th Bt., 1689-1732. S of Sir Thomas Grosvenor, 3rd Bt. of Eaton Hall, Cheshire, MP by Mary, D of Alexander Davies of Ebury, Scrivener of London. Seat Eaton Hall, Cheshire. Eton 1698-1700, GT Switzerland, Bavaria, Italy and Netherlands. M 1) 1708 Jane (d.1720) D of Sir Edward Wyndham 2nd Bt. of Orchard Wyndham, Sis. of Sir William Wyndham, 3rd Bt. (VB) 2) Diana, D of Sir George Warburton, 3rd Bt. of Arley, Cheshire. He was Bro. of Robert and Thomas Grosvenor. Fa.d. and all three Bros. were brought up by Francis Cholmondley, MP, as their mother was deranged. MP Chester 1715-1732. A strong Tory voting consistently against government. [RS.]


Sir Francis Gwynn esq., 1648?-1734. M his cousin, Margaret Prideaux, had 4 Ss and 3 Ds. Politician but trained as a lawyer. 1673 returned for Chippenham, 1685 elected for Cardiff, 1690-1695 sat for Christchurch. Hants. recommended by Henry, Earl of Clarendon. A Tory, lost seat on accession of George I and was dismissed from post as Secretary at War by Lord Townshend (VB). Regained seat in Christchurch in 1717. Had notorious friendship of constancy with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Rochester the wit. [DNB.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir William Gage, 7th Bt., 1695-1744. 3rd S of Sir John Gage, 4th Bt.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nathaniel Blackerby, Employed Batty Langley to build him an ornamental temple. [Colvin, 1995.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexander Gordon of Pitburg, c1692-1754. Antiquary. [National Archives catalogue.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Gray, M.D., fl.1720. Physician. [National Archives catalogue.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Greenway, Mason and carver. Had a yard at Widcombe, nr. Bath. He and his Ss were known as well for their carving of architectural ornaments. Often used by John Wood. [Beard, G., Georgian Craftsmen: Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660-1820, 1981.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westley Gill, Possibly the stone supplier for Newby Park, for William Robinson. [Boynton, Lindsay, Newby Park, the first Palladian Villa in England, in The Country Seat: Studies Presented to Sir John Summerson, ed. by H. Colvin and J. Harris, 1970.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Gansell, 1691-1753. S of Huguenot refugee who acquired estate at Leyton, Essex in 1720 and who was High Sheriff in 1710. Built Leyton Grange (dem. 1860) a Baroque villa. Personal contact between him and Campbell. [Colvin, 1995.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orlando Gee, Probably related to William Gee, a relative of Sir</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Name and Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duchess of Hamilton and Brandon</strong>, 4th Duchess (Elizabeth), only child of Digby Lord Gerard. Had large estates in Staffs. and Lancs., given to Hamilton on M. Hamilton Palace was remodelled for her and Duke c.1684 by James Smith in a “French hotel style”. Outlived husband by 32 yrs. Swift was good friends with her but she had many enemies due to diabolical temper. Witty and spirited. Had 7 children, 4 Ds and 3 Ss. Eldest James suc. (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baron Hattorf</strong>, (Johann Phillip Von). 1682-1737. Helped his own father from 1703 and then made Kabinett Secretary to George as Elector after 1714. [Hatton, R., George I, 2001.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Hopeton</strong>, 1st Earl 1681-1742. Previously Sir Charles Hope. His Mo., Lady Hope, commissioned a house for him in 1698 by Sir William Bruce. It was a geometrically planned pavilion, not a country seat at this stage. But by 1702-3 Bruce was brought back to re-cast it and make it more grandiose, colonnades added. He then became Earl of Hopetoun. By 1720s Lord Hopetoun was already refacing before Bruce’s scheme was complete. Hopetoun was designer of a new plan from 1721 which had huge staterooms and a vast horizontal showpiece façade. His Sis. M Earl of Haddington (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Duke of Dorset's (VB) father) and introduced to wits by him as he wrote verse. 1692 Lord of the Treasury. Lord Justice in 1698 in King's absence. Became Baron Halifax in 1700, nephew to inherit Barony if he himself had no sons. A Whig in favour of Hanoverian Success. 1706 carried insignia of the garter to Elector, Marlborough did not like him. An early patron of Colen Campbell. 1714 Lord of the Treasury, 1715 Earl of Halifax and Visc. Sunbury. Lord Lieut. of Surrey and patron of lit. His gd/Fa. was 1st Earl of Manchester. His nephew George Montagu (16 ?-1739) was in Germany with William Benson in 1704. Montagu returned to England in 1706 and re-fronted and altered Horton. He wanted to make a public library in House of Lords. Nephew Cr. Earl of Halifax on his d. in 1715. [DNB; Summerson, J., The Unromantic Castle, 1990; Doebner, R, (ed) Briefe der Koningin Sophie Charlotte von Preussen und der Kurfurstin Sophie Von Hannover and Hannoversche Diplomaten, 1905.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Viscount Hatton,</strong> 2nd Visc. 1690-1760. S of Christopher Hatton and 3rd W Elizabeth, D of Sir William Haslewood, Knight. Of Northants. Viscount. Hatton died unm. Hatton’s half Sis. (Fa. was previously M to Cecelia, D of Sir John Tufton, 2nd Earl of Thanet) was Anne who was 2nd W of Daniel Finch, 2nd Earl of Notts. (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Haversham,</strong> (Thompson, John). S of Sir John Thompson and Frances, D of 1st Earl of Anglesey. Cr. a Bt. in 1673 and MP for Gratton 1684. Inherited father’s religious and political opinions, strenuous Whig. He was among first to call William of Orange and oust James II. Banked at Hoare’s from 1708. [DNB; Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord How,</strong> 2nd Visc. (Howe, Emmanuel Scrope) c.1699-1735. S of Scrope Howe, 1st Visc. Howe, 1648-1712. and Hon. Juliana Alington, D of William, 1st Baron Alington of Wymondley. M Maria Sophia Charlotte Kilmansegg, D of John Adolph, Baron Von Kilmansegge. His Sisters were 1) Mary. Maid of Honour to Caroline in 1720 who M 1) Thomas, 8th Earl of Pembroke (VB) and 2) Hon. John Morduant, Bro. of Charles Morduant, 4th Earl of Peterborough. She d.1749. 2nd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sis. was Anne who M Col. Charles Morduant. His 1st cousin Anabelle was M to John Plumptre (VB). Banked at Hoare’s from 1698.</strong> [Hoare and Co., Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baron Hardenberg, (Christian Ulrich Von) 1663-1735. Court official and administrator. George’s Hanoverian Hofmarsschal (Housemarshal) from 1707. Came with him from Germany and was made a Hanoverian minister, Grand Marshall of Hanover.</strong> [Hatton, R, George I, 2001.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him in the Dunciad. Banked at Hoare’s from 1697. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Joseph Hodges, under his fathers entry Hodges, Sir William. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Hobart Bart., 1694?-1756. S of Sir Henry Hobart, 4th Bt., who was killed in a duel in 1699 when his S was 5. M 1) 1722 Judith, D of Robert Brittiffe of Baconsthorpe, Norfolk, d.1727. 2) 1728 Elizabeth, Sis. of Robert Bristow. His Sis. was Henrietta, later Countess of Suffolk, King George II’s mistress (VB). Sir John rose to high office due to this. MP St Ives 1715, 1722-27, Norfolk 1727-28. Knight of Bath 1725. Lord Lieut. Norfolk, 1739. Cr. 1st Earl of Buckingham 1746. Suc. by S John (by 1st M) and when he d. another of his Ss, George became 3rd Earl. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Charles Hotham, 4th Bt., 1663-1723. S of Charles Hotham, famous Rector of Wigan and Bermuda and Elizabeth Thompson, D of Stephen Thompson of Humbleton. Of New Hotham, Beverley. Rebuilt house in Beverley (New Hotham) 1716-1721 by Campbell (in VB). Palladian style. His uncle was William Thompson (VB), owner of Ebberston Lodge, Palladian pavilion by Campbell. Also a friend of John Aislabie (VB) and probably known to William Benson (VB). John Moyser (VB), amateur architect was in his regiment. He was intended for the ministry but went into the army and became Brigadier General, was MP for Beverley and was Knighted. Went to Hanover as a youth. M 1) his cousin Bridget Gee, D of Elizabeth Hotham and William Gee of Bishop’s Burton, Yorks. He commanded several regiments the last of which was the Royal Dragoons of which he was Col. Known as one of “Queen Anne’s 4 Colonels”. She raised him to Brig. Gen. and he served under Lord Galway in Spain and at Battle of Almanza in 1707 in which his friend, Gen Carpenter (VB), also fought. Bridget d. of cancer whilst he was prisoner in Spain and he M 2) Lady Mildred, D of James Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, widow of Sir John Uvedale of Corbett, Salop. Not happy and separated early. Whilst in Spain old family seat burnt down and this is when he erected new at Beverley. Also extended farmhouse at S. Dalton (replaced later by Dalton Hall?). Towards 1714 heavily involved with Whigs to prevent papist succession. In the ’15 he safeguarded Newcastle from Jacobite forces after winning town alongside old friend Gen. Carpenter. d aged 60 on Jan 8th in Bristol buried in S Dalton. Probably related to Orlando Gee (VB). Also links with Aislabie family. Banked at Hoare’s from 1705. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; Stirling, A.M.W., The Hothams, 1918.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Charles Hotham, 5th Bt., 1693-1738, S of Sir Charles Hotham, 4th Bt. and Bridget Gee, D of William Gee if Bishop’s Burton, Yorks.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Charles given captaincy of one of his Fa’s regiments in 1706 aged 13, not unusual for the time. Visited Hanover in early yrs. Suc. to title aged 30, on Fa’s death. He was a courtier and fine gentleman of POWs court. On George II’s succession Hotham raised to Groom of the Bedchamber and Plenipotentiary to Court of Berlin. M in 1724, Lady Gertrude, D of 3rd Earl of Chesterfield and Sis. of his good friend Phillip Dormer, Lord Stanhope (who in 1726 became 4th Earl of Chesterfield). 1731 received command of Royal Irish Regiment of the Foot. Made Col. in 1735 of 1st troop of Horse Grenadier Guards. Had house in Stratton St, Picadilly where he d. attended by Dr Richard Mead (VB). Buried at S Dalton, Yorks. 4 children who survived including. Caroline b.1726, Gertrude b.1731, Melusina b.1734 and Charles b 1735. [Stirling, A.M.W., The Hothams, 1918.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir David Hamilton, 1663-1721, Knighted by Q. Anne. Physician to Q. Anne. A Scot. Also in VB3 list but dead by then-a S?) He advised Q. Anne. to avoid emotional scenes as they made her ill. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Herbert esq., Possibly the William Herbert who was in Padua in 1709 with Edward Herbert. [Ingamells, J., A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800, 1997.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hawes, Banked at Hoare’s from 1705. [Hoare and Co. Ltd.,1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hind, Probably the Robert Hind who was in Padua 1717. [Ingamells, 1997. p.500]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **John Harris**, 1680-1740. Engraver, especially architecture, did engravings for *Britannia Illustrata* and the 4th Vol. of *VB* in 1739. [Colvin, 1995.]
|                                                                                | N   | Y   | Y   |
| **Thomas Hinton**, Surveyor to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster. (d 1746?). [Colvin, 1995.]
|                                                                                | Y   | Y   | Y   |
|                                                                                | N   | N   | Y   |
|                                                                                | N   | N   | Y   |
|                                                                                | N   | N   | Y   |
| **John Huggins**, Warden of the Fleet Prison c1729 and sold it on to Thomas Bambridge, whom he later prosecuted for cruelty. [DNB under Thomas Bambridge.]
|                                                                                | N   | N   | Y   |
| **John Henley of Bristol**, 1692-1756, Theologian and preacher. Also a historian. [National Archives catalogue.]
|                                                                                | Y   | Y   | Y   |
| **John Harris**, Probably the John Harris banking at Hoare’s from 1695. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]
|                                                                                | N   | Y   | Y   |
| **John Hughes**, plasterer used by Lord Burlington to work on the Jacobean house that used to be at Chiswick in 1719. [Beard, G., Georgian Craftsmen and their Work, 1966.]
<p>|                                                                                | N   | N   | Y   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nicholas Hawksmoor</strong>, architect. [Downes, K., Hawksmoor, 1996.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jon Hallam</strong>, architect. Protege of Sir Thomas Hewett (VB). He did a design for Earl of Sunderland. Suc. as Secretary to the Board after Benjamin Benson. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs Howard (Henrietta)</strong>, 1681-1767. A Hobart of Blickling Hall, Norfolk. M the Hon. Charles Howard (S of Earl of Suffolk). He was a debauchee. Built Marble Hill, Twickenham 1724. She lived in Hanover with husband where he had a small post at court and they returned to England in entourage of George I in 1714. Became mistress of POW. Friend of Burlington, Pembroke and literary circle. Sis. in law was Lady Betty Germain, VB. [James Lees-Milne, Earls of Creation, 1962.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hon. Philip Howard</strong>, Jeweller to Q. Anne.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Islay</strong>, Design for him in VB1 by Campbell. He owned Combe Bank House nr. Westerham, Kent, built by Roger Morris. He also built Whilton in Twickenham in 1724, the same year that Marble Hill was going up. Bro. to 2nd Duke of Argyll. Justice General and Lord Register for N. Britain. Herbert, Morris and Islay were inseparable. [Hobart Papers, Norwich; Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Henry Innes</strong>, 4th Bt. Fa. of 5th Bt. who d.1763. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord St John of Bletsoe</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1711. [Hoare and co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir William Johnston(e)</strong>, 2nd Bt. d. 1727. 2nd S of Sir James Johnstone, MP of Westerhall by Margaret, D of John Bannayne of</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Hon. Johnston, James, 1655-1737. In 1696 M Catherine Poulett, D of John Baron Poulett. ‘Secretary Johnston’ went to Holland after father beheaded in 1663. After succession of William of Orange to throne in 1688, Johnston was sent as envoy to Elector of Brandenburg. Leased Orleans House, Twickenham, where he gardened, nr. Marble Hill. In 1720s Gibbs built octagonal house for Princess of Wales in grounds. Visited Hanover and George I many times and conversed with him familiarly. He built an octagon at the end of the house for Q. Caroline’s entertainment. John James designed a house for him (Orleans House) in 1710. [G Beard, Georgian Craftsmen and their Work, 1966.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Benjamin, Master Mason. Knew Benson and reported him for fraud for telling members that House of Lords was collapsing, when it was not. [K. Downes, Hawksmoor, 1966.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Joynes of Woodstock, 1684-1754. Built Linley Hall, Shropshire. M Mary, D of Bartholomew Peisley of Oxford (VB) a Master Mason whose S was at Blenheim. He was Comptroller and conductor of work at Blenheim 1705-15. Duties were those of resident Clerk of the Works. Also helped Hawksmoor with Clarendon building in Broad St, Ox. Clerk of Works at Kensington Palace thanks to Vanbrugh. Also had private practice as architect. Did Normanton Park, Rutland for Sir John Heathcote, 1735-40; house</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| in Lincolns Inn Fields (now nos. 57-58) built by Lord Chancellor Talbot 1730. With a palladian elevation designed to harmonize with Lindsey House. Joynes also employed at Carshalton house, Surrey, c1720. [Colvin, 1995.]
| William Jones, 1675-1749. M Maria, D of George Nix, cabinet-maker and chief rival to Chippendale. Mathematician. Went to West Indies, friend of Lord Anson. Upon return became tutor of maths to Lord Hardwicke (Philip Yorke) also Earl of Macclesfield (Thomas Parker, Lord Chancellor, VB3) and 2nd Earl of Macclesfield (George Parker President of Royal Society). Lived for years at Shirburn Castle as member of Parker family. [DNB.]
| Earl of Kinnoull, 7th Earl, (Hay George) d.1758. Of Dupplin Castle, Perthshire. New wings built there 1720-25 by James Smith. Kinnoull (Lord Dupplin at the time) M Abigail, c.1709, D of Harley, Earl of Oxford. Kinnoull's Sis. was M to Earl of Mar (VB). Kinnoull (as Lord Dupplin) had earlier design done by James Smith for Dupplin Castle in 1710 but never built. Gibbs visited him at his English estate at Brodsworth in 1718 and did a drawing, perhaps for that estate in 1719. Never realised. Kinnoull (when Dupplin) was imprisoned in Tower for brief period following the '15. [Friedman, T, James Gibbs,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Chief Justice King</strong>, King, Peter. 1st Lord King, Baron of Oakham 1669-1734. Son of Jerome King of Exeter, grocer and dry salter and Anne, D of Peter Locke (uncle of Philosopher, John Locke) Bred to fa.’s business but studious disposition. Educ. at Leyden. M 1) Anne, had 4 Ss and 2 Ds. Lord Chancellor. MP Beevalston, Devon. Learned and important judge but hopeless chancellor. Raised to peerage in 1715, judged some of rebels after 1715. Lord Justice while King in Hanover. Governor of Charterhouse. Banked at Hoare’s from 1708. In VB1 as Marquis of Dorchester. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Kingsale</strong>, 19th Baron Kingsale, (De Courcy, Gerald). 1700-1759. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Kynaston</strong>, Clerk of Works at Tower of London and Somerset House and was deprived of his posts when Benson came in 1718. Benson put George Sampson in his place instead. He was restored by influence of Vanbrugh later. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr King, Principal of St Mary-Hall, Oxon.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John King</strong>, 1660-1737. Educ. at Charterhouse, entered as a foundation scholar or gown boy. He matriculated at Christ Church, Ox. taking a BA in 1682, MA in 1685 and a BD and DD in 1704. Would have known Aldrich. Returned to Charterhouse in 1696 as preacher and Deputy Master to Thomas Burnet. On Burnet’s d. in 1715 he became Master. 1st person educ. at the school who went on to be the Master. His early years saw much planned improvement to the buildings including great plans for the chapel. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Lincoln</strong>, 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Earl, (Clinton, Henry Fiennes). M Lucy Pelham, D of Thomas, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Lord Pelham and Sis. of 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Duke of Newcastle (VB) and Sis. of Rt. Hon. Henry Pelham. Paymaster General of the Forces, Coffeer of the Household, Constable of the tower. Of Oatlands, Weybridge, Surrey where he had a Palladian garden building designed for him by Lord Burlington in 1725. Burlington also did design for a new house for him but never built. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Leicester</strong>, of Holkham (see entry for Thomas Coke)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Litchfield</strong>, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Earl, (Lee, George Henry) d.1743. S of Sir Edward, Henry Lee, 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Baron of Ditchley Park nr. Spelsbury, Ox. (1720-4 by Gibbs) and Lady Charlotte Fitzroy, D. of Charles II by Barbara Villiers. M Frances, D of Sir John Hales, Bt., 3 Ss and 5Ds. Suc. Fa. in 1716. S, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Earl, was a Jacobite and M Diana, D of Sir Thomas Frankland (VB) of Thirkleby, Yorks. Nephew was Duke of Grafton (VB). One of Gibbs’s main patrons. A confirmed Tory. Banked at Hoare’s from 1717. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Loudoun</strong>, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Earl, (Hugh Campbell) d.1731. Mother was Eleanor, D of 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Earl of Loudoun. She later M the Earl of Stairs (VB). Through influence of his Uncle Archibald, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Duke of Argyll, he became Extraordinary Lord of Session in 1699. Loudoun M Margaret Dalrymple, D of the Earl of Stairs (VB) and his Mo’s step-daughter. Another of his uncles was Hon. James Campbell (VB). Gibbs designed house for him in 1710 in Privy Gardens Whitehall. [Friedman, James Gibbs, 1984.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bishop of London</strong>, John Robinson (1714-1723).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bishop of London</strong>, (Between 1723-1748), Bishop Edmund Gibson, served Sir Robert Walpole.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord (Leimpster) Leominster</strong>, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Baron, (Fermor, Thomas) d.1753. S of William Fermor. 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Baron Leominster of Easton Neston and Lady Sophia Osborne, D of Thomas, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Duke of Leeds and widow of Lord Ibrack, grandson of Henry, Earl of Thomond. M, in 1720, Henrietta Louisa (d. 1761) Countess of Pomefret, D of John 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Baron Jefferts of Wem, Shropshire and Lady Charlotte Herbert. D of Philip Earl of Pembroke. He had 4 sisters. His father built Easton Neston, completed by Hawksmoor in 1702, c20 yrs after erection of the wings by Wren. Whole building was adorned with the Arundel marbles which he tried to restore with the help of Giovvanni Battista. Cr. Earl</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Pomfret or Pontefract in 1721, (Lord Leimpster in VB3 was possibly his son?). His W was Lady of the Bedchamber to Q. Caroline. Toured France and Italy from 1738 for 3 years. Visited in Florence in 1739 by Lady M. W. Montagu and Horace Walpole. He d in 1753 and was suc. by ES George. S was very extravagant and had to sell Easton Neston (Northants). Mother bought statues in sale and gave them to Ox.University. [DNB:]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Langdale,</strong> 4th Lord, Employed William Wakefield to enlarge Holme Hall, Yorks 1720-23. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Lansdowne,</strong> 1st Baron, (George Granville or Grenville) 1667-1735. Trinity College, Cambs. Entered public life in 1702. 1710 succeeded Walpole as Secretary of War. Poet and dramatist. Became Lord Lansdowne in 1711. Suggestion that he may have been part of a scheme to help the Pretender in Cornwall and so lost favour and confined in tower from 1715-1717. In 1717 restored to seat in parliament and settled at Longleat, W’s family home. 1722 went abroad. Granville was an early patron of Pope. Tory. Stepson was 2nd Lord Visc. Weymouth of Longleat who inherited Longleat. Employed Gibbs for changes to Longleat. Tory. Banked at Hoares from 1713. [Hoare and Co.Ltd.,1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Lonsdale,</strong> 3rd Visc., (Lowther, Henry) 1694-1751. S of 1st Visc., Sir John, 1655-1700, and Katherine, D of Sir Henry Frederick Thynne of Kemsford, Glos. Constable of the Tower 1726-27. Father took down old Lowther Hall (Westmoreland) and rebuilt it on large scale, adorned interiors by Verrio, new gardens, extensive plantations etc. Also rebuilt rectory and Church at Lowther. New Lowther Hall almost completely destroyed by fire in 1720. Lonsdale grew up in an artistic environment. Suc. Bro. as 3rd Visc. in 1713. Another Bro. was probably Hon. Anthony Lowther (VB), Lord of the Bedchamber, Lord Privy Seal. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christopher Lister,</strong> Banked at Hoare’s from 1694. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Lock,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lockman, 1698-1771. Probably the writer and translator. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lockhart, 1673-1731. ES of Sir George Lockhart, Lord President of the Court of Session by Philadelphia, D of the 4th Lord Wharton of Carnwath and probably related to Marquis of Wharton (VB). M Euphemia Montgomery, D of 8th Earl of Eglintoun, had 8 Ds and 6 Ss. MP Edinburgh 1702-7, 1708-10 MP Wigton Burghs 1710-13, 1713-15. 1706 Commissioner of Union with Scotland much to his surprise. 1689 succeeded to fortune on d. of Fa. In opposition to his family became a zealous Jacobite. He used post to further Jacobite cause and undermine government. Arrested in 1715 rebellion and taken to Edinburgh castle. Argyll released him but he continued to have Jacobite meetings and Argyll forced him to come to Dryden, his family seat nr. Edinburgh. He was imprisoned again for longer. 1718-27 he was Chevaliers chief agent in Scotland. Lockhart had violent quarrel with Duke of Hamilton in Duke of Wharton’s (VB) House in London in 1725 with whom he was to fight a duel. Duel prevented due to his arrest. He met with indifferent reception at Pretender’s court due to Colonel Hay, 3rd Earl of Inverness so Argyll (VB) and Duncan Forbes (VB) got a license for him in 1728 allowing his return. He came back to Scotland after ‘bending the knee to Baal’ in an interview with George II who pardoned him. Retired and d. in a duel in 1731. Lockhart papers among most valuable in Jacobite history. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Lacy esq, Possibly the Lacy in Rome in 1711. [Ingamells, J., <em>A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800</em>, 1997.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchess of Marlborough. House in Wimbledon probably by Henry</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert (Earl of Pembroke) c1732-5, destroyed by fire in 1785. Grand-daughter was 4th Duchess of Bedford. [DNB; Gila Curtis, The Life and Time of Queen Anne, 1972.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchess of Montagu, D of Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Name and Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to Mar’s S when he d.  Mar was related to Harley (2nd Earl). Harleys D, Abigail, M to 7th Earl of Kinnoull (VB) whose Sis., Margaret, was Mar’s first W. He altered Alloa his seat and Copped Hall at Twickenham (formerly Sir Thomas Skipwith’s). Whilst in exile followed architectural developments. Owned collection of plans including Warterton, Rokeby and Bretton Park, Yorks. Designed houses abroad, Palladian house nr. St. Germain for Marquis de Tesse and Jacobite Lord Falkland. Owned house at Mezieres, Orleans, 1726. Familiar with work of architects incl. Palladio and Bramante. Design for proposed remodelling of Stirling Castle. Bro-in-law was George Hay, Lord Dupplin (VB). [Colvin, 1995; Friedman, James Gibbs, 1984.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Mareschal (Marischal), 9th Earl, (Keith, George) 1693-1778. ES of 8th Earl, d.1712. Of Newburgh where Pretender stayed after landing at Scotland. Mansion at Fetteresso in Kincardinshire. Suc. to earldom in 1712, served under Marlborough 1714. A staunch Jacobite, he escaped to continent after failure of rebellion, estates forfeited to Crown. He was meant to sail with Pretender but failed to arrive and sailed later. Attainted in 1716. 1719 undertook Spanish expedition for Pretender, landing in Scottish islands, but severely wounded. Lived in Valencia for years corresponding with Chevalier. Secretary to Pretender in 1731. Took no part in the ‘45. Moved to live with Bro. in Vienna and Prussia. Became Prussian Ambassador in Paris 1751. Received a pardon by George II in 1759 and returned to England in 1760 inheriting his estates. Returned to Prussia in 1764 and d. unm there. Friends with Voltaire and Rousseau, simple manners and warm disposition. Spent years travelling abroad. VB3 says ‘late earl’ but the earl did not die til 1778, CCs error?). [DNB, vol 10, p1209; Ingamells, p.641.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord William Manors (Manners) 1697-1772. S of John Manners, 2nd Duke of Rutland by 1st W. Bro. of John, Marquis of Granby (b.1696), Lord Robert and Lord Sherard Manners. Sis., Frances Manners, M Hon. Richard Arundell (VB). He rented a house in Gt Burlington St in 1732 after Henry Pelham gave it up. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Mansell,</strong> 1st Baron Mansell of Margam, c1668-1723. [National Archives Catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Micklethwait(e),</strong> (Joseph) 1680-1734. S of Joseph Micklethwaite of Swine by Constantine, D of Sir Thomas Middleton MP of Stansted, Mountfitchet, Essex. Bro. of Thomas Micklethwaite. MP Arundel 1718-27, Kingston upon Hull 1727-34. He and Bro. Thomas were taken up by 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir John Copley as their proteges. Copley recommended Joseph to 1st Earl of Stanhope. He served Stanhope as Secretary whilst in Spain, and on return to England became his principal man of business. Succeeded Bro. as Baron Micklethwait(e) in 1718 and inherited Arundel estate. Visc. Micklethwait(e) in 1724. d. leaving estate to Sis. of Lord Shaftesbury, his mistress Anne Ewer, who had already made a disastrous marriage. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Paul Methuen,</strong> 1672-1757. Diplomat. 1708 MP for Devizes, Wilts. Also Lord of the Admiralty and Lord of the Treasury. Secretary of State during Stanhope’s absence (1716). Principal Secretary of State. d. unm. Collected paintings whilst abroad, design for him in VB 2 by Campbell. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Robert Masham,</strong> Original founding member of the Brothers Club in 1713. Tory. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Philip Meadows Bt.,</strong> d.1757. S of Philip Meadows, diplomat and Constance, D of Francis Lucy of Westminster. Lived in Richmond. M Dorothy, Sis. of 1st Lord Falmouth, 3 Ss and 5 Ds. Commissioner of the Excise (1698-1700). Suc. Stanhope (VB) as envoy in Holland in 1706. Went on special mission to Emperor. Banked at Hoare’s from 1700. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Milner.</strong> Designed Gregories, nr. Beaconsfield, Bucks, for John Waller. House destroyed by fire in 1813. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Mildmay (Milway), In Padua 1723. [Ingamells, 1997, p.885]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Montgomery, Possibly the Montgomery in Leghorn in 1704 and Florence 1753. Jacobite. [Ingamells, J., A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800, 1997.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehemet, (Mahomed) d.1726. One of George’s I’s 2 Turkish body-servants. Captured as a child at Koron where his father was a provincial Governor. Successively Groom and Keeper of the Closet, Keeper of George’s Private Accounts. He and Mustapha held long established positions but they remained bodyguards with no political influence. Mehemet was brought to Hanover by an officer under George’s command. Both so much a fixture at court that they were portrayed in murals of Kensington Palace. Mehemet had the more responsible position, responsible for George’s accounts from 1699-1726. He was enobled in 1716 and chose the name Von Konigstreu which literally means ‘True to the King’. After 1716 he was one of only 25 servants from Hanover retained by George in England. [Hatton, George I, 2001; DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha, one of George’s Turkish body servants along with Mehemet. He and Mehemet held long established positions but they remained bodyguards without political influence. Mustapha came to Service with George after a period of service of a Swede who had captured him. Both so much a fixture at court that they were portrayed in murals of Kensington Palace. [Hatton, George I, 2001;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Murray, 1663-1734.</strong> Portrait painter, pupil of John Riley, painted Hans Sloane (VB), Bolingbroke (VB) and many others. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Moyser of Beverley, MP for Beverely 1705-8.</strong> M 1) Mary Eyre. His ES was James Moyser, c1688-1751, who spent early life in army in Charles Hotham's regiment of the foot. S saw active service in Spain and was Stanhope's (VB) Adjutant in 1710 becoming amateur architect in 1730s and 40s. John Moyser used to visit Burlington at Londesborough, E. Riding and both John and James Moyser were on friendly terms with Lord Burlington. James was one of Burlington's provincial disciples designing Bretton Hall, W. Yorks for Sir William Wentworth in plain Palladian style and Nostell Priory. [Colvin, 1995; Beard, Georgian Craftsmen and their Work, 1966.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Secretary Molineux, (Samuel Molyneux) 1689-1728.</strong> Educ. on Locke's principles under Uncle's care. Trinity College Dublin. M, 1717, Lady Elizabeth Capel, D of Algernon, 2nd Earl of Essex. Her Bro. was 3rd Earl of Essex (VB). She inherited Kew House in 1721, no children. Devoted two years to improvement of estate in Co. Armargh then visited Cambs. and Ox. Universities and seats of the nobility. Astronomer and politician. Knew Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, met them in Antwerp. Sent by Marlborough to Hanover on special mission in 1714 where he saw Electress Sophia die in Herrenhausen garden. Secretary of State to POW, Lord of Admiralty in 1727, MP for Bossiney, St Mawes, Exeter. Member of Royal Society. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor Richard Mead, 1673-1754.</strong> 11th child of Matthew Mead, Minister of Stepney, Middx. Large private means of fa. so educ. well under Thomas Singleton, master of Eton. University of Utrecht 1689. Went to Italy, Padua, Florence, Rome, Naples and back to London in 1696. M, 1) 1699 Ruth, D of John Marsh, merchant, had 8 children, 2) 1714 Anne, D of Sir Rowland Alston of Odell, Beds. His S, Richard, M Anne, D of William Gore (VB3) of Thring, Herts. Good Classic, Antiquary and Whig. Practice in Stepney. Fellow of Royal Soc, Vice President 1717 til d. Lived in Cross Friars, 1711, Austin Friars and Bloomsbury Sq. in John Radcliffes old house. Chief physician of the day, saw Q. Anne 2 days before her d. Physician to new dynasty. 1720 moved to Gt. Ormonde St. on site of hospital. Owned one of largest collections of books, manuscripts, coins etc of the day. His name appears in most of the subscription lists of learned books of the day. He had access to everyone of the day, even Duke of Somerset. Frequented Rawthmells coffee house, Henrietta St, Covent garden for society and Batsons in city for professional interest. Saw most fashionable people as clients. Owned a collection of Palladio's drawings that he sold to Lord Burlington. Sir Charles Hotham's Dr. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Mount.</strong> Employed Henry William Hobden to build Wasing House nr. Newbury 1772. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Maddison</strong>, Possibly George Maddison (d.1783), Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs, Diplomat. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roger Morris</strong>, fl 1754. Architect. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isaac Mansfield</strong>, Plasterer. Worked with Roger Morris on 30 Old Burlington St. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Northampton</strong>, 4th Earl (George Compton) 1664-1727. Of Castle Ashby, Northants. [Colvin, 1995; National Archives Catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of the Council. Adhered to Tory politics of the family. Banked at Hoare’s from 1697. [Hoare and Co. Ltd, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Newton, 1695-1743. S of Sir John Newton 3rd Bt by Susanna, D of Michael Warton of Beverley, sis. of Sir Michael Warton. Of Barr's Court, Glos. and Culverthorpe, Lincs. M 1) 1730 Margaret Countess of Coningsby, D of Thomas Coningsby, 1st Earl of Coningsby (VB). MP Beverley 1722-27, Grantham 1727-43. A wealthy commoner invested with the order of the Bath when Walpole revived it, odd as he voted against government all the time. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Newcome of Hackney, (Peter Newcombe) 1656-1738. Vicar of Hackney. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Orrery, (Charles Boyle) 1676-1731. Christchurch College, Ox. MP for Huntingdon before succeeding to the peerage. From 1706 to be found in London with Christchurch men. A friend of Harley, Earl of Oxford. Lived within 15 miles of Bolingbroke at Dawley (VB), Rochester (VB), Berkeley (VB), Shrewsbury (VB), Richard Hill (VB), Carleton (VB) and Argyll (VB). Banked at Hoare’s from 1705. [Hoare and Co., Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Powis</strong>, (William Herbert) B before 1667, d. 1745. Not Marquis of Powis til 1722 but his fa. d. in 1696. He was the titular Duke of Powis and, although did not press his claim, he was known by the Jacobites as 'the Duke'. Of Powis Castle. Taken prisoner in the '15. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl Paulett</strong>, 2nd Earl (John). House at Hinton St George. Matthew Brettingham did an unexecuted design. Also had a house at 40 Berkeley Square. Banked with Hoare's from 1702. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Portland</strong>, 2nd Earl. (Bentinck, William). Of Bulstrode, Bucks. M, 1734, Lady Margaret Cavendish (1715-1785), D of Edward Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford. (VB) and &quot;noble lovely little Peggy&quot;. His 2nd S, Count Bentinck, M Lady Margaretha, D of Earl of Cadogan (VB). His fa., 1st earl, was Dutch and a great friend of William of Orange. in his confidence. Corresponded with Baron</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstorff for years. Banked at Hoare's from 1704. In VB 2 and 3 as Duke of Portland. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; DNB under fa.'s entry]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Pembroke</strong>, 8th Earl (Herbert, Thomas) 1656-1733. Of Wilton, Wilts. Christchurch College Ox. M 1) Mary, Lord Howe's (VB) Sis. 2) to a D of a Sawyer and in 1732 he M 3) Barbara, D of Sir Thomas Slingsby who was Mo. of Hon. Richard Arundell (VB3). By d. of his two E Bros. he succ. in 1683 to title. Lord Lieut. of Wilts in 1683. Lord Justices entrusted with regency in absence of King. Man of eminent learning, President of Royal Society 1689-90. His S, 9th Earl, was 'architect earl' and friend of Burlington. A Hanoverian Tory. Arundell (VB) inherited the Earl of Warwick's House in 1731 via Warwick's Mo. as a mark of friendship between herself and Barbara, Pembroke's 3rd W. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Polwarth</strong>, See entry for Earl of Marchmont.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Joseph Pringle</strong>, Bro. of Robert and Walter (VB). Distinguished in law and politics. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Thomas Parker</strong>, See entry for Earl of Macclesfield.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always voted with government. [RS.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Thomas Pendergras,</strong> (Prendergast) d. 1760. S of Sir Thomas and Penelope, only D of Henry Cadogan and Sis. of William 1st Earl Cadogan (VB). MP for Chichester and Clonmel, adopted Protestantism, Post Master General of Ireland, Swift liked him. [DNB].</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rt. Hon. Henry Pelham,</strong> 1695-1754. Ygr S of Thomas Pelham, 4th Bt., 1st Baron Pelham by 2nd W, Lady Grace Holles, youngest D of Gilbert, 3rd Earl of Clare and Sis. of John Holles, Duke of Newcastle. Westminster School, Christ Church College, Ox. Left in 1710 aged 15. M Lady Catharine Manners, ED of John, 2nd Duke of Rutland, had 2Ss and 6 Ds. Both Ss d. of ulcerated sore throats in Nov 1739 known as “Pelham fever”. Capt. 1715, volunteered against rebels. GT, returned 1717. MP Seaford elected during absence at GT. Whig under Walpole and Townshend with both of whom he was connected by M. 1721 one of the Lords of the Treasury. Secretary at War 1724. Mediator between his Bro. Newcastle and Walpole. 1730 Paymaster General of the Forces. Horace Walpole hated him. Genuine attachment between him and his Bro. On Pelhams M Newcastle gave him half the land which he had inherited. 1729 Pelham bought Esher Place in Surrey and, with Kent, refurbished it. His widow was ranger at Greenwich Park and d at her house in Whitehall in 1780. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rt. Hon. William Poultnay,</strong> (Pulteney) 1684-1764. S of William Pulteney of old Leicester family. Educ. Westminster School and Christ Church College. Ox. GT. Statesman. M Anna Maria, D of John Gumley of Isleworth and increased his fortune via M. Beautiful W but known as ‘Pulteneyes vixen’ and ‘Bath’s enobled Doxy’. MP Hedon (or Heydon) 1705 in Holderness Yorks. Master of the Rolls. Pulteney visited Walpole when he was in tower in 1711. Adhered to Whigs as long as Stanhope and Walpole in power, three of them known as “the Three Grand allies”. 1724 Pulteney lost his only D. That same year was made Earl of Bath by Walpole ruining his political prestige and he was sidelined. Great love of money and classics. His uncle John sat on board of trade in Q. Anne’s early reign. Inherited property from fa. at young age and also from his guardian later. Lived in the Rolls House Chancery Lane built by 1718. [DNB]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name and Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sylvester Petyt of Bernards Inn, gentleman</strong>&lt;br&gt;Banked at Hoare's from 1701. [Hoare and Co.Ltd.,1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bartholomew Peisley of Oxon</strong>, Master Mason.&lt;br&gt;He and S working at Blenheim. His D M Henry Joynes of Woodstock (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert Pringle</strong>, d.1736, 3rd S of Sir Robert Pringle, 1st Bt. of Stitchel by W Margaret, D of Sir John Hope, a Lord of Session under title of Lord Craighall.&lt;br&gt;Educ. Uni of Leiden. M a Miss Law (D of William Law? (VB)). Service under William of Orange, came over with him in 1688 revolution under Secretary of State for Scotland. 1718 was Secretary at War. He was a younger Bro. of Sir Walter Pringle of Lochton, Lord Newhall (VB). [DNB.]</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Prat, Provost of Dublin</strong>, Probably the Benjamin Pratt of Dublin who was in Padua in 1701. [Ingamells, J., A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy 1701-1800, 1997.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from timber sales from Epping Forest, resigned in 1725 and d. shortly after whilst on his way to Montpellier, Fr. to take the air. Fellow generals were Lord Cadogan (VB), Gen. Evans (VB) Gen Pepper and Gen Stewart all of whom lived in Hanover Sq in 1717. Gen Stewart was builder of the Sq. All were Whigs. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Francis Price</strong>, d 1753. Architect. Published in 1733 'The British Carpenter' dedicated to Algernon Seymour, Earl of Hertford and afterwards 7th Earl of Somerset. 2nd ed. published in 1735 with a supplement containing &quot;Palladio's orders of architecture...described by...Francis Price&quot;. 'The British Carpenter' was long the best book on the subject, reprinted many times. 1734 was surveyor to Salisbury Cathedral. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Price of Richmond</strong>, d.1736. Bro. of Francis above. Architect described as &quot;of Richmond, Surrey and 'armiger'&quot;. Worked a great deal for Duke of Chandos and employed on rebuilding Canons, near Edgeware, Middlesex from 1712-1720 from the design of James Gibbs. He also built the town mansion for the Duke in Marylebone fields. A designer of early Georgian churches, style derived from Wren. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father's d. and at age of 17 was trying to get a summons to parliament. In 1720 he M Lady Catherine Hyde, 2nd D of Henry, Earl of Clarendon and Rochester. Catherine was, 'Sa Singularite' who joined Tory circle and was friends with Bolingbrokes. One of most celebrated women of her day due to her beauty and eccentricity. Gay lived with her and she was friends with Pope and Prior. Walpole once said “Ham walks bound my prospect, but thank God the Thames is between me and the Duchess of Q”. She d. in 1777 from ‘eating too many cherries’. He was Privy Councillor, Lord of the Bedchamber to George I, Vice-Admiral of Scotland under George II. He and Duchess quarrelled with George II in 1728 on behalf of Gay and resigned posts. Went over to POW’s camp. When George III accessed he regained Privy Councillor post again. King and Queen visited him at Amesbury which he acquired in 1725. He went to London to thank them for the honour of their visit and injured his leg dismounting carriage. Mortification set in and he died. Had 2 Ss. Had alterations done to Amesbury probably including the addition of wings in 1720 by Flitcroft. Bridgeman worked on gardens. Cousin of Earl of Ailesbury. 3rd Duke’s Sis’s were Jean, who M Francis, Earl of Dalkeith, later Duke of Buccleugh and Anne who M Hon. William Finch, Bro. of Daniel the Earl of Winchelsea. Dowager Duchess was good friends with Countess of Suffolk of Marble Hill and Lady Bolingbroke. [DNB; J Bold, Wilton House and English Palladianism, 1988.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Rochester</strong>, d.1753. M Jane Hyde in 1693 and they were described as a singularly fine couple at time of marriage. Jane was very beautiful. Had 8 children incl. Jane, later Countess of Essex and Catherine Duchess of Queensberry. Undistinguished career, was Joint Vice treasurer for Ireland for a while. 1711 succeeded to earldom and in 1724 also Earldom of Clarendon. Lived within 15 miles of Bolingbroke, Berkeley, Argyll, Richard Hill, Shrewsbury and Carleton. Banked at Hoare's from 1711. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Rothes</strong>, 8th Earl, (John Leslie). Took an active part against the Pretender in 1715. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Roseberry</strong>, (Archibald Primrose) 1661-1723. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brigadier General Richards</strong>, 1673-1721. (but possibly d. as late as 1725 as he ordered last VB3). S of Jacob Richards, great military career with Marlborough, knew Stanhope (4th Marquis and 1st Duke) became chief engineer of GB. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Robinson</strong> (1700?-1777). S of William Robinson of Rokeby, Yorks and Anne, D of Robert Cundall of Yorks. GT Europe, special attention to Greek and Italy architecture especially Palladio. M 1), 1728, Elizabeth, D of Charles Howard, 3rd Earl of Carlisle (VB) and widow of Lord Nicholas Lechmere (VB). M 2) ….Booth, widow of Samuel, rich ironmonger in Barbados (for honour of being a Lady) she paid him off and refused to come back to England with him. On return from GT and under the influence of Howard family was made MP for Morpeth, Northumberland. He designed Palladian wing of Castle Howard for Earl of Carlisle (his Bro-in-law) in 1735-9. Cr. a Bt. in 1730. Very extravagant spender. Rebuilt Rokeby Mansion 1715-1730, enclosed park with stone wall. These acts recorded on 2 marble tablets fixed in gate piers at entrance to park from Greta Bridge. He became Director of Entertainment at Ranelagh Gardens, built house called Prospect Place adjacent to gardens. Had fondness for books and music. In 1769 forced to sell Rokeby due to debt. Friends with Lord Chesterfield for years and with Lord Burlington who was 3 years older than Robinson. Design of Rokeby in VB3 by Wakefield. Governor of Barbados, and amateur Architect. He designed Claydon c1750 and Compton Verney, for 2nd Earl of Verney. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev Mr Richardson</strong>, (John) 1664-1747. S of Sir Edward Richardson. Knight. Trinity College, Dublin. Lived in house called Manse Maxwell, was Chaplain to James, Duke of Ormonde. Irish divine. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Ripley</strong>, d.1758. 1st W was one of Walpole's servants who d.1737 and he M again in 1742 to the rich Miss Bucknall of Hampton, Middx. and had 3 Ss and several Ds. Architect. B. in Yorks, said to have walked to London in search of fortune. Carpenter first, then kept coffee house in Wood St. Cheapside. 1705 admitted to carpenters Co. Patron was Robert Walpole. 1718 Clerk of Works at</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kings Mews and same year rebuilt Customs house. 1721, Chief Carpenter to his Majesty’s Works (suc. Grinling Gibbons). 1723 carried out Campbell’s plans for Houghton Hall, Norfolk for Robert Walpole and introduced changes of his own. Plans and elevations of Houghton published by Ripley, jointly with Kent and Isaac Ware in 2 vols., 1755-60. 1724-1730 also built Walpole’s seat Wolterton House, Norfolk (according to Rob Walpole “one of the best houses of its size in Eng”) 1724-26 built building of the Admiralty, Whitehall. 1729 interior of roof at Chapel at Greenwich hospital (burnt down in 1779). 1726-1738 Comptroller of Board of Works, successor to Vanbrugh. D. in 1758 in official residence at Hampton Court. Lord Burlington jealous of Ripley as he wanted Kent to have Comptrollership. He was suc. by Flitcroft in 1758. [DNB.]

Rt. Hon. the Lord Romney, (Robert Marsham) 1685-1724, 1st Baron. National Archives catalogue.]


Hugh Rose of Kilravock, 1684-1755. 1st S of Hugh Rose of Kilravock, MP Scotland by Mary, D of Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder. Of Kilravock. M 1) 1704, Elizabeth (d.1714), D of Ludovick Grant of Grant, 2) Jean D of John Rose of Broadley. MP Nairnshire. 1708-10, Rossshire 1734-41. Sheriff Rosshire 1732-4. Bro. in law was Duncan Forbes (VB). Forbes supported him in seat of Ross in 1734 (which he won). During the ‘45’ he entertained the young Pretender and Duke of Cumberland. [RS.]

Benjamin Robinson, 1666-1724. Educ. for the ministry by Samuel Ogden and John Woodhouse. Presbyterian minister. Set up various schools for training for the ministry. [DNB]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D of John Letten of London. Fa. bought Evesham Abbey estate in 1664 and was MP for Borough in 1681 and 1690. Rudge was MP Evesham 1698-1701, 1702-1734. Mayor of Evesham. Bank of England Director 1699-1711, 1715-1740, Deputy Governor 1711-13, Governor 1713, 1715, Deputy Governor of South Sea Company 1721-30. Whig but voted against admin in every decision in George Is reign. Mayor of Evesham 1691. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Richards</strong>, Carver in Office of Works. Worked on 30 Old Burlington Street with Roger Morris and Isaac Mansfield (VB). His D, Elizabeth, M Isaac Ware. Also worked at Burlington house, Piccadilly in 1719, did the rustic basement. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Rose</strong>, He was Hugh Rose' Fa-in-law. Seat was Broadley. [RS]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Roper</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1699. [Hoare and Co Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fry, C. A. 2006 Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Somerset</strong>, 6(^{th}) Duke, (Seymour, Charles) 1662-1748. Ygst S of Charles, 2(^{nd}) Baron Seymour of Trowbridge and Elizabeth, D of William Alington, first Baron Alington. Suce to dukedom soon after entering Trinity College, Cambs. M Elizabeth Percy (b 1667) sole heiress of Josceline, 11(^{th}) and last Earl of Northumberland to whom he owed most wealth and importance. Grandmother raised her and refused her hand to Charles II's S, Duke of Richmond (VB). She was later bestowed on Henry Cavendish, Earl of Ogle, 15yr old heir to Duke of Newcastle. He d. and Elizabeth was immediately matched to Grandmother's ward Thomas Thynne of Longleat (called Tom of 10,000, a rake). Thynne was formally married to Elizabeth (now Lady Ogle) in 1681 but she, at 14, fled immediately after wedding to Lady Temple at the Hague for protection and Thynne was murdered by hired assassins in Pall Mall in 1682 at instigation of Count Konigsmark, a rival suitor. Three months after Thynne's death Countess Ogle, now 15, agreed to regard the Duke of Somerset in light of a suitor and in May 1682 they were married. Somerset as a result became, master of Alnwick Castle, Petworth, Syon, and Northampton, better known by later title of Northumberland. Had house in the Strand. 1683 was Gentleman of the Bedchamber. He was very handsome. A favourite with Q. Anne. 1702, Master of the horse. Elizabeth was mistress of the robes and held position despite opposition from Swift. She aided the Hanoverians as did Somerset. He was known as the 'proud Duke', puffed up. Buried at Salisbury. A well meaning man of slender understanding, Kit Cat Club member. Elizabeth d. 1722. Had 3 Ss and 3 Ds. D Elizabeth M Henry O'Brien (Earl of Thomond), D Catharine or Anne M Peregrine Osborne, later Earl of Leeds. Banked at Hoare's from 1684. ES Algernon Seymour (7(^{th}) Duke 1684-1750) M, in 1713, Frances, ED of Henry Thynne. She was Lady of Bedchamber to Q. Caroline and aspired to learning. She d. in 1754. Duke M (2) in 1726, Charlotte, 3(^{rd}) D of Daniel Finch, 2(^{nd}) Earl of Notts. Had 2 children, Frances, who M John Manners, Marquis of Granby and Charlotte, who M Heneage Finch, Earl of Aylsford. 2(^{nd}) Duchess died in 1773. [Hoare and Co., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duke of Shrewsbury</strong>, (Talbot, Charles) 1660-1718. Of Isleworth, Middlesex. M 1705, Adelhida, D of Marquis Palleotti of Bologna. Fa. died in a duel when Duke of Buckingham killed him. Duke of Buckingham was having an affair with his Mo. She was dressed as page and was present at fight holding her lover's horse according to stories at the time. Mo. moved in with Buckingham afterwards for a time. Supported the Whigs steadily. Shrewsbury defected to the Tories c1710. True friend of the Hanoverian Succession. Died in 1718 at Isleworth. Built Heythrop, Oxon in 1705 by Archer. V popular called 'king of hearts' by William III. Patron of Lord Somers. Lived within 15 miles of Dawley (Bolingbroke), Berkeley, Orrery, Carleton, Richard Hill and Argyll. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Sunderland</strong> 3(^{rd}) Earl (Spencer, Charles) 1674-1722. Of Althorp, Notts. M 1) 1695, Lady Arabella Cavendish, D of 1(^{st}) Duke of Newcastle (d.1698), 2) M. 1700, Lady Anne Churchill, 2(^{nd}) D of Earl of Marlborough (Blenheim Earl), 3) M Judith, D. of Benjamin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tichborne. She later married Sir Robert Sutton (VB). MP for Tiverton. Statesman and Bibliophile. Very Learned. Formed a library at early age. Steady, zealous Whig. His marriage to Anne was political and drew Marlborough towards Whigs. For a while Spencer and fa-in-law remained political opponents. In 1702 Spencer opposed Prince George’s proposed annuity (offending Lady Marlborough who was the special friend of the Queen). Had great influence with George I. Sunderland was rude and violently assertive. Sunderland was Harley’s rival as a book collector as well as a politician. Library at Althorp described in 1703 by Macky as ‘the finest in Europe’. Lady Sunderland (Anne Churchill) was known as ‘the little Whig’- died aged 28. Member of Kit-Cat Club. He designed new library for house in Piccadilly, 1721-3, by John Hallam (VB). He also put Sir Thomas Hewett in place of Benson after his disgrace. Stables at Althorp by Roger Morris 1732. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Sussex, (See Lord Longueville for entry).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Sussex, 2nd Earl, d.1734.</strong> [Ingamells, 1997, p.885]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Stafford,</strong> 2nd Earl, d.1734. [Ingamells, 1997, p.885]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Sutherland,</strong> 15th or 16th (Gordon, John) 1660?-1733. Only S of George (14th/15th Earl) and Lady Jean Wemyss, D of David, 2nd Earl of Wemyss and widow of Archibald, Earl of Angus. M 1) Helen, D of William Lord Cochrane. Her Sis. was M to Lord Dundee. They had a S (Lord Strathnaver) and 2 Ds Jean and Helen. 2) Lady Catharine Talmash, widow of James Lord Doune and D of Sir Lionel Talmash and Elizabeth Duchess of Lauderdale. 3) to widow of Sir John Travel, an English lady of fortune. While still Lord Strathnaver took active part in public life, supported Glorious Rev of 1688. Peer of Scotland and supported unification with England. Lord Lieut. of 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northern counties of Scotland. Popular with George I after helping quell rebellion. On marriage of his S in 1705 to Catherine Morrison of Preston Grange, Sutherland resigned earldom in S’s favour keeping the life rent, so S became Earl. But S d. in 1720 and earldom reverted to father til his d. in 1733 when it passed to grandson William. Suc. as Earl in 1703 on fa’s d. The Earl of Sutherland in VB3 was this Earl’s fa. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Stamford,</strong> (Henry Grey) 1654-1720s. Knew Electress Sophia. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Stairs,</strong> 2nd Earl (John Dalrymple) 1673-1747. Of Carsrecruegh castle, Wigtonshire. Lord Advocate, Lord Justice Clerk, Secretary of State for Scotland. When 8 years old he accidentally shot his Bro. dead at home. Parents could not bear to see his face and after 3 yrs with tutor was sent to gd/faq., Sir James Dalrymple, who was in exile in Holland. Studied at Leiden University and was noticed by Prince of Orange who remained his patron and friend for rest of his life. Served in William III’s campaigns. 1700, travelled in Italy for a year. Became 2nd earl in 1707. Charmed Q. Anne, General by 1712. Retired to Edinburgh where he became leader of Whig party in 1714 in Scotland. In Scotland fell in love with Eleanor, Viscountess Primrose, D of 2nd Earl of Loudon and widow of James, 1st Viscount Primrose. Her S was 3rd Earl of Loudoun (VB). She was beautiful and had been cruelly treated by 1st husband, widowed in 1706 and refusing to marry again. He married her in 1714 by concealing himself in her house and appearing at her bedroom window, she then had to marry him to save her reputation. As Whig leader, on accession of George I he was returned to favour again. Posted in Paris to spy on Pretender and gave lavish parties to watch everyone. Stairs was a great ambassador, recalled in 1720 with shattered fortunes and was inadequately rewarded for invaluable services tracking Pretender. Most foremost agriculturalist and rural economist of his time. Lady Stair became leader of society in Scotland. His bro-in-law was Sir James Campbell. Friend of Bolingbroke. With Lord Essex and Thomas Coke on GT 1717-18. Banked at Hoare’s from 1712. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marquis of Seaforth,</strong> (William Mackenzie) d.1740. Later 5th Earl of Seaforth. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his fortune left to Jon Fitzmaurice, Earl of Shelburne 1753. S was 1st Marquess of Lansdowne. [RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Somerville</strong>, 13th Lord (James). Of the Drum, Liberton, Midlothian built 1726-30 in <em>Vit. Scot</em> [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Scarborough</strong>, (Lumley, Richard) d. 1721. S of John Lumley and Mary Compton, D of Sir Henry Compton. M Frances, D of Sir Henry Jones of Aston and had 7 Ss and 4 Ds. Raised a Catholic Royalist, he went overseas in 1654 and was a favourite of Charles II. 1680, Master of the horse for Queen Catherine of Braganza. 1687 became a Protestant and in 1688 signed the invitation to William. 1689 Lord Lieutenant of Durham and Northumberland. 1690 became Earl. Banked at Hoare’s from 1714. Friends with 4th Earl of Chesterfield. The Lord Scarborough in VB3 was this Lord’s heir. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; Samuel Shellabarger, The 4th Earl of Chesterfield, 1935.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baron Shack</strong>, (Bertram Frei Herr Von Schack). In Hanoverian Diplomatic service on mission to Denmark 1715. Then entered Tsar Peter of Russia’s service in London (missions 1715-16, 1722-23). [Hatton, George I, 2001.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Somers</strong>, (Somers John) 1651-1716. Of Clifton, Severn Stoke, Worcs. Worcester Cathedral School and Trinity College, Ox. Graduated May 1667. Middle Temple and called to the Bar aged 25. Bachelor for life. Looked after by his niece. Early patrons included Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, 12th Earl (VB) whose estates his fa. managed. Shrewsbury introduced Somers to eminent Whigs. Became Lord Somers of Evesham in 1697. MP for Worcester 1688-9. Lord Chancellor of England. He initiated Swift into Whiggism. Somers was virtual head of junto of Whigs (included Wharton, Orford, Halifax and Charles Spencer the Earl of Sunderland). Member of Kit-Cat Club. Villa in Herts., ‘Brookmans’ (built in 1682) which he bought in 1702 from Sir Andrew Fountaine for £8k. Member of Royal Society. Somers had a “large and valuable library and was the basis of the “Somers Tracts”. Friend of Shaftesbury. Dined with Shaftesbury at house in Little Chelsea and used to check his works before publishing. Unclear who the Lord Somers was in VB2 and VB3 as Lord Somers in VB1 (this entry) d. in 1716. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir John Smith</strong>, 1657-1726. Judge, letters to Sir John Clerk (of Penicuik?). [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Edward Smith of Hill Hall Essex</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1695. [Hoare and Co.Ltd.,1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr Steygersdale</strong>, (Steigerdahl). Kings physician, with him at his death. [Hatton, George I, 2001.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mrs Elizabeth Southwell</strong>, (probably wife of above) [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lady Seabright</strong>, (see husband's entry). Henrietta, D of Sir Samuel Dashwood, MP Lord Mayor of London, 1725, Married Sir Thomas Seabright in Nov 1718. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Robert Sutton</strong>, 1671-1746. 1st S of Robert Sutton of Averham, Notts. Educ. Trinity College, Ox., 1688 aged 16. Middle Temple 1691. Of Broughton, Lincs and Averham Park, Notts. Built 1700 in VB4 by Badeslade and Roque. M, 1724, Judith (d.May 1749), D of Sir Benjamin Tichborne, widow of Charles Spencer, MP 3rd Earl of Sunderland. MP Notts 1722-24, 1732, Great Grimsby 1734-41. Secretary and resident of Vienna 1697-1700. Ambassador to Constantinople 1700-1717. Pope referred to him as 'Revd' Sutton. Became chaplain to Lord Lexington his cousin, but gave up chaplaincy. House in Grosvenor Sq. in the city and had estates in Lincs. and Notts., very wealthy. Became 2nd Baron Lexington. On Managing Committee of Charitable Corporation to lend small amounts to stave off pawnbrokers. Sutton obtained licences to raise the authorised capital of corporation from £100K-£600K. Sutton made money from this. City of London and Bank of England attacked this in Commons in 1731 for unfair trading practices. 1732 disclosure of extensive frauds in Charitable Corporation Inquiry. Sutton and others property was alienated and they were banned from leaving country. Sir Robert said to have been prejudiced due to his Bro. being a Jacobite who had been connected with Lord Bolingbroke. Scandal only cleared years later. [RS; Breman et all, Guide to Vitruvius Britannicus, 1972.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Edward Seymour</strong>, 1st S of Sir Edward Seymour, 5th Bt., MP, by</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Edward Simeon</strong>, Of Aston House Nr. Stone, Staffs, (built in 1725), dem. c1800 by Richard Trubshaw, architect, 1689-1745. In a vernacular Baroque style similar to Smith of Warwick. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir William Stewart Bt</strong>, Probably the William Stewart who banked at Hoare’s from 1698. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir John Smith</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1697.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rt Hon. Edward Southwell</strong>, Banked at Hoare’s from 1699. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph Smith</strong>, 1682-1770. M a Sis. of John Murray. British Consul at Venice, employed in commerce, a collector of books and</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuscripts, he patronised painters. Walpole sneered at him as the merchant of Venice who knew only the titles of his books. George III bought his books which are now in Kings Library at British Museum. [DNB.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry Smart</strong>, 1676-1760. Mason of Chichester. S of Robert Smart, a bricklayer. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revd Dr Shippen</strong>, (William Shippen) 1673-1743. Revd, DD, Rector of Stockport, Lancs. [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Sampson</strong>, d 1759. Architect. Posts of Clerk of Tower of London and Somerset House when Benson took over, in 1718. Dismissed when Benson was and became Surveyor to Bank of England and architect of old part of the bank (1732-4). Hans Sloane (VB) consulted him over future of Beaufort House. Associated with John Aislabie (VB) who used him to draw up designs. [Vyner Papers; Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Anne Stone</strong>, nee Anne Holbrooke. M Andrew Stone of Lombard St, London, Goldsmith. Her husband was one of the founders of Martins bank. Her S was MP for Hastings 1741-61 and M in 1743 Susannah, D of Stephen Mauvillain of Tooting, Surrey. S had prestige posts incl. Secretary to Duke of Newcastle (VB). [RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Thanet</strong>, 6th Earl, d.1729. Under nephew Tufton, Sackville. This nephew succeeded him in 1729 as 7th Earl and was Bro-in-law to Lord Burlington. Banked at Hoare’s from 1696. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Thomond</strong>, d.1741. 7th Earl. His W’s Sis. was M to William Wyndham, 3rd Bt. of Orchard Wyndham. In VB1 and VB2 he is notes as Lord Thomond. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Tankerville</strong>, (probably Charles Bennet) formerly Lord Ossulston, under Grey, Forde in DNB. In 1719-20 he was employing Nicholas Dubois to work at Dawley House, Middx. Dawley then bought by Lord Bolingbroke who employed Gibbs there in 1725. [Colvin,1995; B.T White, The History of Dawley, 2001]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Viscount Townshend</strong>, 2nd Visc., 1674-1738. Of Raynham in Norfolk. Educ. Eton and Kings College, Cambs. Married twice, 1) Elizabeth, D of Thomas Pelham (Baron) and 2) in 1713, Dorothy, D of Robert Walpole of Houghton Hall, Norfolk (Dorothy was Sis. to Sir Robert Walpole). Dorothy’s fa. (Robert Walpole, most influential Whig leader in Norfolk) had been guardian to Lord Townshend. The Hon. Robert Walpole, Paymaster Gen. (VB), was Dorothy’s Bro. Statesman, bred in Tory principles. Charles II and Duke of York were his godfathers. Went over to Whigs early but never quite lost traces of Toryism. Banked at Hoare’s from 1700. [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Talman</strong>, 1677-1726. ES of William Talman (architect). Eton, Leiden University studied Law. M Frances Cockayne of Hinxworth, Herts. Visited other parts of Holland and Germany 1698. Travelled for years to see buildings. Travelled to Italy in company of Kent, intimate friends. Corresponded with Aldrich at Christ Church, Oxford. Had huge collection of drawings from all over Europe. No actual buildings known to be built to any of his designs. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William Talman</strong>, 1650-1719. Travelled to Italy with Kent, knew each other intimately. Worked with Vanbrugh on Chatsworth and Canons. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr James Thornhill</strong>, 1675-1734. S of Walter Thornhill of Wareham by Mary, D of Col. William Sydenham, Governor of Weymouth Castle. M Judith D of Walter Thornhill of Wareham and had a D who M William Hogarth. Of Thornhill Dorset. Painter. MP Weymouth and Melcombe Regis 1722-34. Born in Melcombe Regis, Dorset. Thornhill made great progress in his art and travelled on continent. Saloons and stairs etc being erected by Wren and Vanbrugh offered scope to a good decorative painter and Thornhill quickly became a rival of Laguerre. Q. Anne employed him at Hampton Court, Greenwich and Windsor. Drew designs for dome of St Paul’s. His paintings in Greenwich hospital are most familiar. Did Blenheim, Easton Neston, Wimpole, Chatsworth etc but few remain due to fashion and neglect. He painted for Thomas Foley at Stoke Edith, nr. Hereford. Also did paintings at Oxford for All Souls and New college. He amassed enough money to re-purchase the family seat of Thornhill in Dorset which his father had dissipated. Having made a fortune painting he re bought and rebuilt ancestral home of Thornhill. In VB3 he has become Sir. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John (Ivory) Talbot</strong> of Lacock Abbey. [RS]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collonel Tyrell</strong>, 1674-42. S of James Tyrell of Oakley, Bucks.. by Mary, D of Sir Michael Hutchinson of Fladbury, Wores. Of</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shotover, Oxon. Unm. MP Boroughbridge 1722-30, 1742. Whig. Military man, Col. til d. in 1742. Also Groom of the Bedchamber 1714-27. S of a wealthy Whig who was intimate friend of John Locke. Newcastle sponsored him to get Boroughbridge. Shotover Park, Oxon, octagonal garden building and obelisk pre 1733 in Isaac Ware's designs.</strong> [Colvin, 1995; DNB; RS.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>George Torriagno, East India merchant. Travelled on Durrington (boat). Reported to Directors in Leadenhall Street. Merchant working for E. India Co.</strong> [Sutton, J., Lords of the East, 1981.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count Volkra, (Otto Christian Von). From the holy Roman Empire. Charles Vs special ambassador to London.</strong> [Hatton, George I, 2001.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir John Vanbrugh, 1664-1723. Received architectural training in France 1683-1685. Dramatist and architect. Had a military career for a while and was known as Captain Vanbrugh. Then he started writing comedies and plays. But architectural career obscure, first employer of note seems to have been the Earl of Carlisle in 1701 who subscribed to VB and had Vanbrugh build him a new house upon site of old castle in Hinderskelf in 1701. The result was Castle Howard-not completed til 1714. In 1702 he succeeded Talman in the comptrollership of the board of works. He was a member of the Kit-Cat club. He begun Blenheim in 1705. In 1711 Marlborough was dismissed from all his posts and Q. Anne ordered house to stop. The brunt of claims for all arrears payments fell on architect and he was dismissed from Comptrollership of the Board. Accession of George I saw him knighted. Duchess tried to ruin Vanbrugh by publishing a leaflet but failed. Marlboroughs owed Vanbrugh money and, in 1725, Walpole eventually intervened for him and extorted the money from the Duchess. She finished Blenheim by herself but would not let Lady Vanbrugh come and see it. Friend’s with Earl of Carlisle. 1707 restored Kimbolton Castle for Earl of Manchester who became a firm friend. 1710 did ‘Old Claremont House’ at Esher for Earl of Clare (VB), later Duke of Newcastle. In 1715 re-appointed to Comptrollership to the Board of Works by George I, then architect to Greenwich Hospital. Whig. Banked at Hoare’s from 1714.</strong> [Hoare and Co.Ltd., 1955; DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Vernon, 1646-1727. S of Francis Vernon, from Vernons of Haslington, Cheshire and Hanbury, Worcs. Matriculated from Christchurch 1662, and then to Cambs. M, 1675, Mary, D of Sir John Buck, Bt. Private Secretary to many Lords, a staunch Whig. Tories hated him and when came to power he was replaced by Daniel Finch, Earl of Notts. Secretary of state. Retired to Watford. His S James Vernon (d1756) represented Cricklade, Wilts 1708-1710.</strong> [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henry Vernon</strong>, of Sudbury, 1686-1719. S of George Vernon of Sudbury by 3rd W Catherine, D of Sir Thomas Vernon, MP London, Merchant. Catherine's Sis. was Matilda, whose D, Anne, M Sir Robert Furnese (VB). Catherine was also Sis. to Judith who M John Aislabie ie Judith's Bro. was Thomas Vernon 1683-1726 of Twickenham Park, Middx. and he was expelled from House of Commons for trying to influence General Ross in favour of Aislabie in South Sea Bubble affair. Of Sudbury, Derbyshire. M 1) Anne (d.1714) D of Thomas Pigot of Chetwynd, Salop, niece of Peter Venables of Kinderston, 2) Matilda, D of Thomas Wright of Longstone Derbyshire. MP Staffordshire 1713-1715. Newcastle under Lyme, 1715. Tory. Vernon family acquired estates of Swynnerton and Hilton in Staffs by M in 1557. Richard Trubshaw, architect, worked for him at Hilton Hall and Sudbury Hall. Trubshaw also worked for Sir Edward Simeon (VB). [Colvin, 1995; RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mr Van Huls</strong>, B. after 1649-1722. S of Samuel Vanhuls (d.1687) Secretary to Prince of Orange by Sara Maria, D of John le Maire, minister of Amsterdam. Of Whitehall, London. Clerk of the Robes to William III in 1700 and at court in Q. Anne's reign. MP Bramber 1722. Kings letter carrier for life. He was private Secretary to William III who gave him a court place for life. Perhaps his Bro. subscribed in 1725 to VB3 as this Van Huls was dead by VB3. Bro. was Samuel Van Huls, Burgomaster of the Hague. [RS.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Wemyss</strong>, 3rd Earl (Wemyss, David) 1678-1720. S of Sir James Wemyss of Caskieberry, (cr. a life peer as Lord Burntisland and d.1685) and Margaret, Countess of Wemyss (1659-1705), only D of 2nd Earl of Wemyss. M 1) Anna, D of William Douglas, 1st Duke of Queensberry. She was aunt to the Duke of Queensberry (VB) 2) Mary, ED of Sir John Robinson of Framing Woods, Northants 3) Elizabeth, 4th D of Henry, 7th Lord Sinclair. Had 2 Ds, Elizabeth, M to William Earl of Sunderland and Margaret, who M James 9th Earl of Moray. Of Wemyss. Privy Councillor 1705, 1707 Scottish peer, 1706 Vice Admiral of Scotland. Wemyss Castle built in Fife in 1672. He suc. Mo. to title. Unclear who VB3 subscriber was as this Earl was dead. [DNB.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Warwick</strong>, d.1721. The dissolute stepson of Joseph Addison (VB). On his D, Mother took the house. She d. in 1731 and estate left to Arundell as mark of friendship with Lady Pembroke, Arundell’s Mo. Unclear who VB3 subscriber was as this Earl had d. in 1721. [DNB]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earl of Westmoreland, 4th Earl (Fane, Vere). His D M William Stapleton (VB3). His S owned Mereworth Castle in Kent. Banked at Hoare’s from 1691, Countess from 1695. [Hoare and Co,Ltd., 1955.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marquis of Wharton, 1st Marquis, (Thomas) 1648-1715. Reputation as greatest rake in England after a severe up-bringing. Visited Italy and Germany, France and Low countries. Seat was at Woburn but lived at Winchendon. M Anne, D of Sir Henry Lee, 5th Bt. of Ditchley. He was against James II. In 1690 went with William to the Hague. Suc. to peerage in 1695 on d. of fa. Passion for pure Whig principles. In 1702 he became Lord Lieut. for his county, Bucks., but sacked from this and all other posts when Anne succeeded. She had strong personal dislike of him despite being godmother to his S. He joined the Whig junta and more or less managed the party at this time 1700 -1714. 2nd W, Lucy, heiress of Adam Loftus, Visc. Lisburne. He was extreme and saw all Tories as enemies of his country. Wholly taken up with vice and politics. Member of Kit Cat Club. Banked at Hoare’s from 1695. In VB3 as Duke of Wharton. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Visc. Weymouth, 2nd Visc. (Thynne, Thomas) 1710-1751. First W unknown. M 2) Louisa, D of John Carteret, Earl Granville who was very beautiful, everyone surprised she had M him as he was quite slow. She was close to Sarah Jennings, Duchess of Marlborough. Of Longleat, Wilts which he inherited in 1714 when a child, but for most of his life he lived at a simple manor at village of Horningsham nearby, not at Longleat. Reason for this is unknown. His Sis. Frances M Sir Robert Worsley (VB) S of Sir Robert Worsley 3rd Bt. and Mary, D of Hon. James Herbert, S of Philip 4th Earl of Pembroke. Stepfather was Lord Lansdowne who used to live at Longleat. He was ranger of Hyde park and St James Park. Weymouth said to have killed his W’s lover and buried him in the grounds. A body was found in the cellar in 5th Marquess’ lifetime, maybe this is why he did not live there. A main patron of Gibbs. [DNB.]</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bishop of Winchester. Jonathan Trelawney (Bishop of Winchester 1707-21).</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lord Bishop of Winchester, Richard Wills Bishop of Winchester 1723-34.</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Lord Bishop of Waterford.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir William Wyndham.</strong> 3rd Bt, 1687-1740. Politician. S of Sir Edward Wyndham and Katherine Leveson-Gower. B. at Orchard-Wyndham, Somerset. Eton 1698 and Christchurch College, Ox, matriculated 1 June 1704. Went abroad and then elected for Somerset a few months before fall of Whigs in 1710. Secretary at war 1712. Lived on Albemarle street, house burnt down in 1712. Tory and joined plot for the rising of the Stuarts. MP for Somerset 1710-1740. Arrested in 1715 as a Jacobite and escaped but on advice of fa-in-law, Duke of Somerset, surrendered and went to Tower. Released next year. Bolingbroke was his mentor in life and politics. A leading spirit in October Club and Brothers Club. A man of pleasure, not faithful to his wives. M 1) Lady Catherine (d 1731), D of Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset and 2) Maria Caterina, D of Peter Jong of Utrecht and widow of Marquis of Blandford. His daughter M into the Erle family. Bro-in-law was Lord Hertford whose W was best friends with Bolingbroke's Sis. Lady Luxborough. His uncle was the 7th Earl of Thomond (VB3). He was close to Earl of Bathurst (VB). Owned Witham Park, Somerset, designs for remodelling garden front for Sir William by Gibbs, c1716. Recent research proves that the VB2, Palladian design for Witham by Gibbs was actually built Reproduced in John Harris Georgian Country Houses. Colvin says designs done by Dr Clarke of Christchurch, early connection with Wyndham, a Tory. Banked at Hoare's from 1717.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Walter Yonge.</strong> friend of Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury and John Locke and dined with him in Little Chelsea, London c 1700. Owned Escot House, Devon built 1680-8 and illustrated in VB1. Campbell thought of him as a possible patron. Banked at Hoare's from 1713.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rt. Hon Robert Walpole, 1676-1745.</strong> Later first Earl of Orford. Do not confuse with Earl of Orford in VB lists who he was friends with. B. at Houghton where his fa., also Robert, was most influential Whig leader in Norfolk. He was 3rd S. Mo. Mary, was D of Sir Geoffrey Burwell of Rougham, Suffolk. She d. in 1711 aged 58 after bearing 19 children. Younger Bro. was Lord Horatio Walpole (VB3). Uncle was Horace Walpole. Intimately acquainted with Lord Townshend, his fa's ward and later his Bro-in-law, also his cousin. M the exquisitely beautiful Catherine Shorter in 1700, D of Jon Shorter of Bybrook, Baltic timber merchant. Educ. school in Massingham, Norfolk, Eton and then King's College Cambridge in 1695. Of Houghton Hall, Norfolk, Palladian 1721-35. MP Kings Lynn 1702. Patronised by Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough as he was friends with her S, John Churchill. Suc. Fa. in 1700 and Whigs began to take him under their wing, especially Halifax, Sunderland and Devonshire. Lord Townshend was head of government at this time, 1715, and Walpole was considered to be chief minister even though there was no such formal position. Made Paymaster General under George I. Baron Bothmar (VB) did not like him because he was guiding George I. Friend of John Aislabie, Walpole pleaded extenuating circumstances for him in South Sea Bubble. Townshend made Walpole first Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1715. His D Mary M George, 3rd Earl of Cholmondley, whose</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name and Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Details</th>
<th>VB1</th>
<th>VB2</th>
<th>VB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bro., the 1st Earl subscribed. During his 1st W's lifetime he had a connection with Miss Maria Skerrit who lived at his house in Richmond and sometimes Houghton. Rumours say he M her as early as 1737. She was welcomed by Society but d. the following yr, Walpole in deep despair. He had several houses in London, 1) 1716, Arlington St 2) 2 houses in Chelsea 3) Official house in Downing Street offered to him by George II but it needed renovating so he lived at 4) St James Sq, 5) House on Richmond Hill. 1742 left Downing St and moved back to Arlington St House till d. 1723 King rewarded Walpole by Cr. his ES, Lord Walpole of Walpole. Walpoles trusted friend was Earl of Islay, Argyll's Bro., he made him Privy Seal for Scotland, the ministerial manager of the country. 1726 onwards split between Walpole and Townshend. Lady Dorothy had died and no real bond between them anymore. Townshend jealous of Walpole's influence with the Queen. 1729 scuffle and drawn swords between them. 9th Feb 1742 Cr. Earl of Orford. On 11th he resigned all his seats. 3rd Earl of Cholmondley was Walpole's S-in-law, he was M to his D Mary. His Bro., Hugh was 1st Earl of Cholmondley (VB). Houghton built between 1722 and 1735. Chairman of a small club that met in Henrietta Street. Member of Kit Kat Club. Design variant for Houghton in VB2 by Campbell. Banked at Hoare's from 1701. [Hoare and Co. Ltd., 1955.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wood, part of English Dilettanti in Rome. He was one of a few who financed Stewart and Revett's trip to Athens. Celebrated trip to Asia Minor and Syria in 1750-51. [Colvin, 1995.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Wills, (Wills, Charles) 1666-1741. S of Anthony Wills of St Govran, Cornwall by his W Jenofe. Unm. MP Totnes 1718-25,</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wickham. Possibly the same as William Wickham in Padua 1724 and Rome 1723. [Ingamells, 1997, p.998]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wallop, 1st Earl of Portsmouth. 1690-1762. 3rd S of John Wallop of Farleigh Wallop, Hants., by W Alicia, D of William Borlase of Great Marlow, Bucks. John left Eton at 19 and went abroad to Germany. At Hanover was ‘admitted to the most confidential familiarity’ with the Elector (George I). He was in Hanover c1710. MP for Hants 1715-1720. 1717 Lord of the Treasury and made Baron Wallop and Lord Lymington. Supporter of Walpole, Lord Lieutenant of Hants. in 1733. M 1) Bridget. ED of Charles Bennet, Earl of Tankerville in 1716, 2) Elizabeth, D of James 2nd Lord Griffin and widow of Henry Grey in 1746. In VB3 as Lord Lymington. [DNB.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Waller, 1699-1771. 1st S of Stephen Waller by Judith, D of Sir Thomas Vernon, MP of Farnham, Surrey, and 2nd W of John Aislabie. Educ. Eton 1707. Of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, Berks, garden building by Campbell between 1715-1725. MP Great Marlow 1722-41 and Chipping Wycombe 1741-54. Whig. John Aislabie was his stepfather and fa-in-law. As a youth he was used by Aislabie as a cover for his interest in South Sea stock. Against Walpole. [Stutchbury, Colen Campbell, 1967; RS.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and Details</td>
<td>VB1</td>
<td>VB2</td>
<td>VB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Warburton</strong>, 1682-1759. Herald Antiquary. Member of the Society of Antiquaries and collector of lost plays. [National Archives catalogue.]</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plate 1: Detail from Sir Godfrey Kneller’s portrait of King George I. c.1715.
Plate 2: Andrea Palladio. Portrait engraved by Picart in 1716 after a lost original by Veronese, from Leoni’s edition of Quattro Libri.

Plate 4: Galerie Building in Herrenhausen Palace Gardens.
Plate 5: Herrenhausen Garden façade by Johann Georg Tantzel, 1780, Hanover.

Plate 6: Palladio’s Villa Emo, Italy.
Plate 7: Design for a Palladian Villa, based on the Villa Emo attributed to Gottfried L. Pictorius (Münster, Westfälisches Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte).
Plate 8: Design for a Palladian Villa dedicated to the Elector of Hanover by Lambert E. Corfey. (Stadarchiv, Hanover)

Plate 12: Anonymous engraving of Sir Hans Sloane, date unknown.
Plate 14: The Fishing Tabernacles at Studley Royal, Yorkshire.
Plate 15: Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke. Portrait attributed to Alexi Simon Belle, c.1712.
Plate 16: Cranford House, Middlesex.

Plate 17: Line drawing of Cranford House, Middlesex (1943) produced and held by NMR.
Plate 19: Wentworth Castle (Country Life Picture Library)
Plate 20: The Gallery at Wentworth Castle (Country Life Picture Library)
Plate 21: The Gallery chimney-piece, Wentworth Castle (Country Life Picture Library)

Plate 24: Ditchley Park, Oxfordshire.

Plate 25: Lydiard Tregoze, Wiltshire.
Plate 27: South elevation of Studley House now demolished (Country Life Picture Library)

Plate 29: Rear elevation of Ebberston Lodge, Yorkshire.

Plate 30: Front elevation of Newby Park, Yorkshire.
Plate 31: Pediment, front elevation of Newby Park, Yorkshire.
Plate 32: Temple of Venus, Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire.

Plate 33: The Boathouse, Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire.
Plate 35: Temple of Piety, Studley Royal, Yorkshire.
Plate 36: The Banqueting House, Studley Royal, Yorkshire.
Plate 37: The Fishing Tabernacles, Studley Royal, Yorkshire.
Plate 38: Columns adorned with dripping fronds flanking the side entrances to Newby Park, Yorkshire.
Plate 39: Columns adorned with dripping fronds at Ebberston Lodge, Yorkshire.
Plate 40: Dripping fronds adorning the front façade of the Banqueting House, Studley Royal, Yorkshire.

Plate 41: The Gothic Octagon Tower, Studley Royal, Yorkshire.
Plate 42: South Dalton, Yorkshire, by John Roque 1737.
Plate 44: Engraving by Knyff and Kip showing medieval house and formal gardens at Wanstead immediately prior to building of neo-Palladian Wanstead. NMR BB50/372 (Date unknown).

Plate 45: Wanstead House NMR engraving NMR BB53/4 (Date unknown).
Plate 46: Wanstead House showing external staircases, details from a Charles Catton watercolour, c.1714.
Plate 47: Main entrance Stourhead House, Wiltshire.

Plate 50: Five-arched bridge at Swallowfield, Berkshire.

Plate 51: Engraved Plaque with Thomas Pitt’s initials on bridge at Swallowfield, Berkshire.
Plate 52: Evidence of the formal canal extant in the landscape.

Plate 53: Extensions to the West of Swallowfield in plain brick, classical style.
Plate 54: Stone sundial at Swallowfield, Berkshire.
Plate 56: Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk when still Mrs Howard of Marble Hill. By John Faber after John Peters. c1725-1750.
Plate 57: Marble Hill, Twickenham.

Plate 58: Scene IV from Hogarth's Beggar's Opera. This was completed in 1729 and was one of 5 versions of the painting. Note Lavinia Fenton's arm pointing at the Duke of Bolton while she gazes at him. (Tate Gallery, London).
Plate 59: Sir Thomas Robinson of Rokeby by Frans van der Mijn, 1750.
Plate 60: Interior of Ranelagh by Canaletto, 1954.

Plate 62: Plan of the House and Offices of Cannam Park, near Kingsclere, Hampshire by James Gibbs c1725.


Plate 65: Marble Hill, Twickenham, Middlesex.
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