



THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP

Richard Hewlings, 'Wakefield Lodge and
Other Houses of the Second Duke of Grafton',
The Georgian Group Journal, Vol. III, 1993,
pp. 43-61

WAKEFIELD LODGE AND OTHER HOUSES OF THE SECOND DUKE OF GRAFTON

Richard Hewlings

On May 6, 1757, Charles Fitzroy, 2nd Duke of Grafton died, his estates encumbered with appropriately ducal debts.¹ Inconvenient as this may have been for his immediate successors, it provided one small perquisite for posterity. The duke's heir was his grandson, a minor, and the executors' most pressing responsibility was therefore to pay, and carefully document, the 2nd Duke's debts. The documentation, now in the possession of the 11th Duke, has always been kept with the papers of the 3rd Duke, and, until recently calendared by Mrs Margaret Statham on behalf of Suffolk County Record Office, has therefore escaped the attention of biographers of his grandfather.

For historians of architecture its escape has not been of great consequence. The 2nd Duke had two country houses, a principal seat at Euston, Suffolk,² and a hunting lodge at Wakefield, in the Forest of Whittlewood, in Northamptonshire.³ The duke's reconstruction of Euston Hall is largely (although not fully) documented in the account book of his architect, Matthew Brettingham, which survives among the Chancery Master's Exhibits in the Public Record Office.⁴ No such detailed documentation of the new house he built at Wakefield has, until now, been identified, but the most attractive fact about it, the name of its architect, has been known since the publication of Horace Walpole's correspondence in 1903.⁵ Walpole visited it in 1751, described it as "just built", and attributed it to Kent. His attribution has been accepted by the biographers of Kent,⁶ the historian of the house,⁷ and by Howard Colvin.⁸ The 2nd Duke's executors' accounts give no reason to doubt it, for, although they do not mention Kent's name, they show that the house was begun in May 1748,⁹ after Kent's death on April 12,¹⁰ and therefore that, if his, the design was executed posthumously, as has always been argued. But the accounts do itemise principal craftsmen, and thereby bring the execution of this exceptionally interesting house into deeper focus than was ever made possible by mere knowledge of its designer's name.

Indeed it would be an interesting house without such knowledge, for its internal arrangements appear to be typologically unusual. The primary plan¹¹ was apparently a narrow rectangle, seven bays wide by only three deep, with two storeys of equal height raised on a semi-basement. The two principal storeys were identical. The three central bays, from front to back, were occupied by a cubical saloon, two storeys in height, and ringed at first-floor level by a cantilevered balcony. Either side of this saloon each floor contained an apartment of three small rooms, with chimneypieces which were not identical to others in the same apartment, but identical to those in the corresponding room of the answering apartment. Beside the apartments, a small part of the area on each side of the saloon was occupied by a spiral staircase. This plan provided four identical apartments of three rooms each, by putting all the service accommodation in the semi-basement, and some supplementary accommodation in two towers, variants of those at Wilton, raised above the pairs of apartments.

Some of the elements of this plan are not at all unusual. The division into private apartments leading off a public room was standard practice until the middle 18th century.¹² The particular form of the saloon, a cube, ringed halfway up by a cantilevered balcony, was taken from that of the Queen's House, Greenwich.¹³ The spiral staircases are the means of

access provided by the tulip stair in the Queens' House.¹⁴ Admiration of Inigo Jones might be expected from Kent, and further indication of his authorship comes from the stair balusters, which are simplified versions of those in the Marble Hall at Holkham.¹⁵

But elements which are either standard or unsurprising are, at Wakefield Lodge, composed in an unusual manner. It is, in the first place, unusual to find so large a saloon with such small apartments off it. Whereas the saloon occupies three bays in each direction, six rooms and a stair fill the two-by-three-bay space either side. Although the saloon was evidently intended for state, the apartments cannot have been. The duke was of royal descent, a Knight of the Garter, and Lord Chamberlain. The smallness of the rooms and the modestness of the stairs indicate that Wakefield Lodge cannot have been the principal seat of such a grandee. Secondly, these apartments are undifferentiated. It is common enough to find identically-paired apartments (for the owner and his wife, or, with state apartments, for the King and Queen), or even two pairs of apartments, though differentiated. But four identical apartments are rare. Thirdly, there is no great stair in any of the positions favoured in English Palladian plans, but two stairs small enough to be service stairs, although ornamented in a manner appropriate to the duke. Fourthly, although double height saloons are not uncommon in English Palladian architecture, it is rare to find one the full depth of the building. Or, equally, it is rare to find a building narrow enough to be filled by a saloon alone. The canonical preference was a double pile, with a hall and saloon, and sometimes a stairhall, a tribune,¹⁶ or some other circulation space between the two. In double-pile plans it is unusual to find both the central rooms two storeys in height: invisible circulation was at least possible above the one-storey room, if there was a two-storey room to block it. In those few houses where a two-storey room does fill the centre of the house, there is usually a floor above it or below it, to provide invisible circulation when the two-storey room was occupied.¹⁷ Although first-floor circulation at Wakefield Lodge is possible, by means of the balcony, it takes place within view of company on the main floor of the saloon. The saloon isolated each side of the house for guests. Only servants could circulate invisibly, by means of the basement. Fifthly, there are no other communal rooms, such as an eating room, a library, a chapel, a business room or a gallery.

The relative smallness of the apartments, and the modestness of the stair suggest that it was designed for informal use. But the largeness of the saloon and the high quality ornament suggest that this informality was only relative, or that it was informal among a group of high social status. The equality of the apartments suggests that, within this group, equality prevailed, at least when under this roof. The size of the saloon, and its position, preventing invisible circulation, suggests a degree of communal living, certainly communal dining. The absence of other communal rooms suggests that the house was not intended to be versatile, a shortcoming which was presumably acceptable if it was only occasionally used.

Its ornament indicates the house's function still more precisely. A fox and a badger's mask, life-size, are carved prominently on the saloon chimneypiece. The duke was a famous foxhunter,¹⁸ and presumably a badgerhunter also. The Forest of Whittlewood had formerly been a royal park, with a hunting lodge at Wakefield since the time of Henry II. In 1541 it had been attached to the Honour of Grafton, an adjoining royal manor, and in 1673 the whole had been granted to Charles II's chief minister, Henry Bennett, Earl of Arlington. Arlington's daughter was married to Charles' natural son by the Duchess of Cleveland, who took his title from the Honour of Grafton when ennobled in 1675.¹⁹ At the same time as he built Wakefield Lodge, the duke built an adjoining stable block, 15 bays wide, to the house's seven. Its architectural treatment is no less ambitious: it has a pedimented frontispiece with a finely carved Rococo cartouche, and its ground floor is arcaded in the manner of Lord Burlington's design for Sevenoaks Almshouses.²⁰

So it is hardly surprising that, despite the limited ability of Anglo-Palladian ornament to speak (in Ledoux's simile), that at Wakefield Lodge utters the cries of the chase. It uttered more until the partial collapse, earlier this century, of the saloon ceiling, which bore an inscription neither recorded nor remembered.²¹ But when restored, the plasterwork Garter Star which had occupied its centre was restored too, a form of ornament only paralleled in other Garter Knights' houses at Bushy Park,²² Heythrop,²³ Houghton,²⁴ Chiswick,²⁵ and 43 Parliament Street,²⁶ although proposed inappropriately by Hawksmoor for the Ripon Cross.²⁷ The Garter Star at Wakefield Lodge confirms the owner's status, as hypothesised in the previous paragraph. The concentration of ornament in the saloon also confirms what the plan suggests, that the apartments were relatively unimportant, and, by inference from its contrast, that this single large room was used by all the occupants, host and guests alike, inevitably in common, for a variety of activities.

The interpretation of such a brief in a Palladian idiom evidently presented Kent with a problem. There are no Palladian precedents for the plan of Wakefield Lodge, for fox-hunting was not a Venetian pursuit. There are, on the other hand, innumerable English precedents for hunting (if not fox-hunting) lodges, but traditionally such buildings were designed to provide a stand for spectators, with little more internal accommodation than a single banqueting room. In consequence they inevitably took the form of the tower-like Elizabethan standing, usually two to four storeys with only one room in each, and no provision for stabling horses or staying overnight. From paintings such as Wootton's of the Beaufort Hunt,²⁸ we can see that the Elizabethan method of hunting, driving a stag in a confined park across the line of vision of spectators in a house, survived into the 18th century. Wakefield Lodge made some provision for this technique. It has a Tuscan porch outside the front door, formerly surmounted by a balustrade. The porch roof was accessible from the cantilevered balcony in the saloon, and can only have been intended as a viewing platform. On wet days one range of this balcony may itself have served the same function. It is possible that the two towers may also have done so.

But it is clear from the plan that Wakefield Lodge was not designed just as a stand for spectators. The supersession of stag hunting by fox hunting ended the need for standings, since foxes cannot be coralled within parks, and cannot be driven past a group of motionless spectators. Wakefield Lodge was evidently intended to accommodate a medium-sized group and all their horses, overnight, or over several nights: these must, therefore, have been the fox-hunters themselves. This was not entirely unprecedented. There are 17th- and early-18th-century hunting lodges, which, while continuing to provide the facilities of a standing, also offered limited overnight accommodation. Among these are Sedgebrook Manor, Lincolnshire, of about 1632,²⁹ Lodge Park, Gloucestershire, of about 1634³⁰ and Brizlincote Hall, Derbyshire, of 1707.³¹

All of these, however, differed quantitatively, if not typologically, from Wakefield Lodge. First, all are much smaller, Secondly, all more resemble standings than does Wakefield Lodge, by being within a mile or two of their owner's principal seat. Lodge Park belonged to the Duttons of Sherborne, Sedgebrook to the Thorolds of Syston, Brizlincote to the Earls of Chesterfield, of Bretby. Wakefield Lodge was, by contrast, over 100 miles from the duke's main seat at Euston, and the duke's Northamptonshire property constituted a separate estate, with a separate steward.³² At Wakefield Lodge the household had to be self-supporting. No contemporary description of life at Wakefield is known, but the plan of Wakefield Lodge resembles an architectural shadow cast by Sir Robert Walpole's Norfolk Congresses.³³ Houghton is not such a shadow, as, for Sir Robert, it was both his Euston and his Wakefield, and more beside, the *chef-lieu* of a great estate, the seat of a dominant political influence, and a conspicuous object of display. Its plan was correspondingly versatile. Wakefield Lodge appears only to be a *maison de plaisance*.

The social precedents of such a building type are courtly rather than aristocratic. Kent may well have thought of the Prince's Lodging in Newmarket,³⁴ which probably did not quite answer his requirements by being in a town, and a little way distant from the source of the sport. He obviously did think of the Queen's House at Greenwich, which, like Wakefield Lodge, provides both a standing for spectators with views over Greenwich, and accommodation for a substantial household in retreat from formal court. But the retreat was not very far (only a few yards separated it from Greenwich Palace), the provision for spectating was both greater (the capacious portico *in antis* on the park elevation) and more architecturally conspicuous, and the eccentricities of the Greenwich brief (the need to bridge a public road) made the Queen's House a not entirely suitable model. At Wakefield Kent only followed it in the particulars already described.

He could equally have been influenced by the social model of an aristocracy whose income was not so predominantly landed as in England, and who were principally seated at court or in towns, reserving their landed property more for pleasure.³⁵ It is presumably for this reason that there are more 18th-century hunting lodges in France than in England, and that there is no English equivalent of the name *maison de plaisance*. The plan of Wakefield is closer to a French example than most English hunting lodges are. It was evidently inspired by Jules Hardouin-Mansart's Chateau du Val of 1674, published in Mariette's *Architecture Francoise*.³⁶ The Chateau du Val has only one storey, and Kent put stairs in place of one room in each apartment, thereby providing access to the other storeys at Wakefield. Nor are the rooms at Wakefield shaped. These features apart, Wakefield is closer to this French example than it is to the Queen's House, or to any other building.

All the ornamental features of its principal elevation save one, however, had previously been used by Lord Burlington. Indeed the elevation is a variant of a drawing by Burlington which has been identified as a design for Tottenham Park, Wiltshire.³⁷ They have in common corner towers, portico and implied superimposed orders.

The corner towers followed the model of Wilton, which may also have been followed by those at Shavington, Shropshire, about 1680,³⁸ and Blyth, Notts in 1684.³⁹ It was certainly followed by Burlington at Tottenham in 1721,⁴⁰ and that introduced a further 17 buildings with similar corner towers between 1721 and 1748.⁴¹ The precedent for the towers at Wilton was a design published in Scamozzi's *Idea dell'Architettura Universale*,⁴² of which Burlington had a copy in his library at Chiswick.⁴³

The Tuscan porch, or low portico, approached by quadrant-planned steps from each side is a rarer feature. There are 17th-century porches, but few. They include Thorpe Hall, Peterborough,⁴⁴ Moulton Hall, Yorkshire,⁴⁵ Halnaby Hall, Yorkshire,⁴⁶ Lodge Park, Gloucestershire,⁴⁷ Aynhoe Park, Northamptonshire,⁴⁸ and Flagg Hall, Derbyshire. In the first half of the 18th century these were uninfluential: only in the later 18th century did porches become common. The porch at Wakefield might instead have been regarded as a low portico. As a portico it is unusual in being one storey lower than the building it adjoins, and in having no pediment. The portico which Burlington had designed at Tottenham Park 27 years earlier was the same; its only difference from that at Wakefield being its order (Ionic instead of Tuscan), and the steps either side (straight instead of curved). The portico which Pope added to his Twickenham house on Burlington's advice in about 1735⁴⁹ was similar. Like those at Tottenham and Wakefield, it stood on a podium, and its roof was accessible from a door on the floor above. Unlike the others, however, it had no flanking steps, and it adjoined a three-storey building, which in consequence relatively dwarfed it. Burlington had also designed a one-storey Tuscan portico adjoining a two-storey building, the Tuscan pavilion at Chiswick, some time before 1728,⁵⁰ but this portico had a pediment. Its models were a drawing by Jones for an office building at Hassenbrook Hall, Essex, a drawing which Burlington owned,⁵¹ and

possibly a house design among Jones' drawings at Worcester College, Oxford.⁵² Burlington's inspiration for an unpedimented portico one storey lower than the building it adjoined was Jones' portico at the west end of St Paul's Cathedral, known to him also by a drawing (now lost) from which Flitcroft made an engraving.⁵³ But St Paul's is of three-storey height, so its portico, although lower, is still giant. The Wakefield portico is thus a conflation of the Tottenham and Chiswick models, or, alternatively, a conflation of the St Paul's and Hassenbrook models.

The Tuscan cornice of the porch is continued right round the house, with the addition of dentils. Although it is not accompanied by architrave or frieze, it is still the most emphatic horizontal division of the elevation. The eaves cornice is very slight, and is rivalled by a large number of other horizontal divisions – plinth and surbases of implied upper and lower orders contrived as continuous sills of ground and first floor windows. The effect of this considerable Tuscan cornice above the ground floor is to sub-divide the elevation into implied superimposed orders. There are 17th-century precedents for explicit (not implied) superimposed orders, all following Jones' Banqueting House⁵⁴ – notably Craven House, Drury Lane, London,⁵⁵ Stagenhoe Park, Hertfordshire,⁵⁶ Sherborne Park, Gloucestershire,⁵⁷ Chesterton Hall, Warwickshire,⁵⁸ Althorp House, Northamptonshire,⁵⁹ and a house represented in a painting in the Henry Francis du Pont Museum, Winterthur.⁶⁰ Euston itself,⁶¹ along with Knowsley Hall, Lancashire,⁶² and Halnaby Hall, Yorkshire,⁶³ had porticos with two superimposed orders.

But, like 17th-century porches, 17th-century superimposed orders were uninfluential in the first half of the 18th century. Kent's inspiration for Wakefield could have come from Talman, one of whose proposals for Haughton, Nottinghamshire, has superimposed orders.⁶⁴ It is more likely to have come from Burlington, who made four designs for houses with implied superimposed orders, including that for Tottenham.⁶⁵ Kent's model for a Doric palace at Richmond,⁶⁶ has two superimposed orders in its central pavilion, and so (apparently) does his sketch for a new house at Euston.⁶⁷ But the only design of theirs with superimposed orders to be built apart from Wakefield was Kent's Treasury in Whitehall.⁶⁸ Burlington's models were Italian. Palladio illustrated 21 buildings with superimposed orders, and Serlio illustrated 20. Fifteen of Palladio's were on designs of his own invention,⁶⁹ and six were on theoretical reconstructions of ancient buildings.⁷⁰ Ten of Serlio's were on designs of his own⁷¹ (including two in which the lower cornice is substantially bigger than the upper one, as at Wakefield,⁷² two were on modern buildings,⁷³ and the remaining eight were on surviving ancient buildings.⁷⁴ It would therefore have been clear to Kent that superimposed orders were an ancient feature.

This is not the only ornamental feature of the front elevation which is of ancient provenance. The end towers have open pediments, the first floor has Diocletian windows, and the ground floor has serlianas with concentric relieving arches. All these features would have been known to Kent from the record drawings made by Palladio of ancient Roman baths, which since 1719 had been in the possession of Lord Burlington, and were kept in the library at Chiswick House.⁷⁵

The Diocletian windows, the serlianas and their relieving arches are unusual in having voussoirs which are neither semi-circular, not segmental, but semi-oval. The source of this feature is difficult to identify. But the semi-oval is the most assertive element of the external ornament, by virtue of its use on every window of the front elevation, even those on the first floor of the central block which light the balcony of the saloon, where a row of square windows would be perfectly appropriate. The semi-ovals are evidently intended to suggest something, perhaps great parabolic vaults behind, such as might have been found in an ancient Roman bath.

The 2nd Duke's executors recorded no payments to Kent. Matthew Brettingham, however, who had succeeded Kent as the duke's architect at Euston,⁷⁶ recorded in his own account book payment of £42 on June 16, 1755 "for four journeys in a Post Shaize to the Lodge in Wittlewood forest about the alterations, new room and repairs their, including y^e expenses of the Shaizes, trouble and attendance about that Business", and on the same date he also received 10gns for "My Son two Journeys".⁷⁷ In the duke's accounts Brettingham's payments are doubtless disguised among the considerable payments for his work at Euston. The 1755 payment, made when the house had been under construction for seven years, might relate to a later proposal, "the alterations, new room and repairs their" which it describes. However, there was already a house on site, and the irregularity of the rear part of the house may indicate that the present building was an attachment to it, not a replacement. The "alterations" and "new room" could describe what is now regarded as most of the house. The six journeys for which father and son were paid were doubtless made over a long period, perhaps even at yearly intervals. There could even have been earlier journeys, for Brettingham's account book only runs from the end of 1750, by which time Wakefield Lodge had been under construction for nearly two and a half years.⁷⁸ In these circumstances Brettingham might be regarded as its architect, although, if Walpole's attribution is correct, Brettingham would have executed Kent's design.

Four years later, Brettingham made designs of his own. On February 2, 1759, he was paid £21, partly for "Plans and Drawings of the house and New offices at Euston" made the previous November, but partly also "For a Plan and Drawings of the intended alteration at Wittlebury Lodge &c Dilivered to his Grace in Town".⁷⁹ By that date payments for construction at Wakefield Lodge had long ceased, and "his Grace" was the 3rd Duke. These drawings must have been for alterations to the Kent house.

The executors recorded four payments totalling £59 16s to a Mr Horstman (on one occasion Mr Horsman).⁸⁰ On the first two occasions he is called "the surveyor". On the third his payment is "on acct of the Plan at Wakefield". On the last it is "for His plan at Wakefeild Lodg". The first three payments are "on acct", and fall at almost exactly yearly intervals, February 14, 11 and 13, 1750, 1751 and 1752 respectively. The last is "in full" and waited until the Lady Day next following. These payments do not suggest that Horstman acted as an executant architect, on a retainer. An executant architect would expect payment for trouble, for measuring and for expenses, but not "for His plan". Horstman was evidently a designer, if not of the house, perhaps of the landscape.

Whereas it might be unwise to reject Walpole's attribution, recorded while Horstman's payments were still being made, it is quite reasonable to reject one that was not recorded at all until 1895.⁸¹ That is the attribution of the landscape to "Capability" Brown. Marcus Binney rejected it for lack of evidence, and attributed the landscape to Kent instead.⁸² There is no evidence for that either. But Brown may have worked at Wakefield in a more limited capacity. Between December 18, 1750 and May 19, 1755, when he was paid "In full of all Accounts", a Mr Brown received nine payments, usually £50 or £100 each, totalling £707 10s. One is simply itemised "on Acct of the Work at Wakefeild Lodg",⁸³ but the remainder are quite specific. They are all either "upon Acct of the water at Wakefeild",⁸⁴ or "on account of makeing the water at Wakefeild".⁸⁵ If it was "Capability" to whom the payments were made, it would appear that his first independent commission was not to design the park at Wakefield, for that may have been designed by the surveyor Horstman, but to construct a lake in it. He was effectively a civil engineer. The executors' accounts make no further mention of garden work, save recording a payment of £9 5s for trees to a Mrs Foster on December 11, 1755.⁸⁶ However, the gardeners' name was John Wade, as Cater Green the draper was paid £5 16s 6d for providing Wade with "Mourning for his late Grace" on July 15, 1757.⁸⁷

The speculation (above) that Horstman was not executant architect is strengthened by the fact that the building was supervised on a regular basis by a Mr John Marsden. John Marsden was the joiner at Wolterton in 1730;⁸⁸ made the still surviving model of Kent's proposed palace at Richmond in 1736;⁸⁹ and had been both carpenter and joiner under Kent at 44 Berkeley Square in 1742–44,⁹⁰ and at 22 Arlington Street in 1742–54.⁹¹ He may be the Mr Marsden who carved the door friezes in the private wing at Holkham in 1738–41.⁹² He was evidently well known to Kent, and witnessed his will.⁹³ He may have been clerk of works, or he may have had a design responsibility. We cannot be certain, for his payments are simply itemised “on account of the new building at Wakefeild Lodg”.⁹⁴ Twenty payments so described were made between May 7, 1748, and August 28, 1750. The lowest was £50, the highest £160 and most were £100. They occur once a month, with unsurprising omissions in January 1749, and January and February 1750, when winter weather would have stopped work, and inexplicable omissions in July 1748, April, July and October 1749 and June 1750. They total £1,936 1s 6d, and may have continued, for the last was still on account, not in full, and that particular account book ended on January 18, 1751, five months after the payment was made. An earlier six payments to John Marsden, made between January 31, 1743, and September 12, 1747, and totalling £299, may perhaps be added to the total.⁹⁵ But as these were simply itemised “upon Acct”, whereas those from May 1748, with unenfringed regularity, were itemised for Wakefield Lodge, Marsden may have worked on the Duke's other houses as well, and he may only have begun work at Wakefield in May 1748.

Although the first, third and fourth of his payments describe him as a joiner, it is unlikely that the Duke spent £1,936 1s 6d, or more, on joinery alone. Marsden must either have been clerk of works, passing these sums onto the principal tradesmen, or he was a substantial contractor, made free as a joiner, but here undertaking a number of the principal trades himself. He also supplied some material, On June 29, 1749, he was paid £63 5s specifically “for a Marble Chimny and Three Wheel'd Chairs” at an unknown location,⁹⁶ on March 2, 1753, he was paid £25 “for White Lead and Glass” at an equally unspecified location,⁹⁷ and on September 18, 1756, he was paid £27 “for free Stone us'd at Wakefield Lodg”.⁹⁸ The trades for which he may have contracted were probably the principal ones, stonemason, bricklayer, roofer, carpenter and joiner, for no payments are recorded for any of these tradesmen. The £1,936, or more, which Marsden received would therefore probably account for the carcass of the house.

A little doubt might be cast on that hypothesis, as follows. There are six payments to a Mr Deval. Three of these style him “Plumer”, and it is probable that he was therefore either John Devall, Sergeant Plumber in the Office of Works from 1742 to 1769,⁹⁹ or George Devall, plumber at Carshalton House in 1720–21,¹⁰⁰ Carshalton Park in 1726,¹⁰¹ Houghton in 1732,¹⁰² Wolterton about 1730,¹⁰³ Chiswick or Burlington House in 1732,¹⁰⁴ and the Treasury in 1733.¹⁰⁵ His first payment was of £200 “upon account of the Building at Wakefeild Lodge” on July 21, 1749.¹⁰⁶ Just over one year later, on November 16, 1750, he received a further £100 “upon account”.¹⁰⁷ On May 18, 1751, he received £57 5s “in full”.¹⁰⁸ With a total receipt of £357 5s that might seem to be the end of John or George Devall's work at Wakefield. A Mr Devall received £7 6s 7d “for Sail Cloth” on May 5, 1752,¹⁰⁹ but that must have been incidental. However, on July 17, 1753 a “Mr Deval [sic]” was paid £800 “upon Acct of the Work done at Wakefeild”,¹¹⁰ despite the fact that he had been paid in full over two years previously.

There are three possible interpretations of these payments. The first is that this last payment, which gives the location simply as “Wakefeild”, rather than “Wakefeild Lodge” (as in the first payment), refers to another building there, at £800 most probably the 15-bay stable block. The second interpretation is that the second and third payments, with no location itemised, refer to work elsewhere. Devall certainly worked for the duke at at least one place

other than Wakefield, for his sixth and last payment on June 30, 1761, was of £25 15s 5d “in full for London Accot”.¹¹¹ The third interpretation is that one Mr Devall’s account was settled in full (as is recorded) on May 18, 1751, and that the £800 on account paid on July 17, 1753, went to the other Mr Devall, or perhaps to their kinsman John Devall, stonemason and carver,¹¹² or to Jeremiah Devall, another plumber.¹¹³ If the third interpretation is correct it may be that John Marsden did not undertake the stonemason’s work, and that to his £1,936 should be added a sum greater than £800 to complete the carcass of the house.

There was another plumber besides Devall. In a book entitled “No 9 . . . Accot for [the duke’s] Affairs at Wakefield Between 1 Feby 1755 & 10 Feby 1756”,¹¹⁴ are recorded three payments to John Norman for work done some time earlier. The first, made on June 26, 1755, was of £6 0s 2d for “Plumbers and Glaziers Work between 29 January, 1747, and 14 December 1748”,¹¹⁵ If Marsden’s first payment, in May 1748, comes near the beginning of the campaign, it is difficult to see what a plumber and glazier could have been paid for at that stage. Yet Norman’s second payment, made on the same day as the first, is perfectly specific, “Paid Ditto for his Bill for Plumbers Work at the New Buildings at Wakefield between 19th May 1748 and 25th September following amounting to £75 3s 5d whereof £60 was paid in part the 21 of Feby 1749 and £7 16s 8d overcharged and now the Balance £7 6s 9d.”¹¹⁶ If that is too early for plumber’s work at Wakefield Lodge, it could be that the new buildings referred to were the stables: in such a case the stables would have been built before the house. Norman continued to work at Wakefield, for his third payment, made on February 2, 1756, was 5s “for Plumbers Work in October 1755”.¹¹⁷ Two further payments were recorded, both for glazier’s work alone, the first, £13 1s 9d made on February 2, 1757, itemised “for Wakefield”,¹¹⁸ the other, £26 8s. 2d, made on July 13, 1757, for glazier’s work at an unspecified location.¹¹⁹

There were three more glaziers. John Chinner, paid “for Glazing at Wakefield” was dead by July 5, 1753, when his executors John Blaxley and John Middleton received the first of seven quarterly payments ending at Christmas 1754, which totalled £15 4s 2d.¹²⁰ Chinner may have been a local man, or, at least, one of his executors, John Blaxley, may have been. He was presumably a relation of the Samuel Blaxley or Blakesley who rebuilt Bidle’s farm house at Whittlebury in 1727,¹²¹ and who was asked to estimate for Mr Henry Plowman’s farm house and outhouses at Potterspury, Moorend and Stoke in 1727.¹²² Thomas Chinner, “the Glazier”, presumably John’s heir, received the next quarterly payment, of £1 0s 2d, “from Christmas 1754 to Lady Day 1755”.¹²³ But he did not continue. The remaining payments are to Norman, apart from one of £2 1s 4d to Thomas Oldham “for Glaziers Work done at Wakefield” on July 26, 1756.¹²⁴

Apart from Marsden and Devall the only tradesman known from other work is the plasterer Samuel Calderwood, and, although born in London, all his other work so far identified is in Scotland, and none later than 1734.¹²⁵ His presence at Wakefield nearly 20 years later suggests that in old age he returned to his native land. Calderwood’s first two payments (“To Mr Calderwood”) were of £50 each “upon Acct of Plaisterers work done at Wakefeild” on July 4, 1752 and January 31, 1753.¹²⁶ His third payment (“To Mr Samuel Calderwood plaisterer”) was of £41 6s “in full for work done at Wakefeild Lodg” on June 20, 1754,¹²⁷ which identifies both him and the particular location of his work. Calderwood was an outstanding ornamental plasterer. His work in Scotland, notably at The Drum, Midlothian,¹²⁸ is a virtuoso sculptural performance. Unfortunately the single ornamented ceiling at Wakefield Lodge, in the Saloon, has been replaced.

The principal painter was called Broadbelt. He too died before his bill was fully settled. On July 1, 1761 £59 12s 9d was paid to “Lambert Executor to Broadbelt Painter + all demands at Wakefield”.¹²⁹

A Mr Wright was paid £15 on August 3, 1750 "for the Chimneypiece at Wakefeild".¹³⁰ This may have been Stephen Wright, Kent's legatee and the heir of his unfinished work at No 22 Arlington Street,¹³¹ who might have been expected to inherit Kent's responsibilities at Wakefield also. This was apparently the extent of his responsibilities at Wakefield, however, and Stephen Wright is not known to have been a statuary. On March 18, 1751, £33 was paid "To Mr Wright at Euston by a draught of Mr Mason".¹³² Stephen Wright's presence might also be expected at Euston, where both Burlington and Kent had supplied designs,¹³³ but on March 4, 1752 £38 17s ½d were paid by "A draught of Mr Mason's to Mr John Wright".¹³⁴ So the supplier of the chimneypiece at Wakefield may not have been Stephen Wright.

The suppliers included the brazier Richard Wooley, paid £25 11s 4d on January 16, 1756, for work done between Lady Day 1754 and Lady Day 1755,¹³⁵ and £19 11s on July 16, 1757, for "his Bills".¹³⁶ The ironmonger Abraham Chapman was paid £14 17s 3d on January 15, 1756, "for Nails and other Things in the Year from Lady Day 1754 to Lady Day 1755",¹³⁷ and £17 9s 6d on February 11, 1757," for Ironmongers Goods for his Graces' Use at Wakefield".¹³⁸

Mr Maynard received five payments for furniture between August 13, 1750 and May 28, 1753,¹³⁹ Mrs Maynard received two more on February 13, 1754 and April 25, 1755;¹⁴⁰ and "Maynard upholder" received another payment on June 30, 1761.¹⁴¹ Together the Maynards received £1,550 9s 9d, and further bills totalling £197 15s 10d were noted as unpaid on May 6,¹⁴² and July 26, 1757.¹⁴³ Not all of this furniture was for Wakefield. Mr Maynard received £200 on January 1, 1752 "on account of his bill at Euston";¹⁴⁴ £200 on May 28, 1753 "on account for the furniture at Euston";¹⁴⁵ and Mrs Maynard received £300 on February 13, 1754 "on account of work done at Euston".¹⁴⁶ An unpaid bill for £65 18s 10d of "Maynard Upholsterer" was included in an abstract of bills in the accounts of George Burghall "agent . . . for his Grace's domestic Expencc and Concerns in London", and John Mason "agent . . . for his affairs at Euston and his estates in Norfolk and Suffolk".¹⁴⁷ Another list of the Duke's debts incurred "in London" drawn up on July 26, 1757 includes £131 17s owed to "Maynard Upholster".¹⁴⁸ Two payments, £200 "on account" on January 10, 1751¹⁴⁹ and £200 also "on account" on August 30, 1751,¹⁵⁰ do not specify the location of the work. Nor does a payment of £150 9s 9d on June 30, 1761 to "Maynard upholder" for "4 Bills".¹⁵¹ But Mr Maynard received £100 on August 13, 1750 "on account of the Furniture at Wakefield Lodg",¹⁵² and Mrs Maynard received £200 on April 25, 1755 "upon Acct. of work done at Wakefeild".¹⁵³ One or other of them may have been the Maynard who supplied furniture to Holkham in 1750.¹⁵⁴

In an account for the duke's "Affairs at Wakefield" alone, John Smith was paid £2 5s 8d "for Work about the Furniture in the year ending at Lady Day 1755" on July 12, 1755;¹⁵⁵ 9s 9d for the same "in the Quarter ending Midsummer 1755" on the same day;¹⁵⁶ £1 2s for the same "between Lady Day 1755 and Christmas following" on January 29, 1756,¹⁵⁷ evidently overlapping with the previous accounting period, £1 12s 9d for the same on July 26, 1757;¹⁵⁸ and 9s 3d "for assisting in the Butler's Pantry &c at the times his Grace was at Wakefield, in the summer 1756" on January 22, 1757.¹⁵⁹ Probably the "furniture" which Smith repaired was of the same nature as "the covers at Wakefield" supplied by Mr Bullock for £8 6s on July 31, 1752;¹⁶⁰ these were probably similar to the "Pewter covers at Euston" for which Bullock was paid £19 18s 2d on December 7, 1751.¹⁶¹

Specific payments for a new stable were recorded in an account exclusive to Wakefield in 1756 and 1757, but only for paviours, thatchers and the suppliers of board. William Bason was paid 16s 3d "for paving the New Stable in the Paddock" on July 23, 1756.¹⁶² Bason may have been a local man, since John Bason, a mason, had been asked for an estimate for building Bidle's Farm House in Whittlebury in 1725,¹⁶³ and for building Henry Plowman's farms at Potterspury, Moorend and Stoke in 1727.¹⁶⁴ William Tapp was paid 13s 6½d "for paving in the

New Stable in the Assarts" on January 21, 1757.¹⁶⁵ William Webb was paid £1 19s 6d "for Thatching the New Stable in one of ye Paddocks in December 1755" on January 20, 1756.¹⁶⁶ Henry Banks was paid £1 11s 4d "for Thatching in the New Stable in the Assart" on January 22, 1757.¹⁶⁷ The paddock and the assart were doubtless the same thing, but neither the location nor the works are compatible with the great stable by the house. It was evidently a smaller and more distant stable.

John Bland was paid £6 6s for "Oak boards for the New Stable in the Assart and other purposes about the House" on July 13, 1757.¹⁶⁸ Bland and John Foxley, the latter of whom was paid £12 15s 5d "for Bricks and Lime between the 29th of March 1755 and 22 September following",¹⁶⁹ are the only suppliers of unworked materials recorded, apart from those to Marsden.

Almost simultaneously the duke rebuilt Euston. Although the building of Euston is not the principal subject of this paper, it identifies the Euston craftsmen in order to distinguish their payments from those for Wakefield. There are two ways of doing so. Payments made by or through Mr Mason are Euston payments, since Mason was steward of that estate alone. The earliest Euston payment, dated June 30, 1749, is one of these. It is "A draught of Mr Masons to Robert Singleton" for £50.¹⁷⁰ Robert and Thomas Singleton were the leading Bury St Edmunds statuaries and stonecutters.¹⁷¹ The other way is by checking those payments in Matthew Brettingham's account book which are specifically itemised as for Euston. Brettingham evidently contracted for his work at Euston by the great until Michaelmas 1756: he was paid in large round sums at one or two monthly intervals during the building season between April 23, 1750 and September 18, 1756, and these payments totalled £8,679 5s.¹⁷² He must have received at least a little bit more, presumably on some other account, for his own payments on the duke's behalf at Euston came to £8,698 10s.¹⁷³ Brettingham paid himself "For my own trouble, Jorneys, travelling expenses, and attendance about this business" £100 p.a. for the years 1750, 1751, 1752, 1754, 1755 and 1756.¹⁷⁴ He did not record any payments to himself for the year 1753, perhaps indicating some cessation of operations, and on April 23, 1757 he paid himself £25 for the period since Christmas 1756,¹⁷⁵ suggesting that work was then complete, only a few days before the duke's death. Brettingham's managerial responsibility, however, must have been terminated six months earlier, since payments for building work at Euston between Michaelmas 1756 and the date of the duke's death, May 7, 1757, were not made by Brettingham, and appear in the accounts of the duke's executors along with those for Wakefield. These accounts indicate, however, that, although he may have ceased to be the main contractor, he remained the architect, as a group of debts outstanding on September 24, 1759 were noted as "Bills brought in to Mr Mason as for building at Euston Hall, but which ought to be verified by Mr Brettingham, the Surveyor, as only he knows the justness of them".¹⁷⁶ By that time he was charging the 3rd Duke on a drawing by drawing basis, as on November 6, 1758 he billed "His Grace the Duke of Grafton Dr. for a Journey Plans and Drawings of the house and New offices at Euston".¹⁷⁷

From the combination of both sets of accounts it appears that the craftsmen at Euston were the following. Up to November 21, 1751 the bricklayer was John Elliot, who received a total of £2,103 5s 11d.¹⁷⁸ John Elliot was the bricklayer at Holkham from 1738 to 1760.¹⁷⁹ John King, bricklayer, was paid £353 12s 1d between May 1, 1753 and the duke's death.¹⁸⁰ William Mothersole, bricklayer, was paid £232 11s 6d, but only between Michaelmas 1756 and the duke's death.¹⁸¹ Benjamin Adamson, bricklayer, was paid £59 19s 9d between March 9, 1753 and November 25, 1754.¹⁸²

Mr Ivory, joiner, was paid £749 7s 10d up to January 15, 1753,¹⁸³ and his foreman Mr Crockley, together with his son, was paid a further £103 4s, of which nine payments were 5gn gratuities "for his extra: care and trouble and attendance".¹⁸⁴ Ivory was presumably Thomas

Ivory, the leading Norwich builder.¹⁸⁵

Mr Clark, plasterer, was paid £380 19d 0½d, between February 27, 1753 and May 8, 1754,¹⁸⁶ and his foreman Bedford received 1gn “for his extra: care in the Gallery”.¹⁸⁷ Clark was presumably Thomas Clark, an associate of Brettingham’s,¹⁸⁸ and the leading plasterer of the 1750s. He too had worked at Holkham, in 1738, and again from 1746 to 1764.¹⁸⁹ But he had also worked with Brettingham at Petworth in 1751–55;¹⁹⁰ with Flitcroft at Milton from 1750¹⁹¹ and with Paine at Newmarket Palace in about 1754.¹⁹² Later he was to work with Stephen Wright at Ashburnham Place in 1759–63,¹⁹³ and Milton Hall, Berkshire in 1764–72,¹⁹⁴ with Paine again at Bagshot Park, Surrey,¹⁹⁵ with Brettingham at Packington from 1763¹⁹⁶ and with Chambers at Somerset House between 1776 and 1795.¹⁹⁷

Mr Singleton, stonemason (both Robert and Thomas are mentioned), was paid £320 13s 11½d between May 1, 1753 and the duke’s death.¹⁹⁸ “The Holkham masons” were paid £245 19s 6d for cutting the eaves cornice, and the consoles of the east front door on January 13, 1752 and February 16, 1753 respectively.¹⁹⁹ Mr Routhead, marble mason, was paid £49 17s 8d on September 22 and October 18, 1753, presumably for chimneypieces.²⁰⁰ Routhead was presumably Alexander Routhead, mason under Gibbs at Wimpole from 1713 to 1732,²⁰¹ and for the Duke of Kent at No 4 St James’ Square in 1726–28.²⁰² He was also architect of the typologically pioneering Royal Naval Hospital at Stonehouse, Devon in 1758–64.²⁰³

Mr Bidwell, carpenter, was paid £303 3s 2d between January 15, 1753 and April 2, 1755.²⁰⁴ Jonas Shad or Shade was paid £347 5s 10d from June 16, 1755 to the duke’s death.²⁰⁵ Robert Tillot, carpenter, was paid £6 19s 6d for work “at farms” between Michaelmas 1756 and the duke’s death.²⁰⁶ Thomas Stedman was paid £28 12s 6d for carpentry done between Michaelmas 1756 and the duke’s death,²⁰⁷ but as a sawyer he and his partner Mr Stevens had received £24 15s 4½d on February 16, 1753 and May 9, 1754.²⁰⁸ Most of the sawing, however, was carried out by Robert Offord and Robert Whaite, who received £97 12s 6½d between May 9, 1754 and November 27, 1756.²⁰⁹

Mr Marks, glazier, was paid £125 19s between October 25, 1750 and November 8, 1751.²¹⁰ William Miles was paid a total of £102 0s 6d both as glazier and as painter between October 25, 1750 and the duke’s death.²¹¹ Anonymous “Painters and limners” were paid £100 “for repairing the Cielings in the Great Dineing room, staircase and State Apartmt.” on April 23, 1757.²¹² John Jaye, plumber, was paid £137 0s 2d between May 8, 1754 and the duke’s death.²¹³ He was presumably the Mr Jaye who was plumber at Clopton’s Hospital, Bury St Edmunds in 1744–45.²¹⁴ Mary Jaye, upholster, presumably a relation, was paid £34 9s 7d for work done between Michaelmas 1756 and the duke’s death.²¹⁵

Thomas Lusher senior, blacksmith, was paid £172 18s 11d between October 25, 1750 and September 24, 1759.²¹⁶ Thomas Lusher junior, blacksmith, was paid £30 12s 3d between Michaelmas 1756 and the duke’s death.²¹⁷ Richard Woods, smith, was paid £4 3s 8d in the same period.²¹⁸ Benjamin Burrell, called “smith” by Brettingham, who paid him £8 12s on September 9, 1756 for work on the stables,²¹⁹ was called “whitesmith” by the Duke’s executors, who paid him £19 0s 1d in the same period.²²⁰ John Sparke, smith, was paid £26 9s between June 13, 1755 and the Duke’s death.²²¹ He was presumably one of the Sparke or Sparks family who supplied iron lamps for Ampthill House in 1706,²²² worked as braziers for Vanbrugh in 1718,²²³ and for the Duke of Kent at No 4 St James’ Square in 1726–28.²²⁴ Robert Sparke was brazier at either Burlington House or Chiswick in 1719–22 and again in 1725–27.²²⁵ William Sparke supplied grates to Fenham House, Northumberland, on the advice of Daniel Garrett in 1748.²²⁶

Mr Hughes was paid £61 17s for slating between October 25, 1750 and February 16, 1753.²²⁷ He was perhaps Richard Hughes, who slated Westminster Hall in 1748–49.²²⁸

Jonathan Race, “larth river”, was paid £24 1s between February 16, 1753 and Septem-

ber 9, 1755.²²⁹ John Neal was paid £24 on January 23, 1756 for gilding the Dining Room.²³⁰ He was presumably the John Neale who was the gilder at Holkham in 1736–38 and 1746–64.²³¹ David Flodman, gardener, was paid £73 6s 11d between Michaelmas 1756 and the Duke's death.²³²

The best rewarded supplier was William Mixson of Kings Lynn, mayor of that town in 1752,²³³ who received £477 15s for deals supplied between September 22, 1753 and the Duke's death.²³⁴ John Nuel or Newall and his partner Mr Dade received £192 15s 7d for lime between February 16, 1753 and the Duke's death.²³⁵ Mr Austin, brickmaker, received £86 4s on May 8, 1754.²³⁶ He may have been Edward Austin, bricklayer, who worked for the parish of St James', Piccadilly, in 1722,²³⁷ and worked under Campbell at the Burlington School, Boyle Street, in 1719–21.²³⁸ William Cole, maker of white bricks, was paid £11 6s 4d between Michaelmas 1756 and the Duke's death.²³⁹ Mr Walton was paid £74 10d for hair between October 25, 1750 and May 2, 1755.²⁴⁰ Mr Higham was paid £50 for a copper vane on January 13, 1752.²⁴¹ Mr Jackson was paid £34 18s 9d for stone on May 1, 1753.²⁴² Mr Johnsons was paid £27 4s on June 26, 1751.²⁴³ Mr Cole was paid £25 8s for pavements, on February 13, 1755.²⁴⁴ It is possible that this was one of the Cole family of Stamford. John Cole (1735–1797),²⁴⁵ who signed a monument at Tinwell, Rutland,²⁴⁶ was the mason at Casewick Hall, Lincolnshire in 1786–88,²⁴⁷ but was presumably too young to have supplied stone at Euston in 1755. Mr Wright was paid £20 0s 6d for pavements on May 8, 1754.²⁴⁸

The reconstruction of Euston was evidently planned in a manner which allowed at least parts of the house to remain in use, for the duke bought new furniture for it both immediately before work began, and during its progress. "Mr Columbine at Norwich for the furniture at Euston" received £60 4s on November 11, 1749.²⁴⁹ Mr Columbine was presumably Paul Colombine, a Norwich upholsterer who had supplied furniture to Holkham.²⁵⁰ Mr Bullock, who had supplied "covers" for Wakefield Lodge, was also paid £19 18s 2d "for the Pewter Covers at Euston" on December 7, 1751,²⁵¹ and £20 17s "in full for Pewter that went to Euston" on October 24, 1753.²⁵² The biggest of these bills was to Mr Maynard and (assuming they were the same firm) Mrs Maynard, the latter styled "Upholster".²⁵³ Mr Maynard received £200 "on Acct. for the Furniture at Euston" on May 28, 1753,²⁵⁴ and Mrs Maynard £300 "on Acct of work done at Euston" on February 13, 1754²⁵⁵ and £200 "upon acct. of work done at Euston" on August 31, 1754.²⁵⁶ Mr Vanderhagen received £84 "in full for cleaning the Picktures at Euston" on September 10 following.²⁵⁷

According to Sir Robert Taylor's obituarist, writing in 1788, Grafton House in Piccadilly was built for the 3rd Duke "about 1760" to Taylor's designs.²⁵⁸ One group of payments, discrete insofar as they were all made within three days (June 30–July 2, 1761), includes four which are identified as "for London Accot".²⁵⁹ They are in an account book which was begun on May 7, 1757, the day of the 2nd Duke's death, and that alone might indicate that they represent the 3rd Duke's expenditure. However, the account book is part of the sequence of accounts of the 2nd Duke's executors, and it is thus equally possible that they represent payment of debts already incurred by the old duke. In support of this, all four payments are "in full", suggesting completion of an outstanding programme, and are for small sums, two of them very small. These are 7s 6d for "Jelfe Stone Mason", presumably Andrews Jelfe,²⁶⁰ and £2 5s 6d for "Durrant painter".²⁶¹ The slightly bigger payment was of £25 15s 5d to "Devall Plumber",²⁶² and the biggest was of £76 13s 10d for "Gregory Widow Bricklayer".²⁶³ They could mean that the 2nd Duke repaired an earlier London house, which his successor abandoned or replaced; or that the Grafton House which was designed by Taylor was built, or at least begun, by the 2nd Duke.

The remaining payments in the group do not indicate the location of the work which they rewarded. They were probably not made for work done at Euston, as they were drawn up

by George Burghall, agent (sometimes “Housekeeper”) of the London and Wakefield estates. Burghall’s equivalent at Euston was John Mason. One certainly refers to Wakefield – £59 12s 9d to “Lambert Executor to Broadbelt Painter and all demands for Wakefield”.²⁶⁴ Another, £150 9s 9d to “Maynard upholsterer”, was made to an upholsterer who had worked at both Wakefield and Euston.²⁶⁵ The remainder, however, are to tradesmen not recorded elsewhere in the estate accounts. They are:

Luttman Locksmith Widow	£23 13s 5d
Rockhead Lydia Stonemason	£14 11s 5d
House oilman	£54 7s 0d
Bayley Braizier	£ 6 6s 0d
Wood Glazier	£11 1s 5d
Davies Pavior	£16 5s 0d
Webb joiner	£26 11s 7d
Haynes Braiser	£ 3 9s 0d
Norris Braiser	18s 0d
Goodison Cabinet Maker	£51 1s 4d. ²⁶⁶

“Rockhead Lydia” could perhaps be Lydia, relict or partner of Alexander Routhead, the marble mason at Euston. These payments appear to be for work on the London house, but the possibility that they were for work at Wakefield should not be discounted.

There are a few other payments made at isolated intervals, for which also no location is specified. Mr Almond, paid £7 5s on January 18, 1751 “for Gilding in full”,²⁶⁷ may have worked at Wakefield or Euston, although the date makes the former more probable. Mr Bromwich, presumably Thomas the well-known wallpaper manufacturer,²⁶⁸ was paid £100 on July 19, 1754 “upon Acct. of his bill for paper”,²⁶⁹ and £50 on April 25, 1755 “in full of His bill ending the 1st of Decembr. 1753”,²⁷⁰ no location specified. Isaac [sic] Collivor was paid £14 3s 6d “for Lineing + Cleaning of picktures” on May 5, 1752,²⁷¹ while on the same day Mr Lyds was paid £7 16s 11d “for Oyl Cloths”,²⁷² and Mr Devall was paid £7 6s 7d “for Sail Cloth”.²⁷³ The principal family pictures are today at Euston, and may always have been, but, on the other hand, Devall worked at Wakefield. Mr William Hammond was paid £4 7s in full on June 30, 1752 “for Weymouth Pines”, which might have been suitable for either park.²⁷⁴ These tradesmen also may perhaps have worked at the 2nd Duke’s highly unusual hunting lodge.

NOTES

1. G[eorge] E[dward] C[ockayne], *The Complete Peerage* . . . VI, 1926, 45.
2. Arthur Oswald, “Euston Hall, Suffolk”, *Country Life* CXXI, January 10, 17 and 24, 1957, 58–61, 102–105, 148–151.
3. Marcus Binney, “Wakefield Lodge, Northamptonshire”, *Country Life* CLIV, August 2, 1973, 298–301.
4. London, Public Record Office [henceforward PRO], C108/362.
5. Mrs Paget Toynbee (ed.) *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, III, 1903, 67.
6. Margaret Jourdain, *The Work of William Kent*, 1948, 59–60; Michael I. Wilson, *William Kent*, 1984, 226–28, 236.
7. Binney, *op. cit.*, 300.
8. H. M. Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840*, 1978, 493.
9. Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk Record Office [henceforward SROB], Grafton Papers, 10 WS/24.
10. Colvin, *op. cit.*, 491.
11. This paper does not discuss the historical development of the house, as this is to be covered in the

- Royal Commission on Historic Monuments (England), *The Country Houses of Northamptonshire*, 1993 (forthcoming). But it should be noted that there is considerable 19th-century accommodation at the rear (south) of the house; this may replace structure older than 1748.
12. Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, 1978, 126–28, 205–06.
 13. H. M. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works*, IV, 1982, 114–122.
 14. *Ibid.*, 115.
 15. Christopher Hussey, *English Country Houses: Early Georgian 1715–1760*, 1955, 139.
 16. Sandra Millikin, "The Tribune in English Architecture", *Burlington Magazine* CXII, 1970, 442.
 17. For instance, Tissington Hall [Gervase Jackson-Stops, "Tissington Hall, Derbyshire", *Country Life* CLX, July 15, 22 and 29, 1976] and Sandbeck Park [Mark Girouard, "Sandbeck Park, Yorkshire", *Country Life* CXXXIX, October 7, 14 and 21, 1965] have two-storey halls in this position, but on the first floor, making the ground floor available for circulation.
 18. Binney, *op. cit.*, 299.
 19. *Ibid.*, 298.
 20. Chatsworth House, Lord Burlington's architectural drawings (catalogued by the Royal Institute of British Architects to co-ordinate with its collection), Boy [17]2.
 21. Binney, *op. cit.*, 300.
 22. Peter Foster and Edward Pyatt, *Bushy House* (National Physical Laboratory Museum and Archives Publication No 1), 1976, 13, 32.
 23. Kerry Downes, *English Baroque Architecture*, 1966, pl. 202.
 24. Hussey, *op. cit.*, 81, 86.
 25. Richard Hewlings, *Chiswick House and Garden*, 2nd edit., 1991, 13.
 26. London County Council, *Survey of London* X, 1926, 2–5, describes the building, but not this particular ornament.
 27. Richard Hewlings, "Ripon's *Forum Populi*", *Architectural History* 24, 1981, 44.
 28. H. M. Calvin, "Georgian Architects at Badminton", *Country Life* CXLIII, April 4, 1968, 801, fig. 5.
 29. Arthur Oswald, "Sedgebrooke Manor, Lincolnshire", *Country Life* CXV, January 21, 1954, 152–155.
 30. Nicholas Kingsley, *The Country Houses of Gloucestershire* I, 1989, 155–159.
 31. Maxwell Craven and Michael Stanley, *The Derbyshire Country House* I, 1982, 22.
 32. SROB, Grafton Papers, AA105, accounts of George Burghall "agent . . . for his Grace's domestic Expense and concerns in London"; and 10WS/26(3) accounts of John Mason "agent . . . for His affairs at Euston and his estates in Norfolk and Suffolk".
 33. The Earl of Ilchester (ed.), *Lord Hervey and his Friends, 1726–38*, 1950, 71.
 34. Colvin, *King's Works*, *cit.*, V, 1976, 214–17.
 35. Norman Hampson, *A Social History of the French Revolution*, 1963, 7, 9.
 36. [Pierre] Jean Mariette, *L'Architecture Francoise*, II, 1727, [f.43].
 37. Chatsworth House, *loc. cit.*, (see note 20 *supra*), Boy [18]2.
 38. Peter Reid, *Burke's and Savills Guide to Country Houses*, II, 1980, 112–113.
 39. John Harris, *William Talman*, 1982, pl. 12.
 40. R. Wittkower, "Lord Burlington and William Kent", *Archaeological Journal* CII, 1945, 154.
 41. Wanstead III (allegedly 1720, but certainly by 1725); Grimsthorpe (1722); Houghton (1722); Eastbury (by 1725); Rokeby (1725); Combe Bank (c.1725); Clearwell Castle (1727); Studley Royal stables (by 1729); Althorp stables (by 1733); Holkham (1734); Richmond model (1735); Normanton (c.1735); Lydiard Tregoze (c.1743); Okeover (1745); Langley (c.1745); Coldbrook (1746); Hawkstone (1747).
 42. Vincenzo Scamozzi, *Dell'Iddea della Architettura Universale*, 1615, I, 284.
 43. Philip Ayres, "Burlington's Library at Chiswick", *Studies in Bibliography* XLV, 1992, 118.
 44. Oliver Hill and John Cornforth, *English Country Houses: Caroline: 1625–1685*, 1966, 104.
 45. *Ibid.*, 237.
 46. *Ibid.*, 233.
 47. Kingsley, *op. cit.*, 158 and 159.
 48. Cornforth and Hill, *op. cit.*, 220.
 49. [Morris R. Brownell, for] Greater London Council, *Alexander Pope's Villa*, 1980, 7.
 50. Hewlings, *Chiswick*, *cit.*, 42 and 44.
 51. John Harris and Gordon Higgott, *Inigo Jones: Complete Architectural Drawings*, 1989, 264–265.
 52. *Ibid.*, 258–259.
 53. *Ibid.*, 239–240.
 54. Colvin, *King's Works*, *cit.*, IV, 328–334, and pl. 23B.
 55. David Pearce, *London's Mansions*, 1986, 38.

56. J. T. Smith, *English Houses 1200–1800, The Hertfordshire Evidence*, 1992, 91.
57. Kingsley, *op. cit.*, 156.
58. H. M. Colvin, “Chesterton, Warwickshire”, *Architectural Review*, August 1955.
59. Cornforth and Hill, *op. cit.*, 219.
60. John Harris, *The Artist and the Country House*, 1979, 147, pls. 158a and 158b.
61. Oswald, “Euston . . .”, *cit.*, 59, fig. 3.
62. Nikolaus Pevsner, *Lancashire*, I, 133 and pl. 28.
63. Cornforth and Hill, *op. cit.*, 233.
64. John Harris, *William Talman*, 1982, pl. 69.
65. Chatsworth House, *loc. cit.*, (note 20 *supra*), Boy [18]2 (Tottenham), Boy [31], Boy [32] and Boy [33]. The lower cornice in these last two drawings is bigger than the upper cornice, as at Wakefield Lodge.
66. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pl. 70.
67. Oswald, “Euston . . .”, *cit.*, 148.
68. London County Council, *Survey of London*, XIV, 1931, pl. 11–14.
69. Andrea Palladio, *I Quattro Libri dell’Architettura*, 1570, II, pls. 1, 2–3, 7, 16, 20–22, 35, 36, 37, 42, 50, 54, 56, 57 and 58; III, pl. 20.
70. *Ibid.*, II, pls. 17–18, 23, 28, 52, 53; III, pls. 14–16.
71. [Sebastiano Serlio], . . . *Architecture*, 1611, IV, c.6, fols. 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31; c.7, fols. 41 and 42; c.8, fols. 51, 52 and 53.
72. *Ibid.*, IV, c.6, fs. 28 and 31.
73. *Ibid.*, III, c.4, fs. 15 (S. Pietro in Montorio, Rome) and 72 (Poggio Reale, Naples).
74. *Ibid.*, III, c.4, fs. 6, 22, 24, 27, 32, 35, 37 and 66.
75. Vertue Note Books A.F., *Walpole Society XXII*, 1933–34, 73.
76. Oswald, “Euston . . .”, *cit.*, 61.
77. PRO, C108/362, 1755 [June] 16.
78. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10 WS/24, 1748 May 7 (“on account of the new Building at Wakefeild Lodg”).
79. PRO, C108/362, 1759 Feb 2.
80. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/24, 1750 Feby 14; 10WS/25, 1751 Feby 11, 1752 Feb 13, 1753 March 24.
81. Alicia Amherst, *History of Gardening in England*, 1895, 270.
82. Binney, *op. cit.*, 301.
83. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/25, 1751 June 29.
84. *Ibid.*, 10 WS/25, 1751 Octobr 29, 1752 Feb 13, April 27, Sept 16, 1754 Novembr 13.
85. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1750 Decembr 18; 10WS/25, 1751 March 6, 1755 May 19.
86. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1755 Decembr 11.
87. *Ibid.*, 10 WS/26(14), 1757 July 15.
88. Gordon Nares, “Wolterton Hall, Norfolk”, *Country Life CXXII*, July 25, 1957, 168.
89. Colvin, *King’s Works*, V, *cit.*, 221.
90. Geoffrey Beard, *Craftsmen and Interior Decoration in England 1660–1820*, 1981, 76.
91. David Watkin, Antony Ratcliffe, Nicholas Thompson, John Mills, *A House in Town*, 1984, 112–13.
92. Beard, *op. cit.*, 181.
93. Watkin *et al.*, *op. cit.*, 113, without citing the evidence.
94. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/24, 1748, June 4, August 25, Septembr 24, Octobr 20, Novembr 8, Decr 19, 1749 Feby 20, 24, March 23, May 26, Augst 5, Sepr 26, Novembr 11, Decembr 22, 1750 March 1, April 14, May 28, July 14, Augst 28.
95. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1743 Jan 31, 1744 June 15, 1745 July 3, 1746 Feby 4, May 26, 174y Septembr 12.
96. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1749 June 29.
97. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1753 March 2.
98. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1756 Septembr 18.
99. Colvin, *King’s Works*, V, *cit.*, 349, 357, 388, 438, 473; Beard, *op. cit.*, 256.
100. Derek R. Sherborn, “Carshalton House, Surrey”, *Country Life CV*, March 4, 1949, 483.
101. PRO C11/2716/120 (Scawen v Scawen). I am indebted to Mr Andrew Skelton for drawing my attention to these accounts.
102. Cambridge University Library, Cholmondeley (Houghton) MSS, Account Books, Ledger 33.
103. Nares, *op. cit.*, 168.
104. Chatsworth, Devonshire Papers, *Book of Accounts with Nath. Gould and Albert Nesbitt Esqrs begun 29th March 1732*.

105. Colvin, *King's Works V, cit.*, 432.
106. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/24, 1749 July 21.
107. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1750 Novembr 16.
108. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1751 May 18.
109. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1752 May 5.
110. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1753 July 17.
111. *Ibid.*, 10WS/23, 1761 June 30.
112. Beard, *op. cit.*, 256; to which should be added other commissions, notably the Ordnance Wharf, Plymouth in 1723 [J. G. Coad, "Historic Architecture of H.M. Naval Base, Devonport, 1689–1850", *Mariner's Mirror* 69, No. 4, November 1983, 341–392], Wimbledon House in 1731–32 [Frances Harris, ". . . the building of Wimbledon House, 1730–42", *Georgian Group Journal*, 1992, 88] Spencer House c.1756 [Joe Friedman, "Spencer House", *Apollo* CXXXVI, August 1987, 81].
113. Colvin, *King's Works, V, cit.*, 349, 357, 466; Beard, *op. cit.*, 256.
114. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(7).
115. *Ibid.*, f.4.
116. *Idem.*
117. *Ibid.*, f.9.
118. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.6.
119. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(14), f.12.
120. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), ff.4 and 5.
121. Northamptonshire Record Office, Grafton Papers, G3883, pp. 21, 46–47, 49–52.
122. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
123. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(7), f.6.
124. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.5.
125. Beard, *op. cit.*, 249.
126. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/25, 1752 July 4, 1753 Janry 31.
127. *Ibid.*, 1754 June 20.
128. John Fleming, *Robert Adam and His Circle*, 1962, 43, pl. 14; John Gifford, *William Adam 1689–1748*, 1989, 95–98, 160.
129. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/23, 1761 July 1.
130. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1750 Augst 3.
131. Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary, cit.*, 932–33.
132. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/25, 1751 March 18.
133. Oswald, "Euston . . .", *cit.*, 150.
134. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/25, 1752 March 4.
135. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), f.6.
136. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(14), f.13.
137. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), f.6.
138. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(14), f.11.
139. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1750 Augst 13, 1751 Janry 10; 10WS/25, 1751 Augst 30, 1752 Janry 1, 1753 May 28.
140. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1754 Febry 13, 1755 April 25.
141. *Ibid.*, 10WS/23, 1761 June 30.
142. *Ibid.*, 10WS//26(3), AA105.
143. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(2).
144. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1752 Janry 1.
145. *Ibid.*, 1753 May 28.
146. *Ibid.*, 1754 Febry 13.
147. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(3), AA105.
148. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(2).
149. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1751 Janry 10.
150. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1751 Augst 30.
151. *Ibid.*, 10WS/23, 1761 June 30.
152. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1750 Augst 13.
153. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1755 April 25.
154. Geoffrey Beard and Christopher Gilbert (eds.), *Dictionary of English Furniture Makers 1660–1840*, 1986, 598.
155. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(7), f.5.
156. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), f.7.
157. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), f.9.

158. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.6.
159. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.7.
160. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1752 July 31.
161. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1651 Decembr 7.
162. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.5.
163. Northamptonshire Record Office, Grafton Papers, C3883, pp. 21, 46–47.
164. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
165. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(8), f.7.
166. *Ibid.*, 10SW/26(7), f.8.
167. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(8), f.7.
168. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(14), f.12.
169. *Ibid.*, 10WS/26(7), f.8.
170. *Ibid.*, 10WS/24, 1749 June 30.
171. Robert Singleton carved the arms on Lord Bristol's house in Bury in 1737, and chimneypieces and tombstones at Ickworth in 1739 [S.H.A.H. (ed.), *The Diary of John Hervey, First Earl of Bristol, . . .*, 1894]. Thomas Singleton was the stonemason and statuary of Clopton's Hospital, Bury, in 1750 [SROB 317/1, pp. 265, 267].
172. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/24, 1750 April 23, June 11, July 31, Aug 31, Octobr 31, Novembr 6, Decembr 8; 10WS/25, 1751 March 30, June 12, June 29, July 26, Septembr 5, Septembr 28, Novr 23, 1752 Feb 12, June 4, June 13, July 31, Aug 12, Octobr 9, Novembr 30, 1753 Febry 18, April 30, May 17, July 2, Septembr 1, Octobr 8, 1754 Janry 14, May 8, Novembr 5, 1755 April 2, June 7, Septembr 9, 1756 Febry 29, March 29, Septembr 15, Septembr 18. A loose paper in 10WS/24 repeats these payments.
173. PRO, C108/362.
174. *Ibid.*, May 1, 1753 (£300 "being three years"), April 2, 1755 (£100), Sept 9, 1755 (£100 "to Christmas 1755"), Novbr 18, 1756 (£100 "to Christmas 1756 this year").
175. *Ibid.*, April 23, 1757.
176. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(3).
177. PRO, C108/362, 1758 Novr 6.
178. *Ibid.*, [?] 29, Oct 25 1750, April 15, May 9, May 22, June 13, June 26, July 25, Sept 5, Sept 28, Nov 21, Nov 8 1751.
179. I am indebted to Dr Leo Schmidt for this information.
180. PRO, C108/362, May 1, Sept 22 1753, April 2, May 30, June 16, July 22 1755, Febry 23, July 9 1756.
181. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
182. PRO, C108/362, March 9, Oct 18 1753, May 22, August 31, Nov 25 1754.
183. *Ibid.*, [?] 29, Oct 25 1750, April 8, May 21, July 25, Nov 8 1751, Jan 15 1753.
184. *Ibid.*, July 25 1751, March 9, 1753, April 2, July 7 1755, April 13, May 20, July 9, Sept 9, Nov 13, Nov 18 1756, February 24, April 23 1757.
185. Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary, cit.*, 447–48.
186. PRO, C108/362, Feb 27, March 9, Sept 21 1753, May 3, May 8 1754.
187. *Ibid.*, March 3, 1753.
188. *Ibid.*, *passim*, indicates that Clark occasionally acted as Brettingham's partner or assistant.
189. Beard, *op. cit.*, 250; I am indebted to Dr Leo Schmidt for details of the dates.
190. Gervase Jackson-Stops, "The Building of Petworth", *Apollo* CV, May 1977, 324.
191. Christopher Hussey, "Milton, Northamptonshire – II", *Country Life* CXXIX, May 25, 1961, 1212.
192. Peter Leach, *James Paine*, 1988, 203.
193. Christopher Hussey, "Ashburnham Park, Sussex", *Country Life* CXIII, April 23, 1953, 1249.
194. Arthur Oswald, "The Manor House, Milton, Berkshire – II", *Country Life* CIV, December 24, 1948, 1332.
195. Leach, *op. cit.*, 173.
196. Geoffrey Tyack, *Warwickshire Country Houses in the Age of Classicism*, 1980, 70.
197. Colvin, *King's Works*, V, *cit.*, 466.
198. PRO, C108/362, May 1, Sept 21, 1753, May 8 1754, July 7, Sept 9 1755, July 12 1756.
199. PRO, C108/362, January 13 1752, February 16 1753.
200. *Ibid.*, Sept 22, Oct 18 1753.
201. Terry Friedman, *James Gibbs*, 1984, 295.
202. F. H. W. Sheppard (ed.), *Survey of London*, XXIX, 1960, 91 (addendum note).
203. Colvin, *Biographical Dictionary, cit.*, 707.
204. PRO, C108/362, January 15, March 9, Sept 21, Oct 18 1753, May 8, July 19, Nov 25 1754, April 2

- 1755.
205. *Ibid.*, June 16, Sept 9 1755, Feb 23, May 20, July 9, Sept 9, Nov 27 1756. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2), (3).
206. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26/3.
207. *Idem.*
208. PRO, C108/362, Feb 16 1753, May 9 1754.
209. *Ibid.*, May 9 1754, Sept 9 1755, Nov 27 1756. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2), (3).
210. PRO, C108/362, Oct 25 1750, July 25, Nov 8 1751.
211. *Ibid.*, Oct 25 1750, July 25 1751, Feb 16, Sept 21 1753, May 8 1754. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26/3.
212. PRO, C108/362, April 23 1757.
213. *Ibid.*, May 8 1754. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2), (3).
214. SROB, 317/1 (Commonplace Book of Sir Thomas Gery Cullum Bt), 265.
215. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
216. PRO, C108/362, Oct 25 1750, Nov 5 1754, June 13 1755, April 13 1756. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(3).
217. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
218. *Idem.*
219. PRO, C108/362, Sept 9 1756.
220. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
221. PRO, C108/362, June 13 1755. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
222. Lewes, Sussex Record Office, Ashburnham MSS, 4447, November 7, 1706.
223. Kerry Downes, *Vanbrugh*, 1977, 193b, 225a.
224. F. H. W. Sheppard (ed.), *Survey of London*, XXIX, 1960, 91 (addendum note).
225. Chatsworth, Devonshire Papers, *Messrs Graham and Collier Joynt Accounts*; Account Book marked D; Andrew Crotty's account book August 4, 1725 to October 24, 1732.
226. Northumberland Record Office, Blackett-Ord (Whitfield) MSS, E.12, p. 120, August 1748.
227. PRO, C108/362, Oct 25 1750, Janry 15 1753, Feby 16 1753.
228. Colvin, *Kings Works*, V, *cit.*, 388.
229. PRO, C108/362, Feb 16, Sept 21 1753, May 22 1754, Sept 9 1755.
230. *Ibid.*, Jan 23 1756.
231. John Cornforth and Leo Schmidt, "Holkham Hall, Norfolk", *Country Life* CLXVII, February 7, 1980, 361.
232. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
233. D. E. Howell James, "Matthew Brettingham's Account Book", *Norfolk Archaeology* XXXV, 1971.
234. PRO, C108/362, Sept 22, Oct 18 1753. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
235. PRO, C108/362, Feb 16, Oct 18 1753, May 8 1754, April 2 1755, May 8 1756. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
236. PRO, C108/362, May 8 1754.
237. F. H. W. Sheppard (ed.), *Survey of London*, XXXII, 1963, 542.
238. *Ibid.*, 542.
239. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/26(2).
240. PRO, C108/362, Oct 25 1750, May 8 1754, May 2 1755.
241. PRO, C108/362, Jan 13 1752.
242. *Ibid.*, May 1 1753.
243. *Ibid.*, June 26 1751.
244. *Ibid.*, Feb 13 1755.
245. Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *The Town of Stamford*, 1977, lxxxv.
246. Rupert Gunnis, *Dictionary of British Sculptors, 1600-1851*, 1951, 110a.
247. Arthur Oswald, "Casewick Hall, Lincolnshire", *Country Life* CXXXVI, December 31, 1964, 1811.
248. PRO, C108/362, May 8 1754.
249. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/24, 1749 Novembr 11.
250. Beard and Gilbert (eds.), *op. cit.*, 190.
251. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/25, 1751 Decembr 7.
252. *Ibid.*, 1753 Octobr 24.
253. *Ibid.*, 1754 Augst 31.
254. *Ibid.*, 1753 May 28.
255. *Ibid.*, 1754 Feby 13.
256. *Ibid.*, 1754 Augst 31.

257. *Ibid.*, 1754 Sept 10.
258. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1788, ii, 930.
259. SROB, Grafton Papers, 10WS/23.
260. *Ibid.*, 1761 June 30th.
261. *Ibid.*, 1761 July 1st.
262. *Ibid.*, 1761 June 30th.
263. *Ibid.*, 1761 July 1st.
264. *Idem.*
265. *Ibid.*, 1761 June 30th.
266. *Ibid.*, *passim.*
267. *Ibid.*, 10WS/25, 1751 Janry 18.
268. Beard and Gilbert (eds.), *op. cit.*, 110.
269. *Ibid.*, 1754 July 19.
270. *Ibid.*, 1755 April 25.
271. *Ibid.*, 1752 May 5.
272. *Idem.*
273. *Idem.*
274. *Ibid.*, 1752 June 13.