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PREFACE

As a native New Yorker, I have always taken a somewhat chauvinistic interest in the furniture of that state. When I discovered, during a seminar at Winterthur, that the productions of eighteenth century New York had been largely ignored by furniture historians and collectors, both pride and curiosity were aroused. The curiosity grew as research proceeded and the seminar paper became a thesis. New York's eighteenth century furniture is both highly derivative and unique—derivative because of its close dependence on English and other colonial examples for stylistic inspiration and unique in this dependence because of the peculiar social and economic forces that shaped eighteenth century New York.

This thesis is not the last word on eighteenth century New York furniture, but it is the first in many years. I have attempted to lay the necessary foundation for further research by constructing a solid skeleton of facts and then using current theories and methodology to interpret them. The skeleton, however, badly needs flesh as well as some rather important bones. The sources are far from exhausted and further research should produce exciting results.

Any research effort such as a thesis incurs many
debts. I am particularly grateful to the staff of the manuscript department of the New-York Historical Society where I found a wealth of information. Benjamin Ginsburg and Albert Sack gave generously of their time and accumulated wisdom. My classmates at Winterthur provided me with their research on the Queen Anne style in Boston and Philadelphia without which comparisons with New York would have been far more difficult. My very special thanks go to my patient and conscientious advisor, Bruce T. Sherwood, whose intimate knowledge of New York and its history has been of invaluable help, and to my impatient professor, Benno M. Forman, whose innovative work in furniture history has been a source of continuing inspiration.
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CHAPTER I

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MILIEU

Mid-eighteenth century New York was often referred to as the first and the richest of the king's colonies. Unlike its powerful mercantile neighbors, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, it was a royal colony, a favored location for the placement of financially embarrassed royal favorites as governors or Imperial Placemen who used wit and position to replenish their private coffers. New York engaged in relatively little manufacturing as compared to Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. The abundant agricultural products and furs from the accessible upstate area served by the Hudson River were exported, traded, and re-traded for British manufactured goods, making the colony a complimentary partner in Britain's economic scheme.¹

The city of New York, strategically placed at the mouth of the Hudson River, had a superb natural harbor and was the commercial and political hub of the colony, as well as one of the five most populous colonial cities throughout the eighteenth century. Its Dutch tradition was tempered but not dominated by English culture, and subsequent infusions of German and Hugenot immigrants had made it the most diverse
and cosmopolitan of the colonial cities. Only a singular preoccupation with trade and family welded this heterogeneous population into a functioning community. The language of the Dutch colonial had largely disappeared from public usage by 1760, but Dutch values lived on, creating an aristocracy of wealth rather than lineage that became intricately linked by generations of intermarriage. Little of the English distinction between tradesmen and gentry survived since titles were almost non-existent and opportunities within the professions, with the exception of law, were severely limited by the small population. Prestige and influence inherent in wealth and social class fell to the merchant princes, making them the inevitable leaders in politics, fashion, and civic affairs.2

The decisive influence of family ties on the culture and economy of eighteenth century New York pervaded all levels of society, but was especially important to the upper class. As Virginia Harrington found in her perceptive study of New York merchants, the merchant could not be divorced from his uncle the landlord or his brother-in-law the lawyer when considering his politics, trading patterns, and religion. Each participated in and influenced the pursuits of the others through family and mercantile ties. Socially, economically, and politically, the landlords, merchants, and lawyers formed the privileged ruling class. "Generations of
intermarriage had welded these . . . three groups into a large, interrelated clan whose interests could not be far separated." The families for whom New York's fine eighteenth century furniture was produced, and an understanding of the furniture and its stylistic development is dependant upon an understanding of the economic and social milieu that shaped the taste of these patrons.

The city of New York lived almost exclusively by and for trade. Travellers who passed through New York at various times during the colonial period were consistently impressed with the city's strong mercantile character. Andrew Burnaby, an Englishman who visited early in 1760, found that:

The inhabitants of New York in their character, very much resemble the Pennsylvanians: more than half of them are Dutch, and almost all traders: they are, therefore, habitually frugal, industrious, and parsimonious.

Speculation was a way of life for New York's ruling class. Joint ventures, transitory business partnerships, and land deals involving large, unsettled tracts were the major form of investment, and few men confined themselves to one form. Few ships were singley owned—many were divided as many as sixteen ways, diversifying the risk as well as the profit. Buying shares in a departing cargo of rum or wheat was, to most New Yorkers, comparable to speculating in the stock market today.
These speculative partnerships were not confined to the province of New York. Major merchants commonly had partners or correspondents in other cities and colonies. Some associations endured for years and some only the life of a single venture, but all resulted in the development of certain common interests and a high degree of colonial interdependence. Members of the upper class traveled to other colonies where they visited their contemporaries with some regularity resulting in considerable social and cultural exchange.

Long term partnerships and trading interests were frequently strengthened by marriage or by the settlement of a son or nephew in a corresponding city. Charles Ward Apthorpe, son of Boston's leading merchant, Charles Apthorpe, settled in New York City and married into the McEvers family which had complimentary mercantile and political interests. Philip Cuyler of New York married the daughter of John Tweedy, his correspondant in Newport, Rhode Island. The Sephardic Jewish merchants of Newport, Connecticut, and New York—the Lopezes, Riveras, Seixases, Pintos, and Hayes intermarried extensively. Only one New York Quaker, Robert Murray, was a prominent merchant, but his ties and those of many lesser merchants and craftsmen to Quakers in Connecticut and Rhode Island were strong. They saw each other frequently at quarterly and annual meetings where commercial and family ties as well as religious bonds were forged.7

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
New York merchants tended to specialize in a particular facet of trade—British, West Indian, or coastal. The magnitude of the coastal trade and of the relationships that evolved from it are of particular importance to an understanding of the stylistic development of New York furniture since the furniture of the colony's most intimate trading partners, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and northern New Jersey closely resemble many examples produced in New York.

New York's coastal trade evolved because of a shortage of native commodities suitable for direct export to the British market. The colony's agricultural goods, especially flour and pork, were not welcome in Britain, but New York's surplus and that of neighboring Connecticut, New Jersey, and Rhode Island were readily traded for more suitable export items along the southern Atlantic seaboard and in the West Indies. Connecticut and Rhode Island also produced the flax seed necessary for New York's extensive trade with Ireland. New York served as an entrepot, collecting goods from neighboring provinces for re-export to Britain, southern Europe, and the West Indies from which New York merchants returned with manufactured goods and tropical products salable at home to their initial trading partners—Connecticut, Rhode Island, and northern New Jersey.

Few ports in these neighboring colonies traded directly with Great Britain. They usually exported and imported
goods through New York. The shipping routes from southern New England were well protected by Long Island; the Sound provided a safe and convenient funnel for the small ships that emptied into New York's accessible and well protected harbor. From there New York's merchants could deal with their British correspondants on the large scale demanded by the major capital investments and the substantial risks involved in the trans-Atlantic trade. Connecticut was a colony of small shopkeepers, farmers, and merchants who did not amass the capital necessary for such trade, and New Jersey had few suitable harbors or large towns. Even in Rhode Island, most of the British manufactures sold in Providence and Newport, including those of the largest merchants, were imported through New York. New York became the logical receiving and distribution point and therefore the regional wholesaler of British goods.8

Part of the volume of commerce that passed through Connecticut and Rhode Island must also be attributed to extensive smuggling which was carried on through the smaller ports located along their coasts. Foreign cargos, especially goods from Holland, were readily landed at Providence, Groton, Stonington, Stamford, Norwalk, and a variety of other harbors in these non-crown colonies to be smuggled overland or aboard small, fast sloops to principals in New York.9

Trade patterns developed over a period of several
decades were well established in 1760, when Andrew Burnaby wrote of New York:

The present state of this province is flourishing; it has an extensive trade to many parts of the World, particularly to the West Indies; . . . . The troops, by having made it the point of their general rendezvous have also enriched it very much. /Burnaby refers to the large number of troops stationed in and supplied through New York during the French and Indian War./

This flourishing prosperity noted by Burnaby was relatively recent. In comparison to Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, New York's population and economy grew slowly during the first several decades of English rule. Germans and Scotch-Irish landed in Pennsylvania by the boat load and rapidly pushed the frontier westward in their search for cheap land; New England relaxed the stringent rules that had discouraged the proliferation of new townships, the only form in which new land could be procured, but the refusal of the patroons and manor lords of New York to sell any part of their vast tracts of land and the strength of the Iroquois confederacy to the north retarded the colony's development. The small farmers that made early New England and Pennsylvania prosperous left Europe to escape the tenant system with its entwined strands of never ending debt and obligation, not to merely relocate in a new land under a similar system as they would have been forced to do in seventeenth and early eighteenth century New York.11
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By 1730, the situation had begun to change. New York City was growing more rapidly than either Boston or Philadelphia and the overall rate of population growth of the colony was keeping pace with both Massachusetts and Pennsylvania although New York still had significantly fewer inhabitants. New York City's rate of population growth was only slightly less than Philadelphia's between 1740 and 1760 while Boston's rate of growth fell steadily behind both. By 1760, New York City, with a population of 18,000 had surpassed Boston, dormant at 15,631, and fell only 5,500 behind Philadelphia.

New York's economic growth paralleled that of its population. The first great spurt in the city's trade, after several decades of steady growth, came with King George's War (1740-48). The mobilization of the militia and the British regulars against the French and Indian threat to the north created a new and profitable enterprise—supplying the troops. The lure of quick profits drew many of the landed families into trade and shifted the focus of the colony from land to commerce. New York began the transition from a prosperous but provincial town dominated by the needs and concerns of the big landlords who spent most of their time on their estates to a cosmopolitan city dominated by the interests of the merchants whose lives were far more intimately connected with its development. This trend was reflected in a burst of new construction, though most of the homes retained a strong Dutch flavor.
William Smith, one of New York's leading lawyers, commented on the cultural results of this change of emphasis in the appendix of his *History of the Province of New York*, published in 1759:

In the city of New-York, through our intercourse with the Europeans, we follow the London fashions; though by the time we adopt them, they became disused in England. Our affluence during the late war /King George's War/ introduced a degree of luxury in tables, dress, and furniture with which we were before unacquainted. But still we are not so gay a people, as our neighbors in Boston and several of the Southern colonies. The Dutch counties, in some measure, follow the example of New-York, but still retain many modes peculiar to the Hollanders. 15

The observations of Peter Kalm, a Swedish naturalist who toured the American colonies during 1748 and 1749, are also helpful in providing a picture of a city in a state of transition as well as comparing it to other leading colonial cities of the period:

The streets in New York do not run so straight as those in Philadelphia, and sometimes are quite crooked; however, they are very spacious and well built, and most of them are paved. . . In the chief streets there are trees planted. . . I found it extremely pleasant to walk in the town, for it seemed like a garden. . . Most of the houses are built of brick, and generally strong and neat, and several stories high. Some had, in the old style, turned the gable end toward the street; but the new houses were altered in this respect. Many of the houses had a balcony on the roof. . . The roofs are commonly covered with tiles or shingles, the latter of which are made of the white fir tree. . . In size it comes next to Boston and Philadelphia, but with regard to fine buildings, opulence, and extensive commerce, it vies with them for supremacy. 16
The French and Indian War (1756-63) accelerated the city's and the colony's growth. The population of the colony had been increasing at a steady rate of 20-30 percent each decade since 1720, but suddenly jumped 53 percent to 117,138 between 1750 and 1760. The population growth of the city exhibited the same trend, increasing 73 percent between 1743 and 1760. New York City was the home of the military command and a major center for troop deployment throughout much of the war, resulting in great demand for goods of all kinds and a major infusion of specie into an economy chronically short of money.

The boom immediately translated itself into the construction and remodeling of buildings in the city and around it. Within a decade and a half, New York added 1,000 new houses to the 2,600 that existed in 1760. In one particularly well documented example, James Beekman, a leading merchant, and his fashionable wife (nee Kettelas) moved their family into the old Kettelas mansion on Queen Street in 1760 and, by 1764, had spent £2,302 for its purchase, £1,123 for repairs and renovation, and at least another £324 for new furnishings. Townhouses, however, were no longer sufficient for merchants of even moderate wealth. Country houses on Long Island and particularly on northern Manhattan became a social necessity. Orchards and formal English gardens enhanced these country seats and the merchant's image of him-
self as a gentleman. In 1760, Cadwalader Colden, a native landlord of considerable means, complained bitterly that his salary and privileges as governor of the province were not sufficient to enable him to live "in any degree suitable to his Rank, or as some Merchants in this Town do."²⁰

By 1760, New York's merchants lived in a degree of ease and comfort similar to their London contemporaries ²¹ and had developed a similar concern for fashion. This concern was stimulated by the improvement of intercolonial transportation and the establishment of a regular British packet, but its major source was the influx of British army officers between 1740 and 1760. Most of the officers brought with them some knowledge and a general consciousness of the current styles in middle and upper class English homes. The governor and his small circle had always encouraged this consciousness, but never was it so widely and intensely disseminated. The officers were entertained in the best homes and their comments on fashion widely repeated. The British army brought sudden affluence and new stylistic and cultural standards to a provincial town in 1740 and to a far larger and more sophisticated city in 1756.

Lord Adam Gordon, who served in New York during the French and Indian War, succinctly summarized the state of New York in his journal of 1765:
The city of New York has long been held at home the first in America though it neither comes up to Philadelphia in beauty, regularity, size, or the number of its inhabitants and houses ... /New York/ by being the seat of government, civil and military, and the the place to which all the money for the exigencies of America is sent from Britain, is rich. 

The end of the war and departure of British troops brought the inevitable post-war depression that lasted until 1775. With the troops went much business and the abundance of specie that had allowed commerce to flow rapidly and freely throughout the 1750s and early 1760s. Between 1765 and 1770 the depression was profound and fear of new British trade regulations further discouraged expansion and new ventures. The sudden withdrawal of monies disrupted New York's credit with British and American shippers, making it difficult if not impossible to meet relatively minor obligations, including those to tradesmen. In 1767, Johannes VanCortlandt, a leading merchant, wrote to Thomas Shipboy that "there is not enough money circulating to do business," and to Adams Griffer that "Money is so scarce ... the Best People disappoint in their engagements." 

The critical years of New York's pre-Revolutionary economic development fell between the late 1730s and the early 1760s when brisk trade and an expanding population encouraged growth and investment in everything from new ships to new chairs. Before 1740, New York's economy had a strong
agrarian orientation and its society, with the exception of a small circle surrounding the governor, was provincial and little concerned with taste and fashion. Few youngsters, even in later decades, were educated in England, and imported furniture was rare, so there were few avenues of stylistic migration and little demand for fine furniture.

The influx of British troops and ideas after 1740, as well as the growing community of English craftsmen, brought a wider knowledge of the new styles to New York and as growth and affluence changed the character of the city, these new styles became more desirable. New York did not completely lose its conservative, middle class Dutch character, but this element was largely overshadowed by a growing concern with a fashionable, genteel, and cosmopolitan society which could entertain British visitors in comfort and style. Prosperous traders and country gentry became gentlemen merchants and wealthy landlords, and their domestic environments changed with their self-perceptions.

There are a variety of documents which suggest the characteristics of the prevalent furniture styles of eighteenth century New York. Inventories from the early decades of the century list a variety of familiar William and Mary forms. That of Captain Giles Shelly, taken in 1718 and valued at £6812.16.7½, lists a total of 70 chairs of almost every available variety: one red plush elbow, one easy chair,
two elbow chairs, six Turkey work chairs, twenty-one cane, twenty seven matted, twelve leather, and one cane couch.\textsuperscript{26}

The inventory of the royal governor, William Burnett, taken in 1729 and totalling £45,450.4.3\textsuperscript{\textfrac{3}{4}}, suggests the introduction of new forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity or Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a scrutoire with glass doors</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a japanned tea table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a card table, much shattered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a fine gilt cabinet and frame, much shattered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 red leather chairs with embowed backs</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 bass bottom chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 embowed or hollow back chairs</td>
<td>with fine bass bottoms</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 walnut chairs with fine bass bottoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bass chairs, 4 ordinary chairs, and an easy chair covered with silk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the "24 red leather chairs with embowed backs" and "9 embowed or hollow back chairs" are so carefully described implies that they represent a new and unfamiliar form—possibly the popular and widely exported Boston chairs with their contoured backs. The "12 new fashioned matted chairs" worth £4.8.0 in Governor Montgomerie's inventory of 1731 probably refer to the same style.\textsuperscript{28}

It is unlikely that these entries refer to imported English Queen Anne chairs since a pronounced embowed back is not typical of the English style at this period. Since these chairs, found in the inventories of the trend setting royal governors were of a new fashion in 1731, it is fairly safe to assume that the cabriole style had not yet arrived in New
York. The valuable "scrutoire with glass doors," however, was probably an English example in the Queen Anne style.

Few inventories of the 1730s and 1740s survive, and those which do continue to list the same seating forms. Not until 1750 does the inventory of Abraham Lodge, a prominent lawyer, give any clue that a new style had appeared. His parlor furniture included: "8 mahogany chairs with claw feet, seat of crimson damask," a "mahogany scrutoire and bookcase with glass doors," and a "mahogany card table." The main chamber contained a "mahogany tea table with claw feet," a "mahogany bedstead with claw feet," and an "easy chair with claw feet." This claw footed furniture was probably a fairly recent introduction in 1750, since it is specifically noted.

The earliest reference to claw footed furniture and the first documentary evidence of the cabriole form in New York appeared in the account book of the cabinetmaker, Joshua Delaplaine in 1740 when he charged Judah Hayse, a wealthy merchant and prominent member of the colonial Jewish community, sixteen shillings for a large claw table. Judah Hayse was a style setter in 1740; by 1750, the cabriole style was found in the home of a well-to-do local lawyer like Abraham Lodge.

A survey of the surviving inventories for New York City and the prices listed for identifiable chair forms re-
reveals that by mid-century, any single chair worth over £1 was probably of the new cabriole style. By that time the cabriole form was common in the homes of prosperous New Yorkers, though other styles continued to be used. In 1757, when Christopher Bancker and Brandt Schuyler took the inventory of John Moore, worth £974.1.10 3/4, they were quite discerning in their descriptions and appraisals, a reflection of the growing stylistic consciousness of the decade. Their list included:

2 Cain Elbow Chaires (Old fashioned at of 6.00.00
13 Do Common Chaires (8s one with another
a Japand Old fashioned Chest of Drawers
& a Dressin Table 3.00.00
an old fashioned Boilsted Do 0.10.00
an old fashioned Japan Tea Table 0.10.00
5 Old fashioned black leather chers
Walnut frame 2.00.00
3 Old red leather Chairs at 3s 0.09.00
an Old Cain Elbow Chair 0.10.00
5 Black wallnut Matted bottom Chairs
at 5s 1.05.00
6 Old Cain Chairs at 4s 1.04.00

The 1761 inventory of Thomas Duncan, a merchant of the middling sort, was valued at £653.2.11 by the same two men. It provides a fairly complete picture of the middle class home of the period:

1 Mahogany Clock £20.00.00
1 Large black walnut Pirr Glass 16.00.00
6 plain mohogany chaires with loose covers 9.00.00
1 Fire Screen 25, 1 Tea table 20/
1 Large Japand Waiter 2.05.01
11 Red Chaires & 1 Black Do 2.10.00
1 Whitewood Chest 0.10.00
1 Black Walnutt Pier Glass 12.00.00
1 Square mohogany Table 3.10.00
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square Bilstead Table</td>
<td>£0.12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Windsor Chairs 36/s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pair Large carved &amp; Gilted Schonches</td>
<td>24.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Square Mohogany Card Tables</td>
<td>5.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Railed Edge Mohogany Tea Table</td>
<td>2.10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mohogany Carved Chaires &amp; 2 Armed Ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Welton Carpet &amp; 2 Bedside Carpetts</td>
<td>10.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Black Walnut Chaires Old with Harrittean Seats</td>
<td>8.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mohogany Chest of Drawers</td>
<td>12.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dressin Table 50s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Easy Chair &amp; Common Cover</td>
<td>4.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Close Stool Chair</td>
<td>2.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Black Walnut Gilt Pier Glass</td>
<td>13.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leather Chaires very old</td>
<td>4.03.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Whitewood Table</td>
<td>8.08.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In every city, a few pacesetters were in close contact with the London styles and acquired examples as soon as possible, but more general popularization of a style was dependent upon local social and economic conditions, and only after popularization was a style likely to be produced in quantities which allowed a representative sample to survive to the present day. Like New York, the popularization of the cabriole style in Boston and Philadelphia coincided with particular phases of economic and social development. John Smibert painted a few prominent Bostonians seated in Queen Anne chairs in 1729, at a time when Boston was undisputedly the leading city and style center on the North American continent. Scattered references to Queen Anne style forms continued to be found in the inventories of leading Bostonians of the 1730s, but, as one study of the Queen Anne style in Boston notes, "While these few examples of... Boston Queen Anne furniture may have been, or in some cases definitely
were made in the 1730s, inventories and newspapers indicate that the new fashion did not really take hold in Boston until the 1740s. "33 Boston reached its zenith of prosperity and growth in the late 1730s and early 1740s, after which competition from more accessible shipping centers, most notably New York and Philadelphia, resulted in its steady decline.

In Philadelphia, the first documented reference to the cabriole form appeared in 1739 in the account book of a local cabinetmaker whose clients were not among the style-setters of the period, 34 so one may assume that the style was introduced several years earlier, probably within a few years of its appearance in Boston and New York. After a short period of growth in the late seventeenth century, Philadelphia's economy had slowed and William Horner noted a decrease in the size and number of furniture shops and a deterioration in the quality of the wares produced between 1710 and 1735. "This was caused / according to Homer / by a lessening of the former initiative that had characterized the first years in Philadelphia." 35 Pennsylvania was not involved in King George's War during the 1740s and therefore did not benefit from the influx of troops and specie that effected New York and New England. Not until well after 1750 did Philadelphians build the impressive mansions requiring the equally impressive furniture for which that city is famous.

Although the Queen Anne style was probably introduced
in Philadelphia, Boston, and New York at roughly the same time by the style setters of those communities, the period of popularization in each city differed, coinciding with a time of rapid economic growth and high expectations. The style’s first documented appearance was in Boston, the largest and most sophisticated colonial city of the early eighteenth century. There, in an expanding economy where the well-to-do had ample money to spend, it was generally accepted within a decade. Boston’s greatest population growth occurred at this time, increasing 27 percent between 1730 and 1743, but the economy and the population stagnated between 1743 and 1760 as New York and Philadelphia came into their own. 36

When the Queen Anne style first appeared in New York in the 1730s, the city’s economy and population were growing steadily, but New York was far behind Boston in size, social sophistication, and the enthusiasm to embark on new ventures which characterized the New England metropolis at the same period. The style’s acceptance was therefore confined to a small, tight circle surrounding the governor and it did not frequently appear in the homes of the upper class until economic conditions of the 1740s created a social climate which encouraged acceptance of the new style.

Philadelphia was economically depressed when the cabriole style was introduced in the 1730s, and it was the last city where the style was widely popularized. The population
of Philadelphia grew only 13 percent between 1730 and 1743, but jumped 80 percent between 1743 and 1760 to become the largest city in the American colonies. The greatest surge in Philadelphia's growth occurred at the end of this period, and the city continued to grow rapidly after 1760 while New York experienced severe post war depression.

The period of popularization of the cabriole style in each of the three major colonial cities coincided with an expansive social, political, and economic climate and a rapidly growing population. The society of each city had to reach a critical point psychologically, economically, and physically—a level of sophistication, prosperity, security, and economic optimism—where conspicuous consumption of luxury items became economically possible and socially desirable. Boston, New York, and Philadelphia reached this point at different times in their history and therefore popularized slightly different forms of the cabriole style which coincide with successive phases of the English Georgian style. These phases and forms will be discussed in Chapter III, but before the development of the furniture itself can be pursued further, a study of the craftsmen who made it must be undertaken.
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CHAPTER II

THE FURNITURE CRAFTSMEN

Like other tradesmen, records which New York's eighteenth century furniture craftsmen left concerning their work and lives are widely dispersed and incomplete. Individually, the fragments yield little information, but when pooled, collated, analysed, and interpreted within the context of available official records and the general history of the city, they provide a reasonably complete picture of general craft practices and their development. Official records indicate that the furniture making crafts and craftsmen played a significant role in the economic and civic life of the city, and the personal papers of the craftsmen provide a picture of their day-to-day business transactions, shop organization, and intercraft relationships.

Governor William Tryon's 1774 report to the English Board of Trade clearly documents the extent and importance of the furniture industry during the closing years of the colonial period:

More than Eleven Twelths of the Inhabitants of the Province both in the necessary and ornamental parts of their Dresses are clothed in British Manufactures, except linen from Ireland and Hats and Shoes manufactured here. The same proportion
of Houses are in like manner furnished with British Manufactures, except Cabinet and Joiner's Work which is Generally made here.\(^1\)

Tryon went on to list "The Making of Soap and Candles, Hats, Shoes, Cordage and Cabinet Ware, Tanning, Malting, Brewing, & Ship Building,"\(^2\) as the major manufactures of the colony. The large number of furniture craftsmen working in New York in the years prior to the Revolution support Tryon's statement. A total of forty eight cabinet and chairmakers, twenty five chairmakers and turners, thirteen upholsterers, and ten carvers, japanners, and gilders first appear in the records of New York City between 1760 and 1776.\(^3\)

Although there is no recorded statement as specific as Tryon's concerning the earlier decades of the eighteenth century, the role and importance of the furniture craftsmen throughout the period is evident in the extent of their participation in the civic life of the city. New York was a free municipality within a royal colony governed by an appointed mayor and an elected board of aldermen and assistant aldermen. Freemen and freeholders elected these officials as well as men to fill the less important positions of ward constable, assessor, and collector. Of the 153 furniture craftsmen who worked in New York between 1720 and 1776,\(^4\) nearly half were either freemen or freeholders.\(^5\) Twenty held at least one elective office including two, Andrew Gautier and Henry Riker, who served as aldermen. Many others held
appointive offices such as fireman, public measurer, and bell ringer to the Supreme Court, that carried no prerequisite of freemanship.

A freeman of New York had to accept certain responsibilities in return for the franchise and the privilege of practicing his craft. He could not refuse an elective position and was subject to a fee at his initial registration which ranged from three pounds for a merchant to twenty shillings for a manual laborer. Admission to freemanship was severely limited during the early years of the eighteenth century, a factor that effectively limited the franchise and reduced competition. According to municipal law, no one was to "Keep Shop, or Sell or Expose to Sale Any Goods or Wares by Retail, or Exercise any Handy Craft Trade or Occupation, but such as are Freemen." Although this regulation was overlooked in the case of minor craftsmen of little substance, it is safe to assume that the major native craftsmen in the New York furniture industry were freemen of freeholders. In the years after midcentury, pressure for extension of the sufferage resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of freemen which introduced to the records men who began working in their trade years earlier.

Stages in the development of the furniture making crafts of eighteenth century New York coincided with and resulted from the general social and economic development of
the city as a whole. As furniture played an increasingly important role in the life of the citizenry, the number of furniture craftsmen increased. Analysis of the available working dates of the 153 craftsmen listed in Appendix II documents this trend. In 1731, the ratio of furniture craftsmen to the population was 1:850; in 1743, during King George's War, the ratio decreased to 1:500. This relationship remained constant until late in the 1750s when a substantial increase in population and the prosperity brought by the French and Indian War resulted in an increase in the number of furniture craftsmen yielding a population to craftsmen ratio of 1:450. By 1771, the ratio had dropped even further to 1:342. Table I summarizes these figures for each craft.

This absolute and proportional increase in the number of furniture craftsmen was accompanied by an increasing sophistication within the trade which matched that of the general population and reached its zenith in the decades after midcentury. Fifteen new craftsmen from London arrived in New York between 1750 and 1768, bringing with them knowledge of current British styles and the ability to fabricate them. The presence of these craftsmen and the increased contact of the buying public with British officers after 1740 increased the demands made by patrons on local craftsmen for furniture in the contemporary English mode.

During the midcentury decades there were significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of 1st appearance in records</th>
<th>Population(^{10})</th>
<th>Chair maker, turner</th>
<th>Cabinet maker, joiner</th>
<th>Windsor chair maker, seller</th>
<th>Carver</th>
<th>Japanner</th>
<th>Upholsterer</th>
<th>Total craftsmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1720-29</td>
<td>1720-7,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1731-8,622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730-39</td>
<td>1743-11,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-49</td>
<td>1749-13,294</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-59</td>
<td>1756-13,040</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-69</td>
<td>1760-18,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770-76</td>
<td>1771-21,863</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1775-25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
changes in craft nomenclature and specialization which probably resulted from the same influx of English craftsmen and ideas. During the first forty years of the eighteenth century, joiners, turners, and carpenters produced furniture and no single craft designation defined the existence of any specialized furniture making fraternity. In 1739, Nicholas Baily registered himself as a freeman cabinetmaker, but the term did not appear again until the 1750s, after which it rapidly gained acceptance. In that decade, five craftsmen first appear in the records as cabinetmakers. Native craftsmen like Thomas Grig, Sr. and his son Thomas, Jr., were careful to refer to themselves as joiners and cabinetmakers in their newspaper advertisements of 1754. Daniel Shaw registered as a freeman joiner in 1754, but referred to himself as a cabinetmaker in an advertisement of 1761.

The newly arrived English craftsmen consistently referred to themselves as cabinetmakers and that was the term with which British officers and their families would have been most familiar. Their influence brought a new awareness of design among the native furniture makers resulting in the necessity to differentiate joiners' work from cabinetmakers'. Joiners had always been regarded as woodworkers using the same techniques as carpenters, but engaged in the smaller, finer activities such as interior paneling, window sashes, and furniture. According to the Book of Trades published in 1805, furniture had disappeared from the English
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joiner's repertoire, but the situation in America at that date and earlier is still unclear. The use of the term joiner among documented urban furniture craftsmen in New York declined rapidly after 1755, but persisted for many years in more provincial areas of the colony.

The term shop-joiner also developed a special significance at this time. It appeared in 1759 when Gilbert Ash advertised that he carried on the "Shop-Joiner or Cabinet Business," implying that the terms were interchangeable at that date. Two other craftsmen, Harmanus Bussing and Thomas White, registered themselves as freemen shop-joiners in 1756, and Samuel Prince, who produced documented high style furniture, referred to himself interchangeably as a shop-joiner and cabinetmaker between 1772 and 1775. There was no comparable term in English usage and none of the English craftsmen in New York used the term. Its usage may be a compromise of some native craftsmen who were reluctant to limit the range of their activities and to abandon the traditional appellation of their trade, but who nevertheless found it necessary to advertise that they were primarily furniture makers, not carpenters.

The same change in terminology that occurred in the cabinetmakers' business in the 1750s, occurred in the chairmakers' business at about the same time. As the number of men listed as turners decreased, both absolutely and propor-
tionally, the number of chairmakers increased. The new term was first used in 1739 when George Elsworth registered himself as a freeman chairmaker, but it did not become common until after 1750. Between 1750 and 1760, six craftsmen first appeared in the records as chairmakers. Both William Tilou in 1755 and John Clark in 1768 listed themselves as turners and chairmakers. In 1737, Peter Tilou appeared on the freeman's list as a turner, but in 1770 he referred to himself as a chairmaker.

Changes in terminology are one indication of an increasing specialization within the woodworking crafts. Compared to the turners, joiners, and carpenters of the early eighteenth century who performed all tasks involving wood construction, the addition of house carpenters, ship-joiners, shop-joiners, cabinetmakers, and chairmakers to the freemen's list after 1750 reflects an increased sophistication and craft consciousness in all branches of the woodworking trades.

American records offer little information concerning the products and peculiarities of each trade, but a contemporary English publication, *A General Description of All Trades*, published in 1747, offers some enlightenment, assuming that American trade practices retained strong similarities to the English. Under the heading "Chairmakers" is the following description:

Though this sort of Household Goods is
generally sold at the Shops of the Cabinet-makers for all the better Kinds, and at the turners for the more common, yet there are particular makers for each.

The Cain-chair-makers not only make this Sort (now almost out of Use) but the better sort of matted, Leather bottomed, and Wooden Chairs, of all which there is great variety in Goodness, Workmanship, and Price; and some of the Makers, who are also Shop-keepers, are very considerable Dealers, employing from 300 upwards of 500/ in trade and require with an apprentice 10/. The work is pretty smart, the Hours from six to nine and a Journey man's Wages 12s a Week.

The white Wooden, Wicker, and ordinary matted Sort, commonly called Kitchen-chairs, and sold by the Turners are made by different Hands, but are all inferior Employs.

Those covered with Stuffs, Silks &c. are made and sold by the upholsters.17

The banner carried by the "Windsor and Rush Chair Makers" in the New York federal procession of 1788 and described in a newspaper account, provides more clues about the products of American chairmakers:

The standard bourne by two men representing a large manufacturing shop, with a number of workmen at work; in front of the shop a view of the river, several vessels bound to different parts, taking in chairs, boys carrying them to the warfs; in one corner, the American Union, in the other, the chair-makers arms, a turning lath and two Windsor chairs, properly emblazoned Motto: 'Free Trade.' 'The federal stars in union bound, O're all the world our chairs are found.'18

The other furniture fraternity included in the procession were the cabinetmakers, so it appears that by 1788, at the latest, American chairmakers were specializing in a variety of turned products which were exported in quantity, leaving all else to the cabinetmaker.
Aside from a few miscellaneous bills, there are no surviving papers of pre-Revolutionary New York chairmakers, but the account book of Solomon Fussell, a Philadelphia chairmaker, survives intact and provides an interesting case history which is applicable to New York. Fussell worked from 1738 to 1749 and was specifically identified in contemporary records as a chairmaker. He produced slat back chairs, probably of maple, as well as several other inexpensive varieties. On a few occasions, he furnished customers with more expensive walnut frame chairs, but these were rare instances within his total output. The few bills that survive from New York chairmakers list only the inexpensive turned and rush type chairs. The 1755 receipt of Leonard Warnes, chairmaker, is typical. He received £3.12.00 in full from Sir Charles Hardy for "One Dozen of Chairs & all other." Even cheaper were the two dozen chairs worth £2.08.00 delivered to the work house by John Bloom, turner.

There is adequate evidence in newspaper advertisements and surviving bills that New York's cabinetmakers produced "the better kinds" of chair referred to in A General Description of All Trades in 1747. In 1753, Thomas Brookman, cabinetmaker, "Receiv'd from James Beekman twenty Eight pounds & five pence in full for one dozen black Walnut chairs, 1 Mahogany Tea Table & one Mahogany Dining Table." Samuel Prince, cabinetmaker, advertised "chairs of many different and new
patterns" in 1775, and two years earlier, made eight mahogany chair frames worth £10.18.00 for Evert Bancker. Those who advertised as cabinet and chairmakers and upholsters also made only the more expensive, high style, hardwood chairs.

There is some confusion concerning the extent of collaboration between New York cabinetmakers and upholsterers, although the 1747 publication, *A General Description of All Trades*, reported that chairs "covered with Stuffs, Silks, &c. are made and sold by the upholsterer." In New York, more flexible arrangements prevailed. In 1753, James Hirthwaite, upholsterer, received 54 shillings for "One doz'n Seats for Chairs" from James Beekman, presumably to fit in the chair frames delivered by Thomas Brookman a few weeks earlier. Other cabinetmakers preferred to provide their own seats. In 1773, Samuel Prince billed Evert Bancker for:

- 8 mahogany chair frames at 26/ each  £10.18.00
- to stuffing the seats at 5/ each  2.00.00
- to damask covers at 5/ each  2.00.00

Customers sometimes brought chairs to cabinetmakers for seats resulting in entries like that in Martin Van Bergen's account book in 1764, "To Gilbert Ash for stuffing 8 chair seats £4.08.00." Cabinetmakers' involvement in upholstery, however, involved only slipseats, the simplest of the upholsterer's tasks. The upholsterers' advertisements for easy chairs, French chairs, back stools, etc. indicate that they performed
the complicated facets of stuffed chair production, but the question of who made the frames remains unsettled. Since the craftsman who made the frame, whether the upholsterer himself, a shop journeyman, or an outside joiner, was responsible for the basic shape of the form, this question remains an important one in the yet unwritten story of the independent colonial upholsterer. Those who formed partnerships with cabinetmakers or opened warehouses will be discussed later in this chapter.

An unexplored area of craft duplication is that of the cabinetmaker and carver. Of the seven carvers working during the period, four advertised that they carved furniture. Stephen Dwight's notice of 1755 is typical:

he carves all sorts of ship and house work: also tables, chairs, pictures and looking glass frames, and all kinds of work for cabinetmakers, in the best manner and all reasonable terms. 

In 1769, Minshall, "Carver and Gilder from London" offered to carve tables, chairs, candle stands, and clock cases as well as frames, girondoles, and interior woodwork. 

No bills documenting transactions between carvers and cabinetmakers in New York have yet been found, but the presence of many carvers in the city and their newspaper advertisements indicate that much of the carved furniture produced after 1750 passed through their shops. Stephen Dwight's notice of 1762 gives the only concrete hint of a carver-cabinet
maker relationship. He advertised that he intended to move into the shop where "Mr. Osborne, Cabinet Maker, now lives . . . where he intends to follow Carving in general as usual." 

Only one member of New York's entire furniture making community left more than a few scattered bills, receipts, and newspaper advertisements. That craftsman is Joshua Delaplaine whom J. Stuart Johnson discussed in his thesis, "Pre-Revolutionary New York Cabinetmakers." This unique collection, presently at the New-York Historical Society, includes a day-book and an extensive sampling of bills and letters. It provides the only surviving documentation of the day-to-day transactions and organization of a New York furniture craftsman's shop.

Joshua Delaplaine's career began with his apprenticeship to Edward Burling, an English Quaker who registered as a freeman joiner in 1683. Delaplaine became an independent joiner with his own shop by the time he took an apprentice in 1718. His career as a furniture craftsman and joiner lasted until 1760 when he abandoned his workshop to become a full time merchant.

Delaplaine's daybook covers the years 1753 through 1756. During this period he regularly employed his brother Joseph, his son Joshua, Jr., two apprentices, and an occas-
sional journeyman. Although he frequently produced expensive mahogany furniture and counted some of the wealthiest and most influential families of New York among his patrons, he spent much of his time making boxes and coffins, mending furniture, and doing odd carpentry jobs such as erecting bedsteads and planing doors. In the two and one half years covered by his daybook, Delaplaine made 43 sweetmeat boxes, 150 candle boxes, and 73 chocolate boxes for merchants such as Elias Desbrosses, Jacobus Roosevelt, and Samuel Sacket.\(^2\) His coffins, another variety of box, ranged in price from one at eleven shillings made for Mary Hippin in 1753 and entered in his daybook as "to a black coffin for her wench," to one at five pounds for Abraham Lodge's wife in 1757, entered as a coffin "Covered full trimd & Lined with Sadinet."\(^3\)

Delaplaine also produced carved wooden handles for silversmiths like Thomas Hamersley, Bartholomew LeRoux, Adrian Bancker, and Myer Myers. In 1754, he made for Myer Myers the following:

- a kink coffee pot handle 9s
- a pear pot ditto 8s
- a kink milk pot handle 8s
- 2 chafing dishd 6s 4d\(^3\)

Joshua Delaplaine's account with Abraham Duriee (Duryea) between 1754 and 1756 is a good example of the odd carpentry jobs that he performed for many of his customers. Duriee's account includes:

- to mending a table 9d
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to plaining Some Spots out of ye floor 1s 9d
to mending a Cot, found tape and nails 4s 8d
 to mending a Close pot 2s 8d 35

The scattered evidence found in the papers of other furniture craftsmen indicates that Delaplaine was not unique in his performance of a broad range of craft related tasks. In 1768, the Common Council paid Thomas Warner, Jr., chairmaker, £1.03.00 for a spinning wheel for the Bridewell, and, later in the same year, £2.03.00 for "Sundry woolen and linen wheels found for Bridewell." His fellow chairmaker, George Poalk, received £1.15.03 in 1771 "for mending Sundry wheels in Bridewell." Since both Poalk and Warner were producing turned chairs, this sideline was a natural extension of their craft. Anthony Demelt, also a chairmaker, made a coffin on at least one occasion, purchasing sixteen shillings worth of coffin handles from Joshua Delaplaine in 1727. There was a distinct lack of specialization encouraged by the general knowledge and use of many woodworking skills by all members of the woodworking crafts during the first half of the eighteenth century.

Although the practice became less common, cabinet-makers of the later period also performed odd jobs such as those for which Thomas Collister charged Evert Bancker in 1773:

To making a Small Bench 1s 9d
To making a bedd of Lath 2s 6d
To mending of a desk 1s
To making a Window Lath 6s
To altering windows 1s
To making Lath for 2 Bedsteads 2s 6d
To making of a Table 4s
To making of a Knife Box

Even Samuel Prince, whose surviving work attests to his excellence as a cabinetmaker, may have made coffins since he appears in Delaplaine's daybook in 1753 as purchasing a "set middle Coffin handles" for five shillings.

Upholsterers performed the same kind of craft related day-to-day odd jobs as cabinetmakers and chairmakers. Mattresses occupied the same position in the upholsterer's business as did boxes and coffins with the cabinetmakers'. The 1757 bill of Thomas Wenman to Mr. Schuyler is typical:

To Making a tickentent & murkeys with all materials compleat £ 9.06.06
To making a matrass & wool 1.08.06
To Carding Eleven Pounds of Wool and Making the Mattress 0.12.00

Most upholsterers advertised mattresses, tents, and military gear as well as bed hangings, window curtains, and upholstered chairs. Paper hanging was a frequent sideline. John Bower's advertisement of 1765 mentions the full range of services offered by most upholsterers:

John Brower, upholsterer . . . Makes all Kinds of Beds Mattresses, Festeen Window Curtains, stuffs and covers, Sophas, Couches, Easy Chairs, French Chairs, back Stools, &c. Paper hangings put up in City or Country in the best Manner; said Brown /sic/ makes Tents, Camp/Equipage, and all Branches in that Business . . .

The common sidelines of cabinetmakers, chairmakers,
and upholsterers involved craft related skills, but some craftsmen also conducted a variety of unrelated though profitable ventures. After the Revolution, Thomas Collister extended his coffin making activities to become the eighteenth century version of a funeral director. A bill he presented to the family of Margaret Rhinelander for her funeral included the Rector's fees, porters, invitations, coffin, and mourning apparrell. John Taylor, housebroker, upholsterer and cabinet-maker, started this trend earlier, advising the public in 1769 that, aside from his other activities, he could also provide "FUNERALS decently performed." 42

Other craftsmen found less lugubrious activities to augment their income. In 1759 and 1763, Gilbert Ash advertised soap and candles at the same time he informed the public of his cabinetmaking activities. In 1774, Thomas Burling, cabinetmaker, advised his fellow craftsmen that:

Said Burling sells mahogany, ready sawed, fit for carpenters in staircase building and all other kind of stuff suitable for carrying on the joiner's business, all which he proposes to sell on the most reasonable terms. 43

Between 1771 and 1775, John Brower, upholsterer, provided street lamps for the city of New York, and was regularly paid by the Common Council for his services. 44

A few craftsmen engaged in higher risk but potentially more lucrative ventures. Between 1749 and 1775, Henry Carmer, cabinetmaker, sold supplies and loaned money to the city of
New York, speculated in Manhattan real estate, and ran a public warf. Unfortunately, the will he left at his death in 1785 gives no clue to the financial success of his ventures, but he must have begun with adequate resources and political contacts and increased them substantially as the scope and potential profit of his projects grew. Moses Clement's activities involving speculation in the northern lands were more typical of New York craftsmen with adequate funds. In 1754, Clement and Richard Ascough, practitioner of Physic, borrowed £400 of the principle raised as a working endowment to finance King's College. Later in the same year, Clements purchased Ascough's land in Queensbury, Orange County, and three years later sold part of it to Mary Ellston for £200 and registered as a freeman cabinetmaker in New York City. In 1774, he had retired to his lands in Orange County, signed himself "Esquire," and advertised for the return of some stolen silver spoons and tongs.

Joshua Delaplaine's records illustrate another outside source of profit for furniture craftsmen--speculation in food stuffs. His wife, Maria, brought him a substantial dowry, so he began with a fiscal advantage beyond many craftsmen. He borrowed a total of £308 between 1725 and 1727 to finance his ventures and dealt frequently with his fellow Quakers, listing, among other transactions, shipments of flour to Samuel Holmes of Rhode Island in 1732 and 1741, and a consignment of bread,
butter, and meat to Christopher Townsend of Newport in 1745. By 1750, Delaplaine was increasingly preoccupied with his commercial ventures, and by 1760, had accumulated enough capital to abandon his cabinetmaking business and become a full time merchant. At his death in 1771, his bequests totalled £5,800, plus slaves, furnishings, plate, house, lot, and storehouse.  

Delaplaine was not the only craftsman to find that commercial speculation yielded rich rewards. The best cabinetmakers, through their craft, met the leading merchants and most prosperous men of the city; men who could offer small initial investments to craftsmen already prosperous. It is more than coincidental that many of Delaplaine's furniture and box customers later became business associates. Other cabinetmakers like Edward Burling, Samuel Prince, and Marinus Willet, who all became merchants, probably followed a similar pattern. Because their products were less prestigious and less expensive, chairmakers could not expect comparable status, income, or social contacts, and therefore did not engage in the ventures open to the leading cabinetmakers. Surviving records contain no instance of upholsterers rising to the merchant class, although they certainly would have had the social contacts and income. The reason may rest with the English birth and training of almost half, which made them leaders of their trade, but excluded them from those family connections that
played such an important role in New York.

The general prosperity of cabinetmakers for whom there is any evidence, plus their social mobility and commercial proclivities indicate that cabinetmaking, like silversmithing, was among the elite crafts—a stepping stone to financial and social success. Even in the eighteenth century, the aristocracy of New York was primarily based on wealth rather than lineage and members of prestigious families had only to look back a short distance to find an obscure but ambitious ancestor who had laid the foundation for their position and prosperity. The lines between social classes were fluid; family relationships, including those created by marriage were strong, and everyone of every class engaged in trade.

The furniture craftsmen working in eighteenth century New York traded with each other as well as with the customers they served. Joshua Delaplaine’s business records again provide the most complete record of this common practice. He dealt with other craftsmen on several levels, buying and selling both labor and materials in an interdependent though competitive fraternal situation. Delaplaine’s records include dealings with twenty two known furniture craftsmen:

Edward Burling—Quaker, Delaplaine’s former master from whom he purchased supplies and for whom he occasionally worked to pay for some of them.

Nicholas Bellanger—Quaker, nephew, apprentice
William Jones—Quaker, apprentice
Benjamin Lawrence—Quaker, apprentice
John Parsons—Quaker, apprentice, purchased supplies
Francis Warne—Quaker, apprentice
Thomas White—Quaker, apprentice
William Palmer—Quaker, purchased supplies from Delaplaine and worked to pay for some of them
John Osburn—purchased supplies from Delaplaine and worked to pay for some of them
Thomas Rigby—purchased supplies and worked to pay for some of them
William Brown—journeyman, worked for Delaplaine
Richard Byfield—probably Rigby's apprentice, worked for Delaplaine
Joseph Delaplaine—Quaker, brother, worked for Delaplaine
Joshua Delaplaine, Jr.—Quaker, son, worked for Delaplaine
Samuel Prince's apprentice—prob. Quaker, worked for Delaplaine
Samuel Prince—Quaker, purchased supplies from Delaplaine
Alexander Cook—purchased supplies from Delaplaine
Anthony Demelt—
Andrew Gautier—
Thomas Griggs—
Patrick Johnson—
Rue Williams—
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An examination of these relationships illustrates several important patterns of interaction within the craft including the role of apprentices, former apprentices, journeymen, and religious, familial, and related craft ties.

The city of New York was responsible for the laws governing apprenticeships which clearly stated the responsibilities of each party involved. In 1694, the laws of the city required that all apprentices be bound by an indenture of four years, "and at the Expiration of the Indenture the said Apprentice Shall be made Free of the Said City by his Said Master, if he have well and Truely served him . . ." In 1711, the term of service was increased, For as much as great Inconveniences have arisen by Apprentices Serving but Four Years, by reason Thereof they are Seldom Masters of their Trades; For Remedy thereof . . . That from henceforth no Merchant, Shop-keeper or Handy-craft Tradesman shall take any Apprentice . . . for a less term than Seven Years, and at the expiration of said Indenture, the said Apprentice shall be made free of the said city by the Master. In 1725, the Common Council recinded the 1711 requirements and then reinstated them in 1732 minus any stipulation concerning the period of service. No further laws regulating apprenticeships appeared until 1784 when the period of service was again increased to seven years. The town clerk's registry of indentures of apprenticeship survive only for the years 1718-1727. During that time Delaplaine took four apprentices, more than any other furniture
craftsman. Of the four, only Francis Warne appeared again in Delaplaine's records or ever became a freeman in New York. This does not imply, however, that the others did not become furniture makers. They may have settled on Long Island, in New Jersey, or other areas of New York's sphere of influence. William Applegate, Patrick Jackson's apprentice, for instance, practiced his trade in New Jersey and did not appear in New York records. Francis Warne began his apprenticeship in 1718. He witnessed legal documents for Delaplaine in 1725 and 1727, dates beyond the term of a seven year apprenticeship, indicating that he may have worked for Delaplaine as a journeyman. He did not register as a freeman joiner until 1731, and did not appear in the records again until 1743, when he wrote Delaplaine from Kingston, Jamaica that he had "got work and hope to do well at Last." He also desired to be remembered "to thy wife and Family and al Friends & Rest thy Loveing Friend and old apprentice," indicating by the form of address that he was, like Delaplaine, a Quaker.  

The records concerning Delaplaine's later apprentices are more complete. In 1750 and 1751, Richard Smith billed Delaplaine for schooling "your Apprentice Thomas" and "your Apprentice Parsons." "Your Apprentice Thomas" probably refers to Thomas White who was named in full as Delaplaine's apprentice in a bill of 1756 for schooling from Avis Brown. Thomas White became a freeman shop-joiner in 1761. John Parsons ap-
peared in Delaplaine's accounts in 1753, owing £9.04.03 for "Sundries" and his account continued through 1756 with such entries as:

- **7/17/54** to a top for a tea table of french mahogany he payd 7 shillings in part and 18d for making a child's coffin £1.04.00
- **9/8/54** to 6 screws 6d
- **9/19/54** to 6 foot of Inch bilstel ls 6d
- **10/17/54** to a pound beeswax 2/6 and a lb sugar
- **12/10/54** by 2 pillars Mahogany 3/6 by 1 ditto £1.00.06
- **5/27/55** to a black walnut plank 9s 57p

Parsons became a freeman joiner in 1754 and advertised in that year that he:

> has lately set up his business ... near his late master Joshua Delaplaine, makes all sorts of cabinet work, sitting and easy chairs, close stool chairs, and all other kinds of house furniture in that way.58

Although a freeman with his own shop, Parsons was obviously dependent upon Delaplaine for credit and supplies. The fact that he mentioned Delaplaine prominently in his advertisement is an indication of Delaplaine's professional standing and their close relationship.

The same pattern was repeated again between 1755 and 1763 with John Osborne whose accounts are longer and more extensive, indicating that he had a more difficult time establishing himself. He did not register as a freeman, but was referred to as cabinetmaker in his own shop by a newspaper notice of 1762, at which time he was still doing occasional
jobs for Delaplaine such as mending chests of drawers and making coffins.\textsuperscript{59}

Joshua Delaplaine received the same considerations as he gave his apprentices when he finished his own apprenticeship with Edward Burling about 1718. He frequently purchased tools, wood, hardware, fabric, and food from Burling between 1721 and 1729, and occasionally thereafter, often paying for his purchases with labor.\textsuperscript{60} After 1723, however, many of these goods appear to have gone to one Demilt, probably Anthony Demilt, a chairmaker. Between 1723 and 1727, seventeen of the twenty-nine entries in Delaplaine's account with Burling reappear in Delaplaine's account with Demilt. Demilt may have been a former apprentice indentured before the surviving New York records began in 1718, or he may have been a friend using Delaplaine's contact with Burling, a prosperous and well established craftsman, to obtain inexpensive or otherwise unavailable materials.

Although others among Delaplaine's associates may have been former apprentices, especially William Palmer and Thomas Rigby\textsuperscript{61} whose accounts follow a similar materials-for-labor pattern, the basis for the relationships may also have been convenience since all those for whom there are addresses worked on the East side, several within a few blocks of Delaplaine. Since Delaplaine was a leading craftsman, he may frequently have had large stocks of supplies from which he
could afford to supplement other craftsmen's shortages. The barter system of labor for supplies was a common feature in the currency short American colonies of the eighteenth century.

These records indicate that many newly freed apprentices did not become journeymen in New York before starting their own shop, even though their lack of capital resulted in semi-dependence on their former masters. The position, number, and even existence of journeymen in New York is uncertain since the term did not appear in contemporary records. An entry in Joshua Delaplaine's daybook gives some hint of the situation in his shop. In 1756 he noted that "William Brown has agreed to make a full pair of wild cherry draws for £3-5-0 & if I want him to work besides I am to allow him wages." Later in the same year Delaplaine lent him two pounds for "his wife's passage" and took partial payment in labor. By the end of the year, however, Brown had become a freeman joiner, and in 1775 was listed as a cabinetmaker with a shop on Broad Street. Delaplaine regularly employed his brother Joseph, but beyond this arrangement, the Brown entry and the prolonged presence of Francis Warne are the single possible references to journeymen in Delaplaine's shop.

The dearth of journeymen or wage earning craftsmen in the New York furniture industry before 1750 is a clear indication of the small scale of the individual shops. Orders
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were readily filled by a master craftsman and his apprentices with occasional assistance from other craftsman or a loaned apprentice. Demand was limited and competition was constant, fueled by independently minded former apprentices who went into business for themselves as soon as possible. This situation was partially responsible for the lack of craft specialization and the willingness of craftsmen to provide a broad range of services.

The journeyman's situation had changed by the 1760s with the influx of English craftsmen. In 1762 John Brinner advertised that he had brought with him from London six "artificers" skilled in all facets of the cabinetmaking trade and upon James Strachan's death in 1769, his widow advertised that his cabinetmaking and carving business would be carried on "as usual" in the same shop, implying the existence of the necessary craftsmen. Many of the earlier craftsmen who appeared in the records but who did not acquire freeman status may have been journeymen, but there is no documentary evidence to support this theory.

The many relationships among furniture craftsmen were not based solely on business considerations; like the upper class of New York, family and religious ties were often the determining factor. Familial relationships and friendships are evident in wills and inventories. The Wermans (upholsterers), the Griggs (joiners), the Gautiers (joiners), and
the Tilyous (chairmakers), among others, exhibit strong patterns of established family craft practice where skills and tools were passed from father to son. Craftsmen frequently served as executors to each other's wills, as in the case of John Hoffman, a cabinetmaker who, in 1773, named William Warner (turner) executor of his estate, and John Wessels (cabinetmaker) a witness.64

Many of the craftsmen with whom Delaplaine dealt were, like himself, Quakers. Of his apprentices, Francis Warne, and Nicholas Bellanger were definitely Quakers65 and the others probably were since a master was expected to provide his apprentices with moral and religious guidance as well as a trade. In his correspondence with Quakers in Newport, Delaplaine mentioned his former master, Edward Burling, as a Quaker. Thomas Burling, who apprenticed under Samuel Prince, was a Quaker, implying that Prince was also.66 Edward Burling, who emigrated from England between 1674 and 1683, established in New York a community of Quaker cabinetmakers which counted many important citizens among their patrons. The leaders of this community, Edward Burling, Joshua Delaplaine, and Samuel Prince all retired as well-to-do merchants and dominated the New York cabinetmaking industry during their lifetimes.

If the relationships found in Delaplaine's records, plus the scattered references of other craftsmen are indicative of the general situation in New York, the level of inter-
dependence and craft consciousness was fairly high. Craftsmen did not hesitate to extend credit, lend materials, and hire apprentices to and from each other. There was a hierarchy of excellence among the Quaker craftsmen that was recognized throughout the city since only Joshua Delaplaine and Samuel Prince were ever mentioned as former masters by craftsmen seeking to recommend their services to the public.

Although the personal records of New York furniture craftsmen like Delaplaine document their shop and commercial activities and provide much information about the evolution of the individual crafts, they provided few clues to the introduction and development of specific furniture styles. The scarcity of early newspaper advertisements and a lack of indications of style in craftsmen's records make the pre-Chippendale styles, particularly the Queen Anne, difficult to document. The introduction of the Queen Anne style cannot be attributed to a single craftsman or assigned a definite date. Its appearance in the vocabulary of the native furniture makers can only be inferred from the incomplete records of a few men whose role in its introduction and development is unknown.

The first surviving reference to the Queen Anne style in New York appeared in the bills of Joshua Delaplaine. In 1737, he made Jane Gilbert, a well-to-do dry goods dealer, a "round 3 Legged Walnut table with a draw and a Lock to ditto"
for £1.13.09, and "8 black walnut chairs at 23s." J. Stuart Johnson stated that since there was no evidence in the daybook, covering only two and one half years, that Delaplaine made chairs, that he probably purchased them elsewhere and resold them to Jane Gilbert. The facts, however, indicate that Delaplaine did make chairs. The estate of William Beekman credited him £3.15.00 for a mahogany closestool in 1751, and his former apprentice, John Parsons, specifically advertised chairs. An overlooked item in Jane Gilbert's bill suggests that Delaplaine also made the eight for which he billed her. In 1737 he credited her account with "2 yds ozenbrigs Left of ye Chairs 3s." Ozenbrigs was the term for a coarse linen often used under upholstery. The entry suggests that Jane Gilbert, who carried the fabric in her shop, gave Delaplaine a piece to upholster the slip seats of her chairs and that he kept the remnant for future use and credited her account accordingly.

Delaplaine was a joiner, not a turner, so these chairs could not be examples of the ubiquitous turned chairs in the William and Mary style. Such expensive chairs of black walnut with some type of simple upholstery strongly suggest the Queen Anne style.

Delaplaine's account with Judah Hayse, a well-to-do Jewish merchant a few years later includes several Queen Anne forms:

1740 to a large mahogany triangle table £3.00.00
1740 to a large claw table 0.16.00
The year 1740 was not Delaplaine's first contact with a claw table since he repaired one for John Burnes in 1738. The relatively low price of sixteen shillings for Hayse's table of an unspecified wood can be explained by an entry of 1744 when Delaplaine made Elizabeth Moyon a "bilstel claw table" for the same price. Bilstel, or red gum, was a native wood commonly used in New York for good but inexpensive furniture. The fact that a stylistically advanced form was made of an inexpensive wood in 1740 indicates that the style had probably appeared somewhat earlier.70

A table presently in VanCortlandt Manor may provide a second early date for the Queen Anne style in New York. The cherry table (Fig. 1) is branded "DG" several times on its stretchers and may have descended in a branch of the VanCortlandt family. In 1727, one Daniel Gautier, joiner, made a coffin costing five pounds for Gertrude VanCortlandt, wife of Stephanus VanCortlandt, second lord of the manor. Gertrude VanCortlandt was a social leader in her day, and 500 people followed her to her grave in funeral procession. The close pattern of relationships in early eighteenth century New York suggests that the man asked to make her coffin was a craftsman whose work the family knew and trusted.71 Daniel
Gautier is the only New York craftsman of the period with the initials "DG," and his honored connection with the family who may have owned the table suggests that he made it for them sometime between 1725 and 1743, his working dates.\(^{72}\)

The craftsmen's records indicate, therefore, that the Queen Anne style was being produced by local cabinetmakers and joiners by 1740, but these fleeting references provide few clues about the particulars of form and ornament. Newspaper advertisements were conspicuously absent before 1750, so they can provide no information concerning the early years of the style in New York. Even after that date the notices of native craftsmen usually refer to form or material rather than style. In 1759, Gilbert Ash, cabinetmaker, advertised that:

> The Shop-Joiner or Cabinet Business is carried on... where may be had, all sorts of Work made in that Branch, Tables, Chairs, Desks, &c.\(^{73}\)

Thomas Grigg, Sr., cabinetmaker, was only slightly more specific in 1754 when he advertised "house-chairs, couches, close-stool chairs, seats for houses, and easy chairs."\(^{74}\)

Among the sparse newspaper references to the styles of the decade, the first appeared in the advertisement of two London upholsterers, Stephen Callow and James Hirthwaite, who implied that the style should be a consideration of their customers when they advertised "all Sorts of Beds, Settees, Chairs and Couches, after the Newest Fashion."\(^{75}\) In 1753,
Robert Wallace, a native joiner, advertised:

all Sorts of Cabinets, Scrutoires, Desks and Bookcases, Draws, Tables whether square, round, oval or quadrile, and Chairs of any Fashion.0

Wallace's advertisement of "Chairs of any Fashion" indicates that there were several acceptable styles, familiar to everyone, in use at that time.

With the influx of English craftsmen during the prosperous years of the French and Indian War in the 1760s, stylistic descriptions suddenly became more explicit and detailed, making it very clear that the Chippendale style had arrived in New York. In 1762, John Brinner, Cabinet and Chair-maker from London, advertised "Gothic and Chinese Chairs; all Sorts of plain or ornamental Chairs . . ."77 In 1773, John Cox, upholsterer, cabinet and chair-maker from London, advertised "sophas, settees, couches, burgairs, French elbow, gothic and rail back chairs . . . All finished in the newest Taste."78 It is obvious from these advertisements that London craftsmen considered the Chippendale style the "Newest Taste."

In contrast, the native craftsmen remained almost indifferent to stylistic considerations. Among the upholsterers, only Theodosius Fowler, in 1774, advertised that his work would be "finished in the genteelest and newest taste." Fowler's wares included "stuffed sophas, settees, couches, French elbow, easy, corner and backstool chairs."79 In 1775, Samuel Prince, one of the most prominent native cabinetmakers, adver-
A parcel of the most elegant furniture, made of mahogany, of the best quality, such as chest of drawers, chest upon chest, closet press, desks, desks and bookcases of different sorts, chairs of many different and new patterns, bureau tables, dining tables, breakfast tables, and other sorts of Cabinet work, very cheap.

As in earlier newspaper notices, the selling point was form and material rather than style. The only exception, "chairs of many different and new patterns," emphasizes variety rather than stylishness.

If these advertisements are indicative of the priorities of most New Yorkers, and therefore of the native craftsmen who knew them best, style seems to have been a minor consideration to be mentioned after material and workmanship, if at all. From the offers to make chairs of "any fashion" and the lack of emphasis on furniture in the "newest Taste," except among the English craftsmen, it appears that several styles coexisted in the two and one half decades preceding the Revolution, and, although one style was newer, all were acceptable to most New Yorkers.

Both the Queen Anne and the Chippendale styles continued to be made and used in New York well after the Revolution. In 1785, William Mooney, upholsterer, advertised "Sophas, Settees, Easy Chairs, French Elbow ditto, Backstool ditto, Common Mahogany ditto, Balloon ditto," implying that the balloon seat of the Queen Anne form was still readily available.
available. In an advertisement of 1787, Thomas Burling, cabinetmaker, illustrated, beside an elaborate ribbon back Chippendale chair, a two drawer slant top desk supported by a frame on plain, pad-footed, cabriole legs.®

New York was not alone in its stylistic attitudes. The 1768 list of prices that belonged to Benjamin Lehman of Philadelphia indicates that the Queen Anne chair was still an acceptable option for the citizens of that stylish city. Under the heading "chairs with Crooked Legs" he listed the following variations:

- Chairs with Plain feet & Banister with Leather Bottoms
- Do with claw feet
- Do with shells on the Knees & Front Rail
- Do with Leaves on the Knees
- Do for fluting or ogee Backs
- For relieving the Bannisters add according to the worth of them
- For extraordinary carved work add in Proportion

In Philadelphia, the craftsmen saw the distinguishing elements of the Chippendale as elaborations on a basic form that sounds suspiciously like a plain Queen Anne chair. There is no reason to believe that native New York craftsmen reacted any differently to changes in the cabriole form, even if their English bretheren, fresh from London, saw the matter differently.

The newspaper advertisements of the post 1750 period provide information about two other developments in the New York furniture industry that had important stylistic implications—the widespread availability of ready made furniture.
and the establishment of total service shops. Gilbert Ash, a native craftsman, was the first, in 1763, to advertise that he had "A parcel of ready made Chairs, Mahogany and Black Walnut, Mahogany Tea Tables, and dining Tables." Samuel Prince, in 1775, advertised "on Hand, for sale, A parcel of the most elegant furniture, made of mahogany of the very best quality" as well as "Orders for the West Indies, and elsewhere, completed on the shortest notice."

Thomas Burling, in an advertisement of 1787, explained the introduction of these pre-Revolutionary innovations:

Thomas Burling . . . has opened a Ware Room of Mahogany and other Furniture, on a more extensive plan than heretofore, and for the convenience of strangers and others, who may resort to or settle in this city, he means to keep an assortment where they may be supplied on the shortest notice; for it must hurt the feelings of every citizen to observe the daily impositions strangers are liable to, in purchasing new furniture at these public vendues.

The rapid expansion of the city in the two and one half decades before the Revolution created a situation which the furniture craftsmen sought to use to their advantage. The influx of new residents who needed to furnish their homes immediately lead to the production of ready made furniture. Furniture for export, venture cargo in search of a buyer, was a logical extension of the ready made trade, although evidence indicates that, except for the chairmakers, it remained a small scale business until after the Revolution. Isolated shipments
left Delaplaine's shop during the 1750s such as that to the
account of Capt. Scot Lawrence in 1753:

- to a pair of Mahogany Chest of draws £15.10.00
- to Cases for ditto 1.02.00
- to 1 Mahogany Dining Table 3.10.00
- to 1 Bilstel Do 1.12.00
- to Case for Do 0.10.00

The inclusion of cases indicates that the furniture was prob­
ably made to fill a special order from a customer outside
the colony such as the 1760 shipment to Alexander Scougall
of Maryland of a "Chair bed" worth £2.05.06.89

Windsor chairmakers were the most active exporters
before the Revolution. Thomas Ash's advertisement is typical:

Thomas Ash ... Makes and sells all kinds of
Windsor chairs ... he has now by him, and in­
tends keeping always a large quantity, so that
merchants, masters of vessels, and others, may
be supplied upon the shortest notice.90

The London craftsmen went well beyond the ready-made
offerings of the native craftsmen, and attempted to save their
customers the inconvenience of dealing with several crafts­
men by providing a full range of services in one shop in a
manner similar to the large cabinetmaking establishments of
London. In 1762, John Brinner, cabinetmaker and chairmaker
from London, advertised his shop:

Where every Article in the Cabinet, Chairmaking,
Carving and Gilding Business, is executed on the
most reasonable Terms, with the utmost neatness
and Punctuality ... N.B. He has brought over
from London Six Artificers; well skilled in the
above Branches.91
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By 1768, James Strachan, Carver and Gilder from London, had formed a partnership with David Davidson to provide the same range of services. They also opened a "Cabinet-Warehouse" where their products could be displayed and sold alongside their imported looking glasses, picture frames, girandoles, brackets, and table frames.92

The English upholsterers' business of the 1760s followed the same pattern as the cabinetmaker's. Joseph Cox, from London, advertised simply as an upholsterer when he first arrived in 1756, but by 1773, he had become an "Upholsterer, Cabinet and Chairmaker" providing a wide variety of bed furniture, drapes, upholsterers' seating forms, carved chairs, and cabinetwork. Like Cox, John Taylor, who arrived and advertised as an "Upholsterer and House-Broker from London" in 1768, had added the business of cabinetmaking by 1770.93

These multi-service establishments required the employment of many craftsmen and a division of labor within the shop. The profits were substantial. English master craftsmen became entrepreneurs within the furniture industry rather than engaging in the mercantile ventures open to native craftsmen like Delaplaine, Prince, and the Burlings. The prestigious English training which gave them an edge on the indigenous craftsmen when competing for the choice commissions within the trade worked to their disadvantage outside of it where religious and familial ties were paramount. This large shop or-
ganization did not appear among the native craftsmen until after the Revolution when businessmen/cabinetmakers/manufacturers like Duncan Phyfe made it common place.

There is no way to assess how extensive or influential the productions of the large shops were before the Revolution, since no bills or records of any kind survive for the English craftsmen. Because of the late date of establishment of the full service shops, their impact may not have been felt until the late 1780s when New York emerged as the major American furniture center. The preferences of the immigrant craftsmen for the Chippendale style made it readily available, and probably encouraged Queen Anne furniture to be relegated to the upper chambers of the most fashionable homes. The appearance of Rococo ornament on Queen Anne forms as well as their occurrence in post-Revolutionary newspaper advertisements, indicates that native craftsmen continued to make fine furniture in the Queen Anne style long after the introduction of the Chippendale.
ENDNOTES


2 Ibid., p. 761.

3 See Appendix II for a complete listing of furniture craftsmen.

4 There is evidence that each of these craftsmen was in some way connected with furniture production and there may have been more, especially among those simply listed in the records as joiners.

5 Freemen are listed in New-York Historical Society (NYHS), Burgers of New Amsterdamm and Freemen of New York 1675-1866, NYHS Collections 1888 (New York: NYHS, 1886). Since a man had to be a freeman or freeholder, defined as one who owned property valued at forty pounds or more, to vote or hold public office, those who held office but were never listed as freemen are assumed to be freeholders. George William Edwards, New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality (New York: Columbia University Press, 1917), p. 43.

6 Edwards, p. 85.

7 The English craftsmen who settled in New York after 1750 never became freemen although they were important figures in the furniture trade.

8 Edwards, p. 43.

9 They were John Brinner, cabinet and chairmaker who brought with him six skilled workers; James Strachan, carver, gilder, cabinet and chairmaker, and a total of seven upholsterers: Richard Bird, Stephen Callow, Joseph Cox, James Hirthwaite, George Rigby, John Taylor, and Blanch White.


11 Charles Montgomery attributes this general tendency throughout the colonies to the increasing population and expanding coastal markets. While these may have been factors in New York, the influence of the British was far more direct.


19 Sir Charles Hardy, bills, NYHS; Bill to the Common Council from John Bloom, May 1736, City Clerk Collection, Municipal Archives and Records, New York, N.Y.

20 James Beekman, receipt book, March 1753, NYHS; Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 116; Evert Bancker, bills, NYHS.

21 Quoted in Symonds, Furniture Making, p. 77.

22 James Beekman, receipt book, 1753, NYHS.

23 Evert Bancker, bills, NYHS.

Nicholas Barnard, John Brinner, Richard Davis, Stephen Dwight, Henry Hardcastle, Minshall, and James Strachan.

Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 127. Since Dwight advertised that he carved furniture, his former master Henry Hardcastle and his partner Richard Davis probably did also.

Ibid., p. 128.

Ibid., p. 127. Mr. Osborne was probably John Osborne. This reference could imply a working association with Osborne, or simply that Dwight was taking over a shop soon to be vacated.


Johnson, p. 49.

Joshua Delaplaine, daybook, Dalaplaine papers (DLP), NYHS.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 8 vols. (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905), 7:120, 98, 296. The Bridewell was New York's combination work house and poor house.

Bills, DLP. He was listed in Delaplaine's bills simply as Demilt, and also purchased chest locks, padlocks, bed screws, drops, and eschutheons from Delaplaine between 1722 and 1727. Anthony Demelt, mentioned as a chairmaker in a newspaper of 1758 (Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 112) is the only recorded craftsman with a name similar to Demilt. He may have begun his career as a joiner like Delaplaine and, with the increasing emphasis on specialization, become a chairmaker by 1758.

Evert Bancker, bills, NYHS.

Daybook, DLP.

F. Ashton DePeyster manuscripts, NYHS.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Among the commissions Carmer executed were: "Providing Sash Window Frames Glass &c. for the New Exchange," 1753 £40 (5:405), "further carrying on the Exchange abuilding," 1753 (5:45), and loaning the City £100 for which he received 7 interest in 1755 (6:23). In 1766 he requested under water rights to land off Rotten Row (7:37) and, according to an indenture between the city and Carmer in 1775, was allowed to rent the land from New York for £3.05.03 per annum, providing he maintained there a public wharf from which he retained all profits. (Box 8, New York City records, NYHS) His real estate ventures included deals like the 1743 sale of land on Manhattan to John Watts for £100. (DePeyster deeds, NYHS) He was elected collector of the South Ward in 1739 (4:468) having never registered as a freeman, therefore he had to be a freeholder worth at least £40 at the time.

Leake Papers, NYHS; DePeyster Paper, 6:4, NYHS; NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 186; Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 44.

Johnson, p. 30; Merchant's daybook, DLP. Bond, 1725, to Mary LeChevalier for £32, Bond 1726/27, to Deacons of Dutch Protestant Church of Bergen, East New Jersey for £50; Bond, 1727, to Jeremiah Williams of Hempstead on Nassau Island, merchant, for £226.

Bill of Lading, Winterthur; Bills, DLP; Johnson, p. 31.

DLP. Delaplaines's records are incomplete except for the years of his daybook, 1753-56, so the pattern of his craft relationships was probably much broader. Further information about these craftsmen can be found in Appendix II.

NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 52.

Ibid., p. 464.

Ibid., pp. 474, 484, 239.

The four were Francis Warne, 1718; Benjamin Lawrence, 1719; Nicholas Bellanger, 1720; William Jones 1724-5.
54 DLP, Memorandum, April 1725, regarding repairs to a house rented by Mary Glarson; Bond, Feb. 10, 1726/27 of Delaplaine to Deacons of Dutch Protestant Church of Bergen, East Jersey.

55 NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 118.

56 DLP, Letter to Joshua Delaplaine from Francis Warne, April 26, 1740. The letter was dated only Kingstown, but mentioned a "pat of tammarins" Warne was sending to Delaplaine. Tamarinds is a plant available in Jamaica whose flowers and leaves provide a mordant used in dyeing and whose fruit can be made into preserves or a laxative drink.

57 Daybook, receipts, DLP; NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 213.

58 NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 181; Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 116.

59 Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 127; Bills, DLP. See Johnson, Appendix J for a complete account of Osborne's account with Delaplaine. There is no documentary evidence that Osborne was ever Delaplaine's apprentice, but the pattern of their relationship makes it probable.

60 See Johnson, Appendix E, for a complete list of Delaplaine's accounts with Burling.

61 In 1738, Thomas Rigby appeared as a credit of £1.01.00 in Delaplaine's account with Burling, suggesting that he was an apprentice whose labor was hired out at that time.

62 Daybook, DLP; NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 185; List of those who returned muskets to the city of New York, 1775, McDougall Papers, Winterthur.

63 Susswein, Arts and Crafts, 1726-1776 pp. 110, 129.

64 NYHS, Abstracts of Wills, 17 vols., NYHS Collections 1892-1908 (New York: NYHS, 1893-1913), 8:127.

65 Nicholas Bellanger was probably Delaplaine's nephew (Johnson, p. 24) and Francis Warne wrote Delaplaine a letter in 1743 using the thee's and thou's of the Society of Friends.

66 Bills, DLP. In 1785, Burling advertised that he had served his time with Samuel Prince, and in 1789, he ad-
addressed the editor of the N.Y. Daily Gazette as "Friend M'Lean" and used the Quaker form of address in thanking the citizens of New York for their assistance in saving his home from fire. (Susswein, Arts and Crafts, 1777-1799, pp. 111-112) There is nothing to document any relationship between Edward and Thomas Burling, but Burling was a common name among New York Quakers and they may have been part of the same family.

67 Bills, DLP.

68 Johnson, p. 32; Account book of inventory of estate of William Beekman, Beekman Papers, NYHS; Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 115; Daybook, DLP; Jane Gilbert Account book, NYHS.

69 Bills, DLP.

70 Ibid. Many New Yorkers habitually used bilstel, walnut, and mahogany furniture interchangeably in the same room, but bilstel items always received a lower appraisal in inventories than comparable forms in walnut or mahogany.

71 Katherine Schuyler Baxter, A Godchild of Washington (New York: F. Tenneyson Neely, 1897), p. 291. Another example of this custom occurred in 1752 when Lewis Morris, a wealthy and influential lawyer, landowner, and Chief Justice of the N.Y. Supreme Court, wrote to Joshua Delaplaine who had executed several earlier commissions for him, announcing the death of his mother and then continuing that "She often Desired me in her Lifetime, That I would have you to Make her coffin." (Letters, DPL)

72 Daniel Gautier first appeared in the records in 1725/26 when he accepted an apprentice (NYHS, Indentures, p. 186); He became a freeman in 1730/31 (NYHS, Burgers and Freemen, p. 116) and died between 1739 when he made his will (NYHS, Abstracts of Wills, 4:149-50) and 1743 when Abraham DePeyster credited "Sundries to the Estate of Daniel Gautier" (Account book, Abraham DePeyster, NYHS). The records of the Common Council indicate that Gautier was familiar with the form since he made a table worth 6 shillings for them in 1733. (County Clerk Collection, Municipal Archives and Records)

73 Susswein, Arts and Crafts 1726-1776, p. 109.

74 Ibid., p. 113.

75 Ibid., p. 133.

76 Ibid., p. 119.
The situation was analogous to that which exists today, where chairs designed by Charles Eames, Mies van der Rohe, and Eero Sarriinen more than twenty years ago are still considered eminently fashionable and modern by all but the most avant-garde. While the art historian finds a world of difference between the chrome and leather Barcelona chair of 1929 and the molded plastic of Verner Panton's side chair of 1968, the average man sees them both as simply modern. Watered down versions of the 46 year old Barcelona chair appear more often in contemporary furniture stores than molded plastic chairs in the "newest Taste."
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CHAPTER III

THE QUEEN ANNE STYLE

In dealing with high style furniture in eighteenth century New York, the question of importation immediately arises since the source and degree of furniture importation at various periods had far reaching social and stylistic consequences. There is no information concerning the quantity of furniture imported from other colonies, but the records of the English Board of Trade provide a fairly reliable picture of England's furniture trade with New York and its neighboring colonies.

The export figures recorded by the Board of Trade (see Table 2) should be interpreted with discretion since they do not include the furniture brought by immigrants or the furniture ordered from English cabinetmakers directly by the colonists or their English representatives.¹ The values given for the exports are wholesale prices and do not include the cost of shipment or the retail mark-up added once the furniture reached the colonies. The term "upholstry ware" includes beds, mattresses, easy chairs, couches, and fabrics for curtains, wall hangings, and chair covers.² The available documents give only a total figure for goods exported to New

70

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1720-1729</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>Looking</td>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Upholstery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>Glasses</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>68 .002</td>
<td>780 .018</td>
<td>132 .003</td>
<td>65 .002</td>
<td>1,035 .024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.</td>
<td>331 .003</td>
<td>2,712 .026</td>
<td>81 .001</td>
<td>915 .009</td>
<td>4,039 .039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>90 .002</td>
<td>207 .005</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>78 .002</td>
<td>375 .009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740-1747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>126 .002</td>
<td>5 . .</td>
<td>433 .006</td>
<td>564 .008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>675 .004</td>
<td>11 . .</td>
<td>3,656 .022</td>
<td>4,342 .026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>123 .001</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>357 .003</td>
<td>480 .005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-1767</td>
<td>Cabinet</td>
<td>Upholstery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.</td>
<td>1,077 .008</td>
<td>9,318 .067</td>
<td>10,395 .074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E.</td>
<td>341 .002</td>
<td>3,914 .018</td>
<td>4,255 .019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa.</td>
<td>922 .004</td>
<td>4,749 .022</td>
<td>5,651 .027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all figures in pounds sterling
& consumption per individual in pounds sterling
England which is both a commentary on how the English viewed that group of independent minded, non-crown colonies and, through the mid-1740s, a reflection of reality. Until that time, most English goods used in New England entered through the port of Boston and were then dispersed through the other colonies. By 1745, however, New York had become a strong and increasingly successful competitor for markets in Connecticut and Rhode Island and continued to be the major source of English goods for northern New Jersey. Therefore, population figures for Massachusetts alone rather than for all of New England have been used to calculate consumption per individual in Table 2. This allows a more accurate analysis of importation patterns.

Looking glasses and upholstery wares were important retail trade commodities that were produced in the colonies only on a small scale and at a late date. The amount imported by Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania relative to population is therefore indicative of the prosperity of the colony and the extent of its inter-colonial trade. Since cabinetwares and clockcases were readily available from local craftsmen, and imported English examples were far more expensive, they were luxury items and their importation is an indication of both prosperity and the taste of the upper class.

A calculation of consumption per inhabitant for each colony during various periods shows that English imports were
of minimal importance in terms of overall consumption. Although furnishings were sparse by later standards, in 1720 most homes in New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania had the basic household necessities made by local craftsmen. Imported English furniture was significant because of the stylistic message it carried to local craftsmen and their patrons; it did not represent any real competition.

These calculations also allow a revealing comparison of the imports of each colony. Massachusetts clearly dominated New York and Pennsylvania through the mid-1740s. Between 1720 and 1729, as Massachusetts was moving toward a peak of prosperity and influence, it imported almost twice as much furniture as New York. New Yorkers, however, valued luxuries enough to import clockcases. All three colonies were still dependent upon England for chairs in the caned and carved William and Mary style prevalent in the colonies during the period.

About 1740, Massachusetts reached its peak as the most populous, prosperous, and sophisticated English colony in the New World and its imports reflect that position. None of the colonies imported chairs after 1740 because of the growing presence and acceptance of native craftsmen and because of the change in style from the light, inexpensive, readily exportable turned chairs of the William and Mary period to the heavier, more expensive chairs of the Queen .
Anne period whose mass export was not practical

By 1760, import patterns had changed dramatically. In both absolute and proportional terms, New York and Pennsylvania imported more than Massachusetts. New York imported more than twice as much as Pennsylvania per inhabitant, reflecting that colony's dominance of the Connecticut and Rhode Island markets formerly supplied by Massachusetts. The relatively large quantity of cabinetwares imported by New York between 1760 and 1767 is indicative of the prosperity of the city approaching its zenith about 1760, and of the continuing demand for English furniture by its upper class. Pennsylvania was as prosperous during this period, but in Philadelphia the leading families were far more likely to be supplied by local cabinetmakers, while New Yorkers in similar circumstances continued to look to England for their most impressive furnishings.¹

The preoccupation of New Yorkers with English furnishings is evident in the impact of English craftsmen, discussed in Chapter II, and in newspaper notices advertising vendue sales of English furniture where the items' English origin or recent importation from London was used as a major selling point. The following advertisement of 1763 is typical:

To be Sold, at Vendue, Sundry pieces of neat mahogany furniture, lately imported from London by, and was the property of the deceased Mr. James Morrison (one of the unfortunate Gentlemen who lately perished in crossing this bay) viz. A mahogany bookcase and drawers, in the neatest taste, finely ornamented; a mahogany bedstead, a mahogany
desk; genteel mirrors, mahogany chairs; a curious sett of pictures; &c. &c. Also a parcel of curious books.5

One major reason for New Yorkers' preference for English furniture was the presence of a royal governor who inevitably became the style setter for the increasingly cosmopolitan city. Most brought furnishings with them from England. Mrs. Anne Grant Logan, an English woman who lived with the Johannes Schuylers between 1755 and 1768, noted during the early years of her visit that "An expensive and elegant style of luxury had begun already to take place in New York; which was from the residence of the governor and commander in chief become the seat of a little court."6

The items listed in the 1755 bill from the London upholsterer, John Trotter, to Sir William Hardy, governor of New York, are indicative of the wealth of household furnishings brought by royal governors. Aside from numerous small items and eight bedsteads and furniture, the bill lists:

To two Mahogany French Elbow Chairs Stuffed in Canvass bordered and quilted & upon Casters with a Red & White Check Case to one and a Green & White Check Case to other £4.08.00

To 18 Mahogany Back Stool Chairs Stuffed in Canvass border'd and quilted with 12 Crimson and White Check Cases and 6 Green & White Check Ditto 22.10.00

To 24 Walnut Tree Chairs with open Backs Marlborough feet the Seats Stuffed in Canvass and Cover'd with black Spanish Leather and Brass Nailed 27.12.00
To 3 walnut Tree Chairs to match the above Chairs with Elbows to Ditto Brass Nailed £5.05.00

To a large Walnut Tree couch Stuffed with Curled Hair and covered with Black Spanish leather with a Squab bolster and two pillows quilted / felted and Brass Nailed & finished in the best manner 12.15.00

To two very Neat Walnut Tree Card Tables Cover'd wth Green Cloth 5.10.00

To a neat Mahogany Solid Desk and Book Case with panel'd doors with pigeon holes in Ditto letter'd 10.00.00

To a Neat Mahogany pillar and Claw fire Screen mounted with India paper 1.02.00

To 3 pier Glass's the frames carved & Finished in the White 11.05.00

To a Chimney Glass Carved frame finished in the White 5.10.00

To a Mahogany Writing table upon Casters 5.10.00

The furnishings imported by other prestigious immigrants were also influential. Of particular interest is the £700 worth of furniture brought by Susan Fox Strangeway O'Brien in 1764, which included items valued at £240 from the workshops of Thomas Chippendale. When the young widow, Mary Provoost, married James Alexander, a recent English immigrant, in 1721, their new home reflected their combined wealth. A grandson later described it:

It contained apartments innumerable, sumptuously furnished in all the pomp of that period. There was the great dining room and the lesser dining room, the room hung with blue and gold leather, the green and gold room, and the little front parlor and the little back parlor, and the great tapestry room upstairs, besides red rooms and
green rooms and chintz rooms upstairs and down, furnished with damask hangings, costly carpets, and buffets furnished with costly plate.  

Mary Alexander's will of 1756 left:

To Daughter, Catherine Parker, One Dozen and four Crimson Damask chairs the Crimson Damask Window Curtains in the Dining Room . . . to Susannah . . . twelve chairs with Yellow Bottoms the five pair of Window Curtains . . . in the Room Hung with Blew and Gilt Leather.

England was not the only source of furniture imported into New York. A scattering of documents and surviving examples indicates that Boston, Newport, and Philadelphia all contributed furniture to New York homes. In 1749, Henry Lloyd of the Manor of Queens Village on Long Island had his son, Henry Lloyd II of Boston, order the following for delivery to the manor:

12 Chair Frames at 6  £72.00.00
1 Ditto round about  9.00.00
13 seats stuffing and Covering at 48 31.04.00

Three years later, Henry Lloyd II shipped another dozen chairs for Mr. Willis of Stamford. In 1762, John Rowe of Boston sent a mahogany table and desk to David VanHorne of New York, his friend and business associate. VanHorne appreciated the gift and possibly saw some commercial potential in the furniture since he wrote Rowe in 1769 requesting that he send more mahogany desks and tables. Rowe replied, however, that George Mills, the cabinetmaker,

is gone from hence Sometime in the Service of the Government but at what place I cannot exactly tell, so there is no hope of Getting any Mahogany
Tables or Desks on acct of that not till he
Returns and I fear but Little or nothing when
he does, he is very Poor has no stock nor I
believe and tools, however I'll keep a look
out for him—& get anything I can for you.13

Long Island was largely settled by New Englanders who maintained
strong ties with Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts,
so Lloyd's Boston connections are not unexpected. David
VanHorne's request could be an isolated incident, but the use
of furniture as venture cargo to the southern colonies and the
West Indies was a common practice among merchants like VanHorne.

An entry of 1763 in Samuel Gifford's account book for
the ship "William and Mary" lends further credence to the prob-
ability that New York merchants used the furniture of other
colonies as venture cargo. The ship's master, anchored in
Havana Harbor, took aboard two clocks from the ship "Chance"
whose last port-of-call was Providence, and entered in his ac-
count book: "Sail of 2 Clocks on Acct of Mr. John Franklin,
Merchant in New York." Nine days later he sold the clocks to
Don Sebastian Peneiber at £100 apiece. After paying duties,
freight portage, and his own commission, he credited Franklin's
account £176.04.00.14

Joshua Delaplaine, the New York cabinetmaker, was
selling furniture for his fellow Newport Quaker, Christopher
Townsend. The earliest recorded incident occurred in 1745
when Delaplaine debited Townsend for "selling, fitting and
delivering according to agreement 2 desks £0.10.16" and then
credited him "by ye produce ye mahogany desk £6.05.00" and "by ye maple ditto £2.05.00." On the bottom of the bill which also lists the purchase of foodstuffs, is penned the note:

Respected frd. C. Townsend
Pursuant to thy request have sold and bought ye above mentioned. Hope it may be to satisfaction. I have been offered but 30/ for ye tea table and thought it too little.15

On March 20, 1746, Christopher Townsend wrote the following receipt for a commission administered by Delaplaine:

Rec'd of John Freebody the sum of Sixty one Pounds in ful for One Case of Draws & one tea table of Mahogany made for Mr. Thos Moone of New York, Merch C/L 16

Other important examples of Newport craftsmanship belonged to the VanCortlandt family of VanCortlandt Manor at Croton-on-Hudson. Pierre VanCortlandt, who lived in the manor between 1750 and 1814, ordered six mahogany Chippendale chairs for the dining room from Goddard of Newport.17 Although most of the furniture used at the manor was made in New York, the family furnishings also include a Chippendale style Philadelphia dressing table and an English Queen Anne chair. The varied origin of these furnishings is indicative of the mixture found in most upper class New York homes in the eighteenth century. Another branch of the VanCortlandt family owned a Philadelphia Queen Anne chair presently in the collection of the Boston Museum of Fine Art and the same collection includes another Philadelphia Queen Anne chair with a long history in the Wheelock family of New York.
The presence of this variety of English, Boston, Newport, and Philadelphia examples in New York indicates that New York cabinetmakers and their patrons had a broad range of stylistic interpretations from which to borrow ideas for their own furniture. One group of New York furniture exhibits marked similarities to Rhode Island examples, but the major source of inspiration was the furniture of the English middle class. This group included the prosperous merchants with whom New York merchants traded and to whom they often entrusted personal orders for imported furniture. The English middle class was also the source of many of the officers who served in New York during King George's War (1740-48) and the French and Indian War (1756-63). These officers brought with them a knowledge of what was considered fashionable in middle class English homes and they disseminated this information among their eager colonial hosts.

English furniture historians have given the Queen Anne (or, in English usage, the George I) style little scholarly attention. Its ascendancy as a leading furniture style was brief; most of the men who produced it remain anonymous, and in the homes of the nobility it was rapidly overshadowed by William Kent's lavish baroque-classicism. The middle class, however, preferred the simpler lines of the George I style and continued to use it although various Kentian motifs such as lion heads, claw and ball feet, and ancanthas leaves replaced
earlier decorative motifs. The basic form also assumed some Kentian characteristics such as double reverse curve back stiles. This period of furniture is known to English furniture historians as the George II style and it furnished the homes of the English middle class through the mid-eighteenth century. It consistently appears in scenes of domestic interiors painted by Hogarth, Arthur Davis, and Joseph Highmore and on the trade cards of English cabinetmakers. 18

Figure 2 illustrates an early eighteenth century, c. 1715, English chair in the George I style. It is similar to those produced in Massachusetts and to a much lesser extent, Philadelphia. This form remained popular in New England throughout the first half of the eighteenth century while Philadelphia, with some later English inspiration, evolved a more sinuous, curvilinear interpretation. New York adopted and popularized a somewhat later version of the English style, the George II style. Figures 3-5 illustrate typical English examples that incorporate forms and motifs found in New York chairs. Boston and Philadelphia found little inspiration in this style of English furniture, but New York used it almost exclusively through the mid-eighteenth century after which it co-existed with closely related Chippendale forms until well after the Revolution.

Because the Queen Anne and Chippendale styles are so closely related in New York, the division between these two
variations of the pervasive cabriole style is often rather arbitrary. This similarity is particularly evident in unupholstered chairs. Aside from the shaping of the crest rail and the piercing of the splat, many examples are interchangeable in form, ornament, and overall conception. The Queen Anne style spans the broader period of production (1730-1780); its introduction was totally dependent upon imported examples and immigrant craftsmen rather than on design books, and the great majority of New York Chippendale chairs never escaped from the original Queen Anne aesthetic as it developed in New York. The Queen Anne style chair has, therefore, been chosen for discussion here as the most revealing example of eighteenth New York furniture production. The division between Queen Anne and Chippendale style chairs is made here only to allow this paper to focus on a reasonably limited number of related objects. Queen Anne chairs are defined as those cabriole chairs that have a solid splat and crest rails which flow into the back stiles in a continuous curve.

The chair is one of the commonest forms that has survived from eighteenth century New York but it presents certain problems for the furniture historian trying to analyse it. Compared to case furniture, construction details are minimal. Only one basic joint, the blind mortise and tenon, was commonly used in the colonies except in Philadelphia where the open mortise and overlapping knee joint provide im-
mediately identifiable characteristics. Corner blocks are often replaced or entirely absent and secondary woods are minimal or nonexistant. The regionalization and grouping of eighteenth century American chairs is therefore usually based on less tangible characteristics with only a few firmly documented examples in each area to anchor almost countless attributions.

New York chairs present a few additional problems of their own. Aside from the Metropolitan Museum of Arts's "Loan Exhibition of New York State Furniture" in 1934 and a spate of articles in The Magazine Antiques at about the same time, New York furniture has received little scholarly attention. There are no signed or documented examples in the Queen Anne style and very few in the Chippendale style. Provenance and process of elimination have been the main tools of attribution. The products of Philadelphia, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island have always been more collectible and have therefore received more attention and study from dealers and collectors.

This dearth of documented examples has created two major attribution problems... One was stated by Ben Ginsberg twenty years ago and the situation has changed little since then.

The present level of our knowledge does not allow us to separate form the city's production the considerable heritage of furniture from Long Island,
the shores of the Hudson, and Albany. Perhaps some of it came from Manhattan via the great waterway, but surely not all. Yet it displays a remarkable consistency.19

The seasonal movement of families from country manor to city residence as well as the intricate web of intermarriage that blanketed the entire colony makes it almost impossible to separate upstate productions. A New York Chippendale chair in the collection of Colonial Williamsburg stamped P V R for Philip VanRensselaer of Cherry Hill in Albany is also signed "Ro Ray" on the top of the front left leg projection inside the seat rail. Robert and Richard Ray ran a lucrative dry goods business in New York City and sent regular shipments of goods up the Hudson River to merchants like Robert Sanders and Philip VanRensselaer. Yet Albany was a prosperous city and, by the decade of the Revolution, boasted several competent cabinetmakers. Long Island was a diverse and, as yet largely unstudied subculture. Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New York met there culturally and stylistically and the relationship of the furniture produced there to that produced on Manhattan remains unknown.

Rhode Island presents the second major attribution problem. Authorities form Helen Comstock to Benjamin Ginsburg and Albert Sack have noted the extraordinary similarity of certain New York and Rhode Island examples. Several chairs included in this catalogue and discussed as part of Group C have been attributed to Rhode Island in the past, but they
are indistinguishable from examples traditionally attributed to New York. A thorough re-evaluation of this entire New York-Rhode Island group is badly needed.

In spite of attribution problems, there are several features common to most New York and New York-Rhode Island Queen Anne chairs. Most have claw and ball feet that display various degrees of expertise in carving. Only the very blocky, square version found on some Chippendale forms, most notably the VanRensselaer tassel and ruffle diamond back chairs (c. 1764) is not found on any Queen Anne chair. The most notable exceptions to the claw and ball norm are those with beaded trifid feet. This feature is common to some English chairs, but is found only in New York and possibly Rhode Island on this side of the Atlantic. The only examples with pad feet are in the questionable New York-Rhode Island group. Horseshoe seats with tapered interior shaping are universal with one exception (fig. 33). Stretchers are rare and often limited to a single turned stretcher between the rear legs. The rear legs are usually gracefully rounded and end in a small square or disc shaped foot. The back stiles are usually pieced and the splat is almost always seated in the shoe rather than passing behind it to be secured directly into the rear seat rail.

A few features, including the beaded trifid foot, are found almost exclusively in New York although they are not
common to all New York chairs. Double reverse curve back stiles (found in Groups A and B of the Catalogue) and the bulbous, ginger jar shaped splats (found in Group A of the Catalogue) are typical of many New York chairs. Volute shaped knee brackets, veneered splats, and cupids bow moldings at the base of the splats are also peculiar to New York. These features were taken directly from the English George II style eschewed by the other colonies.

Beyond these common stylistic elements is considerable diversity of detail that is best analysed by dividing New York's chairs into four groups and discussing each group separately.

Group A Figures 5-15

This group contains the "classic" New York Queen Anne chairs and is the most consistent in style and construction. Exclusive to it are the bulbous, ginger jar splats that follow the shaping of the double reverse curve back stiles. Unlike the back stiles of the chairs in Group B, the lower curve of these stiles is rounded rather than squared and follows the convex curve in the lower part of the splat. With the exception of figure 9, all the splats of the chairs in this group terminate in a shoe with a cupids bow molding and have volute shaped knee brackets. All the chairs examined have remarkably similar dimensions, falling within a range of 3/4" in both overall and width measurements taken at specific points on
their spalts and back stiles. A significant majority of those examined also share the following construction characteristics (exceptions are noted in parentheses):

1. Shoes are one piece with the back seat rail rather than being formed from a separate piece of wood. (fig. 12, 13)

2. The volute shaped knee brackets are only half the width of the seat rail and are attached to crudely shaped pieces of wood which are sometimes dovetailed into the front legs. Figures 12, 15, and 16 are definitely constructed in this manner. Others maybe, but the tightness of construction often made this point difficult to determine. (fig. 13, 14)

3. The rear responds are cyma curves composed of two pieces of wood, the upper applied with the grain running horizontally and the lower with the grain running vertically.

4. Corner blocks that are either old or original are triangular like those found in New England chairs. (fig. 9, 10, 12)

5. Splats are veneered, often on a secondary wood. Only one chair outside this group, figure 23, has a veneered splat. (fig. 6, 7, 9, 12)

6. The back seat rail is made of the primary wood.

7. Pegging patterns (number and placement) should be significant construction features, but the available sample of chairs was too small for any conclusive pattern to emerge. There are two possible groupings. Figures 9, 10, and 12 each had one peg in the side of the rear leg and two, one at each side, of each front leg. Figures 8, 13, 15, and 16 each had two
pegs in the side of the rear leg but exhibited varying peg patterns in the front leg. Figure 11 has no original pegs and figure 14 has one peg in the side of the rear leg and none in the front.

The ornamental features exhibited by the chairs in this group are also remarkably consistent. Of those that have claw and ball feet, all except figures 11 and 13, exhibit the same deplorable carving. Their heavy globular talons and drooping webs flow around a slightly flattened sphere. This type of foot appears only once (fig. 30) outside this group. Ironically, Group A also includes the most spectacular carving found on New York Queen Anne chairs—the pierced crest rail composed of a shell supported by acanthas leaves or strapwork, figures 11, 12, 13, and 14. The details of the design are almost identical on three of the four examples although the execution of the carving varies. This feature does not appear outside Group A.

Less demanding crest rail ornamentation, consisting of a broad, rather flacid shell resting on a scroll, is more common in Group A. Except for figure 8, which is more plastic and three-dimensional, all the shells in this group exhibit a linear, two-dimensional quality produced by carving the lobes at flat alternating depths. Of the three chairs in this catalogue with crest rail carving composed of a shell flanked by slender tendrils of flowers and leaves, two, figures 15 and 16,
are in this group.

All the chairs in this group exhibit shells, with or without scrolls and husks, carved on their knees except figures 9 and 10. These are also the only two chairs in this group with beaded trifid feet, but the similarity ends there. Figure 10, with its veneered splat and cupids bow shoe, is similar to the other chairs in the group. Figure 9 is, in almost every respect, the exception to the norm.

**Group B Figures 17-22**

Like the chairs in Group A, the chairs in Group B have been consistently attributed to New York. They are characterized by similar double reverse curve back stiles but the lower curve, in conformity with the narrow waisted urn shaped splat it reflects, is squared rather than rounded. All the chairs have horseshoe shaped seats and claw and ball feet. Only two, figures 17 and 19, have splats that terminate in cupids bow moldings. No chairs in this group have stretchers. Those examined have very similar dimensions both overall and in width measurements taken at selected points across their splats and back stiles. They exhibit the following common construction characteristics (exceptions are enclosed in parentheses):

1. The knee brackets are either volute shaped or small carved scrolls that are only half the width of the seat rail. They are backed with a crudely shaped piece of wood which is some-
times dovetailed horizontally into the front legs.

2. The rear responds are one piece and shaped as quarterrounds. (Figure 18 has a one piece cyma curve.)

3. Corner blocks which are old or original are one or two piece quarter rounds similar to those found in Philadelphia chairs.

4. The shoe is a separate piece of wood from the rear seat rail.

5. The rear seat rail is often composed of a secondary wood, usually oak, cherry, or maple. (Figure 20 is made entirely of cherry.)

6. There are two pegs in the side of the rear leg and none in the front leg. (Figure 17 has four in each front leg that appear to be repairs.)

This group of chairs also shares several common ornamental features. Unlike the chairs in Group A, the claw and ball feet tend to be moderately well carved. Most have a sinuous though rather flacid quality and no webs. The claws on figures 18 and 22 are blockier and grasp the ball more firmly with more convincing, better defined knuckles than those of the other chairs in the group.

Except for figure 18, the shells and foliage that ornament the crest rails of the chairs in this group do not protrude above the crest rail. The line of the crest rail extends upward in a smooth line that totally contains the
bas-relief carving. The forms of the shells and foliage vary, but all exhibit a lighter, freer, more rococo treatment than the disciplined baroque shells and foliage in Group A. Two chairs in Group B, figures 17 and 18, exhibit carving on the edges of their splats in a flower and foliage motif closely related to the ornamentation on their crest rail and knees.

Except for figures 21 and 22, the chairs in this group have typically Chippendale style ancanthas leaf carving on their knees. Figures 17 and 18 are unusual in their use of a small stylized flower on their knee brackets and in the arrangement of the ancanthas leaves on their knees which flow both up and down from a central point on the knee. The carving on the chairs in this group, except for that on figure 22, has a flat two-dimensional quality that adds unobtrusive, linear definition to the dominant form. The small stylized flowers and bas-relief crest rail also appear on some late Philadelphia Queen Anne chairs. Two of the chairs in this group, figures 20 and 22 also have Philadelphia type "stump" rear legs. Figure 22 is probably an upstate chair from the Albany area and is therefore heavier in construction and plainer in detail than the other chairs in this group.

Group C Figures 23-30

This group of chairs is the least consistent in construction and design of the three major groups of New York
Queen Anne chairs. Several illustrated here have been attributted to Rhode Island while others, almost identical in design, have been attributted to New York. All those included here have characteristics that make New York a reasonable regional attribution, but equally strong arguments can be made for Rhode Island in many cases.

All the chairs in this group have single reverse curve back stiles and vase shaped splats that bulge outward at the base before decending into the shoe. This lower curve is similar to the protrusion at the base of the splats in Group A, but none of the splats in Group C terminate in a cupids bow molding. Most chairs in this group have shaped seat rails, unveneered splats, and cyma curve shaped knee brackets. A greater percentage of them have stretchers than the chairs in Groups A or B.

They exhibit the following common construction characteristics (exceptions are noted in parantheses):
1. The knee brackets are almost as wide as the seat rail and have no backing blocks.
2. The shoe is a separate piece of wood from the seat rail.
3. Corner blocks, when they are old or original, are triangular like those commonly found in New England chairs. (Figures 28 and 29 have unusual corner blocks that do not relate to any common pattern.)
4. The side and rear peg patterns vary, but these chairs have
two pegs in each front leg, one on each side. (fig. 28)

5. Rear responds are formed by the shaping of the seat rail rather than by applied pieces of wood. (fig. 24, 28)

6. The rear seat rail is made of the primary wood. (fig. 29)

The ornamental features of this group of chairs exhibit no consistent pattern. The two chairs in this catalogue with pad feet (fig. 26 and 27) are part of this group as is one of the three chairs with beaded trifid feet (fig. 23). The execution of the carving of the claw and ball feet includes at least one example from each of the types previously mentioned—the heavy, globular, low webbed feet that dominate Group A (fig. 30), the sinuous but flacid examples that dominate Group B (fig. 24 and 28), and an example of the blockier, firmer type found in that same group (fig 25). The slender, superbly carved claws of figure 29 are unique among the chairs illustrated here and more akin to those found on Rhode Island examples.

The shell and scroll ornamentation found on the crest rails of several chairs in this group (fig. 24, 25, 27, 28, 29) resembles that found on the chairs in Group A, but these shells have a tighter, more plastic quality. Only the shell in figure 27 exhibits the broad, two dimensional quality associated with the classic New York examples. Three chairs in this group have shell and foliage ornamentation on their crest rails (fig. 23, 26, 30). Although the shells on figures 26
and 50 protrude above the crest rail, the design of the carving resembles that found on the chairs in Group B. The shell and tendril design on the crest rail of figure 23 is similar to that on figures 15 and 16 in Group A. This chair is also closely related to the chairs in Group A by two other features—it is the only chair outside that group that has a veneered splat and beaded trifid feet.

The design of the carved shells that ornament the knees of the chairs in this group is varied and presents no pattern. Only one chair, figure 25, has ancanthas carving on its knees, executed in a flat, primitive manner and surrounded by a row of punch work. This is also the only chair in the catalogue that has a beaded outer edge on its back stiles and crest rail.

Of the five chairs in the catalogue that have "H" shaped stretchers, four are in this group (fig. 23, 26, 27, 30). Two have medial stretchers that terminate in blocks and two have medial stretchers that terminate in turned cones. It has been theorized that all New York medial stretchers end in blocks rather than cones, but there is little substantiation for this. Massachusetts and Rhode Island chairs exhibit both kinds of terminals and there are too few solidly attributed New York chairs with stretchers to establish any reliable pattern. Two chairs with medial stretchers that terminate in a cone, figures 26 and 27, also have pad feet and the same
rear leg treatment, but other design elements differ significantly. Aside from the shaping of the medial stretcher, figures 26 and 30 are closely related in design. Of the three chairs in this catalogue with beaded trifid feet (fig. 9, 10, and 23) two, figures 9 and 23 have stretchers. On both chairs the medial stretcher terminates in a block, but the design of the other stretcher turnings as well as the chairs themselves is unrelated.

Group D Figures 31-33

The chairs in this group are leftovers that have little in common with the other chairs in this catalogue except New York attributions. The shaping of the splat and rounded back stiles of figure 33 is closely related to that of some Connecticut Valley examples, but the unusual shop slipper feet are more commonly found on examples of upstate New York furniture. Until a more thorough study is made of the eighteenth century furniture produced in upstate New York, no firm attribution is possible.

The chairs in figures 31 and 32 are closely related from the seat rail down. The sinuous, detailed, skillfully carved claws of the front feet are the finest found on any New York chairs. The front legs are boldly undercut at the knee and gracefully shaped throughout. The slender rear legs of both terminate in delicate undercut pad feet and the seats of both have unusually broad and generous proportions. Above the
seat, the differences in design and carving are evident. Each is, at this time, a unique example.

Figure 32 and the four other known examples from this set have been carefully analysed by many scholars who have come to no firm conclusion. Although the cypher carving of the splat and the interior cross ties suggest an English origin, the secondary woods, overall design, and family history favor a New York attribution. Except for figure 31, no other chair combines the double reverse curve back stiles of Group A with the vase shaped splat of Group C. The design of the shell on the crest rail and the shaping of the knee brackets and rear responds is unique. The chair was not available for examination so it was impossible to determine if any of the unusual features are later restorations.

New York's chairs do not invite a facile, succinct stylistic interpretation. Their division into well defined groups with consistent stylistic features indicates that New York, unlike Philadelphia, did not develop a single regional style which then evolved with time and changing English styles. The evidence of the chairs indicates that New York cabinetmakers were fragmented into three major groups. Stylistically, the chairs in Group A are earlier than those in Group B, and the evidence indicates that the men who made the chairs in Group A did not make the chairs in Group B. The details of construction and carving, especially the claw and
ball feet, differ too sharply. The chairs in Group A are almost direct copies of English examples like the chair in figure 3 while those in Group B exhibit more freedom in their use of English sources (fig. 4, 5) and a decided hint of Philadelphia's influence.

Many New York Chippendale chairs were originally attributed to Philadelphia including the infamous Gilbert Ash chair now at Winterthur. Since that reattribution, the differences between New York and Philadelphia furniture have been strongly emphasized, but the similarities that lead to the original confusion are still present and should not be ignored in evaluating New York furniture. Philadelphia was the leading commercial center of the colonies by 1760 and it continued to grow prosperous while New York declined after 1765. There is no documentation that Philadelphia influenced New York furniture, but visual evidence and historical fact suggest this possibility.

The close resemblance of many New York chairs to documented Rhode Island examples suggests a more concrete connection. The documented relationship between New York and Newport's Quaker craftsmen and the similarity of many Newport chairs to those in Group C indicates that the chairs in Group C are probably the product of Quaker craftsmen working in either New York or Newport. There is no documentary evidence that the Burling-Delaplaine-Prince group of New York cabinet-
makers are responsible for any chairs in Group C, but the circumstantial evidence strongly suggests this possibility. If this theory is correct and New York paralleled Rhode Island's development, the production of this group of chairs spans the entire period from 1730 to 1780.

The fact that the chairs in Group A are so closely related in both style and construction suggests that they were made by a closely related group of craftsmen. The fact that they evolved so little stylistically suggests that they were, essentially, copies of a few available examples made during a limited period of time. Yet there are more surviving examples of this style of chair than any other. The facts indicate, therefore, that this style of chair was made during a period of prosperity before the Chippendale style was popularized and before many New Yorkers cared enough to demand the latest English furnishings for their parlors. The earlier years of New York's boom, 1740-1755, fulfill these requirements. Some of the chairs in this group were undoubtably made later, but the most spectacular examples, especially those with pierced crest rails, were produced during this period.

There are, unfortunately, no specific craftsmen or groups of craftsmen to whom Groups A and B can be attributed. There are no surviving apprenticeship records for the period after 1727, and no collection of a craftsman's papers that,
like Delaplaine, defines a group of craftsmen who worked together. Detailed genealogical probing into the origins and relationships of individual craftsmen would probably yield the necessary evidence for establishing these groups, but such a time consuming task is beyond the scope and purpose of this paper. A careful analysis of Chippendale style chairs and of the tables and case furniture for the entire period might also yield further information.

New York was not a pre-Revolutionary style center in the same sense as Philadelphia or even Boston. It did not develop a cohesive regional style but remained fragmented and heavily dependent on other style centers for inspiration. Although this fact makes New York's furniture somewhat less interesting aesthetically, New York's vulnerability also makes it an ideal laboratory to study the effect of social and economic trends on furniture styles.
FIG. 1. New York (1730-1743) Sleepy Hollow Restorations. This cherry table is branded "D G" in several places on the stretchers and may have been made by Daniel Gautier.
FIG 2. England (c. 1705) This George I chair is similar in design to the chairs in Group C.
FIG. 3. England (c. 1725)  
This George II chair is extremely similar in design to the chairs in Group A.
FIG. 4, England (c. 1730)\textsuperscript{25} This George II chair has many design elements that later appeared on New York chairs in Group B.
FIG. 5. England (c. 1730-35)26 This George II chair has many design elements that later appeared on New York chairs in Group B.
Provenance: none
(L5234) Chairs from same set in New York State History
Collection, Albany, N.Y. (70.27.1)
Woods:  walnut frame, white pine corner blocks, maple slip
seat, splat veneered on poplar.
Dimensions:  height 38 $\frac{1}{4}$", width 21$\frac{3}{4}$", height seat 15 3/4"
Provenance: One example from this set descended in the Roose­
velt family and another in the family of N.Y. governor Joseph
C. Yates of Albany (1768-1837).27
Woods: mahogany frame, pine slip seat
Dimensions: height 37 7/8", width 21 1/4". seat height 16 1/8"
Provenance: none
FIG. 10. New York (1740-55) Winterthur Museum (52.140)
Woods: walnut frame
Dimensions: height 38 1/8", width 21 7/8", seat height 16 1/2"
Provenance: none
Woods: walnut frame, pine corner blocks, maple slip seat, splat veneered on maple.
Dimensions: height 38½", width 22', seat height 15 3/4"
Fig. 12. New York (1740-55) Winterthur Museum (63.615.1)
Woods: walnut frame
Dimensions: height 38 1/2", width 21 7/8", seat height 16 1/4"
Provenance: none

Woods: walnut frame, white pine corner blocks, red gum slip seat

Dimensions: height 39½", width 26¼", seat height 16½"

Provenance: Made for the Stephanus VanCortlandt house in Manhattan.29
FIG. 14. New York (1740-55) Photo courtesy of John S. Walton Antiques, Inc. Another chair from the same set in Winterthur Museum (63.615.21)

Woods: walnut frame, pine corner blocks, splat veneered on pine

Dimensions: height 38½", width 21 7/8", seat height 16½"

Provenance: none
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FIG. 15. New York (1740-55) Brooklyn Museum (68.182.1-2) .
Other chairs from same set in Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and Deerfield Village, Mass.
Woods: walnut frame, poplar seat, new corner blocks
Dimensions: height 38 1/4", width 15 5/8", seat height 15 3/4"
Provenance: Belonged to Boston merchant Col. Henry Bromfield and Margaret (Fayerweather) Bromfield who were married in 1749.31
Woods: walnut frame, secondary woods unknown
Dimensions: height 38½", width 20¼", seat height 16"
Provenance: One of a set of twelve that descended from Radcliffe Baldwin of New York, 32
FIG. 17 New York (1755–80) Van Cortlandt House, Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Tarrytown, N.Y. (Y.C. 52.186)
Wood: mahogany frame, cherry back rail, poplar slip seat, pine and red gum corner blocks
Dimensions: height 38 7/8", width 22 1/2", seat height 16 1/4"
Provenance: The chair was sold at auction to Ginsburg and Levy in 1934 by Harry Arons who had purchased it from A. F. Jones of Garden City, Long Island.33
(40.100.1-2) Other chairs from same set in Winterthur Museum
(56.31.1-2) and Van Cortlandt Manor, Sleepy Hollow Restorations,
Tarrytown, N.Y.
Woods: mahogany frame, cherry back rail, white oak and cherry
slip seat, pine and mahogany corner blocks
Dimensions: 38 5/8", width 22½", seat height 16 3/4"
Provenance: Descended in family of Marinus Willet, New York
cabinetmaker and merchant (see Appendix II) who married Anne
Pearsey, daughter of his partner William.34
FIG. 19 New York (1755-80) Winterthur Museum (52.232)
Woods: mahogany frame, maple back rail, red oak slip seat
Dimensions: height 32", width 22", seat height 16½"
Provenance: none
FIG. 20. New York (1755-80) Photo courtesy Israel Sack, Inc.
Woods: cherry frame, cherry slip seat, pine corner blocks
Dimensions: height 39¼", width 22 5/8", seat height 17"
Provenance: none

Provenance: none
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Woods: mahogany frame, secondary woods unknown
Dimensions: height 38 3/4", width 22 1/2", seat height 16 3/4"
Provenance: Descended in family of General Philip Schuyler (1733-1804) who married Catherine VanRensselaer in 1755 and built his mansion in Albany, "The Pastures," in 1761.37
FIG. 23. New York (1740–60) Museum of the City of New York (53.150.8) Other chairs from same set in Winterthur Museum (52.66.1-2)
Woods: walnut frame, poplar corner blocks, maple slip seat, spalt veneered on maple
Dimensions: height 39\(\frac{1}{2}\)", width 22", seat height 17 3/8"
Provenance: Owned by family of Flushing, Long Island
FIG. 24. New York-Rhode Island (1730-80) Photo courtesy of Israel Sack, Inc. Chair from set in Metropolitan Museum of Art (58.154)

Woods: mahogany frame, pine corner blocks, maple slip seat
Dimensions: height 40 1/2", width 22 1/4", seat height 16 1/2"
Provenance: none
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Provenance: none
FIG. 27. New York–Rhode Island (1755–80) Garvin Collection, Yale University (1930.2712)
Woods: walnut frame, pine corner blocks, maple and birch slip seat
Dimensions: height 39 3/8", width 21 7/8", seat height 17 1/8"
FIG. 28. New York-Rhode Island (1755-80) Henry Ford Museum (73.75.2)

Woods: walnut or mahogany frame, secondary woods unknown

Dimensions: height 40", width 20½", seat height 17"

FIG. 22. New York-Rhode Island (1755-30) Albany Institute of History and Art, Albany, N.Y.
Woods: walnut frame, red oak back rail and slip seat
Dimensions: height 38 5/5", width 21 3/4", seat height 16"
Provenance: Purchased from Israel Sack, Inc. who attributed it to New York
Woods: walnut or mahogany frame, secondary woods unknown
Dimensions: height 40", width 20", seat height 17"
Provenance: none
Provenance: none
FIG. 33. New York or Connecticut Valley (1740-80) Winterthur Museum (58.961)
Woods: cherry frame, pine corner blocks, new slip seat
Dimensions: height 39\(\frac{1}{4}\)", width 22 3/8", seat height 17"
Provenance: none
1 Although family collections in New York have been widely dispersed, there are several surviving examples of English furnishings that descended in New York families. A Queen Anne arm chair presently at Van Cortlandt Manor at Croton-on-Hudson descended in the Beck family until Catherine Beck married into the Van Cortlandt family in 1836. In 1753, Lt. Gov. James Delancey imported a japanned secretary bookcase made in the English Queen Anne style of 1710, which now belongs to the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art. When Philip Schuyler was in London on business in 1761, he ordered £900 worth of furnishings for his new home, the Pastures, at Albany. (Schuyler Papers, New York Public Library)


3 Ibid., p. 160; See Appendix I for documentation and complete population statistics.

4 See Chapter I for a thorough discussion of the economic development of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York and its effect on furniture production and styles.


7 NYHS. Although there is no specific reference in the bill to shipment to New York, the bill itemizes packing and crating materials, labor for packing, and the hire of horses and carts for transport of the items to Scotland Yard.

8 Lecture at Winterthur Museum, "Thomas Chippendale" by Christopher Gilbert, 1972.


10 Quoted by R.T.H. Halsey and Charles O. Cornelius, Handbook of the American Wing (New York: Metropolitan Museum
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11. Papers of the Lloyd Family of Manor of Queens Village, Lloyd's Neck, Long Island, New York 1654-1820, 2 vols., NYHS Collections 1926 (New York: NYHS, 1927), 2:423-24. The prices for these items are much higher than for comparable English or New York items because they are expressed in terms of badly inflated Massachusetts currency.


14. NYHS, Samuel Gifford Papers. Book of the William and Mary 1759-63. The high price of the clocks indicates that he was dealing in an inflated currency, like that of Rhode Island. New York's currency remained fairly stable through the colonial period.

15. Letters, Delaplaine Papers, NYHS.

16. Ibid. John Freebody was a New York merchant who later became a Tory.

17. The chairs are presently in a private collection and will be returned to the restoration upon the present owner's death. Antoinette F. Downing, "Furnishings of Van Cortlandt Manor at Croton-on-Hudson, New York," Sleephollow Restorations, Tarrytown, N. Y., Aug. 1959 (typewritten), p. 9.


21. Ibid., pp. 72-74.

22. Ibid., p. 45.

23. Herbert Cescinsky; George Hunter, English and American Furniture (Grand Rapids: Dean Hicks Co., 1929), p. 110.
Charles Ward Apthorpe built a late Georgian mansion called "Elmwood" on Bloomingdale Road in 1764. The stylistically advanced house had a recessed portico and Corinthian columns. Apthorpe married Mary McEvers, daughter of John and Catherine (VanHorne) McEvers. Mary's brother James was a Quaker who married Apthorpe's sister Elizabeth. Charles Ward Apthorpe maintained a close family and commercial relationship with his father in Boston and his brother John in London. He assisted his father as an agent who made local arrangements for British troops during the French and Indian War.

Joseph Downs, American Furniture: Queen Anne and Chippendale Periods in the Henry Francis DuPont Winterthur Museum (New York: Viking Press, 1952), #26. H. F. DuPont purchased this chair from Charles W. Lyons in 1936. Stephanus VanCortlandt (1643-1700) died long before this chair was made, but he did build a house on Cortlandt St. that was later occupied by his son Philip who married Catherine DePeyster, daughter of Abraham. Philip died in 1747 and the house passed to his fifth son, Pierre (1721-1814) who married Joanna Livingston in 1748.

Exhibited MET, 1934, #54; MET, 1963, #3; and Museum of the City of New York, "Furniture by New York Cabinetmakers," 1956 (hereafter MCNY, 1956), #33.

Harry Arons advertisement, Antiques (June 1964), p. 631. He purchased the chairs from a direct descendant, probably Francis Weld, daughter or granddaughter of Daniel Dennison Slade, grandson of Henry Bromfield. The slip seat of one of the chairs in the Brooklyn Museum is inscribed "Capt Fayerweather" probably one of Margaret Fayerweather's brothers. She was born in 1732, the daughter of Thomas, a Boston mer-
chant, and Hannah Waldo. She died in 1761 and Henry remarried Hannah Clarke. Henry Bromfield worked for John Rowe & Co. of Boston and was a friend of Charles Ward Apthorpe of New York. A younger brother, Thomas, spent most of his adult life in London. (Rowe, pp. 274, 421)

32 Ginsburg and Levy advertisement, Antiques (March 1968), p. 281. The only Radcliffe Baldwin who appeared in New York records was born in 1841, the son of Austin Baldwin and Julia Huych. The chair at the Henry Ford Museum was purchased from John S. Walton Antiques, Inc.

33 Illustrated in Nutting, Furniture Treasury, #2138 and Antiques (April 1934), p. 152.

34 The chair was acquired from a direct descendant, Cornelius Willet. (files of the MET)


36 Exhibited MCNY, 1956, #35.

37 The chairs were given to the restoration by two granddaughters, Louise Lee and Georgina Schuyler.

38 Records of Mrs. J. Insley Blair who donated the chair to MCNY. Exhibited MET, 1934, #53; MCNY, 1956, #25.

39 A chair from this set appeared in a David Rubenstein advertisement, Antiques (July 1939), p. 8.


41 It is doubtful if the chairs were made as wedding gifts, but they may have been owned by the Livingstons later and used either in their townhouse near Bowling Green or at Clermont, their home on the Hudson. The chairs may also have been made for Robert Livingston, Jr., who married Mary Stevens in 1770. See Kirk, p. 43 for a brief history of the controversy over the possible English origin of these chairs.
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Unpublished

New York, N.Y. Municipal Records and Archives of the City of New York. City Clerk Collection.


______. Beekman Family Papers.

______. Delaplaine Papers.

______. Sir Charles Hardy Papers. Bills.


Queens, N.Y. Queens College. Queens Historical Documents Collection. Bills of the city of New York for repairs to city properties.

______. Queens Historical Documents Collection. New York inventories 1720-1776.

______. Queens Historical Documents Collection. Records of the Mayor's Court of New York City 1720-1738.


______. Joseph Downs Manuscript Collection. Appraisements made by Christopher Bancker and Brandt Schuyler.
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Joseph Downs Manuscript Collection. New York inventories 1720-1776. Microfilm of originals in NYHS.
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### Comparative Population Statistics

**Population growth and percent increase per decade of New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, 1720-1770**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>36,919</td>
<td>91,008</td>
<td>30,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>48,594</td>
<td>114,116</td>
<td>51,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>63,665</td>
<td>151,613</td>
<td>85,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>76,696</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td>119,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>117,138</td>
<td>202,600</td>
<td>183,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>162,920</td>
<td>235,308</td>
<td>240,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population growth and percent increase per period of New York City, Philadelphia, and Boston 1720-1775

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1730</th>
<th>1743</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,622</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>16,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>15,631</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above statistics are taken from Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness, p. 303 and Cities in Revolt, p. 5, 216. Although there are inadequacies in Bridenbaugh's estimates which he derived primarily from Greene and Harrington, American Population, and from local documents of sometimes doubtful accuracy, they are the best consistent set of statistics presently available for colonial cities. They are used throughout this paper to illustrate general trends since population growth is a primary economic indicator. They should not be interpreted as absolute data. Philadelphia's statistics are especially suspect because of the unique development of suburbs around that city. The role they played in various contemporary population estimates is unclear.
APPENDIX II

CHECKLIST OF NEW YORK FURNITURE CRAFTSMEN

Key to Source Abbreviations


DLP  Delaplaine Papers, NYHS.


L of W  Listed as subscriber to Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. George Whitefield, M.A. quoted by Susswein

McD  Alexander McDougall, List of those who returned muskets to the city of New York, 1775, Winterthur.

QHDC  Queens Historical Documents Collection, Queens College.
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Cabinetmakers and Joiners

ANDERSON, ALEXANDER Freeman joiner 1770 (B&F). Bill for furniture 1786 (Historical Society of Pa.)


BAILLY, NICHOLAS Freeman cabinetmaker 1739 (B&F). Baily was the first to use this term.

BALL, PETER Cabinetmaker 1774 (L of W).

BETTS, JOHN Freeman cabinetmaker 1774 (B&F).


BRESTED /BREESTED/, ANDREW III Appointed fireman Dock Ward 1762, 1768. Interior carpentry jobs for Common Council, 1763-67 including an order that he "do finish the Library Room in the City Hall in the most plain an Cheap Manner that Can be, and Repair the Stairs as well Leading from below to the Assembly Chamber." Paid £39 "for Twenty four Mahogany Chairs made for use and By order of this Board," 1765 (C.C.).

BRINNER, JOHN Newspaper advertisements 1762, 1763. Cabinet and chairmaker. He brought six artificers from London skilled in cabinet and chairmaking, carving and gilding and advertised "Architectural, Gothic and Chinese Chimney Pieces" as well as "Gothic and Chinese Chairs" and other furniture forms (A&C).

BROOKMAN, THOMAS Received orders for furniture from James Beekman 1752-53. Appeared in Nicholas Bayard receipt book 1766. Elected assessor South Ward 1772-75 (C.C.).

BROWN, WILLIAM Freeman joiner 1756 (B&F). Purchased materials from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1756 and paid part of bill in labor including a "full pair of wild cherry Drawers" worth £3,05.00. He was a new immigrant from elsewhere, since Delaplaine lent him £2 for his wife's passage (DLPL). Appeared as cabinetmaker on Broad St. 1775 (McD).

BURLING, EDWARD Immigrated from England between 1674 and 1683. Freeman joiner 1683 (B&F). Died 1753 (Inventory, NYHS).
Took JOSHUA DELAPLAINE as an apprentice before 1718. Account with Delaplaine 1721-34 selling Delaplaine tools and materials often in return for labor. Quaker (DLP). Referred to as a merchant in will dated 1744 (Ab of W).


BUSSING, HARMANUS Freeman shop-joiner 1765 (B&F)

CARMER, HENRY Elected collector of South Ward 1739 and held various public offices and commissions (C.C.) until his death in 1785 (Ab of W). Executed many jobs for city including building and maintaining a public warf and repairing city structures (C.C.). Mentioned as cabinetmaker in newspaper notice of 1774 (A&C).

CAROW, ISAAC Freeman cabinetmaker 1765 (B&F).

CLARKE, CHRISTOPHER THOMAS Newspaper advertisement 1766, announcing his plans to follow the "Cabinet and Upholsterers Business." (A&C)

CLEMANTS, MOSES Elected constable of South Ward and disqualified 1745 (C.C.). Freeman cabinetmaker 1757 (B&F). Involved in land speculation in Orange Co. 1754-74 (NYHS). Mentioned in account book of John Appy, Secretary and Judge Advocate of his Majesty's forces 1760 "reimbers'd Mrs. Appy wt. she pd Clements for my Camp Table/ Two Camp Chairs 12" Brother of Samuel who made signed high chest in Winterthur Museum.

COOK, ALEXANDER Appeared in JOSHUA DELAPLAINE'S daybook, 1755 purchasing materials including "to bilstel stuff for a tea table" and "to a tea table snap & nails" (DLP).

COX, JOSEPH See upholsterers.
CROSS, JOHN Appeared in newspaper notice placed by THOMAS BROOKMAN, 1763, as a cabinetmaker run away from bail (A&C).

DAVIDSON, DAVID Formed partnership with JAMES STRACHAN after 1765. Died 1768 (A&C).

DELAPLAINE, JOSEPH Worked for brother, JOSHUA 1730s through 1760s. Quaker (DPL). Married Esther Lane of Hempstead Harbor in 1716. Died June 12, 1799.

DELAPLAINE, JOSHUA Apprenticed to EDWARD BURLING before 1718 when Delaplaine accepted his first apprentice. Quaker. Died 1771 and referred to himself as merchant in will. Left bequests totalling £5,800 plus slaves, furnishings, plate, house, lot, and storehouse. A detailed account book, 1753-56, and numerous bills and letters survive (NYHS).

DELAPLAINE, JOSHUA, JR. Worked for father, JOSHUA 1740s through 1760s. Quaker. (DPL)

FAULKNER, JOHN Mentioned in newspaper as successor to JAMES STRACHAN (Susswein). Elected constable Out Ward, 1772, 1774, 1775 (C.C.).

GAUTIER, DANIEL Accepted an apprentice 1725/26 (Ind of Ap). Made coffin for Gertrude VanCortlandt 1727. Freeman joiner 1730/31 (B&F). Elected constable of Dock Ward 1730 (C.C.). Worked for city 1733 making a table, benches, etc. for £1.17.06 (C.C.). Died between 1739 (Ab of W) and 1743 (NYHS, Abraham DePeyster Papers) leaving tools to his son ANDREW (Ab of W).

GLEAVES, THOMAS Freeman joiner 1719 (B&F). Elected assessor South Ward 1726, constable ditto 1729 (C.C.). Sued by Anthony Byvanck 1728 and promised to deliver either £6 or a "Chest of Drawers made of Gum Wood of the Value of Six pounds" (QHDC).

GLOVER, JOHN Witnessed will 1763 (Ab of W). Applied to be appointed public measurer 1769 and referred to as cabinetmaker (C.C.).

GOLDSMITH, JEREMIAH Listed as a cabinetmaker on subscription list 1774 (L of W).

GRIGG, THOMAS, SR. Freeman joiner 1715/16 (B&F). Newspaper advertisement mentions "house-chairs, couches, closestool chairs, and easy chairs, likewise all sorts of joiners and cabinetwork" (A&C). Will dated 1763, proved 1775, mentioned eldest son THOMAS (Ab of W).

GRIGGS, THOMAS, JR. Newspaper advertisements 1754 and 1768 advertising same services as father, THOMAS GRIGG, SR. (A&C).
Purchased wood from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1749-1755 including £15 worth of mahogany in 1749 (DPL).

HIGGINS, BENJAMIN Listed as cabinetmaker on Cortlandt St. 1775 (McD).

HOFFMAN, JOHN Died 1773 and mentioned as cabinetmaker in will (Ab of W) u. i newspaper notice (A&C). His will was witnessed by two chairmakers, WILLIAM WARNER and JOHN WESSELS.

HORNER, Mentioned in newspaper notice as cabinetmaker on Beaver St. 1774 (A&C).

HUBBELL, ISAAC Partnership with PATTERSON Dissolved and carried on by HUBBELL alone, cabinet and chairmaker 1774 (A&C).

HUNT, WARD Freeman joiner 1760 (B&F). Listed as cabinetmaker on subscription list 1774 (L of W).

INGLIS, THOMAS Appeared as cabinetmaker on subscription list 1774 (L of W). Letter of Administration 1786.

JACKSON, PATRICK Sued Cornelius DePeyster and Philip French for payment for carpentry work 1726 (QHDC). Elected constable Montgomery Ward 1748 and assessor ditto 1758 (C.C.). Purchased wood and tools from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1735-52 including a tea table snap, bed screws, coffin handles, and walnut. (DPL) Took William Applegate (1726-76) as an apprentice c. 1742 who served 5½ years before returning to his native New Jersey to practice his trade.

KINGSTON, JOSEPH Accepted apprentice 1720, 1723 (Ind of Ap). Mentioned as joiner and paid £4.02.06 by city for a table for the Common Council Chamber 1723 (C.C.).

KNOLTON, DAVID Freeman cabinetmaker 1770 (B&F).

LOW, PETER, JR. Listed as cabinetmaker in Leary St. 1775 (McD).

MC CLEAN, HUGH Listed as cabinetmaker in William St. 1775 (McD).

MONAT, JOHN Freeman cabinetmaker 1765 (B&F).

NICHOLAS IS Appeared on subscription list as cabinetmaker 1774 (L of W) and advertised as "joiner and cabinetmaker" 1792 (A&C,II).

NORTON, WILLIAM Newspaper notice mentioned "very good Leather Chairs by William Norton" 1740 (A&C).
OSBORNE /OSBURN/, JOHN Purchased wood and materials from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1755-64 and often paid in labor (DPL). Mentioned as cabinetmaker in newspaper notice 1762 (A&C).

PALMER, WILLIAM Joiner, Quaker.

PARSONS, JOHN Quaker, apprentice to Delaplaine (DPL). Free­man joiner 1754 (B&F).

PATTERSON, ___ Partnership with ISAAC HUBBELL, cabinet and chairmaker, dissolved and carried on by Rubbell alone 1774 (A&C).

PEARSEY /PEARSEE/, JONATHAN Partner of MARINUS WILLET, Cabinet and chairmaker, and venue store owner 1773, 1774 (A&C). Appeared on list of subscriptions as cabinetmaker 1774 (L of W). His inventory, taken c. 1813 totalled several thousand dollars.

PELTON, BENJAMIN Listed as cabinetmaker in Ann St. 1775 (McD).


PRINCE, SAMUEL (1727-1778) Purchased supplies and hired out his apprentice to JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1753 (DPL). Appeared in receipt books of Nicholas Bayard, Evert Bancker, and James Beekman for providing furniture 1762-1774. Died in Somerset Co., N.J. leaving bequests of over £2,400 plus land, furniture, etc. (Ab of W). Described by his former apprentice, THOMAS BURLING as "a conspicuous character in his way, and esteemed one of the first workmen of this city" 1785 (A&C).

RIGBY, THOMAS Freeman joiner 1738 (B&F). Purchased materials, tools, and wood from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1735-38 and often paid in labor. His purchases included "a tooth plain Iron," bed screws, coffin handles, chest locks, and "8 pair of dovetails at 12d." He was credited with RICHARD BYFIELD's work 1737, so Byfield must have been his employee or apprentice at that time. Advertised in American Weekly Mercury of Philadelphia in 1734 for a runaway servant, John Howey, a joiner.


ROUSBY, JOHN Witness to will 1756 and mentioned as cabinet­maker (Ab of W).
SHAW, DANIEL  Freeman joiner 1754 (B&F). Referred to as cabinetmaker (Ab of W).

STRACHAN, JAMES  Newspaper advertisement in 1765 as carver and gilder from London. Formed partnership with DAVID DAVIDSON and opened "Cabinet-Warehouse" before Davidson's death in 1768. Died in 1769 and mentioned as "Carver and Cabinetmaker" (A&C). Letter of Administration filed 1769.

TAYLOR, JOHN  See upholsterers.

TREMAIN, JOHN  Announced intention to follow the "Business of a cabinet-maker" having "declined the Stage" and advertised "Tea-Tables, plain or scollopt; tea Chests . . . Dressing-Boxes" among other items 1751 (A&C).

WALLACE, ROBERT  Referred to himself as joiner in newspaper advertisement of furniture 1753 (A&C). Elected constable Dock Ward 1756 (C.C.). Mended field bed of John Appy, Secretary and Judge Advocate of his Majesty's Forces, 1758.

WARNE, FRANCIS  Apprenticed to JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1717/18 (Ind of Ap). Freeman joiner 1731 (B&F). Wrote to Delaplaine 1743, Quaker (DPL).

WATSON, JOHN  Freeman cabinetmaker 1770 (B&F). Paid £ 8.05.00 "for making two large mahogany arm'd Chairs for the use of the Common Council" (C.C.).


WILLET, MARINUS  (1740-1830) Elected constable West Ward 1769 (C.C.). Married Mary Pearsee, daughter of JONATHAN PEARSEE, 1760. Formed partnership with Jonathan Pearsee by 1773 and advertised as cabinet and chairmaker and owner of vendue store 1773-75 (A&C). Served as Lt. Col. during Revolution and became first Sheriff and then Mayor of New York after the Revolution at which time he was listed as a merchant.

WILLIAMS, RUE  Purchased materials from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE, 1744-45 (DPL).

Chairmakers and Turners

ARMSTRONG, RICHARD  Freeman turner 1722 (B&F).

BELSEN, CORNELIUS  Freeman turner 1749 (B&F).
BILL, JOHN  Freeman turner 1739/40 (B&F).

BLOOM, JOHN  Freeman turner 1736 (B&F), Appointed public measurer 1736. Paid £2,08,00 for "2 Dossend Chairs for the Work House" and 3s for "Balls for the Gate" 1836 (C.C.).

BOGART, ARON /~ARIE/  Freeman turner 1734 (B&F), Accepted apprentice 1718 (Ind. of Ap). Swore a deposition in 1722 having witnessed the men of H.M.S. Greyhound trying to return a deserter to the ship.

BOGERT, ADRIAN  Elected constable of South Ward and disqualified 1731 (C.C.).

BREVOORT, HENRY  Freeman turner 1737 (B&F).

BURGE, RICHARD  Freeman turner 1750 (B&F).

CLARK, JOHN  Freeman turner & chairmaker 1768 (B&F).

DEMELT, ANTHONY  Purchased wood and materials from JOSHUA DELAPLAINE 1722-77 including coffin handles, escutcheons, and bedscrews. Mentioned as being in debt 1727 (QHDC) Referred to as chairmaker in newspaper notices in 1758. (A&C).

DOUW /~DOW/, JOHANNES  Freeman turner 1747 (B&F). Was one of the leaders of the chairmakers in 1788 Federal Procession (A&C,II).

DUGLAS, THOMAS  Appeared on subscription list 1774 (L of W).

ELSWORTH, ASHUERUS  Accepted apprentice and mentioned as turner 1724 (Ind of Ap). Witness to will 1757, mentioned as chairmaker (Ab of W).

ELSWORTH, GEORGE  Freeman chairmaker 1739 (B&F).

GOLDSMITH, JEREMIAS  Listed as chairmaker 1775 (McD).

HARPEIR, GIDEON  Freeman turner 1749 (B&F).

JOHNSON, JOHN  Listed as chairmaker on Broadway 1775 (McD),

LAMB, GEORGE  Freeman turner 1731 (B&F). Executor of will 1750 (Ab of W).

LAWRENCE, JAMES  Freeman chairmaker 1765 (B&F). Appointed fireman West Ward 1769 (C.C.L)

LAWRENCE, SAMUEL  Mentioned in newspaper as chairmaker 1766 (Susswein).
METCALF, JOHN  Freeman joiner and turner 1732 (B&F).

MITCHELL, VINTER  Listed as chairmaker opposite St. Pauls 1775 (McD).

POALK, GEORGE  Paid £1.15.03 for mending spinning wheels at Bridewell (C.C.). Witness to will mentioned as chairmaker 1772 (Ab of W).

POOL, JACOB  Listed as chairmaker Broad St. 1775 (McD).

POST, JACOB  Listed as chairmaker in Maiden Lane 1775 (McD).

SAMANDIKE, NICHOLAS  Listed as chairmaker in Bowry Lane 1775 (McD).

SIBLEY, RICHARD  Freeman turner 1744/45 (B&F).


SMITH, MICH'L  Listed as chairmaker in Broad St. 1775 (McD).

SPRANGER, CHARLES  Mentioned as turner in his will dated 1744, proved 1757 (Ab of W).

STACKHOUSE, STACY  Listed as chairmaker at the corner of Wall and Broadway 1775 (McD).

TILLSON, WILLIAM  Freeman chairmaker 1761 (B&F).

TILYOU, PETER, SR.  Freeman turner 1737 (B&F). Mentioned as chairmaker in newspaper notice 1770 (A&C).

TILYOU, PETER, JR.  Freeman turner 1765 (B&F).


TILYOU, WILLIAM  Mentioned as turner and chairmaker in Maiden Lane in newspaper notice 1775 (A&C).

VAN DALSON, WILLIAM  Freeman turner 1743 (B&F).

VAN GELDER, GERRET  Freeman chairmaker 1765 (B&F). Will dated 1805, proved 1807, included bequests of "my large looking
glass with two and plates and a Guilded Shell in the top of the Frame also the dresser Table that generally stands under the said Glass." (Ab of W).

VANALER CORNEL  Listed as chairmaker in Batteau St, 1775 (McD).


WAINER, THOMAS  Freeman chairmaker 1750 (B&F).

WARNER, THOMAS, JR.  Freeman chairmaker 1770 (B&F). Paid by city for spinning wheels supplied to Bridewell 1768-69 (C.C.).

WARNER, WILLIAM  Freeman turner 1765 (B&F). Mentioned as chairmaker in will of JOHN HOFFMAN 1773 (Ab of W).

WARNES, LEONARD  Freeman turner 1755 (B&F). Paid £3.12.00 by Sir Charles Hardy for "one Dozen of Chairs & all other" 1755 (NYHS).


WOOLHAUPER, DAVID  Freeman turner 1765 (B&F).

WOOLHAUPER, GOTTFRIED  Freeman turner 1759 (B&F).

Upholsterers

ATTLEE, WILLIAM  Advertised beds for lower rooms and alcoves 1734 (Halsey).

BIRD, RICHARD  Advertised his arrival from London and entry into business 1761 (A&C).


CALLOW, STEPHEN  Advertised arrival from London opening of upholsterer's shop 1749 and formed a partnership with JAMES
HIRTHWAITE in 1750. He left the city in 1764, returning in 1768 and reestablishing himself as an upholsterer (A&C).


DAVIS, JOHN Freeman upholster 1754 (B&F). Advertised services in 1776 specializing in military items "Tents, camp bedsteads, drums and colours, &C, &C." (A&C). Billed Andrew Elliot for a coffin worth £16.15.00 1780.

EVANS, ELIZABETH Advertised that she had returned to city where "she has been employed for several years as upholsterer, also making lady's boned waiscoats and stays." 1776 (A&C).

FOWLER, THEODOSIUS Offered all upholstery ware "in the genteelst and newest taste" as well as "Linens and tassels for beds and window curtains of various colours, with an assortment of bed lace of different kinds." 1774 (A&C).

HIRTHWAITE, JAMES Advertised as upholsterer from London in 1750 and also offered to "destroy the Buggs entirely, without damaging the Furniture." Formed a partnership with STEPHEN CALLOW 1750. Received £2.14.00 for "one doz seats for Chairs" from James Beekman 1753 (NYHS).

KIP, RICHARD Freeman upholsterer 1775 (B&F). Engraved label found on upholstered Windsor chair.

RICHEY, GEORGE Advertised his services as an upholsterer and tent maker in 1759, 1769 (A&C).


TAYLOR, JOHN Advertised as "Upholsterer and House-Broker from London" and included upholstery wares, looking glasses, and mahogany furniture in his list 1768. Added "FUNERALS decently performed" in 1769 and in 1770 advertised that he intended to carry on the "business of a cabinetmaker, upholsterer, and auctioneer" (A&C).

WENMAN, RICHARD Advertised as an upholsterer 1763, 1766, 1770 (A&C). Freeman upholsterer 1770 (B&F). Furnished candles to the Supreme Court and served as cryer and bell ringer 1772-76 (C.C.).
WENMAN, THOMAS  Freeman upholsterer 1719 (B&F). Elected constable West Ward 1728, 1730; deputy constable East Ward 1734, 1735, 1738, 1739; ditto West Ward 1740, ditto Dock Ward 1743, ditto North Ward 1744. Paid £1.05.00 by city in 1724 "for Making a silk Covering for the Seal of Justice in the Court Room in the City Hall and putting on the same Covering and Carpetts" and 10s in 1734/35 for "Altering the Cloth or Carpet for the Common Council Table" (C.C.). In 1723, Isaac Bobbin, Private Secretary of George Clark the Secretary of New York, paid Wenman for "Six Balls of Gold and one of Silver thread for Miss Molly Clark" at £1:6.

WHITE, BLANCH  Advertised as "Upholsterer from London" offering "Bed Furniture in the newest Fashion" as well as military gear. Also mentions that she "had followed the Business for many Years past in Philadelphia" Called herself "Upholsterer and Undertaker" in 1768, "Funeral furnish'd with all Things necessary and proper Attendance as in England." (A&C).

Carvers, Gilders, Japanners, and Looking Glass Makers


BRINNER, JOHN  See cabinetmakers.

CLARK, JOHN  Freeman Shagreen casemaker 1770 (B&F). Advertised as "Shagreen and Mahogany Case-Maker" 1774 (A&C).

DAVIS, RICHARD  Listed as carver 1775 (McD). Formed partnership with STEPHEN DWIGHT before 1774 (A&C).

DUYCKINCK, GERARDUS I (1695-1746)  Freeman limner 1731 (B&F). Advertised "Lookin-glasses . . . the Frames plaine Japan'd or Flowered, . . . all manner of Painting Work done." 1735 (A&C). Painted several portraits of leading citizens, N. Y. Hist. Soc. Received £8.07.06 from city "For painting of Kings Coat of Arms & blacking and guilding the frame" 1733 (City Clerk Collection, Municipal Archives and Records).

DUYCKINCK, GERARDUS II (1723-1797)  Freeman limner 1748 (B&F). Advertised that he carried on his father's GERARDUS DUYCKINCK I, business "Limning, Painting, Varnishing, Japanning, Gilding, Glasing, and Silvering of Looking-Glasses" 1746, and added in 1750 an assortment of painters colors and "Prints of Sundry Sorts, Do. ready Coloured for Japanning." (A&C). He wrote to Peter DuBois in 1763 that he was settling his father's debts.
to J. Walters and "you'll also find I Paid Since in August 6th 1756 The sum of 23 \textdollar\, 15s as per Receipt and have Still a Small Account for Gilding & Painting his Organ" (NYHS).

Dwight, Stephen Advertised as a carver, late apprentice to Henry Hardcastle, and offered to carve "tables, chairs, picture and looking glass frames, and all kinds of work for Cabinet-makers" 1755. Moved into shop of John Osborne, cabinetmaker 1762. Mentioned his partnership with Richard Davis. 1774 (A&C). James Beekman hired him in 1760 to carve frames for portraits of him and his wife just completed by Lawrence Kilburn. In 1775, the city paid Dwight and Davis £19.02.00 "for Work done in Ornamenting the Court Room in the City Hall." (C.C.).

Foddy, James Freeman looking glass maker from London who sold imported glasses and repaired damaged items, 1729, 1730, 1737 (A&C).

Gireubel, Stephen Advertised his recent arrival and offered for sale "a quantity of beautiful furniture elegantly painted and varnished in the Japan taste . . . some complete toilets." Offered to paint couches and chairs in the "same manner" 1771 (Halsey).

Hardcastle, Henry Freeman carver 1751 (B&F). Mentioned in newspaper notice 1755 (A&C).

Minshall /Minshull/, __ Advertised as "Carver and Gilder, from London" and offered carving for frames "Tables, Chairs . . . Candle Stands, Clock and Watch Cases" 1769. Advertised a looking glass store in 1775 offering "Birds and baskets of flowers, for the top of bookcases or glass frames." Also, "Any Lady or Gentleman that have Glass in old Fashioned frames, may have them cut to ovals . . . finished white, or green and white, purple, or any colour that suits the furniture of the room, or gilt in oil or burnished gold" (A&C).

Rost, William Paid 35s for gilding by James Beekman 1762 NYHS).

Strachan, James See cabinetmakers.

Sorge, John Julius Advertised that he was "very much noted among the nobility in Germany . . . makes all sorts of Japan Work of divers fine colours" 1755 (Halsey).

Waghorne, John See chairmakers.
Windsor Chair Makers and Sellers

ASH, THOMAS  Advertised as Windsor chairmaker 1774. "As several hundred pounds have been sent out of this province for this article, he hopes the public will encourage the business." Has a large quantity always in stock to supply merchants and masters of vessels (A&C). In partnership with WILLIAM ASH according to receipt for "2 windsor chair £2.08.00" signed by Thomas and William Ash, 1787. (Winterthur)

ASH, WILLIAM  Listed as chairmaker 1775 (McD). Partner of THOMAS ASH.

GALER, ADAM  Listed as chairmaker 1775 (McD). Advertised as "Windsor Chair-Maker, (lately from Philadelphia)" Offered to supply masters of vessels. 1774 (A&C).

GAUTIER, ANDREW  Advertised Windsor chairs "well painted, Viz. High back'd, low back'd and Sackback'd Chairs and Settees, or double seated, fit for Piazza or Gardens. Childrens dining and low Chairs, &c." Offered to supply any quantity "Wholesale or Retail" 1765 (A&C).

KELSO, JOHN  Freeman Windsor chairmaker 1774 (B&F). Advertised as Windsor chairmaker from Philadelphia and "as he served a regular apprenticeship in one of the finest shops in that way in Philadelphia" proposes to provide "as well-finished, strong, and neat work as ever appeared in this city" (A&C).