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This year marks the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Chippendale, England’s most famous cabinetmaker, as well as the one hundredth anniversary of what may be called The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s infatuation with him. In 1918, the December issue of the Bulletin celebrated the purchase of the George S. Palmer collection of eighteenth-century American and English furniture, which included a now famous Philadelphia high chest that incorporates exact quotations from printed designs by Chippendale. The same issue published an article by print curator William M. Ivins Jr. elaborating on their engraved sources, most notably Chippendale’s The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director. Two years later, at a Manhattan auction, Ivins purchased a collection of nearly two hundred of Chippendale’s original drawings for that great book, the foundation for one of the world’s great collections of drawings and prints related to eighteenth-century design.

For this issue of the Bulletin, we brought out of retirement Morrison H. Heckscher, Curator Emeritus of the American Wing, to address the history of Chippendale at The Met, a story that first fascinated him fifty years ago while a Chester Dale Fellow in the Department of Prints. He recounts Chippendale’s meteoric rise from rural obscurity to the heights of the London luxury trade and credits that remarkable success to the Director, a brilliant example of what today would be called branding. In doing so he analyzes the Museum’s rare collection of drawings by Chippendale to see what they can tell us about him as a gifted and highly imaginative designer.

Concurrent with this Bulletin, and on view through January 27, 2019, in the American Wing’s Anthony W. and Lulu C. Wang Galleries of Eighteenth-Century American Art, is the exhibition “Chippendale’s Director: The Designs and Legacy of a Furniture Maker.” A collaboration between Femke Speelberg, Associate Curator in the Department of Drawings and Prints, and Alyce Perry Englund, Associate Curator in the American Wing, the exhibition puts on public view for the first time a wide selection of the Director drawings, placing them within the context of European and English ornament prints and in association with furniture that was either inspired by the Director or actually made in Chippendale’s shop. This groundbreaking display combining woodwork with works on paper is drawn almost exclusively from the Museum’s collection.

We wish to express our sincere gratitude to The Met’s William Cullen Bryant Fellows for their critical support in making this publication possible. The Met’s quarterly Bulletin is also supported in part by the Lila Acheson Wallace Fund for The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Daniel H. Weiss
President & CEO
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
CHIPPENDALE, the most famous name in all the annals of English furniture! As a noun it refers to Thomas Chippendale, the eighteenth-century London cabinetmaker. As an adjective it is a synonym for carved mahogany furniture in that florid, uniquely English version of the French Rococo that flourished briefly during the 1750s and 1760s.

But why the special fame? Thomas Chippendale (1718–1779) was but one of a number of high-end London purveyors of household furnishings during the reigns of George II and George III. His was not the largest shop (that was to be George Seddon’s), nor did he have a monopoly on work of the highest quality (think of William Vile and John Cobb, cabinetmakers to the Crown). In fact, it was commonplace for clients furnishing grand houses to shop around—in 1768 John Spencer, a Yorkshire squire, wrote about going to “Cobbs, Chippendales, & several others of the most eminent Cabinet Makers to consider of proper Furniture for my drawing Room”—and to end up employing more than one firm.

No, what cemented Chippendale’s fame was his book. According to the antiquarian John Thomas Smith, writing in 1828, Chippendale was “the most famous Upholsterer and Cabinet-maker of his day, to whose folio work on household-furniture the trade formerly made constant reference.” It was this publication, The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director (first edition, 1754), that jump-started his career, made his name, and ensured his lasting reputation. The book, with 160 large and elegantly engraved plates, printed on the best paper, and a fine example of the art of making books, was a brilliant exercise in branding, giving Chippendale broad name recognition long before he had won a single major furniture commission. Indeed, it was the Director, which included in the subtitle Being a Large Collection of the Most Elegant and Useful Designs of Household Furniture, that caused “Chippendale” to become a household name, even into our own time.

In the eighteenth century, the work of craftsmen, as distinguished from artists, was rarely deemed newsworthy, so the paucity of contemporary comment about Chippendale is no surprise. But such was his reputation that, from time to time, this rather arbitrary distinction was overlooked, and a newspaper like the Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser could refer to “that celebrated artist, Mr. Chippendale, of St. Martin’s Lane.” Succeeding generations, starting with Thomas Sheraton in his 1793 Cabinet-Maker and Upholsterer’s Drawing-Book, praised Chippendale’s book as “a real original [and] extensive and masterly in its designs,” but with the caveat that the designs “are now wholly antiquated and laid aside, though possessed of great merit, according to the times in which they were executed.” This ambivalence—artistic ability but suspect style—was a recurring theme, one expressed con brio in a special issue of the Art Journal in 1862:

It is impossible not to admire the artistic spirit evinced by every touch of Chippendale’s pencil; but, as the longer a bowl on the wrong bias runs it gets further from the “jack,” so, the more elaborate Chippendale becomes, he gets further from the truth in design. He was a strong man, overcome by the Art-vices of his age. . . . He was a designer in the best sense, however perverted the style in which he clothed his thoughts. . . . His fantasies may now provoke laughter, but it cannot be denied that they were inspired by genius, and guided by method . . . which brought him great renown with his own and the succeeding generation.

The occasion for this commentary was the London International Exhibition of 1862, to which forty furniture designs attributed to Chippendale and to the draftsman and carver Matthias Lock were lent by the latter’s grandson George Lock. At the exhibition’s close, the South Kensington Museum, a museum founded principally to promote good design and British manufacturing that had opened in 1857, purchased from George Lock seventy-eight drawings, forty-six attributed
to Matthias Lock and thirty-two to Chippendale, followed the next year by a large scrapbook of Lock's drawings. In 1906 the museum, renamed the Victoria and Albert in 1899, purchased another cache of 144 related drawings. Chippendale now had an honored place in British design history, one memorialized in stone in a monumental full-length statue (purely imaginary) on the Exhibition Road facade of the museum's new building. Here, in a pantheon of ten British craftsmen, he is paired with another ubiquitous eighteenth-century household name, that of the entrepreneurial potter Josiah Wedgwood.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art was founded in New York City in 1870, just thirteen years after the South Kensington opened, and with a similar mandate to improve the design quality of domestic manufactures. But it was to be another fifty years before the Metropolitan began collecting eighteenth-century English ornament and design. In January 1920, William M. Ivins Jr., curator of the four-year-old Department of Prints, first requested an annual appropriation specifically for the purchase of “ornament.” At the end of the year he reported to management on his expenditures, including “A number of extremely rare and important items . . . at least one of which, bought on an off day at auction, in the catalogue of which it was not properly described [fig. 1], is reasonably worth more than the entire appropriation. It is a collection of 228 of the original drawings made in Chippendale's shop, almost 200 of which were engraved in his Cabinet Maker's Director. Not only is it unique, but it is the most important set of English eighteenth century furniture designs in existence.”

What the cataloguer for that sale at the Anderson Galleries in New York City had not realized was that these were not just any old furniture drawings, but the originals for Chippendale's book—catnip to a bookman like Ivins. The two volumes (fig. 2), each measuring 17¼ by 11 inches and bound in paper-covered boards with parchment spines, the latter inscribed Original drawings Chipp. Vol. 1 and Vol. 2, were part of a large collection of books and manuscripts assembled by the noted New York dealer George D. Smith in London during the winter of 1919–20, at a moment in postwar Britain when many great country-house libraries were being sold off. Smith died aboard ship en route home, and his new stock, one thousand lots in all, was consigned directly to auction.

Thus inspired, and armed with his annual appropriation, Ivins went on to build a collection of eighteenth-century British architecture and ornament second only to that of the Victoria and Albert Museum. He acquired impressions of most of the printed designs in the Rococo taste by Chippendale’s contemporaries—the likes of Lock, Copland, Johnson, and Ince and Mayhew, about all of whom more later—as well as a number of unique treasures, all illustrative of this brief, exotic chapter in the history of taste. Thus began this Museum’s century-long infatuation with drawings, prints, and books—and, of course, furniture—in the Chippendale style; and thus this year we celebrate the three hundredth anniversary of the master’s birth.

Chippendale’s lasting fame may assuredly be attributed to his great book, but the first half of his life is, quite literally, a closed book. “Thomas Son of John Chippindale of Otley joyner bap ye 5th,” an entry in the Otley, Yorkshire, parish church register recording his baptism in June 1718,⁷ is the sole proof of Thomas’s existence prior to 1747, when he was twenty-nine years old.

Otley is a small market town in northern England, north of Leeds and west of York, along the river Wharfe in the Yorkshire Dales. It was there that Thomas, the only child of Mary Drake and John Chippindale (1690–1768), was born into a family of woodworkers. His grandfather John, his cousin William, and his nephews Joseph and Benjamin were all carpenters or joiners. Thomas would, as a matter of course, have spent his formative years within this close-knit craft community, serving an apprenticeship—traditionally seven years beginning at age fourteen—learning joinery or basic woodworking under his father, a joiner, or another family member. Thus we may surmise he came into his own in about 1739. But then what? Regrettably, the next years, so critical to understanding his later achievement, are a complete blank.

It is only in 1747 that we pick up his trail, now in the context of a London milord. This is in a laconic entry, dated October 13, in a private account book of the Earl of Burlington: “to Chippendale in full £6 16 o.”⁸ By way of context, Chippendale’s earliest known furniture bill, from 1757, lists “A mahogany Cloaths-press wt sliding shelves” for £6 6s.⁹

Richard Boyle (1694–1753), third Earl of Burlington and fourth Earl of Cork, was the leading arbiter of taste during the reign of George II (1727–60). He was a munificent patron of artists and architects, as well as an architect in his own right. His goal was to reestablish in England the principles of classical architecture as practiced by the sixteenth-century Venetian Andrea Palladio (1508–1580) and the seventeenth-century Englishman Inigo Jones (1573–1652). Palladio had codified his theory and practice in a richly illustrated book, I quattro libri dell’architettura (The Four Books of Architecture) of 1570. Burlington chose to spread the word through books as well. He encouraged the publication of great folios for the nobility and the gentry: for architecture, William Kent’s Designs of Inigo Jones (1727); for interior decoration, Isaac Ware’s Plans, Elevations, and Sections . . . of Houghton in Norfolk (1735), the original drawings for which were acquired for the Metropolitan Museum by Ivins in 1925;¹⁰ and for furniture and accessories,
John Vardy’s *Some Designs of Mr. Inigo Jones and Mr. William Kent* (1744). In addition, Ware published the first accurate English edition of the *Quattro libri* (1738) and dedicated it to Burlington. These tomes, together with more modest handbooks for builders and craftsmen, led to a widespread basic literacy in the language of classical architecture: the five orders of architecture, proper proportions, and molding profiles.

We do not know Chippendale’s precise relationship with Burlington, but we can be sure that he knew these sumptuous, magnificently illustrated volumes. Indeed, his own magnum opus was to be informed by them in its grand format and splendid engravings; in its dependence on subscriptions from the nobility, gentry, and artisan classes; and in the firm underpinning of classical architecture in many of its designs.

Beginning in 1748, church records and tax rolls document that Chippendale had moved to London and that, at thirty, his life was taking off both personally and professionally. On May 19, at St. George’s Chapel, Mayfair, he married Catherine Redshaw of the nearby parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. The first of their nine children, Thomas Jr., baptized on April 23, 1749, was to work for and with his father, and ultimately to carry his cabinet business into the nineteenth century.
Meanwhile, Chippendale had determined that the area of St. Martin’s Lane was the place to be. It was in the center of the City of Westminster (fig. 3), which abutted the City of London to the east, and to which it was connected, along the river Thames, by the Strand. St. Martin’s Lane was the principal paved thoroughfare leading north at right angles from the Strand, near Charing Cross (now Trafalgar Square), with the landmark church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, as well as numerous culs-de-sac, or private courts, opening off it (fig. 4). Hugh Phillips, modern-day chronicler of Georgian London, has described it as “the arts-and-crafts street of London.” Representing the arts, on the west side, looking south from the top of the lane (fig. 5), was Old Slaughter’s Coffee House (nos. 74–75, after street numbers were introduced in 1765), home base for the set of young artists fed up with the classical strictures of Burlington and enthused with the playful ornament of the French Rococo, together with the nearby St. Martin’s Lane Academy (for life-drawing classes), established by William Hogarth (1697–1764) in 1735. Representing the crafts, on the opposite side of the street and facing Old Slaughter’s, were some recently arrived cabinetmakers, including Messrs. Vile and Cobb at number 72, at the corner of Long Acre, and next door, Vile’s former master William Hallett. So when, in due course, Chippendale leased numbers 60–62 (fig. 3, location C), he was within a few doors of two of London’s leading cabinet shops.

Also nearby, between 1746 and 1750, at number 9 Nottingham Court, Castle Street, near Long Acre, were the premises of Matthias Lock (ca. 1710–ca. 1765), the carver who first introduced the French Rococo to woodworkers in London. During the 1740s, he published a half-dozen modest cahiers, or suites, of ornamental designs, including A Book of Shields in 1746, all in the Rococo taste and executed in a loose, freehand etching manner (see fig. 16). In 1752, together with the engraver Henry Copland (ca. 1706–1752), he coauthored A New Book of Ornaments, the largest and most ambitious such English publication to date. With its chimneypieces, pier glasses, and candlestands, all professionally engraved, it was the forerunner of Chippendale’s great folio. The Lock collection at the Victoria and Albert contains many drawings by Chippendale, and the Chippendale albums at the Metropolitan a few drawings by Lock, suggesting a close working relationship between the cabinetmaker and the older carver. The grace and delicacy of line of Lock’s pencil renderings (see fig. 6) would seem to justify cabinetmaker James Cullen’s 1768 judgment of “the famous Mr. Matt Lock... reputed the
best Draftsman in that way that had ever been in England. And it was this ornamental style that Chippendale would superimpose on a Palladian architectural framework.

The local Poor Rates, or tax records, document Chippendale’s rapid rise to prominence. At Christmas 1749, he leased a modest house in Conduit Court, a cul-de-sac off the south side of Long Acre, a little east of the junction with St. Martin’s Lane (fig. 3, location A). In the summer of 1752, he moved to the bottom of the lane and across the Strand, near Charing Cross, to another, but more upscale, cul-de-sac, Somerset (later Northumberland) Court (fig. 3, location B). He was to remain there, in a handsome brick house, until the end of 1753. This is where The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director, the great book that was to make Chippendale’s name and reputation, was created. He advertised for subscribers from this address in the spring of 1753. He shared the premises for a time with the drawing master Matthias Darly (fl. 1741–73), whom he had engaged to engrave most of the copper plates used to illustrate his book. An undated engraved invitation card is signed T Chippendale Inv MDarly Sculp Northumb’d Court Strand. One would like to credit Darly with having instructed Chippendale in the art of drawing, but there is no evidence of their prior acquaintance to support this argument. According to a cryptic note in the Poor Rate records for 1753, “Darly entered at Lady Day [Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, a traditional day on which yearlong contracts were renegotiated] Chippendale before lives opposite Slaughter’s Coffee house.” In other words, apparently Darly moved into Chippendale’s house in Northumberland Court, following the latter’s move to St. Martin’s Lane—on the east side of the street across from Slaughter’s, and just around the corner from his Conduit Court workshop (fig. 3, location C). Chippendale had seized the moment, when one building was empty and the tenants in the other two were hard-pressed to pay the rates, to lease three properties (nos. 60, 61, and 62) owned by the Earl of Salisbury. With a covered passage between two of them giving access to an extensive inner court (fig. 7), the properties were ideally suited to Chippendale’s grand ambitions. (Indeed, they would continue to house the firm, under Thomas Chippendale Jr.’s leadership, until 1813.) On May 30, 1754, the General Evening Post announced, “This Day was published . . . The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director . . . by Thomas Chippendale of St. Martin’s Lane, Cabinet-Maker.” Chippendale had literally arrived—in print and at a good address.

But where was the capital to run this expansive business? In his newly published book, Chippendale coyly referred to “persons of distinction” and “of eminent Taste” who had promoted his
8. Thomas Chippendale (British, 1718–1779). *A Bed*, 1759. Black ink with gray wash, graphite; sheet, 12 ¼ x 8 ½ in. (30.8 x 21.5 cm). For pl. xxxix in the *Director*, 1762. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.1[32])
career. Whoever they were, they did not now step up to the plate. Instead he had to turn to an investor, one James Rannie, a well-to-do Scot, a cabinetmaker, and a subscriber to the *Director*. The exact terms of the partnership are unknown, but the results were clear enough. Chippendale got no equity in the business, he was never able to reap the financial rewards befitting his brilliant career, and his son would ultimately be bankrupted by the obligations entered into here. According to Robert Campbell’s *The London Tradesman* (1747), “A Master Cabinet-Maker is a very profitable Trade; especially, if he works for and serves the Quality himself; but if he must serve them through the Chanel of the Upholder, his Profits are not very considerable.” For Chippendale’s upholsterer, or upholsterer, read Rannie.

In August 1754, Rannie and Chippendale signed a new, joint lease on the St. Martin’s Lane properties and insured the various buildings with the Sun Fire Insurance Company. And they issued an engraved trade card reading *Chippendale & Rannie, Cabinet-Makers and Upholsterers, in St. Martin’s Lane, Chairing [sic] Cross; London.*

Then within a year, on April 5, 1755, a major setback: “On Saturday Night,” according to the *Public Advertiser*, “a dreadful Fire broke out in the Workshop of Mr. Chippendale, in a Court in St. Martin’s Lane . . . and as there was a great Quantity of Timber on the Premises and that inclosed by Wooden Workshops and Sheds, it threaten’d Destruction to the Neighbourhood . . . .” Fortunately the fire was contained and the loss limited to two of the workshops in the complex. Out of total coverage of £3,700, an insurance settlement of £847 12s. 6d. was paid in May and the structures were promptly rebuilt. For the “22 Chests of the Journeymen’s Tools quite destroyed,” however, there was no such coverage. The *Public Advertiser* published appeals for private contributions to enable those hapless craftsmen to replace the tools of their livelihood.

The partnership continued until Rannie’s death in January 1766. Thomas Haig, Rannie’s longtime bookkeeper and confidant, was his principal executor. The business being short of cash, he promptly auctioned off all its stock in trade. Later, by 1771, he became a partner in Chippendale, Haig & Co.,...
Hugh Douglas Hamilton (Irish, 1739–1808). *Sir Rowland and Lady Winn in the Library at Nostell Priory*, ca. 1770. Oil on canvas, 39½ × 49½ in. (100.3 × 125.7 cm). Nostell Priory, West Yorkshire; National Trust (NT 960061)

A relationship that was to continue with Thomas Chippendale Jr. until Haig’s own death in 1803, at which time the firm was forced into bankruptcy.

Chippendale’s career in St. Martin’s Lane spanned some twenty-five years, from 1754 until shortly before his death in 1779. His principal business was furnishing the country houses of the nobility and gentry. Based primarily on country-house archives and bank records, Christopher Gilbert, Chippendale’s authoritative biographer, has firmly documented sixty-five clients, together with some seven hundred pieces of furniture, far more than can be ascribed to any other maker of the time.

William Crichton-Dalrymple (ca. 1699–1768), fifth Earl of Dumfries, Chippendale’s first major patron, visited London in the winter of 1758–59 with the express purpose of furnishing his new house in Scotland. The most expensive of the more than fifty individual pieces he ordered from Chippendale was a bed based on a design Chippendale had just made in preparation for a new edition of the *Director* (fig. 8). On the drawing he wrote, “Agreed to cost between x 60 & 70 pound.” He billed Lord Dumfries £38, “To a large mahogany double screw’d Bedstead wt. a Dometop ornamented in the Inside the feetposts fluted & a Palmbranch twisting round & carv’d Capitals a carv’d headboard a strong burnish’d Rod a lath bottom & strong triple wheel castors”; but with all the upholstery, the bill totaled £90 16s. 1½d. (fig. 9). The Dumfries commission, the only one in which Chippendale consistently executed designs in the manner of the first edition of the *Director*, survives intact and in situ after nearly being dispersed at auction in 2007.

At Nostell Priory, Yorkshire, some three dozen surviving letters and accounts, spanning the years 1766–71, paint a vivid picture of Chippendale’s often fraught relationship with one of his most important clients, Sir Rowland Winn. That very tension may have inspired him to create such splendid pieces as the library table, at a cost of £72 10s. in June 1766, which soon had pride of place in a family portrait (fig. 10). Though this table harked back to a design in the 1754 *Director* (see fig. 11), Nostell was the first of some dozen commissions in which Chippendale designed and manufactured furniture for interiors conceived by architect Robert Adam in his signature Neoclassical style.

But what about furniture the Chippendale firm made for stock, to be put in the showroom and sold off the shelf? The only evidence for this is the daily notices in the *Public Advertiser*, March 3–15, 1766, for the auction of “The entire genuine and valuable Stock in Trade of Mr. Chippendale and his late Partner, Mr. Rennie [sic] . . . a great Variety of fine Mahogany and Tulup Wood, Cabinets, Desks, and Book-Cases, Cloaths Presses, double Chests of Drawers, Commodes, Buroes, fine Library, Writing, Card, Dining, and other Tables . . . fine Pattern chairs, and sundry other Pieces of curious Cabinet Work . . . also all the large unwrought Stock . . . fine Mahogany and other Woods, in Plank, Boards, Vanier, and Wainscot.” None of this furniture is identifiable today.

Catherine Chippendale died in 1772, and Chippendale remarried and sired three more children.
Chippendale first announced his plan to publish The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director in the London Daily Advertiser for March 19, 1753. He was seeking four hundred subscribers up front, at a prepublication price of £1 10s. in sheets or £1 14s. bound in calf. Publication, originally planned for July 1754, was rescheduled to August. In the event, the book appeared at the end of May 1754, two months ahead of schedule, with a list of 308 subscribers and orders for 333 copies.

A typical copy of the Director, printed on paper with the watermarks of James Whatman (1702–1759) and bound in the original reverse calf, measures 18½ by 12 inches and weighs 8 pounds 8 ounces. Its handsome title page, in red and black letterpress (fig. 12), is followed by an elaborate engraved dedication to Chippendale’s former neighbor the Earl of Northumberland; a preface, dated March 23, 1754; a list of subscribers; and twenty-seven pages of captions for the 160 plates (actually 161, two plates being numbered xxv) that follow. Each engraving, measuring 14 by 9 inches, is inscribed at bottom left, T. Chippendale, inv et delin (abbreviations of the Latin inventor and delineator); at bottom right, M. Darly sculp (engraver) or another engraver; and at bottom center, Published according to Act of Parliament, sometimes with the date 1753 (see fig. 19). In 1735 Hogarth had successfully championed parliamentary passage of “An Act for the encouragement of the arts of

The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Director: The First Edition

From it we learn that he died of consumption and was buried in the North Old Ground, now the site of the National Gallery. He died intestate, and when his estate was finally settled in 1781, his debts exceeded his assets.
designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints,” also known as “Hogarth’s Act,” allowing artists to copyright their engraved designs for fourteen years.

While no expense had been spared in production of the Director, errors and inconsistencies in the numbering of the plates and the placement of inscriptions abounded, doubtless the result of Chippendale’s having rushed publication to coincide with the opening of his St. Martin’s Lane shop. In copies known to have been ordered by the original subscribers, a handful of plates were later numbered manually in brown ink. In some such copies, the titles for the desk and bookcase engravings were placed at right angles to the images. Once Chippendale saw how awkward those printed pages looked, he took one of his original drawings by way of instruction to the engraver, crossed out the title, and relocated it (see fig. 48). While these anomalies were corrected in subsequent printings, others, like having two different plates numbered xxv, never were.
Chippendale’s 1754 *Director* sold well, and in 1755 he issued a second edition, unchanged except that, instead of being printed for the author and sold at his house, he farmed it out to the printer John Haberkorn so that he could focus on growing his business. Four years later, however, in October 1759, not long after he had landed that first major country-house commission for Lord Dumfries, he suddenly advertised a third edition. He claimed to have been “encouraged . . . to revise and improve several of the Plates first published, and to add Fifty New ones.” In fact, he was responding to a looming commercial challenge by the recently formed partnership of two up-and-coming craftsmen, William Ince (1737–1804) and John Mayhew (1736–1811). Back in July, they had published the first “Of a New Book of Original Designs, Entitled, A General System of Useful and Ornamental Furniture: . . . in One Hundred and sixty large Folio Copper Plates . . . in weekly Numbers, each containing Four Plates . . . at One Shilling” (see fig. 14). So read their broadside, or advertisement, which also contained a none-too-veiled reference to the *Director*: “And as a Work of this Kind was delivered to the Public some few Years since, by a very ingenious Artificer, and met its deserved Applause; they being instigated by so good an Example, hope the Candid and Ingenious will be kind enough to receive this their Attempt.”

Chippendale must have been outraged at their arrogant appropriation of everything about his book—the size and number of plates, even the style of the designs—not to mention the threat to his business. That is why, on October 6, 1759, he responded in kind, announcing that “This Day were published No. 1. of the Third Edition (being Four Folio Copperplates, printed on Royal Paper, Price 1s.), The Gentleman’s and Cabinet Maker’s Director. To be continued Weekly, and the whole completed in Fifty Numbers.” The new edition would include improvements to some plates as well as fifty altogether new designs. In March 1760, he declared a brief hiatus in the scheduled distribution of the remaining twenty-five numbers, instead promising nearly a hundred new designs. This was all too much for Ince and Mayhew, who stopped issuing designs with their twenty-first number, or installment, and published their *Universal System of Household Furniture* with fewer than half of the 160 contemplated plates. The Museum’s copy of

---

17. The Third Edition of the *Director*

this rare book, purchased by Ivins in 1934, retains the blue paper wrappers for each of the individual numbers, upon many of which the broadside is printed (see fig. 14). Though their designs were derived from, and often inferior to, Chippendale’s, Ince and Mayhew were first-class cabinetmakers and became serious competitors.

The third edition of the Director (see fig. 13) was available, depending upon when ordered, as fifty weekly numbers at a shilling each; as the first twenty-five numbers altogether; as the 106 new plates separately in sheets, for £1 10s.; or as the complete 200 plates in sheets, for £2 12s. 6d. Most of the new plates are dated, so one can follow Chippendale’s progress in preparing the promised new designs: fifteen in 1759, thirty-nine in 1760, thirty-three in 1761, and eight in 1762. During the winter of 1761–62, however, he made twelve more new designs to replace ones from 1759 and 1760 that, made in haste to thwart Ince and Mayhew and printed and included in the weekly installments of the prior year, he must later have found unsatisfactory. No wonder the third edition is found today in so many variants!

The installment plan as a way of underwriting a book—the selling in parts rather than as a finished whole—had been introduced into Chippendale’s circle in 1758 with the publication of A New Book of Ornaments by Thomas Johnson (1723–1799), a carver who had first been associated with Matthias Lock in 1744 when they were together in the workshop of James Whittle. Late in life, Johnson
recalled having taken “great delight in copying Lock’s drawings.” Not surprisingly, the designs of the fifty-two plates in his book, midway in size between Lock’s booklets and Chippendale’s folios, owe their primary inspiration to the former. Bound in the back of the Museum’s copy, acquired by Ivins in 1932, is the only known impression of Johnson’s charmingly illustrated proposal for publishing his book by subscription (fig. 15). It instructs the would-be purchaser on how to go about ordering the thirteen numbers, each with four prints measuring 10 by 7 inches, which were to be available the first of every month, beginning January 1, 1756, until finished, at 1s. 6d. each.

Not every carver, however, got to publish his own designs. Gideon Saint (1729–1799), a near contemporary and neighbor of Johnson in the Leicester Square area west of St. Martin’s Lane, established himself on Princes Street in 1763. Shortly thereafter, he purchased a large blank book, cut out finger tabs for easy access to sections devoted to different furniture forms, and proceeded to fill it with a vast assemblage of mostly English Rococo ornament prints, including many by Lock and Copland (fig. 16), and drawings (some of these being his own), each design numbered for easy reference. (Chippendale’s were noticeable by their absence, presumably because they were too large to fit and were also readily available.) This visual cornucopia, acquired by Ivins in 1934, is evidence that the Director was never the only source of inspiration for carvers’ designs in the Rococo taste.
The Foley Chippendale Albums

The two albums the Museum acquired in 1920 (see fig. 2) contain the principal collection of drawings associated with Chippendale and the Director. Unlike the drawings at the Victoria and Albert Museum that have an unbroken Lock family provenance, the early history of these volumes is uncertain. While they likely descended to Thomas Chippendale Jr. (1749–1822), the demonstrable provenance only begins with Thomas Henry, fourth Baron Foley (1808–1869), formerly of Witley Court, Worcestershire, whose bookplate (datable to 1849 or later) is pasted in both of them (see inside front cover of this Bulletin); thence in a direct line to Gerald Henry, seventh Baron Foley (1898–1927), of Ruxley Lodge, Claygate, Surrey. The Ruxley Lodge library was auctioned off in situ, October 23–25, 1919, and the albums were subsequently acquired by George D. Smith and brought to New York.

The bound volumes contain 207 drawings mounted individually on coarse blue paper sheets numbered 1–226 (see fig. 8): 144 drawings (for 141 plates—three have been cut in half and mounted on six sheets) for the first edition of the Director; thirty-five for the third; and a miscellany of twenty-eight by Chippendale, Lock, and unidentified others. On the drawings for the first edition, the plate number for the engraving is inscribed at top left (see fig. 11); on those for the third edition, at top right (see fig. 29). (Chippendale used arabic numerals, which were engraved on the plates as roman numerals.) There are also the stubs of nineteen missing pages, the drawings for eight of which (six being for the first edition) appeared at auction in the 1970s, consigned by the son of an antiques dealer near Witley Court. In sum, eleven album pages remain missing together with fourteen of the 161 drawings employed for the first edition.

The drawings are somewhat the worse for wear. Surface grime and occasional tears and losses indicate extended exposure to a workshop environment; and whoever then put them in the albums, presumably Lord Foley’s librarian, aggressively trimmed their edges before pasting them down with what became a disfiguring glue. They are arranged according to form: volume one with the seating furniture and beds, the looking-glass frames, and other carvers’ work; volume two with cabinet or case furniture. Drawings for the third edition are interspersed throughout.

The Director drawings are not sketches or studies; they are the final, finished images from which the engravings were made, identical in every detail, though the printed images are very slightly smaller and, of course, in reverse (see figs. 19, 20). Yet in another way, the two could hardly be less alike. Whereas the engravings are technically perfect, stylized, and anonymous (one is hard-pressed to distinguish the work of engravers Matthias Darly, Johann Sebastien Müller, and Tobias Müller), the drawings are vibrant and expressive. The drawings also show that Chippendale was editing and reordering his designs even as they were being engraved. For example, having consecutively numbered the first seventy-eight designs, he deleted numbers 33 and 34 and inserted in their place numbers 49 and 50, his only designs for breakfast and china tables, which necessitated crossing out and renumbering plates 49–78 (see fig. 11).

The Designs for the Director

Chippendale prefaced his belief in the primacy of cabinetwork based on classical architectural practice by beginning the Director with “a short explanation of the five Orders [of Architecture] . . . and rules of Perspective,” what he claimed to be “the very soul and basis of [the cabinetmaker’s] art.” His first eight plates illustrate the “General Proportions” of the five orders, copied from Rules for Drawing the Several Parts of Architecture (1732), by James Gibbs (1682–1754), architect of the church
17. Thomas Chippendale, after James Gibbs. *Ionick Order*. Black ink with gray wash, traces of graphite; 13 3/8 × 8 1/8 in. (35.4 × 22.4 cm). For pl. iii in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.1[3])
of St. Martin-in-the-Fields (see fig. 4), where, incidentally, Chippendale was a parishioner. “Of all the arts which are either improved or ornamented by architecture,” Chippendale opined, “that of Cabinet-Making is . . . the most useful and ornamental.” These plates illustrate the components—pedestal, shaft, capital, and entablature—that make up each of the classical orders—Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, Composite—together with profiles of their moldings and the modular system for keeping the various elements in proper proportion (see fig. 17). They are the authority for so many features that appear in Chippendale’s patterns.

His next three plates illustrate chairs and cabinetwork according to his written “Rules to Draw [Furniture] in Perspective,” that is from the perspective of a standing person, either at a three-quarter angle—usually viewed, in the drawings, from the left with light coming from the right foreground—or straight on. Plate x (fig. 18), for example, shows a dressing, or bureau, table drawn at the groundline (e), with the point of sight (o) and point of distance (v) on a horizontal line 5 feet 6 inches above the groundline, that is, at eye level. He was to use the same image again when illustrating bureau tables (fig. 19). The source for that engraving was a drawing (fig. 20) to which Chippendale added all the information necessary for a craftsman to make the piece: the dimensions, in feet and inches, and the molding profiles “at large” (full size). The moldings for the bracket feet of the plainer bureau table, at upper left, conform to those of Gibbs’s Doric order; those for the fancier one, to his Ionic (see fig. 17). The visually arresting, sometimes exaggerated, representations of furniture so characteristic of the first edition are clearly the product of Chippendale’s rules for perspective.

Sometimes large cabinet pieces like bookcases were shown both frontally and in profile (fig. 21), while depictions of smaller objects allowed space to show complex construction details (fig. 22). This combination of the structural and mechanical with the ornamental is a recurring feature in the designs of the first edition.

After the perspective plates, Chippendale arranged the designs by form: chairs and beds,
19. Thomas Chippendale. *Buroe Tables*. Engraving by Tobias Müller; plate, 8 7/8 x 13 3/4 in. (22.4 x 35 cm). Pl. xli in the *Director*, 1754. Thomas J. Watson Library (161.1 C44 Q)

20. Thomas Chippendale. *Buros Tables*. Black ink with gray wash, traces of ruling in graphite; 8 7/8 x 14 in. (20.6 x 35.5 cm). For pl. xli in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[68])
21. Thomas Chippendale. *Dressing Chest and Bookcase*. Black ink with gray wash, traces of ruling in graphite; 8⅜ x 13⅛ in. (21.8 x 33.3 cm). For pl. lxxxix in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[66])

22. Thomas Chippendale. *Writing Table*. Black ink with gray wash, traces of graphite; 8⅜ x 12¾ in. (21.8 x 32.5 cm). For pl. xliv in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[37])
23. Thomas Chippendale. *Cloths Chest, Cloths Press*. Black ink with gray wash, graphite; $6\frac{7}{8} \times 12\frac{3}{8}$ in. (17.5 × 31.9 cm). For pl. xcvii in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[76])

24. Thomas Chippendale. *Two Designs of Cloths Chests*. Black ink with gray wash, $8\frac{7}{8} \times 13\frac{3}{8}$ in. (22 × 34 cm). For pl. cti in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[73])
tables and cabinet pieces, and, last, stands, frames, and other carvers’ work. For the first edition that meant multiple variations on a limited number of furniture forms. “Cloths Chests” and “Cloths Presses,” for example, are illustrated in ten individual designs on six plates (xcvi–ci), ranging in form from simple to complex, in ornament from plain to fancy (see figs. 23, 24).

The first edition’s title page (fig. 12) proclaimed its designs as being in the “Gothic, Chinese and Modern Taste.” This reflected Chippendale’s keen awareness of the fashions of the moment. In 1753 Horace Walpole had just completed the first phase of Strawberry Hill, his villa at Twickenham and the preeminent statement of the Gothic Revival; meanwhile, nearby at Kew, in 1749, Frederick, Prince of Wales, had built his Chinese summer-house (the House of Confucius), introducing the fad for all things Chinese. On March 22, 1753, the World published a letter to the editor on the subject of current fashion: “A few years ago every thing was Gothic; our houses, our beds, our bookcases, and our couches. . . . According to the present prevailing whim, every thing is Chinese.” Accordingly, Chippendale offered side chairs, beds, cabinets, shelves, and pier glasses in either Gothic or Chinese dress, the only differences being in the ornament: Gothic crockets and pointed arches or pagoda-like canopies and latticework railings. He described plate cxiv as “Two Designs of hanging shelves, the one Gothic, the other in the Chinese manner” (see fig. 25). But some forms were best suited to a specific taste: for writing tables, library tables, and library bookcases, it was the Gothic; for china cases, cabinets, shelves, and railings, it was the Chinese.
Then there was the “Modern” taste, synonymous with the French, or what today we call the Rococo. Chippendale identified his upholstered armchairs (see fig. 28) and his commode tables (see fig. 32) as “French.” On a design for clothes chests (see fig. 24), he deemed the right side, with its pierced feet with pointed arches, Gothic; the left side, with its applied Rococo, C-scroll, and foliate carving, French. Significantly, he had nothing to say about the exuberantly Rococo pieces exclusively the work of carvers—pier glass frames (fig. 26) and candlestands (fig. 27) and screens—relegated to the back of the book. They are entirely in the manner of Lock and Copland.

The third edition’s title page, issued in 1762 (fig. 13), was less specific, describing its designs simply as “In the Most Fashionable Taste.” Chippendale had begun the process of pruning back the ranks of original plates and adding new ones in 1759, the year after Robert Adam returned from Rome intent upon infusing the English interior with the art of classical antiquity. Neoclassicism was in the air, and Chippendale welcomed it. Gothic and Chinese were out, “Modern” (French) and Neoclassical in. To create room, he made deletions wherever he had multiple examples. And the repertoire of forms was now much expanded to include hall and garden chairs; writing, dressing, and toilet tables specifically for ladies; even chimneypieces, fire grates, and lighting fixtures. Whereas the first edition exhibited a consistent, if highly idiosyncratic, design ethos, the third, with half its designs old and half new, was a mixed bag.

The new designs for the third edition also exhibit a change in the conventions governing representation. The crisp and lively outlines, exaggerated perspectives, and deep shadows found in the first edition gave way to calmer, more static forms; to paler, sometimes tinted, washes. For chairs, the three-quarter perspective and angular, spiky ornament were superseded by frontal views and typically French-style scrollwork; for their seat covers, the exquisitely rendered chinoiserie vignettes were replaced by sketchy suggestions of fables and
28. Thomas Chippendale. *French Chairs*. Black ink with gray wash, traces of red chalk; 8¼ × 13¾ in. (21 × 34.8 cm). For pl. xix in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.1[14])

29. Thomas Chippendale. *French Chairs*, 1759. Black ink with gray wash, 8¼ × 13¾ in. (22.3 × 34.8 cm). For pl. xxii in the *Director*, 1762. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.1[13])
30. Thomas Chippendale. *Sideboard Table*. Black ink with gray wash, graphite; 8⅜ × 13⅝ in. (21.8 × 34.6 cm). For pl. xl in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[39])

31. Thomas Chippendale. *Sideboard Tables*, 1760. Black ink with gray wash, faint traces of graphite; 8½ × 13⅞ in. (21.7 × 34.4 cm). For pl. lxi in the *Director*, 1762. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[40])
32. Thomas Chippendale. *French Commode Table*. Black ink with gray wash, 8 1/4 × 12 3/4 in. (20.9 × 31.5 cm). For pl. xlvi in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[56])

flowers (figs. 28, 29). For tables and case pieces, single large-scale images shown in perspective (figs. 30, 32) were domesticated, made safe and tasteful, and replaced with pairs of smaller, less aggressive, sometimes overtly Neoclassical designs (figs. 31, 33). It is no coincidence that the three perspective studies in the first edition are missing from the third. On the other hand, a handful of the drawings dating from 1760–62 are distinctive for a more sculptural, more richly modeled, and less linear manner of rendering (fig. 34). And this raises the question of authorship.

A Question of Attribution

More than thirty of the Director drawings, and all of the engravings, bear Thomas Chippendale’s signature as inventor (artist) and delineator (draftsman), yet their authorship has long been subject to debate. Ivins, in 1921, thought that the signatures had been added by someone in Chippendale’s shop, but hedged regarding the drawings, concluding that “there is no reason to think that Chippendale may not have made them himself.” 37

In “The Creators of the Chippendale Style,” their 1929 landmark study of the Museum’s drawings, Fiske Kimball and Edna Donnell proved that
Lock and Copland introduced Rococo ornament to England a full decade before publication of the Director. They also convincingly demonstrated, by comparison with autographs on his correspondence, that the signatures and inscriptions on the Director drawings were in Chippendale’s own hand. But then, on the basis of perceived stylistic affinities, they gave almost exclusive artistic credit for the first edition’s designs to Copland, relegating to Chippendale the role of “the modern man of business” who capitalized on the artistic genius of others. This was the fashion of early Chippendale scholarship from the turn of the twentieth century taken to its logical conclusion. In 1958 Peter Ward-Jackson, writing about the Victoria and Albert’s drawings, offered a long-overdue corrective—since confirmed by the discovery that Copland died in January 1752, before work on the Director had begun—reasserting Chippendale’s reputation as an important artist.

But the nagging question of who actually drew the Director designs, Chippendale or someone in his employ, remains. It is rooted in our ignorance about Chippendale’s early training, as well as in the dearth of surviving drawings intended for execution rather than publication. It is time to review the evidence.

First, we have Chippendale’s word that he was master of his own drawings: in the preface to the Director, he “confess[ed], that in executing many of the drawings, my pencil has but faintly copied out those images that my fancy suggested.” In the London Chronicle of March 28, 1760, he claimed that ill health and the need “to allow him Time for the executing some New Designs” had delayed the publication of the new plates for the third edition. And in a letter to Sir Rowland Winn at Nostell in July 1767, he mentioned going to Harewood, seat of Edwin Lascelles and destined to be Chippendale’s costliest commission, where, having “look’d over the whole of ye house I found that [I] Shou’d want a Many designs & knowing that I had time Enough I went to York to do them.”

Second, we have those authenticated signatures, presumably added by Chippendale when assembling and ordering the images for engraving and publication. It was common practice, particularly with engravings asserting the Hogarth Act, to give separate credit to artist, draftsman, and engraver; and it seems inconceivable that Chippendale would have grossly misrepresented his role and claimed credit for both their design and their delineation if others were involved.

Third, of course, are the drawings themselves. We have seen the dramatic changes from those for the edition of 1754 to those of 1762, but, with possible exceptions (see fig. 34), they look as though they have a common origin (see figs. 20–33). Most

35. Isaac Ware (British, before 1704–1766). Hall Chimney-Piece. Black ink with gray wash, 14 3/16 x 9 3/16 in. (37 x 23 cm). For pl. 26 in Plans, Elevations, and Sections . . . of Houghton in Norfolk, 1735. Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1925 (25.62.51tr[a])
demonstrate a lively assurance and easy elegance, a sense of immediacy, and the ability to instill ornament with nervous energy that are the mark of an accomplished artist. Compare the Director drawings to those for the engravings in Isaac Ware’s Plans, Elevations, and Sections . . . of Houghton, in which the interior illustrations were conceived by William Kent, notorious for his sketchy and informal graphic style, but then drawn by Ware (fig. 35) preparatory to engraving by Paul Fourdrinier (1698–1758). These delineations are the bland but proficient product of the copyist. The engravings are unambiguously inscribed W. Kent inv. I. Ware del. P. Fourdrinier sc.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that the designs are in Chippendale’s own hand is offered by those for cabinetwork for the first edition, which offer a unique window on his design process. On a number of them, the ruled pencil lines with which they were laid out can still be discerned, confirming that they were composed according to Chippendale’s rules of architecture and perspective. A good example is number 97 (fig. 23), where one can see the pencil lines used to locate the clothes chest and the clothes press on the page, the perspective lines to construct the outlines of the individual pieces, and the precise measurements of the different parts (see back cover of this Bulletin). Then the drawing was finished in black or gray ink and wash, and the dimensions neatly transcribed. And only after that were the plate numbers, titles, signatures, and other inscriptions added—in brown ink, the handwriting more or less freehand—in striking contrast to the gray-toned, engraver-ready designs themselves.

### Chippendale Furniture

Furniture that can legitimately be called “Chippendale” falls into two categories. The first is pieces indebted to the Director for their design, regardless of who made them. This category is central to Chippendale’s stated purpose. In the first edition he declared that only four of its designs had already been executed—two china cases by himself (pls. cvi, cviii) and a ribbon-back chair and Gothic writing table by others unnamed (pls. xvi, lii). But he hastened to claim to “have given no design but what may be executed with advantage by the hands of a skillful workman.”²⁴ In the commentary on the individual plates, he repeatedly said that a particular design would look extremely or exceedingly well, or give a good or the desired effect, or great satisfaction—but only if well or skillfully or neatly executed, by a good or fine or ingenious workman. To that end he provided “Proper Directions for executing the most difficult Pieces, the Mouldings being exhibited at large, and the Dimension of each Design specified.”²⁴ In sum, the Director is a book whose designs were intended to be mixed, matched, and mined; whose designs were only as good as the craftsmen who executed them.

Two letters from a principal of the Gillow firm of Lancaster, a leading provincial cabinet shop, offer a window on the way the book worked in practice. On July 5, 1760, nearly a year after Chippendale had begun issuing his new designs, Richard Gillow wrote to his cousin James in London, requesting “Chippendale’s additional Number as soon as possible.” And on April 26, 1765, he sent a client “2 Sketches of Library Book Cases,” adding that “if any of Chippindales designs be more agreeable I have his Book and can execute ’em & adapt them to the places they are for if you’ll be so obliging to Point out the Number.”²⁵ In other words, the trade looked forward to Chippendale’s latest offerings and had no compunction about customizing them.

The Museum has, from the collection of Judge Irwin Untermyer of New York City, two textbook examples of such “Director-style” Chippendale furniture.²⁶ The first, a pair of side chairs (fig. 36), is based on a design for “Ribband back Chairs” (fig. 37). In the first edition, Chippendale claimed them to be “the best I have ever seen. . . . The Chair on the left hand [the right in the drawing] has been executed from this Design, which had an excellent
36. Side chair, England, ca. 1755–60. Mahogany, wool tent-stitch embroidery on canvas; 39½ × 23 × 19½ in. (100.3 × 58.5 × 49.5 cm). Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 (64.101.983)

38. China table, England, ca. 1755–60. Mahogany, 28¼ × 37¾ × 26½ in. (71.8 × 95.9 × 67.3 cm). Gift of Irwin Untermyer, 1964 (64.101.1099)

39. Thomas Chippendale. China Tables. Black ink with gray wash, graphite; 8⅞ × 13⅛ in. (20.7 × 33.4 cm). For pl. xxxiv in the Director, 1754; pl. li in 1762. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[92])
effect, and gave satisfaction to all who saw it”; in the third, that “Several Sets have been made.” 47 The second example, an exceptionally graceful rectangular tea or breakfast table (fig. 38), combines the serpentine-shaped tray top of one of his two designs for “China Tables” with the cabriole legs and cross stretchers of the other (fig. 39). While we do not know from which set the judge’s chairs might have come, his unique table has a colorful history of having turned up at a country auction in Wales before passing through a succession of leading British and American dealers and collectors.

40. Pier glass mirror, made for Shillinglee Park, Sussex, ca. 1760. Carved and gilded linden wood, glass; 114 × 55 in. (289.6 × 139.7 cm). Purchase, Morris Loeb Bequest, 1955 (55.43.1)

41. William Ince. Pier Glasses. Engraving by Matthias Darly; plate, 14 × 8⅞ in. (35.5 × 22.5 cm). Pl. cxxi in Ince and Mayhew, A General System of Useful and Ornamental Furniture, ca. 1760. Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1934 (34.100)
42. Thomas Chippendale. *China Shelf*. Black ink with gray wash, some ruling in graphite; 8⅝ × 12⅛ in. (21.8 × 31.9 cm). For pl. cxv in the *Director*, 1754. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[89])
For that most characteristic of “Chippendale style” furniture forms, the carved and gilded pier glass intended for placement between windows, the Museum has a pair (fig. 40) from Shillinglee Park, Sussex, former seat of the Earls Winterton. Here, however, the source is not the Director but a plate in Ince and Mayhew’s Universal System (fig. 41). Where their engraved design peters out at the top, the carver has added an oriental figure in a garden seat. Also at the Museum is a pair of standing shelves (fig. 43) made for the fourth Duke of Beaufort’s Chinese bedroom at Badminton House, Gloucestershire, by the firm of William and John Linnell, in the manner of designs in the Director for latticework shelves intended to be decorated with “japanning,” or imitation lacquer work (fig. 42).

The second category of Chippendale furniture consists of all the documented products of Chippendale’s shop. The earliest pieces are those ordered by Lord Dumfries in 1759, many being free adaptations of designs in the 1754 edition: solid mahogany chairs and tables with cabriole legs, carved and gilded Rococo looking-glass frames, and girandoles. Ironically, the one piece copied directly from a Director design—the bed for which Dumfries paid £90 16s. 1½d.—was from a 1759 design for the third edition (fig. 8).

Thereafter, other than Chippendale’s japanned bedroom suite for David Garrick’s Thames-side villa, it is hard to see the influence of the first edition in the firm’s own work. Neoclassicism à la Robert Adam was his forte. The set of side chairs displayed in the Museum’s Adam-designed dining room from Lansdowne House, London, was made by Chippendale, Haig & Co. for Goldsborough Hall, the Yorkshire seat of Daniel Lascelles, younger brother of Edwin Lascelles at Harewood. With their rectilinear form, pierced splats with carved Neoclassical accents, and tapered front legs, the chairs are iconic examples of a favorite Chippendale form (fig. 44).

About the same time, for William Weddell of nearby Newby Hall, the firm made an almost identical set of dining chairs. It also supplied carved and gilded armchairs and sofas for Weddell’s Tapestry
Room, one of six such Adam interiors with walls and seating furniture covered in tapestry woven at the Gobelins Manufactory in Paris. The earliest of these rooms, at Croome Court, Worcestershire, and now installed in the Metropolitan, also has its original, very similar furnishings. These include “6 Large Antique Elbow Chairs, with oval Backs, Carv’d with Double husks & ribbon, knot on top, Gilt in the Best Burnish’d Gold, Stuff’d with Besthair,” for which Ince and Mayhew billed the Earl of Coventry £77 8s. on October 5, 1769 (fig. 45). The chairs are finely made and with their superb original gilding, but perhaps lack some of the grace and elegance with which Chippendale, Haig & Co. executed the same overall design five years later for Newby (fig. 46).


Influence Abroad

The *Director’s* reach was international; there was even a French translation of the third edition in 1762. But this influence is nowhere more evident than in colonial Philadelphia in the years following the publication of the third edition.⁴⁹ London-trained cabinetmaker Thomas Affleck probably brought his own copy with him when he arrived in 1763; and the Library Company of Philadelphia, which counted numerous craftsmen among its members, acquired a copy sometime between 1764 and 1769. Philadelphia, then the fourth-largest city in the English-speaking world—after London, Edinburgh, and Dublin—looked to London for the latest fashions, but a series of nonimportation agreements aimed at stymieing British imports led the local gentry to welcome London-trained cabinetmakers and carvers who could incorporate the latest London fads into the regional idiom. Thus, readily recognizable design motifs from the third edition appear proudly
47. High chest of drawers, Philadelphia, ca. 1765. Mahogany; 91⅜ × 44⅜ × 24⅜ (233 × 113.3 × 62.5 cm). John Stewart Kennedy Fund, 1918 (18.110.4)
48. Thomas Chippendale. Desk & Bookcase. Black ink with gray wash, traces of graphite; 13⅜ × 8⅛ in. (33.8 × 20.7 cm). For pl. LXXVIII in the Director, 1754; pl. CVIII in 1762. Rogers Fund, 1920 (20.40.2[30])

50. Detail of figure 47, showing carved lower drawer

integrated into some of the best bespoke local furniture, including chairs, tables, and chests now in the Metropolitan’s American Wing.

Perhaps the perfect example of this amalgamation of Director motifs and regional style is a splendid scroll-top high chest (fig. 47), part of a large collection of American and English furniture in the Chippendale style that was purchased by the Museum just one hundred years ago. Here the unidentified maker borrowed the broken scroll pediment, particularly its scroll terminals metamorphosing into acanthus leafage and its bust finial, from a first-edition desk and bookcase design (fig. 48); he exactly traced the dentil cornice from the full-size molding profile of a third-edition desk and bookcase design, as well as adapting its draped urn central finial for the Philadelphia piece’s side finials (fig. 49). For the carved lower drawer, where two swans converse within a large C-scroll (fig. 50), however, he turned to the design for a chimneypiece tablet (fig. 51), part of a suite of six prints published by Thomas Johnson in 1762. The likely carver was Hercules Courtenay, who had been apprenticed to Johnson before emigrating from London to Philadelphia by 1765.

There is no more telling expression of the pervasive influence of Chippendale’s great book than Philadelphia cabinetmaker John Folwell’s unrealized attempt, in 1775, after the start of war, to publish an American “Chippendale.” His printed proposal for The Gentleman and Cabinet-Maker’s Assistant (fig. 52), consciously aping the text and typography of the title page of the 1754 Director (fig. 12), is bound into some copies of the Philadelphia edition of Abraham Swan’s British Architect, the first architectural book to be printed in colonial America. Oh, to know what Folwell’s drawings would have looked like!

Bibliographic Note

The Chippendale bibliography is extensive. The essential reference is Christopher Gilbert, *The Life and Work of Thomas Chippendale* (New York: Macmillan, 1978), a two-volume monograph published in celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Chippendale’s death. It incorporates virtually every fact about the man and his work that a century of antiquarian and scholarly research had uncovered, and those facts are the underpinnings of this essay. Little new has been unearthed in the subsequent forty years. Other sources are given in the notes.


Notes

6. Memo from William M. Ivins Jr. to the Director and to the Committee on Purchases, December 13, 1920, Metropolitan Museum Archives, P9378 Appropriations.
7. Illustrated in Gilbert, *Chippendale*, vol. 2, fig. 2.
10. See fig. 35.
13. The card is in the Chippendale Society, Leeds; illustrated in Gilbert, *Chippendale*, vol. 2, fig. 12.
21. For a full account of the Dumfries commission, see Gilbert, *Chippendale*, vol. 1, pp. 130–39. The contents of the house were catalogued for sale by Christie’s, London (*Dumfries House: A Chippendale Commission*, 2 vols.), scheduled for July 12–13, 2007, but the auction was canceled.
This Bulletin is a long-overdue tribute to the late Christopher Gilbert, for whose friendship and scholarship I am deeply indebted. For their shared enthusiasm and assistance in celebrating the three hundredth anniversary of Chippendale’s birth, I am grateful to Barbara Bridgers, Alyce Perry Englund, Elizabeth Zanis, and, especially, Femke Speelberg, all at the Metropolitan Museum; to Leela Meinertas and Olivia Horsfall Turner at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London; and to James Lomax at Temple Newsam House, Leeds.
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