**Drawer Cavity or Carcase Construction:** Chippendale’s workshops did vary their approach to constructing the inside of the drawers. On most occasions oak runners were employed – see Figures 5-20 and 5-21. However, sometimes the workshop used straight walls\(^{69}\) on the sides of the carcass (again of oak) without runners – see Figure 5-22. In virtually all cases, Chippendale made use of a small hexagonal piece of oak glued to the front of the drawer cavity to act as a drawer stop - see Figures 5-20 and 5-21. On the Harewood Library Table, each of these approaches is exemplified; on the top centre drawer, there are drawer runners; on the four corner drawers there are drawer runners and on the inside of the pedestal drawers there are straight oak walls. All three have small oak drawer stops. This seems to be the pattern for Chippendale’s library tables – the top drawers will have drawer runners of oak, whilst the drawers in the pedestal do not use them; and all drawers will have oak drawer stops.

\(^{69}\) If these ‘walls’ were toward the outside of the furniture, they were frequently the sides of the carcass.
Locks: Following examination of the locks employed across the case study samples of Chippendale’s furniture, a surprising uniformity emerges - and the Harewood Library Table is no exception. This is somewhat surprising since this library table is so much grander than most of the other library tables included in this research.

On the left are pictures of the locks from the Harewood Library Table which were the same as those found on all of the other library tables with the exception of the Nostell table, which had ‘S’ shaped keyholes in the centre of each door, operating a piston which extending to the edge. In all cases, the locks were made of the same materials (believed to
be brass and steel) and required only one turn to extend the bolt to its full length. While most Chippendale library tables had a very simple ward system, as evidenced by the key and its location in the centre of the door, the Nostell table had a much more complicated design.

On drawers, the locks were simply located in a recess cut in the inside, top edge of the drawer front and the single bolt extended into the top of the drawer frame.

To house the lock in the door, Chippendale frequently used a similar approach where a recess was cut into the door and the frame around the door was cut to allow the bolt to enter and finished with a metal cover or (more commonly) striking plate—see Figure 5-25.

Figure 5-24: Two of the drawer locks used on the Harewood Library Table. The top picture is the lock on the centre, front drawer and the lower lock is for the left front drawer.

**The Doors on the Harewood Desk:** The doors on the Harewood Library Table are exceptionally heavy. There are a number of reasons for this. First the wood used for the doors was dense (oak) and the pieces used were thickly cut (each are approximately 2 cm thick) and finally, each door carries two very weighty pieces of ormolu and four smaller pieces, in addition to the lock. The resulting weight of the doors clearly necessitated a system that would allow for the doors to operate effectively while supporting their weight. This solution was found in an arrangement of steel brackets to the top and bottom of the door which attached to similar brackets on the body of the library table by use of steel pins – hence its name the pin hinge.
This should not imply that this is a unique or unusual solution nor that the only reason to use this pin hinge for this table is because of the weight of the doors. In fact, this type of hinge was used quite often because the most common alternative, so called butt hinges, would be visible from the outside and therefore aesthetically less pleasing. The following pictures demonstrate how this was done. What was unusual about this particular pin hinge, as will be shown on the next few pages, was the weight of the metal used for these hinges. They were most likely custom made to take the weight of these doors.

Figure 5-27: Located at the top of the door, two strips of steel are screwed onto the Library Table, one to the body of the Library Table (It is located between the top of the pedestal and bottom of the top section.) and the other, longer piece is screwed to the door itself. On the piece screwed to the door; there is a small pin that is fit into the hole that is drilled into the strip attached to the body of the table.

Figure 5-28: A similar apparatus is positioned on the bottom of the door. Here the pin is on the body of the Library Table and the hole is positioned on the bottom of the door.
The lock that was used on this desk was (by contrast) was entirely typical - a single action lock that sends a bolt into the doorplate placed on the inside of the body of the Library table.\textsuperscript{71}

**Casters:** Each of the pedestals on the Harewood table is supported by two custom-made wheel assemblies comprised of brass and steel. The two sets of casters are located on a piece of pine that runs from front to back at the centre of the pedestal - see Figure 5-29. There are four components to each assembly; firstly the wheel itself; second a double pronged bracket holding the wheel and connecting it to the third element, a triangular bracket mounted on in turn to the fourth element, a circular steel plate, attached to the pedestal with four large steel screws. In order to support the weight of the table and to allow for as much freedom of movement as possible, each assembly was made to move in three ways. The arrangement is a sophisticated one. The wheels spin around the double-pronged bracket holding them (see Figure 5-30). This is then connected to a triangular piece with housings containing ball bearings, so called Roller

\textsuperscript{71} As locks were discussed in more detail earlier (see p.233) they will not be discussed in detail at this time. It only needs to be pointed out the type of lock and how it held the door closed.

---

**Figure 5-29:** Bottom of pedestal from the Harewood Library Table showing the two wheel assemblies.

**Figure 5-30:** These pictures detail the actual wheel assembly located at the base of each of the pedestals. The first picture (left) points out the components of the assemblages and the second picture (right) demonstrates the assemblage’s movements.
bearings, under two of its three corners. The third corner is attached to the base with a device allowing the entire triangular bracket to pivot.

**Overall Design:** As mentioned above, the overall design of the Harewood Library Table was very similar to the design put in Chippendales Director.\(^7^2\) It is interesting to note that only one other library table makes use of the canted corner columns that characterise this design – the one at Nostell Priory. However, the corners of the Harewood table are finished in ormolu and terminate in a goat’s head, while the corners of the Nostell table makes use of carved timber and terminate in a lion’s head (See Figure 5-31).

\(^7^2\) T. Chippendale, *The Gentleman and Cabinet Maker’s Director, Third Edition*, Dover Publications, NY, 1966 (reprint of volume published in 1762) plate LXXXIII or 83. This is shown on Figure 5-6 of this chapter.
**Marquetry & Marquetry Sources:** This section concerns both the techniques used in the marquetry and discussion around the marquetry designs.

The Harewood Library Table was one of a number of pieces made for Harewood House that were decorated with marquetry, a technique that had fallen out of favour but appears to have been reintroduced to Harewood through the combined efforts of Chippendale and Adam. 73

> Once it was considered that Hepplewhite and Sheraton were the earliest of our English cabinet-makers to avail themselves of this method of treatment, but it now seems probable that the credit for the introduction of the craft is due no less to Adam and Messrs Chippendale. 74

In designing the Harewood table, Chippendale it is generally thought to have followed the lead set by Robert Adam. 75 While Adam is known to have designed furniture as part of his interior schemes 76 in this case several factors suggest that he did not design the furniture for Harewood House, Chippendale did.

First of all we must consider Chippendale’s lengthy association with his client. Chippendale started work for Lascelles in 1767 and continued working for him until 1778 – eleven

---

73 Other examples of marquetry in Harewood house include the side tables in the Music Room, the Dianna and Minerva side table, the library folding stairs and the Lady’s Secretary.


75 As noted elsewhere, Chippendale did not have the classical training of Adam; also, he started his career approaching using only Rococo designs. It was only after working with Adam that Chippendale began to use the Neo-Classical designs. Furthermore, as pointed out later in this chapter, many of the design elements for the Harewood Library Table obviously mirrored the elements that Adam used for the room. It is highly doubtful that Adam followed Chippendale on the inclusion of these design motifs (See p. 242).

76 Probably the most known example of Adam designed room and furniture was Croome Court’s tapestry room (C. Musgrave, Adam and Hepplewhite and other Neo-Classical Furniture, Faber and Faber, London, 1966. p. 62.) Adam, usually, thought of mirrors and side tables as part of the room design, while other pieces of furniture were less important to the overall design. Thus, he tended to design the mirrors and side tables, but sometimes designed other pieces. Consider for example, Syon house there are a number of all types of furniture that were in the Adam style including card tables, chests, sofas, stools and window seats. (C. Musgrave, Adam and Hepplewhite and other Neo-Classical Furniture, pp. 87-88.)
years.\footnote{C. Gilbert, The Life and Works of Thomas Chippendale, Studio Vista/Christies, London, 1978, p. 195. The foundation of Harewood House was begun on 1759 by the architect John Carr. Adam was known to have started work on Harewood House interiors in 1765, just a few years before Chippendale was brought in to work for the estate. While much of his major work was completed by 1771, he was still submitting plans as late as 1777. So, Adam was working for the Lascalles’ estate for about the same length of time as Chippendale and much of their work overlapped. (No author given) Harewood, Yorkshire: A Guide, Harewood House Trust, Leeds, (no date given), p. 7.} This is why C. Gilbert describes the Harewood commission as ‘definitely the most valuable of his career’.\footnote{C. Gilbert, The Life and Works of Thomas Chippendale, p. 195.}

Another reason for assuming that Chippendale took responsibility for the furniture design is because although we have many of the Adam drawings relating to Harewood House, we do not have designs for the furniture and certainly not for the Harewood table, which is of course a variation on a design found in Chippendale’s Director.\footnote{T. Chippendale, (preface by R. Symonds) Chippendale furniture designs from the Gentleman and Cabinet-makers’ Director, Thomas Chippendale, London, 1762.}\footnote{T. Chippendale, The Gentleman and Cabinet Maker’s Director, Third Edition, Dover Publications, NY, 1966 (Reprint of the volume published in 1762).} Furthermore, there are separate bills from Adam & Chippendale for the work rendered.\footnote{R. Symonds, Adam and Chippendale: A Myth Exploded, Country Life, Annual, 1958, pp.53-56.}

Furthermore, while it is true that the marquetry designs set into the Harewood table are similar to those associated with Adam, they are different. To quote E. Harris:

“His (Adam’s) authorship can also be ruled out on stylistic grounds. The choice and handling of ornament, the shape of the parts, and the general proportioning of the major Harewood pieces are typical of Chippendale, but markedly different from any authenticated Adam design.”\footnote{E. Harris, Furniture of Robert Adam, A. Tiranti, London, 1963, p. 27.}

Other pieces of furniture supplied by Chippendale for Harewood (much of it a good deal less ornate than the library table) also appear entirely consistent his work.\footnote{E. Harris, Furniture of Robert Adam.} \footnote{One is a set - a sideboard, with pedestals, urns and a wine cooler. Here again, it is obvious that the designs are inspired by the Adam’s Style and to the decorative elements of the Harewood House, but certain characteristics are simply not like anything else that Adam had done. Again, there are no paper trails that make a direct link between Adam and Chippendale underlining the possibility that Chippendale himself designed the pieces of furniture.} However, on the
other hand there is no question that Chippendale was influence by Adam’s designs. As Rowe notes:

The motifs and general layout of the main panels derive ultimately from the source books available at the time, specifically no doubt Wood and Dawkins’s Palmyra and Baalbek and Sir William Hamilton’s Vases; more directly perhaps from the Adam interiors and designs - including some for Harewood House itself - that Chippendale must surely have seen by the time he needed to think about this piece (the Harewood table).

Certainly as Rowe suggests, many of the motifs used on the Harewood table are to be found on the walls and the ceiling of the room that was to contain the Harewood Library Table, suggesting Chippendale either had sight of the room – or Adam’s scheme – before creating the Harewood table.

Another interesting observation about this design is that a very similar table was produced for another Adam client, Osterley Park in 1773. This other table, although smaller than the Harewood Library Table share many of the same design characteristics such as the pieces of ormolu in the pedestal corners, the vase motifs, the use of a repeated pattern across the top-drawer section. Because this Osterley Park Library Table was executed after the Harewood Library Table it is impossible to tell if it was a Chippendale design that influenced Adam or the other way around. It does, however, demonstrate that they too were thinking in similar ways about how to approach the design in these pieces of furniture.

See E. Harris, Furniture of Robert Adam, pp. 104-105.

84 These include:
85 See C. Musgrave, Adam and Hepplewhite and other Neo-Classical Furniture, pp. 96-100 and plate 39.
Architectural Design Elements that were used by Adam in the ‘Old Library’ at Harewood House

Figure 5-32: This shows some of the key neoclassical design elements that Adams used in the Harewood House Library. The guilloche is the ornaments that act as borders dividing sections of the designs on the ceiling. While in this case the guilloche does not include flower designs in the centre frequently Adams did include them. On the upper right is an anthemion that was copied from the cornice of the Temple of the Sun at Palmyra (See Wood, R., Ruins of Palmyra, Plate XV). The third illustration, below the anthemion, on the right is the patera that Adam repeated quite often on this ceiling. Lastly, is the circular, enclosed floral pattern that was also repeated throughout the ceiling.

As shown on the next page that the same designs were used on the desk, obviously suggesting that Chippendale took cues from Adams in order to produce a piece of furniture that fit within its environment.
Design Elements that were used by Chippendale in the ‘Old Library’ Table at Harewood House

Figure 5-33: The same design elements are seen on the Harewood desk. In the upper left there is the Guilloche pattern which runs between the upper section and the tops of the pedestals across the entire desk. Next (to the right) is the circular, enclosed rose pattern, which forms a banner all the way around the desks upper section. The palm or anthemion design is seen on top of each of the four doors and finally the circular patera is located on each end.
Shown on the previous page are (clockwise from the top left) are:

- The guilloche pattern that is incorporated in the brass ormolu that separates the top section of the Harewood Library Table.
- Details of the embedded flower pattern to be found on the Harewood table.
- The anthemion or palm pattern that is embedded at the top of each of the doors of the Harewood table.
- The *patera* pattern that is located on each of the Harewood table’s sides.
- A repeated circular patterns on both the ceiling and on the Harewood table.

Many of the other elements on the table are classical in origin; the vase on the door panels; the ram’s heads ormolu on the doors; the ormolu rosettes also on the doors and the use of floral swags – all of are details associated with Adam.

During a recent restoration of the doors on the Harewood Library Table (This restoration was conducted by the current restorer for Leeds, Ian Fraser in the year 2000.) veneers were lifted from the desk in order to identify the woods employed in the marquetry and to access the colours of the original design (long since faded or darkened) and examine how the marquetry was executed. While it was established that a standard marquetry technique was employed – i.e. a ‘packet’ was put together and pieces cut out using a fret saw, then put together in such a way to remove the excess. That assembly was then used to mark and cut the background material. The clean cut of the edges suggests the use of a fret saw to cut the pieces. The lack of space between the individual items and surrounding areas strongly suggest that these cut out designs were used to create the background pattern.\(^8^7\) It also became apparent that the technique made use of considerable repetition - which in itself suggests that the marquetier(s) working for Chippendale made some use of a tool that allowed for cutting multiple objects at the same time. These would most likely be either a *chevalet de marqueterie* with an arm holding the saw straight and perpendicular to the

---

cutting surface, or a type of jigsaw saw that is mounted on a solid frame. According to the author Pierre Raymond the cutting arm of the marquetry saw was added in the late C18th. However one should be cautious here. Raymond has more recently conceded (in interview) that it was perhaps not until the early C19th when this device was invented and to date, no evidence has surfaced of such a device made for cutting multiple copies at one time in England before the C19th. One attempt to resolve this issue was made by this author would by looking for an error or distortion in one piece of marquetry that was repeated elsewhere. After careful examination of the repeat designs, no such repeated distortion was located – however absence of evidence (as we know only too well) is not evidence of absence.

---

88 In P. Ramond’s book Marquetry, there are several variations of this saw. Frame jigsaw, fixed frame jigsaw, an independent recall jigsaw, or just a jigsaw. In this thesis, it will be referred to as a recipicating jigsaw or a fixed frame jigsaw (See P. Ramond, Marquetry for a description and design, here they are called ‘frame jigsaw’, p. 208)
89 P. Ramond, Marquetry, Taunton Press Classics, New Town, CT, USA, 1989, p. 205
90 Interview with P. Ramond, 21-6-2008.
91 In support of this research, a fairly exhaustive search was conducted, from visiting tool museums in both England and France, reviewing all available literature, contacting experts in the field, etc. and no one had any firm evidence that any of these devices were in use for marquetry in the late C18th. A few of the organisations contacted are: The Ken Hawley Collection Trust (Yorkshire), Museum of St. Albans (Herts), The Tools & Trades History Society (TATHS), Troyes Maison de l'Outil (Troyes), Musee des Arts et Metiers (Paris). Furthermore, there were no texts published in England that even discussed the use of the simple clamp for marquetry, however in France there were several texts that showed variations of the clamps that were illustrated in this text (See for example; J. Coignard, Des Principes de l'Architecture, de la Sculpture, de la Peinture, et des Autres Arts Qui en Dependent, (no publisher listed, however listed as having Royal approval), Paris, 1690.)
92 it is evident that this logic is limited as just because I did not find such a repetition, that they did not exist. However, it was a fairly thorough review without finding such an example and it seems very probable that the patterns were cut out individually.
Figure 5-34: Different views of the tools used to cut marquetry. Upper left and the lower pictures show different versions of the clamp that were known to have been in use in the late C18th. The picture on the upper right, shows the version with the arm the so called "chevalet de marqueterie."

---

93 The pictures of the different marquetry tools came from the following sources:
Upper Right: P. Ramound, Marquetry, p. 205.
Lower Centre: D. Diderot, J. d’Alembert (editors and writers), Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, André Le Breton, Paris, 1751.
Another issue related to the techniques used to lay the marquetry in the Harewood table relates to whether or not a knife was used to insert the pieces of marquetry. According to one source, such knife cuts are present in the surface under the marquetry suggesting that a knife has been used to apply the marquetry on the Harewood table.94 Bearing in mind the problem outlined above, the question now arises as to whether knives were used to cut out the background pattern too (not some kind of jigsaw) or just used to help inlay and make final adjustments to the background pattern, as would seem to be the case suggested by a painting of two marquetiers by Elias Martin (1739 – 1818) – conjecture that must lie for the moment beyond the remit of this thesis.95

94 A. Bowett, Chippendale’s Neo-Classical Marquetry Revealed, pp. 164-167. It should be pointed out that there has been some questions as to whether or not these were knife cuts, however none of these other comments nor the evidence to back them up have been published or backed up with photographs.

95 Elias Martin (1739-1818) was a Swedish artist who studied and worked in both England and France. He was part of a large family of craftsmen and artists while he was taught furniture making by his father, he went on

---

Figure 5-35: Top picture shows an example of a ‘distortion’ that could have been repeated if multiple copies of this design were cut at the same time. The bottom picture shows some of the other examples of this design without the distortion.

Distorted leaf
Figure 5-36: The Marquetiers a painting by Elias Martin, showing two craftsmen executing a marquetry panel. Notice the use of a simple version of the marquetry clamp and the use of a knife to fit the marquetry into place. Two things that are not evident; the arm holding the saw on the marquetry clamp or the use of a shoulder knife (nor is there a shoulder knife appearing elsewhere in the picture.)

However, he still produced several pieces, such as the marquetiers, which related to his furniture crafts background.