

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

‘SO BEAUTIFUL A PERFORMANCE’
MAPPING GENDER AND POLITICAL SPACE:
THE ROLE OF ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN FORMS – LONDON AND
GROSVENOR SQUARE 1720-1760

Two Volumes
Volume I

Julie J. Schlarman

PhD

Centre for Studies in Architecture and Urban History
Department of Archaeology
Faculty of Arts

February 2003

MASTER COPY

This thesis was submitted for examination in February 2003. It does not necessarily represent the final form of the thesis as deposited in the University after examination.

Errata

Schlarman, JJ

PhD 2002

University of Southampton

Abstract

Faculty of Arts

Archaeology

Doctor of Philosophy

‘So Beautiful a Performance’

Mapping Gender and Political Space: The Role of Architecture and Urban Forms—London and Grosvenor Square 1720-1760

By Julie J Schlarman

In his Lectures on Architecture, Robert Morris described the three-house block of homes on the north side of Grosvenor Square as ‘so beautiful a performance.’ Performance can be interpreted on many levels. Architecturally, a performance can develop as patterns in the urban landscape, such as the garden square, townhouse and street. These architectural and urban elements can serve as platforms for the society which consumed them.

Performance, on the interpersonal level, was a necessary task in order to convey one’s place in society, and could manifest itself in terms of gender, class and political alliance. This investigation will explore the manner in which architectural and urban forms staged social performance, and the means in which eighteenth-century London society consumed and utilized specific spatial patterns in the urban landscape. The model utilized to test my spatial theories was the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair during the period of 1720 to 1760.

Demographic studies of the estate harvested evidence of a rich and diverse society in residence, which included a significant number of single women, builders and architects, and influential political persons. This work seeks to reveal the manner in which urban environment, as witnessed in the first half of eighteenth-century London, provided spatial stages upon which to establish and promote one’s social standing, political alliance and gender relationships.

A starting point for this investigation was the establishment of those architectural, urban and social patterns in eighteenth-century London. Bill Hillier’s and Julianne Hanson’s, The Social Logic of Space, provided the theoretical catalyst from which to launch this query, and the framework necessary to examine social and spatial arrangements.

Architectural and urban space were investigated from a number of different perspectives, whilst utilizing diverse social variables, such as gender and class to explore their meaning and application to first half of eighteenth-century London. The concepts of ‘public’ and ‘private’, and their appropriateness to contemporary society will be refined through an investigation of their spatial properties. This work will challenge the conventional usage of these terms in an attempt to expand the current understanding of their eighteenth-century meanings and applications. By refining the definition of ‘public’ as a spatial dimension which could extend into the domestic, and the ‘private’ as including spaces beyond the home, this work will seek to challenge the application of the ‘separate spheres’ ideology in regards to gender relationships and spatial practice in eighteenth-century London. This work seeks to expose the varied roles and dimensions played by the urbanite, specifically those which utilized Grosvenor Square as their platform for social and spatial performance.

List of Contents

Volume I

List of Tables	i
List of Illustrations	ii
Preface	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	vii

One: A Sense of Place and Space

Research Statement	1
Gender, Politic and Architectural History	2
Spatial Theory	10
Language of Space	19

Two: The City

‘Idea of the Place’	37
The City is Many Cities	42
Perceptions of the City	47
Public Spaces in the City	54
Performance and the City	65

Three: The Garden Square

The Role of the Garden Square	73
Patterns in the Garden Square	74
The Society of the Garden Square	86
The Garden in the Square	97

Four: The Street

The Role of Streets	103
Patterns and the Street	109
The Society of the Street	123
Performance and the Street	129

Five: The Townhouse

The Role of the Townhouse	135
The Society of the Townhouse	144
Patterns in the Townhouse	155
Conclusions	168

Volume II

Tables	174
Illustrations	235
Bibliography	299

List of Tables

Volume II

1	Parliamentary Duties: Residents of Grosvenor Square 1720-60	174
2	Women as Rate-Payers on the Grosvenor Estate	178
3	The Social Make-up of Grosvenor Square	180
4	Court Posts and Honours: Residents of Grosvenor Square 1720-60	181
5	Inventory of Pictures at the home of Paul Methuen, esq. in Grosvenor Street from <i>London and Its Environs Described</i> , 1761	193
6	Inventory of the Right Honourable Henrietta Wentworth, Countess Dowager of Strafford	200
7	Inventory of the Household of the Honourable Lady Elizabeth Cole	204
8	Inventory of William Benson Esq.	206
9	Schedule of Fixtures and Inventory of the principal rooms of Lord Hertford's townhouse at No 16 Grosvenor Street, 1763	209
10	Residents of the Grosvenor Estate as Subscribers to Colen Campbell's <i>Vitruvius Britannicus</i>	215
11	Widows as First Occupants on the Grosvenor Estate	219
12	Lords of the Realm – The Grosvenor Estate	220
13	Aristocratic Creations of George I and George II: Residents of Grosvenor Estate 1720-60	221
14	Families in residence on the Grosvenor Estate 1720- 1760	223
15	Newly Weds as residents of the Grosvenor Estate 1720-60	231
16	Grosvenor estate property inherited by women 1720-1760	232

List of Illustrations

Volume II

- 1 Detail of Horwood's map of Westminster, 1792-99
- 2 Detail of John Mackay's survey of the Grosvenor estate, 1723
- 3 Women as First-time Residents on the Grosvenor estate
- 4 Political Associations of the Residents of the Grosvenor estate
- 5 Bowles's engraved view of Leicester Square, c1751
- 6 Anonymous, *Ideal Cityscape*, sixteenth century, Palazzo Ducale, Urbino, Italy
- 7 Canaletto, *The Thames and the City of London from Richmond House*, 1747
- 8 William Hogarth, *Morning*, 1738
- 9 Extract from John Rocque's Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, 1745
- 10 William Hogarth, *Gin Lane*, c1750
- 11 William Hogarth, *Night*, 1737
- 12 Thomas Gainsborough, *Gainsborough's Forest*, c1746-8
- 13 View of the Rotunda at Ranelagh and the Royal Hospital at Chelsea from the Thames, c1750
- 14 William Jones's aerial plan of Ranelagh Gardens, c1742
- 15 Canaletto, *The Interior of the Rotunda at Ranelagh, London*, c1751
- 16 Engraved view of the Centre Cross Walk, Vauxhall Gardens, c1755
- 17 Engraved aerial view of Vauxhall Gardens, c1755
- 18 Engraved view of the interior of the Music Room, Vauxhall Gardens, c1755
- 19 Engraved view of the Chinese Pavilion, Ranelagh Gardens, c1750
- 20 Engraved view of the Chinese Pavilion, Vauxhall Gardens, c1755
- 21 Canaletto, *The Grand Walk in Vauxhall Gardens, London*, c1751
- 22 Ink drawing of Grosvenor Square, looking east, for J Maurer's engraving of 1741
- 23 Engraved view of The Hermitage, Richmond, c1745
- 24 Sir Christopher Wren's proposal for rebuilding London, 1666

25 Engraved view based on Thomas Malton's aquatint of Cavendish Square, c1800

26 Thomas Malton's view of Hanover Square, c1800

27 Plans of Hanover and Soho Squares

28 Map of the Building on the Grosvenor estate to 1730

29 Map of the Building on the Grosvenor estate to 1740

30 Map of the Building on the Grosvenor estate to 1750

31 Sutton Nicholls's engraving of Grosvenor Square, c.1730

32 Sutton Nicholls's engraved view of Red Lyon Square, 1751

33 Sutton Nicholls's engraved view of Soho Square, 1751

34 Sutton Nicholls's engraved view of Bloomsbury Square, 1751

35 Sutton Nicholls's engraved view of Hanover Square, 1751

36 Engraved view of the Foundling Hospital, looking north, c1750

37 Engraved view of Grosvenor Square, looking north, by T Bowles, 1751

38 William Hogarth, 'The Young 'Prentice Executed at Tyburn' from *Idleness and Industry* series, 1747

39 Map of Women as Rate Payers on the Grosvenor estate 1720-1760

40 Elevation of proposed east side of Grosvenor Square by Colen Campbell, located in volume III (1725) of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, the British Library

41 Engraved view of Hanover Square, looking south, c1750

42 Engraved view of The Mall, looking east towards Charing Cross, c1750

43 Leonard Knyff's ink drawing of an aerial view of Whitehall towards the west and St James's, 1695-7

44 William James, *Horse Guards' Parade from St James's Park, London*, c1760

45 Engraved view of the Royal Mews, c1750

46 Canaletto, *Northumberland House*, Charing Cross, London, 1752

47 Engraved view of Green Park, looking east, c.1750

48 Engraved view of the Piccadilly Reservoir, Green Park, c1750

49 Plans of Lady Vane home, 50 Grosvenor Square, c1737

50 Plan of Lord Hertford's home at No 34 Grosvenor Street, based on original in the Warwickshire Record Office

51 Elevation of Lord Lindsey's home in Lincoln Inn's Fields, from volume I, 1715, of Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus*

52 Elevation of proposed three-house block for Grosvenor Square by Colen Campbell, c1725

53 Elevation of John Aislaby's home on Grosvenor Square

54 Elevation of Inigo Jones's Covent Garden, from volume I, 1715, of Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus*

55 Engraved elevation of Colen Campbell's back parlour, Brook Street from volume III (1725) of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, the British Library

56 William Hogarth, 'The Marriage Contract,' from *Marriage Ala Mode* series, 1745

57 Printed view based on Thomas Malton's aquatint of Grosvenor Square, looking east, 1800

58 Henry Aldrich, Peckwater Quadrangle, Christ Church, Oxford, 1707-14

59 Elevation of John Wood the Elder's proposal for Queen Square, Bath, c1725

60 Elevation of staircase at No 44 Grosvenor Square

61 Mural from the staircase at No 44 Grosvenor Square, Victoria and Albert Museum

62 William Hogarth, 'The Countess's Morning Levee,' from *Marriage Ala Mode*, 1745

63 William Hogarth, 'Surrounded by Artists and Professors,' from *The Rake's Progress*, 1735

64 Detail of Sutton Nicholls's engraved view of Grosvenor Square

Preface

Performance can be understood from many levels, including as a presentation or act, a feat or accomplishment, a means of functioning or a method of execution. In the present context, performance will be understood as those acts of human drama and spatial ballet which were executed upon the urban stage. These architectural and spatial platforms were varied in scale and function, ranging from large-scale urban locales such as pleasure gardens and parks to scenes set within the domestic interior, specifically the eighteenth-century London townhouse.

This work will investigate the manner in which architecture can act both as a stage and a performance in itself. As the spatial support for social performance, architecture can help model and shape social, gender and political roles and relationships. On the other hand, the formal elements which compose a building, a street, or a garden square can be interpreted as a visual performance of mass, colour, light, form, rhythm and pattern providing beauty and enjoyment for their audience. This work will attempt reveal the varied levels of meaning which upon inspection of Colen Campbell's carefully composed architectural proposal for the east end of Grosvenor Square provoked the comment of 'so beautiful a performance'.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank the funding institutions which made this endeavour fiscally possible, including the CCVP for the Overseas Research Award Scheme and the Faculty of Arts at the University of Southampton for the Tuition Grant and a one year Maintenance Studentship.

Research assistance was provided by the many archivists and librarians whom assisted me in the composition of my archive, which included the staff in Special Collections, the Hartley Library, who created a refuge in the ‘summer of my discontent,’ at the University of Southampton, the Institute for Historic Research, University of London, Hampshire Public Record Office, Westminster Archives, West Yorkshire Archive Service, King’s Manor, York, and the British Library. Special thanks go to the staff at the Warwickshire Public Record Office for their exceptionally elegant presentation of artefacts and those members of staff at the Public Record Office in Kew who realised that I was not just another American composing a genealogy study and trying to trace my aristocratic roots.

My friends and family have been of the greatest support in this endeavour. I would like to acknowledge the open and critical encouragement of my colleagues, including Stewart Abbott, Ann-Marie Akehurst, Hannah Greig, John Hubbard, Eleanor Quince and Mark Westgarth. Special consideration goes to Abigail Harrison Moore for paving the way and providing a great example, and Lucy Watkins Rumble for her expertise on Colen Campbell. To my dear friend Teri Goodmann, who always believed in my abilities and constantly encouraged me to spread my wings and fly away from that small Iowa town, I can only express my deepest gratitude. There is not enough appreciation to express the motivation and unshakable confidence provided by my parents, Madi and Joe, with regards to the pursuit of this dream. Thank you very much. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the unconditional, relentless, and expert support and advice provided by my mentor and supervisor, Professor Dana Arnold, who put faith in my capabilities and confidence in my abilities.

Lastly, my deepest appreciation and heartfelt thanks goes to my closet friend, companion and confidante, The Englishman, Ray Scott, who helped to formulate my curiosity and ultimately my love of the city of London. Your personal history as related through the stories of your exploits in the city and our shared love of maps and competition, brought the places of my dreams and aspirations to life, and motivated me to start anew in England in order to pursue my lifelong ambition of achieving a doctorate. I sadly regret that there was not enough time for us to share in this triumph. However, as I walk along the streets of this wonderful metropolis, I know that you will always be there right alongside me.

Abbreviations

BST – Brook Street
CPL – Chapel Street
GRN – Green Street
GER – Grosvenor Estate Records
GST – Grosvenor Street
GSQ - Grosvenor Square
HL – Hartley Library, University of Southampton
illeg - illegible
NAD – North Audley Street
PRK – Park Street
PRO – Public Record Office, Kew
SAD – South Audley Street
SS – South Street
Survey – *The Survey of London*, edited by FW Shepherd
UBS – Upper Brook Street
UGS – Upper Grosvenor Street
WA – Westminster Archives
WRO – Warwickshire Record Office, Warwick
WYAS- West Yorkshire Archive Service, Leeds

All texts were published in London unless otherwise noted.

In regards to eighteenth-century source material, original spelling and format was maintained.

Chapter I

A Sense of the Place and Space

Research Statement

This investigation was launched by a driving question concerning the position in which built space operates in the definition of social, political and gender roles. Architecture and its urban environment provides the setting for the activities and functions of day-to-day life. The pertinent questions concerning this research revolves about the manner in which architecture can speak of those people who act out ordinary activities in its midst. Whilst considering that people, urban dwellers in particular, demonstrate multi-faceted roles, how does the urban space they occupy and consume shape, define and enhance their exhibition of those roles? This investigation will explore the way in which architecture and urban space act as stages upon which to perform diverse social roles, such as that of man or woman, public or private, Whig or Tory, court alliance and social class. This dissertation will also look at the manner in which the built environment can shape these roles, and conversely how these roles shape the spaces utilized for the performance of these roles. The case in point involves both the physical environment and social make-up of Grosvenor Square during the first half of the eighteenth century.

Why Grosvenor Square?

The model I have chosen to test my theories, is Grosvenor Square, London during the period of 1720 to 1760, which marks not only the initial development of the Mayfair estate, but roughly the reigns of the first two Hanoverian kings. As will become apparent throughout the course of this investigation, Grosvenor Square was a significant early eighteenth-century urban development in terms of its physical design, geographic placement and the number and type of residents and visitors it attracted. In order to avoid isolating and monumentalising Grosvenor Square this research also engages in its relationship both physically and socially to London's West End. The Square's importance to the needs and desires of urbanites can only be fully understood by exploring its broader relationships to both city and nation.

Gender, Politics and Architectural History

This investigation initially stemmed from a lack of published information regarding feminine consumption and production of architectural space in the eighteenth-century. Treatises that explore female involvement in urban space and the built environment, their role in architectural consumption, development and appreciation are nearly non-existent, although there are a few studies which generally concentrate on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹ The chapter on femininity and architecture in Dana Arnold's *The Georgian Country House* has implications for further research into this underdeveloped area, suggesting that there is a rich field for investigation.² Jane Rendell's *The Pursuit of Pleasure*, explores the commodification of women in the public spaces of Regency London, while utilizing a feminist approach influenced by Luce Irigaray.³ Rendell locates women in London's public spaces, which she perceives as under male domination and control. Her work explores only three conditions of women in the format of virgin maid, wife and as a prostitute. This work ignores the participation of a significant portion of the feminine population – the widow. This marital and social condition plays a major part of my arguments concerning gender, space and power. In addition, Rendell's evidence centres on the illustrative narrative of Pierce Egan's *Life in London*, although the author rarely engages specifically with the images, but predominately with its text. Here, as in Egan's work, illustrations by the Cruickshank brothers merely illuminate passages from the text and the author draws little meaning from their visual content. The present work seeks to explore the meanings evident in both textual and visual evidence of eighteenth-century urban and domestic space, to better understand gender relationships and spatial functioning.

On the whole, histories of gender and architecture are scarce, providing a virtually untapped resource in terms of eighteenth-century research. An initial search of women and architectural consumption from the late seventeenth through the early nineteenth centuries uncovered over 350 women who were involved in various aspects of building design, gardens, interiors, improvements and material culture through capital means - such as an inheritance, purchase, gift or bequest - or through direct participation in the design process.⁴ Unfortunately, the information provided in most sources was minimal and limited in scope. History and historians have chosen to define women in terms of their relationships to men, i.e. fathers and husbands, making the process of gathering information about specific women difficult and at times, impossible to pursue. An entry that demanded further investigation was one of an heiress of a large portion of London's West End and the daughter of a merchant, Mary Davies Grosvenor. The implications that

the origins of Britain's current wealthiest man, the Duke of Westminster, began with the inheritance of a young orphaned girl of merchant class origins was a compelling attraction. Dame Mary Grosvenor's inheritance of nearly five hundred acres of Westminster as an infant made her one of the wealthiest women in England during the early eighteenth century.⁵ So important was the actual and potential financial status of Mary Davies's inheritance that in 1677, at the age of twelve, her marriage to Sir Thomas Grosvenor was secured. Her property was an enormous swath of land extending from the Thames at Millbank northwards to Oxford Street, intersected only by the King's Road and the grounds of Buckingham House (later Buckingham Palace). This property included the former Manor of Ebury at Millbank, where Mary's son Richard would make improvements during the 1720s. Mary Grosvenor's inheritance would eventually include another 56 acres of Mayfair, land held in dower by her mother, Mrs Mary Tregonwell (d.1717), for her lifetime.⁶ The Mayfair portion of her estate, which was in early deeds referred to as The Hundred Acres, was south of present day Oxford Street and east of Park Lane.⁷ (Illustration 1)

Dame Mary Grosvenor was the daughter of Alexander Davies (1636-65), a member of London's newly influential mercantile class, which was typically cash rich, but poor in land holdings. Unlike other members of this rising social stratum, Mary Grosvenor's ancestors had the opportunity to invest their wealth in land, which would produce vast amounts of rental income for nearly 300 years to the present day.⁸ The development of Mary Grosvenor's legacy would propel latter generations of the Grosvenor family from the mercantile class and lower gentry to the Dukedom of Westminster in less than 100 years. Of foremost concern to this work is the Mayfair portion of Mary Grosvenor's estate, with the Square as the centrepiece of the estate plan that was to make the name Grosvenor synonymous with wealth, influence and style.

After the death of her husband in 1700, Mary Grosvenor was showing signs of mental illness and in 1701, while residing in Paris, was enticed into a 'bogus marriage' with the Roman Catholic, Edward Fenwick.⁹ In 1705, a commission of lunacy declared Mary Grosvenor mentally unfit, and until her death in 1730, her estate and its revenues were governed by the Court of Chancery.¹⁰ As a means of securing a financially advantageous marriage to Jane Wyndham, daughter of Sir Edward Wyndham of Orchard Wyndham, Somerset, Mary Grosvenor's eldest son, Richard, obtained an Act of Parliament (1711) to provide a settlement of his and his mother's property in order to secure a jointure for his new wife. A clause in this Act permitted Sir Richard Grosvenor to grant building leases to

speculators on his mother's portion of the estate, but due to limiting leasing tenures, construction on the Mayfair estate did not commence in full until 1720.¹¹ The first building agreements were granted to Thomas Barlow, the estate surveyor.¹² Barlow's plan for the estate centred a large garden square on the available land, which was approached from all directions by substantial boulevards.

The earliest visual record of the Mayfair development was a survey commissioned by Richard Grosvenor and produced by John Mackay in 1723.¹³ (Illustration 2) This impressive map may have been utilized as legal visual representation of Mary Grosvenor's property, since it situated the building development in relation to other West End developments. Sir Richard Grosvenor, the patron of the map, was noted in its inscription, but significantly, this document highlighted the terms of ownership, in which the estate legally belonged to his mother.

... the INHERITANCE of DAME MARY GROSVENOR WIDOW
DAUGHR and HEIRESS of Alex DAVIES Late of Ebury ...¹⁴

It appears that Sir Richard used this map and its representation of his mother's property as a means to elaborate its political and social significance, accenting the estate's physical associations to other West End developments. The survey also plays a role in the justification of the estate's development. Through the appropriate legal channels, Sir Richard Grosvenor assumed possession and control of his mother's property and began the process of distributing permits to speculative builders. I believe it was at this point that the masculine spatial dominance of the Grosvenor estate began to ebb, and feminine spatial qualities came to the forefront.

Demographic investigations have revealed the diverse society evident on the Grosvenor estate in the first half of the eighteenth century. (Table 1 and 2; Illustrations 3 and 4) The conventional understanding of the Grosvenor estate relies upon the concept of a population of wealthy, political males.¹⁵ In relation to other West End developments, Grosvenor Square had the largest percentage of aristocratic and political men, excepting St James's Square. (Table 3) The seminal text on the estate development and history, *The Survey of London*, is dependent on this premise and neglects past residents which do not adhere to these conditions.¹⁶ Female residents and members of the gentry were a significant portion of the populace of Grosvenor Square, but little has been revealed concerning their histories. This work will attempt to broaden an understanding of the

importance of both women and members of the gentry in shaping the urban scene of eighteenth-century London.

The Course of the Investigation

Due to the lack of historical evidence surrounding women in eighteenth-century London, much exertion in this research has occurred in the act of locating women in this historical context. Upon further investigation of the Grosvenor estate, via the epic empirical compilation known as *The Survey of London*, it was revealed that a large proportion of the early inhabitants of the estate were single women.¹⁷ As illustrated on the map titled ‘Women and Grosvenor Square – 1720-1760’, women rate payers were distributed throughout the estate with significant concentrations along Upper Brook Street and Upper Grosvenor Street. (Illustration 3) The majority of the women who lived on the Grosvenor estate and held the financial responsibility of leasing their own homes were single women, including spinsters, widows and unmarried maidens. This realization provoked many questions concerning the attraction of the metropolis for women, their desires and motivations for living in the city and the manner in which the physical environment could help shape their social roles, potentially providing a venue for the exhibition of power. However, with this research, women were not an exclusive group. One aim of this project was to place women, along with other groups of individuals, such as architects and builders, whose social context and gendered encounters have been broadly overlooked by architectural historians, within the cultural framework of eighteenth-century London. This work will also adopt an approach used by the feminist Judith Butler in which gender is a flexible concept which varies according to a person’s place and the activities which take part in this space.¹⁸ Gender is a social characteristic which can be performed¹⁹, and this investigation looks specifically at the spaces chosen for the enactment of gender on the urban stage, and the patterns which emerged in both eighteenth-century London society and its architectural surroundings.

Thus, the determination of the society of eighteenth-century Grosvenor Square has been a vital aspect of this investigation. A number of variables have been considered throughout the course of this investigation concerning the social makeup of the Grosvenor estate. Demographic evidence of the social configuration of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair during the first half of the eighteenth century, has been compiled in regards to gender, social rank and political affiliation. (Tables 1, 2 and 3) For nearly three centuries, Grosvenor Square has been associated with the nation’s politically powerful and wealthy

men.²⁰ This research will question this stereotype by looking more closely at its earliest residents in terms of gender, class and political/court affiliation to discover the manner in which those people utilized the built environment to project and assert those roles. In terms of political conditions, the early eighteenth century was a period of testing and asserting the newly acquired power of the aristocratic elite. From the Glorious Revolution of 1688, led by the Whig oligarchy, which questioned the notions of divine kingship by placing limitations on the monarchy and diverting power to Parliament, to the installation of the Hanoverian king, George I, on the British throne, the political face of Britain was in a constant state of flux.²¹ The new political roles of both the nation and individuals were shaped to some extent by the physical dimensions of Westminster as a whole and Grosvenor Square in particular.

Another variable applied to the Grosvenor estate was the political responsibilities of its residents. A demographic survey of the estate revealed that a large number of Grosvenor Square's first residents had government connections, either through direct participation in Parliament or through duties in court and the royal household, and included both men and women. (Illustration 4; Table 4) Politics is one of the arenas in which gender roles can be revealed, and one of the primary reasons for maintaining a London residence, providing a platform on which to promote and fulfil one's duties to court and country.²² As indicated on the map, 'Politics: Grosvenor Square 1720-1760', the estate and especially the Square was saturated with men who held positions in Parliament. These men played key roles in insuring the political stability of the time by reinforcing the power bestowed upon them by the Bill of Rights (1689) and the Act of Settlement (1701).²³ The need to maintain a London residence was created by the fulfilment of these duties. For the average member of the House of Commons, their London home was their primary residence. Those aristocrats who had taken up their seat in the House of Lords, also maintained a London townhouse to act on their responsibilities, but generally possessed country homes, and often times a suburban villa. Historians have often noted the 'metropolitan' qualities of politics during the reign of George II, constituting London as the primary site for governmental activities.²⁴ The role of the metropolis in the political climate justifies the time under consideration. The span of 1720 to 1760 covers the entire reign of George II, and roughly spans the time it takes for the initial development of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair. This work will explore the manner in which the metropolis and its dependent urban forms of the townhouse, street, and garden square acted as stages upon which various elements of society could enhance their political goals, needs and aspirations.

Architecture and Urban History

This work seeks to integrate the ordinary townhouse into the epic history of the city of London, an aspect of architectural history which has been sorely neglected. According to the architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner, architecture, as opposed to building, has been defined as that group of buildings which have aesthetic appeal.²⁵ As Andrew Ballantyne has noted in his rich essay on the approaches to architectural history, this determination of architecture's value and significance would eliminate most of vernacular architecture²⁶, and for this purpose, bias any further investigation into the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair. It should be noted that the *Survey of London* ignores most of the 'ordinary' buildings on the Grosvenor estate. Only as large blocks of terrace housing were demolished to make room for Claridge's Hotel and other 'significant' buildings, does their aesthetic value increase and merit inclusion in this tome. This work shall seek to demonstrate that 'aesthetic value' should not be the only determining factor which separates architecture from mere building. Ballantyne has called for new histories to be written about 'ordinary' architecture.²⁷ The author proposes that architecture is in the eye of the beholder, noting that the everyday and ordinary are essential in the search for its cultural understanding.²⁸ Activities and routines are closely associated with a culture or a lifestyle, thus creating a vital role for vernacular architecture,²⁹ and this work will seek to position the role of the townhouse as a platform for social performances.

Many architectural surveys look at religious and civic architecture, with the exploration of domestic architecture often neglected. The London townhouse is often neglected in favour of the suburban villa or the country house, marginalizing the townhouse's historic significance.³⁰ Authors have noted that the aristocracy lived in 'palatial' metropolitan homes, but in reality only a handful of detached palaces of the elite existed in eighteenth-century London.³¹ On the Grosvenor estate, only one 'palatial' home existed, which belonged to the Irish peer, Lord Chetwynd. With few large detached homes existent in eighteenth-century London, the majority of society, including the wealthy, lived in terraced housing. Few texts are entirely devoted to this architectural form, and those that exist focus primarily on the nineteenth century.³² Other architectural histories neglect to place the eighteenth-century townhouse in either a formal construct or a social setting.³³ M.H. Port's interesting exploration of the inter-relationships between the townhouse and country house in eighteenth-century society, highlights the variables of their complex workings and implies a need for further investigation.³⁴ This work will focus on both the formal elements of the early eighteenth century townhouse, the social and cultural needs

and desires which brought about its social significance and the creation of a greater understanding of the role it played in everyday life, and its context of the broader settings of the city, street and garden square.

The first half of the eighteenth century has been largely ignored by many architectural and urban historians. John Summerson described the architecture and urban expansion during the reign of George II as ‘a rather dim period.’³⁵ This viewpoint was fuelled by the lack of large-scale public building and improvements to royal palaces, but ignores the fact that the shape and form of London’s West End was changing dramatically from 1720 to 1760, which included the development of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair. Another reason for the lack of research into this period and locale may be the absence of any significant architects directly involved with its design and construction. The domination of the biographical approach to architectural history has been evident in Britain since its inception in the 1950s.³⁶ In order to explore the spatial history of the Grosvenor estate in London, I feel there is a strong need to go beyond the approach which concentrates on the architect and the patron. *The Survey of London*, the most comprehensive examination of the Grosvenor estate to date, focused its investigation on those buildings in which a known architect was involved in either its original construction or later alterations.³⁷ The biographical method of investigating architectural history is important, and although there are huge gaps and omissions in the investigation of significant eighteenth-century architects, such as Gibbs, Webb, Flitcroft, Morris and Campbell, these individuals are only part of the story.³⁸ In addition, this approach tends to monumentalise the patron and architect, but fails to draw out broader social and cultural meaning from the form.³⁹ Although the development of this movement in architectural history runs hand-in-hand with the establishment of architectural history as a professional practice in Britain, this methodology continues to dominate the field of enquiry.⁴⁰ The discovery of a new drawing, letter or plan by a noted architect becomes the means to justify the established canons of architectural history. This work proposed to expand upon these ‘discoveries’ in order to integrate the role of the built form into social histories.

The concept of meaning in architecture is often applied to the way in which the built forms of a particular society reflect its relationship with the land, its technology, its social order, its worldview and its religious beliefs.⁴¹

Many existing theories and approaches to architectural history ‘... do not first conceptualise buildings as carrying social determination through their form as objects.’⁴² The resonance of the symbolic power of architecture was clearly demonstrated by the

terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in the United States, on September 11th, 2001. The symbolic power of space can be further be evidenced by the gathering of people in Grosvenor Square to lay tributes to express grief and sympathy for a nation and the tragedy's victims. Ironically, Grosvenor Square came to life in order to symbolise death.⁴³ These events clearly show the multiple layers of meaning that space can metaphorically express. This work will investigate the manner in which architecture and urban forms, such as squares and streets, acted as visual and spatial metaphors for the society which took advantage of their spaces for the performance of those social roles which determined their gender, political and social identities.

Spatial theory

In order to reveal the integral relationships between the urban space and architecture of Grosvenor Square and its residents, I have applied theoretical paradigms which propose strategies for examining the varied and complex conditions of space and its consumers. Bill Hillier's and Julienne Hanson's important text on spatial relations has provided one strategy for examining the manner in which the Grosvenor estate was ordered, both physically and socially.⁴⁴ Their basic premise relies on the concept that societies can take on a spatial ordering in two senses: first, by the arrangement of people in space in relation to one another, and secondly, through the patterning of space by means of the built environment.

Spatial order is one of the most striking means by which we recognize the existence of cultural differences between one social formation and another, that is, differences in the ways members of those societies live out and reproduce their social existence.⁴⁵

This research has concentrated on revealing the complexities of the social ordering, in terms of class, gender, politics and court, of the Grosvenor estate during its first development and the manner in which each of these societal roles can be both revealed and embellished by the built environment. Hiller and Hanson have provided a theoretical framework upon which to structure the various layers of historical knowledge, so that each chapter of this text will be arranged according to the physical and social patterns evident in the first half of eighteenth-century London. An understanding of the dynamics of this urban space must take into account the reciprocal relationship which existed between people and their environment.

Architecture is not a 'social art' simply because buildings are important visual symbols of society, but also because, through the ways in which buildings, individually and collectively, create and order space, we are able to recognize society: that it exists and has a certain form.⁴⁶

In order to determine the manner in which the architecture of Grosvenor Square shaped the social roles of gender, class and politics, and the format that eighteenth-century London society acquired from this environment, the following questions were posed. Was the Grosvenor estate unique in its relationship to the city of London? Were the people who lived on the estate more varied in terms of economic class as compared to other locations in the West End? Were there more women residing on the Grosvenor estate than in other estates of the metropolis? If so, why? What was the relationship of the Grosvenor estate to the metropolis as a whole? Did gendered, gentrified or court forms of

built space appear on the landscape of early eighteenth-century London? The built environment is complex, and its relationship to society is not only vital, but can be disguised or hidden. According to the theory set forth by Hiller and Hanson, in order to understand the way in which a society consumes space, one must also look for the actual patterns that were created in the built environment. Space contains a collection and organization of forms, which in turn creates a pattern. In order to investigate this dense and complex problem, forms have been broken down into smaller and thus, more comprehensible units: the city, the garden square, the street and the townhouse. These urban patterns will be explored to reveal both the physical and social patterns that existed in eighteenth-century Grosvenor Square. This work will propose the manner in which the ‘patterns’ of the urban environment, in the physical forms of the city, garden square, street and townhouse, functioned in accordance to these societal traits of its consumers. This spatial theory will allow me to examine not only the microcosm of the Grosvenor estate, but also how its society and built environment related to the metropolis as a whole.

‘Public’ and ‘Private’

A characteristic definition of space, especially with regards to gender and class relationships, can be expressed in terms of ‘public’ or ‘private.’ Many current theories concerned with the gendered use of space, utilize the term ‘private’ to define the space of the home and domestic life, and often times, the sole location of women in the built environment.⁴⁷ This ‘domestic thesis’, as Lawrence Klein has termed the theory, raises many questions as to its practical application to the eighteenth century.⁴⁸ This model relies upon the strictly dichotomous understanding of the terms, defining ‘private’ as that which relates to the home and the ‘public’ as that which lies beyond the domestic scope, i.e., the street, the city, the nation. Klein provides contemporary evidence of the various levels of meaning evident in the terms ‘public’ and ‘private,’ as expressed in the following passage by John Trenchard.⁴⁹

What is the Publick, but the collective Body of private Men, as every Man is a Member of the Publick? And as the Whole ought to be concerned for the Preservation of every private Individual, it is the duty of every Individual to be concerned for the Whole, in which himself is included.⁵⁰

The current use of the simple dichotomy of these terms does not appreciate the elasticity with which these terms were used in the eighteenth century. “Most historians would agree that over the course of the eighteenth century and more insistently in the nineteenth

century that public and private spheres were created ideologically and endowed with gender and class meaning. But the degree to which in practice families actually adhered to the ‘separate spheres’ ideology remains the subject of much debate.⁵¹ In regards to the first half of the eighteenth century, my investigation shall demonstrate the ineffectiveness of this formula in regards to the role many women played in the consumption of the urban environment.

Klein does not address an important aspect of this topic, which is that the terms ‘public’ and ‘private’ have been charged with gendered connotations by current historians, with disabling affects.⁵² This spatial approach assumes that eighteenth-century notions of ‘public’ and ‘private’ were gendered. A brief passage from Alexander Pope’s ‘An Epistle to a Lady’, demonstrates the multiple layers of meaning evident in these terms. Pope defined the ‘private’ as directly to the sphere of the home, but also suggested its meaning related to both interpersonal and social relationships.

But grant, in public men are sometimes shown,
A woman’s seen in private life alone:
Our bolder talents in full light displayed;
Your virtues open fairest in the shade.
Bred to disguise, ‘tis in public you hide;
There, none distinguish ‘twixt your shame or pride,
Weakness or delicacy – all so nice,
That each may seem a virtue, or a vice.⁵³

This passage makes apparent that the eighteenth-century usage of ‘public’ and ‘private’ may be more concerned with social rather than spatial configurations. The ‘domestic thesis’ appears to be a nineteenth century innovation and may have occurred as a result of the widespread consumption of the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau in which women were relegated to their ‘natural’ maternal sense.⁵⁴ The arena for maternal demonstrations in Rousseau’s interpretation was the home. As evidenced in Klein’s work, the historian can gain a broader knowledge of the eighteenth-century understanding of ‘public’ and ‘private’ from contemporary descriptions. Lawrence Klein has called for more research in this area, not only in regards to the concepts of language, but also ‘the precise ways that gender symmetry and asymmetry manifest themselves in the organization and use of space.’⁵⁵ In his *Spaces of Modernity*, Miles Ogborn has identified problems with Klein’s theory. The author argues that it is not enough to simply identify spaces within the public sphere, but that it is necessary to understand the manner in which the ‘private man’ or ‘woman’ operates within these spaces.⁵⁶ In using the writings of contemporaries such as Hume, Ogborn expands our understanding of eighteenth-century concepts of ‘public’ and

‘private.’ Hume, himself did not place women specifically in the domestic sphere and argued that men were “civilized by conversation or ‘commerce’ with women in public and nothing embellishes, enlivens and polishes ‘society’ better.”⁵⁷ In this work, I intend to enhance the current understanding of the spatial concepts of ‘public’ and ‘private’ by looking at visual and written depictions of both the urban and domestic space, from the city and street, to the garden square and townhouse, to reveal the manner in which gender relationships operated in the eighteenth-century metropolis. The terms ‘public’ and ‘private’ can be useful in analysing how space was consumed, but as already indicated, the gendered elements of these terms may not be applicable to most of the eighteenth century. The writings of Rousseau may have caused a change in the general attitude of the role women played in terms of domesticity. This work will seek to expand the notion that women, and specifically those of Grosvenor Square, realised a ‘public’ dimension to their lives through the patterns developed in the built environment.

Separate Spheres

The ‘public/private’ approach to spatial theory evolved into the notion of men and women operating in distinct and divided worlds. The paradigm of ‘separate spheres’ has been consistently utilized by historians as a method for describing gender relations and spatial usage.⁵⁸ Amanda Vickery provides convincing arguments against the view of ‘separate spheres,’ which may be applicable to the nineteenth century perhaps, but not to the early eighteenth century.⁵⁹ It appears as a bit of a contradiction to Vickery’s feminist approach as she so successfully argued against the use of the ‘separate spheres’ approach in the afore mentioned article, yet could not avoid from applying it to her lengthy study on women in eighteenth-century Lancashire.⁶⁰ This clearly indicates the inherent pitfalls of the ‘separate spheres’ approach when applied to women’s history. Luce Irigaray’s theories are heavily based on the assumption that male and female are polar relationships, which translates spatially into the ‘separate spheres’ model. Jane Rendall has utilized Irigaray’s theories as a framework for her study of gender in Regency London.⁶¹ The author states that ‘when women submit to such theories [polar opposition of male and female] they either subject themselves to objectification by being female or try to re-objectify themselves as masculine subjects.’⁶² Although in this statement the author has tried to refute the usage of the polar qualities of gender, this work falls into the trap of the ‘separate spheres’ philosophy and leaves the impression that women were mere shadows in the public spaces of Regency London. The historical impression of complete and divided worlds for men and women is unrealistic and impractical, since both genders must

interact with one another on various levels in everyday life. Even today, the gendered space of a public toilet demonstrates flexibility in a crowded bar or club, as women avoid overcrowding and invade the male domain. Gender restrictions do not prohibit its spatial use. Via the gendered mapping of both urban and domestic space, this work should reveal both the neutral and gender specific qualities of these spaces. Furthermore, my evidence will reveal that eighteenth-century women were not confined to the ‘sphere’ of domesticity.

The formula of ‘separate spheres’ is reliant upon the concept that women had little or no choice about what space they were to occupy, which implies conflict and oppression.⁶³ The political agendas of feminist historians to attempt to outline historical feminine suppression and oppression in order to implement changes in attitudes in the present day, has left gaps in the history of those persons, including women, who enjoyed a certain amount of personal and financial freedom in their life times. Many of the female residents of the Grosvenor estate in the eighteenth century, which compose an important element of this investigation, were wealthy, landed and single, and a ‘category’ of women generally overlooked by feminist historians.⁶⁴ The ‘separate spheres’ model, when blended with patriarchal approaches to feminist history, is further limiting, with claims that all financial responsibilities were in the hands of men. Historians have refuted this claim with regards to early eighteenth-century women, stating that those women enjoyed a certain level of financial freedom.⁶⁵ Women thus exercised their privilege of material consumption and property ownership, making the ‘separate spheres’ model redundant for my research.

In this work, it should become apparent that the early eighteenth-century ideology of gender did not require separation either in physical or psychological space. ‘The language of separate spheres is to deny the reciprocity between gender and society, and to impose a static model on dynamic relationships.’⁶⁶ This work will survey personal and spatial relationships in order to gain a greater understanding of how the genders interrelated to one another in terms of urban and domestic space. The rhetoric of ‘separate spheres’ would be disabling to this process. This work will map the roles of both genders in the consumption of domestic and urban space of London in order to refute the notion that ‘separate spheres’ was an aspect of early eighteenth-century life and spatial usage.

Spatial ideology

In this work I propose to construct a theoretical approach to gendered space which is not reliant upon the ‘separate spheres’ formula, but one which looks at the differences in which both sexes consumed space on the ‘public’ and ‘private’ levels and in their various contexts. This process will involve mapping spatial usage and functioning with regards to ‘public’ and ‘private’ notions to determine the manner in which urban and domestic space was consumed. At this point it is necessary to define the consumers of the built environment with regards to this particular work. According to Henri Lefebvre, space is produced ‘within the triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived.’⁶⁷ The dynamics of conceptual and representational spaces will be discussed in my archival survey. The third element of this ‘dialectic’⁶⁸ involves the determination of those people who actually lived these spaces. My investigation determines those persons who lived in Grosvenor Square from 1720 to 1760, their inter-relationships and social practices.⁶⁹ The demographics of this space as formulated by gender, class and political affiliation will be utilized in determining if a specific spatial ideology existed in early eighteenth-century Mayfair.

In Ann Bermingham’s *Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition, 1740-1860*, the author defines ideology as the point of view of a specific class. She explains that the ‘study of a particular ideology can clarify not only connections between various social institutions and apparatuses, but also their relation to the base.’⁷⁰ In her text, Bermingham successfully argues the existence of an ideology of landscape in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This approach can be applied not only to the landscape, but to the structures sited in the landscape. In a historical period, a ‘class view...embodied a set of socially and...economically determined values’ in which literary and visual representations granted cultural expression.⁷¹ However, Andrew Hemingway, who adopts a similar approach to imagining a landscape ideology, warns that ‘images have no single meaning.’⁷² Images function for different people in different ways. In identifying a spatial ideology of early eighteenth-century London it is fundamental to assume that spaces possessed varied meanings and functions for its consumers.

The determination of the spatial ideology of London’s West End, and more specifically the Grosvenor estate, during the early Hanoverian dynasty is one of the primary objectives of this research. In order to formulate this ideological view of space, a determination needs to be made of the group of persons responsible for constructing this view. At first observation the ideology of Grosvenor Square appears to have been constructed by the

landed classes, but this view may be limiting. The ideology belongs to those who possessed the space physically and culturally, which upon further investigation should reveal a group that was not constructed only along the lines of money and property. This determination would provide the structure and justification of the group of individuals I intend to investigate.

The historian must look for those cultural signposts which help to define this collection of people and thus their ideology of space – neither of which can be entirely known because the values, conditions and determinants shift from person to person and also within a singular person from time to time within their lifetime. These may be traps for the cultural historian, since history cannot be totally understood and an ideology must be based upon generalizations.⁷³ At best, the historian can get an impression. The ideology of space during the chosen time and place may be ambivalent with regards to the concept of gendered space, however the structuring and the domination of space by men seems to have been superimposed on the period by architectural and feminist historians.⁷⁴ A sense of shared space may be closer to the accepted ideology of the early eighteenth century, which would provide an avenue for the empowerment of women through their consumption of the urban and domestic environment. This work will investigate gender relationships and space in an effort to determine the perception of space and its subsequent usage.

Social Mapping

In order to examine my theories of spatial production and consumption in the early eighteenth century, the consumers must be identified and their ideology analysed. The density of a large city provides a plethora of variables in which to try to map the qualities of its societies. The complexities of the metropolis must be reduced into units easier to comprehend, which for this investigation will consist of the city, the street, the garden square and the townhouse. Each of these physical manifestations of urban space will become the basis for the investigation into their social composition, which will in turn permit a means to reveal the spatial ideology of London, and specifically the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair, in the early eighteenth century.

Built form is an abstract concept, but its realization is sensible. This tangible quality of architecture is one of its characteristics that sets its history apart from the other ‘fine’ arts, excepting sculpture.⁷⁵ ‘The impossibility of ever *seeing* a building in a single synthetic

view renders it resistant to art history's traditional techniques of visual analysis.⁷⁶ This clearly establishes a need to approach architectural history in a different manner. The other unique characteristic of architecture is its utilitarian purpose. This aspect of architecture places it within an entirely different realm than the other fine arts, however it is not necessary to select between architecture's form and its function.⁷⁷ I would agree that what is vital to the understanding of a building's (or built environment's) history is the interplay between form and function, which can unearth its layers of cultural meaning. This work is concerned with how space functioned – who used it, how it was used, and the activities which took place in its setting. By exploring the qualities, uses and understandings, not only of the built environment, but also of the society and culture of eighteenth-century London, the role architecture and urban space played for the people who consumed those spaces can be revealed.

By giving shape and form to our material world, architecture structures the system of space in which we live and move. In that it does so, it has a direct relation – rather than a merely symbolic one – to social life, since it provides the material preconditions for patterns of movement, encounter and avoidance which are the material realisation – as well as sometimes the general – of social relations. In this sense, architecture pervades our everyday experience far more than a preoccupation with its visual properties would suggest.⁷⁸

In addition, it should be noted that each society organises space in its own manner, thus creating its unique patterns of the built environment. This work will focus on the mapping of the movements of the urban pedestrian, and investigating the points of intersection, diversion and encounter, and the manner in which the built environment helped to reinforce gender, social, political and kinship roles in early eighteenth-century London.

In order to draw out greater meaning from built forms, objects should not be viewed, judged or inspected in isolation. All too often in architectural history this is the case.⁷⁹ This approach monumentalises the form, which serves to both defy and deny its functions and purposes.⁸⁰ To fully appreciate the historical context of architecture, built space should not be isolated from either the time, place or purpose for which it was created, and in the case of the early construction of the Grosvenor estate, must be reconstructed to determine its historical significance. In order to contextualize architecture, the historian must look beyond (but not past) the built space and its representations to the ways in which it was used and functioned.

The meaning of a building lies in, as much in its place, in the popular imagination of its time, in how it was perceived by visitors, be they

guests or the uninvited audience of passers-by, and the artists and engravers who catered for the onlookers market.⁸¹

This investigation will utilise both visual representations and literary commentaries of visitors and residents to London's rich urban fabric in order to expose its consumption and appreciation. This research will investigate the mundane daily rituals of urban life, through letters, inventories and images to reveal the integral relationship between consumer and their environment. In the form of the visitor, architecture in a sense becomes 'public property' and is subjected to the 'contrasting interpretations of different individuals, societies and ages.'⁸² Through the investigation of guidebooks, surveys, engravings, personal letters and journals the manner in which London and in particular, the Grosvenor estate, was perceived by the viewing public, should provide greater understanding of the way in which the urban environment was appreciated, and in the case of the 'gaze', coveted. The experiences of contemporaries will provide the vital information from which to create the early eighteenth-century spatial ideologies. 'The evidence of experience, whether conceived through a metaphor of visibility or in any other way that takes meaning as transparent, reproduces rather than contests given ideological systems.'⁸³ Thus the writings and visual representations of Grosvenor Square and the metropolis will provide the support for the perceived concepts of spatial and social organization.

The Language of Space

Another dilemma facing the historian occurs in the comprehension of architecture itself. Even when historical forms are existent in the built environment, architecture is never wholly visible or tangible. Its understanding is reliant upon the comprehension of abstractions.⁸⁴ Unlike a painting or engraving, architecture requires the viewer to utilize a number of vantage points and movement through its physical form in order to realise, comprehend and appreciate its historical significance. Evidence of architecture's historical existence must be obtained by other means, such as the interpretations and impressions left by contemporaries, such as the written descriptions found in letters, journals, diaries and guidebooks.

A further challenge to architectural historians involves the adaptation of current models of art historical theory to artefacts which do not either physically or conceptually fit into the paradigms. Art historians, such as Griselda Pollock with her investigation of the pictorial representation of women in nineteenth-century Paris, have opened up new avenues in which to explore gender identity and pictorial space.⁸⁵ Her study provides a strategy in which to question the manner in which both social and gendered space were composed by challenging the canons of feminist history. Pollock proposed an escape from the 'biological representation of difference which traps the historian in a male-oriented narrative [and a shift to] to a more psychological and subjective exploration of semiotics and difference.'⁸⁶ This work proposes an investigation grounded in difference- the varied and multi-faceted aspects of gender, class and politics- to explore the manner in which eighteenth-century London and Grosvenor Square staged performances of these differences.

Space can speak of those who consume it, and the abstract language of space manifests itself through the concrete revelations of both written and visual representations. In order to 'read' a geographical and historical location, the historian must look to the evidence provided by those who consumed that space. This research has concentrated on the investigation of descriptions of the physical space and social conditions of London and Grosvenor Square provided by residents, poets, novelists and travellers, and the pictorial illustrations left by artists, surveyors and architects. 'In everyday life and language, it seems, the experience of spatial formations is an intrinsic, if unconscious dimension of the way in which we experience society itself. We read space, and anticipate a lifestyle.'⁸⁷ The historian needs to look to the experiences and evidence of everyday life to draw cultural meaning from its architecture and built spaces. The relationship between a society

and its built environment can be revealed through the visual and written impressions, such as a journal entry detailing a visit to a country estate, or an engraved view, which pictorially highlights the physical form and social function of a London square. The following eighteenth-century evidence of urban space of London and specifically, Grosvenor Square, will represent the archive constructed to formulate queries and investigate theories of social performance, urban consumption and their relationship to the built environment.

Written Representations of Space

The archive composed to investigate spatial theories has been separated into two formats: written representations of space, including guidebooks, poetry, letters journals and legal documents; and figurative representations of space in the form of maps, views, architectural drawings, genre painting and conversation pieces. These sources have provided the evidence upon which to test the theories concerning the manner in which the social performance of gender, class and political roles were revealed through the architectural patterns of the landscape of eighteenth-century London and Grosvenor Square.

Guidebooks and Travel Journals

A wealth of evidence is available to the historian searching for literary representations of London and the West End during the early eighteenth century. The metropolis was the centre of the nation's wealth, economy, and culture, and people were encouraged to explore its vast resources through a variety of print media. An increasingly literate public and an expanding print trade provided a fertile ground for the proliferation of a critical analysis of London's architectural feats and social conditions.⁸⁸

One form of print culture which provides substantial evidence of the physical environment of eighteenth-century London is the printed guidebook. The earliest guides for the metropolis were published in the late seventeenth century and establish a format of noting public buildings, gardens, private homes and frequently, garden squares.⁸⁹ Guidebooks were often written for the pedestrian consumer of urban space. For example, *London in Miniature* (1755) takes the format of an ambulator, noting the architectural feats, gardens, walks and thoroughfares, while also describing their usage and the type of society which inhabited or frequented the recorded site. In the following description of The Mall, the

author notes the time of day in which to appreciate the urban space, providing useful evidence to the social habits of eighteenth-century urbanites.

In this Walk the Company is often very numerous and brilliant, on a Summer's Evening, when the *Beau Monde* resort hither, to enjoy the cool Air and Conversation of the Place. The Hours of Walking here, for People of Distinction, are generally from Eight in the Evening till Ten in Summer Time and from Eleven or Twelve, till Three in the Afternoon, in Winter, if the Weather is fine.⁹⁰

This passage provides evidence of the year-round occupation of the city by 'People of Distinction,' dispelling urban myths concerning the temporary inhabitation of the metropolis.⁹¹ The pedestrian format of *London in Miniature* highlights noted places, monuments, events and persons, the reader would encounter on a walk through the city, while providing the 'accepted' or 'conventional' manner to traverse the city. This guidebook has proved particularly useful in that it provided detailed descriptions of each of the city's squares, noting the social status of the residents, conditions and features of their gardens and the materials used in building, paving and landscaping. Many of these descriptions were complemented with engravings from an aerial vantage point, providing the reader with a privileged and unattainable view of the scene.

While most guidebooks followed the pedestrian format, the author of the six-volume edition of *London and Its Environs Described*, strayed from this approach, to list all the paintings displayed in the home of Grosvenor estate resident, Paul Metheun, esq.⁹² (Table 5) This unusual description provides a room-by-room inventory of the gentleman's collection of Great Master paintings, noting not only the artist and title, but also the placement of the work within the interior space. This description is unique not only to this particular work, but to the entire genre of guidebooks. An investigation into the social implications of this listing and its relevance in terms of the relationship of the interior space to the works could reveal the connection of the collection to the political and social ambitions of the owner.

In broad terms, guidebooks were often times a tool used to encourage domestic tourism.⁹³ Throughout the eighteenth century, Continental travel was often limited due to conflicts and the sheer difficulties of travel, although during those brief periods of peace there was a rush of Britons to fulfil their Grand Tour. In an effort to counter this migration guidebooks could take a decidedly patriotic tone in their encouragement of domestic travel.

Our young Nobility and Gentry have been too frequently, and I fear, too justly, charged with extending their curiosity to other countries, before they have acquired sufficient knowledge of their own...⁹⁴

Social and cultural chastisement of this nature was an unusual feature of guidebooks, but was a more common tone for the personal appraisal found in travel journals. Generally travel journals could take one of two formats: the published accounts of travel for mass consumption and the personal recollections of the singular traveller. Both sources provide vital information about the consumption of urban space, with the noting of architectural features and social conditions, but each format could vary greatly in tone. One of the earliest and most widely consumed of eighteenth-century travel journals was composed by the novelist, Daniel Defoe. His *Tour*, which was composed of three volumes written between 1724 and 1726, never varied from his stated patriotic theme of exposing Britain's wealth, prosperity and 'increase.'⁹⁵ Defoe used the landscape of Britain to project his political agenda. His descriptions of architecture project his personal pride in the nation's accomplishments. In the following description of the homes along the Thames from Richmond to London, the author instructed the viewer to take a distant vantage point in order to fully appreciate the 'beauty and magnificence' of the scene.

But I find none has spoken of what I call the distant glory of all these buildings: There is a beauty in the things at a distance, taking them *en passant*, and in perspective, which few people value, and fewer understand and yet they are more truly great, than in all their private beauties whatsoever; Here they reflect beauty and magnificence upon the whole country, and give a kind of character to the island of Great Britain in general.⁹⁶

Defoe preferred a physical distance from the objects of his appreciation, in order to gain a larger view of the space and its relationship to society. In this case, Defoe compared the space to the nation as a whole. He described the architecture as reflections, and metaphors for the broader concepts of nationhood. For Defoe, buildings were mirrors, which projected an image coloured by the viewer. These observations and Defoe's deliberate patriotic tone, has provided valuable insight into the manner in which the built environment acted as a platform for political performance.

The archive for this project has also been constructed of the travel accounts of foreign visitors which provided insight into concepts such as national character and identity. Significantly, it was the visitor's ability to note events, occurrences and places which may have appeared too ordinary and everyday to the Londoner, which were of particular

interest to this work.⁹⁷ A foreigner's observation of the character of female pedestrians in London's West End has provided valuable evidence of the spatial qualities of gender performance, and has provided a starting point upon which to investigate social performance and the street.⁹⁸ On the other hand, the personal recollections of the young Viscount Palmerston's Grand Tour has provided evidence of the manner in which an English visitor interpreted and understood the built environment of another land.⁹⁹ His journal of domestic travel provides only brief descriptions of the major country houses and their settings, whereas his Continental journal provides expansive descriptions of Rome's significant architectural feats. These journals not only provide information about the role architecture played in a young man's education, but also as an indicator of gender and class.

Poetry

One of the most expressive and imaginative forms of written evidence of eighteenth-century life and culture was its verse. Throughout the century, poetry was the most frequently published form of literature, consumed at many levels of society and by both genders.¹⁰⁰ Poems were often published in the periodicals of the day, expanding their accessibility. The city of London, its inhabitants and visitors, provided endless inspiration for many eighteenth-century poets.¹⁰¹ The epic topographical work, *Trivia, or the Art of Walking the Streets of London*, (1716) by John Gay, contains useful evidence of the expected behaviours of the city's pedestrians. In the following passage, Gay proposed a particular form of street etiquette.

Let due civilities be strictly paid.
The wall surrender to the hooded maid;
Nor let thy sturdy elbow's hasty rage
Jostle the feeble steps of trembling age.

You'll sometimes meet a fop, of nicest tread,
Whose mantling periuke veils his head,
At ev'ry step he dread the wall to lose,
And risques, to save a coach, his red-heel'd shoes;
Him, like the miller, pass with caution by,
Lest from his shoulder clouds of powder fly.¹⁰²

This epic poem provides not only information of the appropriate social behaviour for walking in the metropolis, but also maps the movement of the pedestrian throughout the course of the day and night, noting perils and pleasures. This singular work contains a wealth of evidence concerning the performance of gender and class roles, by placing the participants in specific urban locales. Although Grosvenor Square had not been created by

the date of this poem's publication, the inclusion of other social spaces and squares warrants the poem's inclusion in my investigation. These places project messages which can provide vital clues to not only urban and domestic space, but the manner in which gender functioned in the urban environment. The following passage from *Trivia*, notes the appearance of 'ladies' in the Mall, one of the most highly charged court environments of eighteenth-century London.

Nor do less certain signs the town advise,
Of milder weather and serener skies.
The ladies gaily dress'd, the Mall adorn
With various dyes, and paint the sunny morn...¹⁰³

As noted in this work, gender identity can be recognized in specific urban spaces, but it must be noted that topographical verses can often take note of abstracted and idealised forms of social performance and spatial consumption.

Letters and Journals

Evidence of spatial usage, social performance and urban consumption can be found in the correspondence of Londoners. Letters, journals and manuscripts of eighteenth-century Londoners and residents of Grosvenor Square have been used in this research as proof of the varied functions of urban space. These written descriptions can be particularly useful in mapping both the physical and social movements of the urbanites. Public aspects of urban life were often disclosed in this form of written evidence, containing vital information on varied aspects of urban life including social events and practices. Daily routines, social meetings, political bias, gossip, fashion, and events were only a few of the revelations presented in these ordinary documents. In the following passage of a letter from Lady Cecilia West, she half-heartedly encouraged a friend to visit London, and apologizes for the lack of entertainments.

I am really sorry you don't think of coming to Town yet, because you really have nothing but Ranelagh ... and if you like that place as little as I do, 'tis little indeed. I never coud [sic] bear it for its self alone, or the stupid swarm that goes there ...¹⁰⁴

This personal observation presents an issue which is contrary to the conventional manner in which the city's public spaces were consumed. Lady West's snub of both Ranelagh and its 'swarm', contradicts the pleasure garden's role as the location of the city's elite society of which she was a member. As noted here, letters may reveal more and diverse attitudes, since they were relayed in a manner that was hidden from the public gaze.

This research has involved the compilation of the correspondence of residents of Grosvenor Square, and friends or family members of people living on the estate, which has yielded the published letters of Horace Walpole, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, Lord Hervey, Fanny Boscawen, Mrs Delaney, and Hester, Lady Granville, and the unpublished correspondence of Baron de la Warr and his daughter, Lady Cecilia West. For example, the letters of the Duchess of Marlborough to her granddaughter have provided essential information concerning the particulars of establishing a London residence. The Duchess had selected a home on the Grosvenor estate for the newly married Lady Jane Russell and subsequently advised the young woman on its furnishing and décor. These letters highlight the feminine preoccupation with the functions and display of a home and have provided strong evidence of the physical characteristics of built space and its ornamentation.

Correspondence can also reveal the paternal role many men assumed in their communication with young women. Throughout a series of letters spanning nearly a decade, Lord de la Warr provided Frances Poole (later the Viscountess Palmerston) with suggestions on reading material and appropriate social behaviour. In the following passage the distinguished gentleman chastised the young woman for the rhetoric set forth in an earlier letter.

Your coffee house conversation, madam, is a miscellaneous kind of skipping dialogue that my soul does not delight in ...¹⁰⁵

This passage clearly demonstrates that language can be associated with a physical space. The structure of Miss Poole's writing has been substituted for a sign, denoting a specific urban locale, the coffee house.¹⁰⁶ De la Warr strongly linked his disapproval of the young woman's language with a geographic and social locale. This passage, and others, provided key evidence of the manner in which physical spaces of the urban environment become stages for performing roles of gender and class.

Legal Documents

Legal documents, such as wills, inventories and royal warrants, reveal much about the manner in which eighteenth-century Londoners occupied, utilized and appreciated the built environment and urban space. By their very nature, these legal documents possess political power, providing potent evidence of the relationships between land ownership, gender, class roles and political aspirations. Although these documents assume a specific

format, which include a florid and verbose construct of the language, they can provide vital clues to the political patterns which evolved in eighteenth-century London.

This constructed archive comprises of a number of inventories, documents compiled immediately after one's death and placed in probate along with the will. (Tables 6, 7 and 8) These inventories of Grosvenor estate residents are accounts of their personal household possessions and provide proof of the manner in which the home was furnished. The format in which the inventory was taken, on a room-by-room and floor-by-floor basis, provides information about the usage of space, its furnishings and the general traffic flow throughout the home. In addition, Lady Strafford and William Benson were first time rate-payers on the estate, thus their inventories should provide an indication of the spatial arrangement of the original home.

An unusual inventory and schedule of fixtures was taken on Lord Hertford's home on Grosvenor Street, prior to letting the home to the Duke of Portland. (Table 9) This document contains an abundance of information concerning not only the furnishing of one of the largest homes on the Grosvenor estate, but signifies the home's important role for gender performance, concepts of self-promotion and political aspirations. The published account of the 'Schedule of Fixtures' for Philip Dormer, Earl of Chesterfield's residence in Grosvenor Square, reveals the manner in which a newly constructed townhouse was furnished and prepared for occupation.¹⁰⁷ This schedule included the materials provided in the home's construction, and noted the particulars such as the materials used for the construction of its interior features.

Royal warrants, such as those permitting the construction of the gate at Hyde Park, utilize a language which is topographical and specific to spatial organization, as indicated in the following example.

... a large road has been lately made directly from the Square called Hanover Square by the Mount called Oliver's Mount to the wall of Hyde park ...¹⁰⁸

Royal warrants containing evidence in regards to Grosvenor Square have generally referred to the particulars of land permits and usage. The site-specific language of these legal documents have provided literal clues to the interpretation of urban space.

In regards to feminine wealth and land ownership, this archive was constructed of the contents of many wills, as they contain proof of capital and property. The wills of both men and women were considered in order to gain greater insight into the gendered qualities of land, specifically the home. These documents act as an important indicator of the subsequent distribution of wealth and property. A number of wills have yielded vital evidence of the bequest of Grosvenor estate homes to women.¹⁰⁹ As legal proof of the valued personal possessions of the deceased, wills can specify the distribution of household items, such as furniture, china and silver to family members, friends, charities and institutions. These documents encapsulate the treasured possessions of the deceased, indicating the accepted social mores in the transmission of wealth and power, vital factors in the construction of social practices of gender performance.

Figurative Representations of Space

As noted previously, images can provide evidence of the urban setting that has been altered through time. In the construction of this archive figurative representations of Grosvenor Square and eighteenth-century London have played a significant role in the reconstruction of a physical and historical setting. These representations have taken varied forms including views, maps, architectural renderings and conversation pieces. Pictorial evidence has been utilized for the consideration of the role the built environment played in the construction and demonstration of social performance in eighteenth-century London.

In the early eighteenth century, architecture, its study and appreciation, was considered a polite art. An aspect of a contemporary gentleman's (and as it appears, gentlewoman's) education was the comprehension and appreciation of the abstract concepts of architectural form and space. The title page of Robert Morris's *Lectures on Architecture* confirms this aspect of a polite education:

As an Agreeable Entertainment for Gentlemen: And more particularly
Useful for all who make Architecture or the Polite Arts, their
Study.¹¹⁰

Architecture as a polite art may have been limited in terms of the society it attracted, but does not appear to have been restricted in terms of either class or gender. The eighteenth-century appreciation of architecture may also be evidenced by the commissioning and consumption of architectural tomes. An investigation of the subscription lists in publications such as Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715, 1717 and 1725) and

James Gibbs's *Book of Architecture* (1728) produced a diverse group of subscribers. (Table 10) These lists contained political men, craftsmen and artisans, and women, many of whom maintained residences on the Grosvenor estate. These books were created for more than practical applications as books of design, which would account for the vast number of subscribers who were not in the building trades. The dedication pages of these architectural volumes were also an indication of political aspiration, or positioning. The first two volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus* were dedicated to King George I, the third volume to his son, Prince of Wales (later George II), and Gibbs's volume was dedicated to the Duke of Argyll.¹¹¹ These dedications provide proof of the politically charged nature not only of society in general, but the implications of linking the appreciation of architecture with specific political and/or court alliance, since permission for their dedications needed to be granted prior to publication.

The significant consumption and appreciation of architectural principles in the eighteenth century warrants an investigation into the various types of figurative representations of urban space and the built environment. A variety of visual images were used in order to create a 'picture' of the manner in which the performance of political, class and gender roles on the urban stage, and as tools for the reconstruction of the physical characteristics of early eighteenth-century London, lost through years of change.

The Architectural Drawing

The architectural rendering provides an imaginary journey through a structure. Architectural drawings, such as plans and elevations, reveal the relationships between spaces for the comprehension of traffic flow and movement through the space, as well as providing a conception of the space filled with objects and persons. The plans and elevations provided in *The Survey of London* can demonstrate the organization of interior space and the role of ornament and decoration as a signifiers of contemporary society.¹¹² A small sampling of eighteenth-century plans and elevations were provided in the *Survey*, yet their cultural context has not been thoroughly explored.

By embodying intelligibility in spatial forms, the individuals of a society can create an experiential reality through which they can retrieve a description of certain dimensions of their society and the ways in which they are members of it.¹¹³

While it is true that societies can learn about themselves from their built environment, it is unjust to apply twentieth-century comprehension of spaces to historical context. Hillier and Hanson have noted that '... from the point of view of words and images, plans are

both opaque and diffuse. They convey little to the image-seeking eye, are hard to analyse, and give little sense to the experiential reality of the building.¹¹⁴ However, there is plenty of evidence which points to the fact that in the eighteenth century, large numbers of men and women were commissioning, purchasing and appreciating the abstract architectural rendering presented in such ‘polite tomes’ as Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*, which may indicate an understanding and comprehension of the abstract language of architectural renderings, such as plans. This three-volume collection of folio-sized engravings presents plans and elevations of both built and proposed structures. The eighteenth-century gentleman or gentlewoman may have appreciated these images for their abstract qualities, since their admiration and understanding was a signifier of education and polite society.

The View

Daniel Defoe’s observation of London ‘from a distance’ was realized in many eighteenth-century pictorial views.¹¹⁵ The bird’s eye perspective, as popularised in the topographical works of Kip and Knyff, and published in *Britannia Illustrata*, takes its origins from the Dutch tradition of cartography.¹¹⁶ The elevated view can create a sense of detachment, that of the viewer and subject. According to Michel de Certeau, the bird’s eye view is licentious, creating a detached appreciation of the represented space.

His [the viewer] elevation transfigures him into a voyeur. It puts him at a distance. It transforms the bewitching world by which one was possessed into a text that lies before one’s eyes. It allows one to read it, to be the Solar Eye, looking down like a god.¹¹⁷

As a paradigm for the representation of urban space in early eighteenth century architectural surveys and guidebooks, the elevated view acts as an indicator of the appreciation of urban space and the built environment. In *Stow’s Survey of London* (1754-5), the elevated views of London’s garden squares were the primary manner of illustrating the text. (Illustration 5) This point of view maintains a unifying quality in which ‘the panoptic mechanism arranges spatial unities that make it possible to see constantly and to recognize immediately.’¹¹⁸ However, this perspective can also create aloofness and a sense of both physical and psychological distance, distancing the space from the actual consumers of the space. These topographical works could create an impression of the land which was authoritative and vast, quite unlike the humanist viewpoint provided by Renaissance painters. The one-point perspective, as popularised in imaginative views of the idealised cities, created order out of imaginary space. The Italian Renaissance painter Piero della Francesca has been credited with the production of such images for the walls

of the Ducal Palace in Urbino, which served as cultural indicators of good government and humanist thinking. (Illustration 6) The artist organized and assembled spatial elements, oftentimes centred on the urban square, to create the impression of order, balance and harmony. These one-point perspectives were indicative not only of the idealised organization of urban space, but brought to the forefront the significance of the urban square in the modern world, a major focus of my research.

The tradition of pictorial representation was changing in the eighteenth century, from idealized, aerial, urban and topographical views to the painterly tradition of contemporary artists such as Canaletto, Claude and William Hogarth. Artists such as Canaletto created picturesque views of the early eighteenth-century metropolis in a more naturalistic manner than the bird's eye perspective. However, it must be noted than these works were often filled with idealised and romanticised spaces, portraying stylised versions of social performance, set within real urban places. Canaletto's *View of the Thames from Richmond House* speaks as much about the physical environment as the patron and society depicted. (Illustration 7) On the other hand, William Hogarth's works provide insight into London of the early eighteenth century, with his looks at the somewhat seedier side of everyday life in the metropolis. His progresses were visual journeys through the city, which often contain identifiable geographic locations.¹¹⁹ Hogarth's works have been particularly useful in that they also emote severe and direct criticism of contemporary society, utilising the streets and buildings of London for their setting. For instance, St Paul's, Covent Garden was the setting for his illustration of *Morning*. (Illustration 8) The artist used the spatial entities of the metropolis to make the viewer aware not only of the physical setting, but also the society which operated within its confines. 'Architecture determines to a substantial extent the degree to which we become automatically aware of others, both those who live near and strangers, as a result of living out everyday life in space.'¹²⁰ Each of these varied eighteenth-century views of the metropolis will permit the mapping of social relationships throughout the city, and provide visual evidence of the manner in which the city was constructed physically, socially, in terms of gender and political alliance.

Maps

The final form of visual representation which comprised this constructed archive to investigate the eighteenth-century Grosvenor estate in Mayfair were contemporary maps and cartographic surveys. Maps adhere to the Dutch cartographic tradition and can provide objective information on the organization of urban space. Maps and surveys

created at a specific points and time, can provide vital data about the development of the metropolis. However, the historian should be warned that these images cannot be taken simply for their face value, since like paintings or engravings, maps and surveys can provide an imaginary and idealised view of the scene.

Both in the selectivity of their content and in their signs and styles of representation maps are a way of conceiving, articulating, and structuring the human world which is biased towards, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations.¹²¹

The physical characteristics of the depicted environment can be hidden or distorted in maps and surveys. The only contemporary survey available for this investigation was John Mackay's ambitious map of the Grosvenor estate of 1723, in which the newly developed property of Mary Grosvenor was presented in relationship to the townhouses of noted peers and royal palaces, and is believed to be the only indication of the estate designer's original plan.¹²² For the practical purpose of physically mapping the demographics of the Grosvenor estate, this survey would prove to be entirely impractical. Instead, the demographic characteristics of the Grosvenor estate have been superimposed upon Horwood's map of 1792-9. Although many of the buildings had changed by the time of its publication the streets remained the same. In addition, it is the only eighteenth-century map which indicates individual residences and house numbers.¹²³

Maps can be especially useful if the physical elements of the environment have disappeared, changed names or purpose, since they 'collapse both space and time so that the most remote places, once measured and rendered as information and fixed on a planar map, can be brought home and viewed right before one's eyes. Thus maps offered the pleasures of vicarious travel and imaginary exploration...'¹²⁴ This 'vicarious travel' can permit the historian to realise spatial relationships which have disappeared through time.

The most vital aspect to maps and their historical production was their purpose as a physical delineation of ownership. 'Maps are a form of visual language in which social structure and power relations are transmitted through their functioning as containers of knowledge.'¹²⁵ Drawing along the lines of Michel Foucault's concept of 'Otherness', it is vital to look beyond the seemingly obvious representation of space provided in maps, to the manner in which they can actually disguise content to exert a certain political, commercial or social agenda.¹²⁶ The most comprehensive map available for this investigation was John Rocque's survey of the cities of London and Westminster, published in 1745 according to an Act of Parliament. This survey should be particularly

noted for its use of ‘subliminal geometry’ as a way of distorting the lived experience and projecting a sense of orderliness to an otherwise chaotic and congested environment.¹²⁷ (Illustration 9) Through stylised forms, a lack of noting individual buildings and an absence of detail, Rocque’s map superimposed a sense of order onto the confused cityscape of eighteenth-century London.¹²⁸ This investigation will look at the manner in which Rocque’s survey and other visual descriptions of the metropolis indicate and identify spaces consumed for social and political performance.

In summary, this diverse and vast array of written and pictorial evidence has been compiled with both direction and a bit of good fortune. The notoriety and initial novelty of the Grosvenor estate yielded a vast amount of information, much of which has been utilized to form a ‘picture’ of the spatial patterns and social configuration of the estate and its society in early eighteenth-century London. The importance of the city itself, its place in the public consciousness and its role in everyday eighteenth-century life has meant that the historical evidence regarding London has had to be sifted in order to retain those pieces of evidence which suited this investigation. ‘The historian is naturally selective... and the historian is obliged to choose...’¹²⁹ In this investigation, personal interests, desires and curiosity have determined the course of this investigation into the gendered and political spaces of eighteenth-century London and Grosvenor Square.

¹ Shirley Ardener, ed., *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), Alice Friedman, *Women and the Making of the Modern House: A Social History* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998) and Jane Rendell, Barbara Penner, and Iain Borden, eds., *Gender Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, (New York: E. & F.N Spon, 1999). Sources of women’s history which touch on the subject of architecture include: Anne Lawrence, *Women in England 1500-1760: A Social History* (Orion, 1996); Jane Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure: Gender, space and architecture in Regency London* (The Athlone Press, 2002); Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1998); and Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman’s Daughter: Women’s Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

² Dana Arnold, ‘Defining Femininity: Women and the Country House,’ in *The Georgian Country House: Architecture, landscape and society*, ed. by Dana Arnold (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), p.79.

³ Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure*.

⁴ A sampling of the sources for this data included: A.T. Bolton, *The Architecture of Robert and James Adam*, 2 vols (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collectors Club, 1984); John Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century: The Peerage of Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Christopher Clay, ‘Marriage, Inheritance, and the Rise of the Estates in England, 1660-1815’, *Economic History Review*, 21, (1968), 503-518; Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain*, ed. by P.N. Furbank, W.R. Ownes and A.J. Coulson, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991); Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978); Christopher Thacker, *The Genius of Gardening: The History of Gardens in Britain and Ireland* (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1994); and Paget

Toynbee, ed., 'Horace Walpole's Journals of Visits to County Seats &c', 16, *The Walpole Society* (1927/28), 10-80, 1928.

⁵ Mary Davies was born in 1665, the daughter of Alexander Davies (1636-1665) and Mary Dukeson (d.1717). At the age of 12, Mary Davies married Sir Thomas Grosvenor, 3rd bt (1655-1700), grandson and heir to Sir Richard Grosvenor, 2nd bt (d.1664).

⁶ F.H.W. Sheppard, ed., *The Survey of London*, 48 vols (Athlone Press, 1960- 1977), xxxix (The Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part I – General History), pp.4-5.

⁷ Public Record Office, C66/880, m.32. See *Survey*, xxxix, p.1.

⁸ *Survey*, xxxix, pp.2-3.

⁹ *Survey*, xxxix, p.4.

¹⁰ *Survey*, xxxix, pp.4-5.

¹¹ *Survey*, xxxix, pp.4-5.

¹² Barlow was a master builder involved in the earlier West End developments in Albemarle Street and on the Conduit-Mead estate. See *Survey*, xxxix, p.11.

¹³ There are indications that Barlow had documented his plan, but any visual evidence has not been found. See *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 11-13. Mackay's survey is located at the Westminster Archives, Grosvenor Estate Records, WA 1049/12/216, and due to the enormous size of the plan, only part of it has been illustrated here.

¹⁴ GER WA 1049/12/216.

¹⁵ *Survey*, xxxix, pp.83-86.

¹⁶ Volume xl (The Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part II – The Buildings) of the *Survey* focuses on the buildings of the estate and provides detailed information on the wealthier and/or titled men in residence.

¹⁷ I have mapped the gender qualities of the Grosvenor estate utilizing the rate book information provided in *The Survey of London: The Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair*, xxxix and xl (1977). I have concentrated my research to the residences along the primary thoroughfares of the estate – North and South Audley Streets, Grosvenor and Upper Grosvenor Streets, Brook and Upper Brook Streets and the Square – in part since this information was more readily available and in order to manage the data, since the Grosvenor estate has always been very densely populated. The total number of residences I have included in this investigation numbers 274.

¹⁸ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (Routledge, 1990), p.139.

¹⁹ Butler, pp.136-7. See also Dana Arnold, *Reading Architectural History* (Routledge, 2002), pp.129-33.

²⁰ *Survey*, xl, Chapter 5, pp. 83-102.

²¹ See Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging a Nation 1707-1837* (Vintage, 1996), Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People 1727-1783* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), Eliga Gould, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century: British Political and Social History 1688-1832* (Arnold, 1997), Kathleen Wilson, *A Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

²² Joan W Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category,' *American Historical Review*, 9 (1986), 1053-75, p.1069.

²³ For more information concerning the political atmosphere of the early eighteenth-century, see Gould, pp. 1-34. The following authors also devoted major portions of their tomes to the politics of the first half of the eighteenth century: O'Gorman, Colley, and Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*.

²⁴ Colley, p. 68. See also J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1688-1832* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

²⁵ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Outline of European Architecture* (Penguin, 1943) p.15. See also Andrew Ballantyne, ed, *What is Architecture?* (Routledge, 2002) p.11.

²⁶ Ballantyne, p.11. The author's essay 'The Nest and the Pillar of Fire' highlights the multi-faceted dimensions to the many definitions of architecture.

²⁷ Ballantyne, p.48.

²⁸ Ballantyne, pp.26 and 49.

²⁹ Ballantyne, p.49.

³⁰ The quintessential text which expresses this viewpoint is John Summerson's *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953).

³¹ Michael Snodin and John Styles, eds., *Design and the Decorative Arts: Britain 1500-1900* (V&A Publications, 2001), p.178.

³² Stefan Muthesius, *The English Terraced House*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982).

³³ Giles Worsley, *Classical Architecture in Britain: The Heroic Age*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995) the discussion of townhouses is entirely absent, and in Summerson's *The Architecture of Britain*, the discussion is limited to the works of Wood and Nash. Girouard's *Life in the English Country House* has a brief discussion of the social workings of Norfolk House in St James's Square, pp.193-99.

³⁴ M.H. Port, 'Townhouse and Country House: Their Interaction in Dana Arnold's *The Georgian County House: Architecture, landscape and society*, (Stroud, 1998), pp.193-99.

³⁵ Summerson, *Georgian London*, p.112.

³⁶ David Watkin, *The Rise of Architectural History* (Architectural Press, 1980).

³⁷ See *Survey*, vol xl, which deals specifically with the buildings on the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair.

³⁸ There are a number of important and widely used texts on British architecture that are mainly concerned with architects, patrons and styles of architectural movements. The most comprehensive study of architects, their patrons and style is Summerson's *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830*, which has been reproduced in many editions since its first publication in 1953. James Lee Milne's *The Earls of Creation* (Hamilton, 1962) is an in-depth look at the patrons and architects of the eighteenth century including Lord Burlington and Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of Pembroke. Lord Burlington was the focus of John Harris's text *The Palladian Revival: Lord Burlington, His Villa and Garden at Chiswick* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994).

³⁹ In Dana Arnold's *Reading Architectural History*, pp.35-50, the author explores the emphasis placed on the identification of an architect (author) and the manner in which the canons of architectural history focus on this aspect.

⁴⁰ Watkin, p 161. *The Journal of Architectural Historians of Great Britain* often focuses on the work of individual architects and/or patrons, largely ignoring the medium's social history.

⁴¹ Alan Holgate, *The Aesthetics of Built Form* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962) p.141.

⁴² Bill Hillier and Julianne Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984) p. 8.

⁴³ In Richard Sennett's discussion of modern squares, the author sees them as social voids in the urban landscape. See *The Conscience of the Eye The Design and Social Life of Cities* (Boston, MA: Faber and Faber, 1990), pp.90-1. For a contemporary description of the lack of activity in London's squares, see Louis Beat de Muralt, *Letters describing the Character and Customs of the English and French Nations. With a curious essay on travelling*, 2nd ed (1726), pp. 78-9.

⁴⁴ Hillier and Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space*.

⁴⁵ Hillier and Hanson, p. 27.

⁴⁶ Hillier and Hanson, p.2.

⁴⁷ Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 204-6; Jill Franklin, *The Gentleman's Country House and Its Plan 1835-1914* (Routledge, 1981) in which the author assigns rooms in the home with a gender; Colin Cunningham, "An Italian house is my lady": some aspects of women's roles in the architecture of Robert Adam', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-century Art and Culture*, by Gill Perry, and Michael Rossington, eds., (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1994) links feminine space and French taste. Another widespread distribution of this concept occurs frequently in current guidebooks for historic houses in England.

⁴⁸ Lawrence Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction in the Eighteenth-Century: Some Questions about Evidence and Analytic Procedure', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, (1995), pp. 97-109. Other historians who have challenged this model include: Dena Goodman, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Towards a Synthesis of Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory*, 31, (1992), 1-20, and Amanda Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres: A Review of the Categories and Chronologies of English Women's History', *The Historical Journal*, vol.36, no. 2, (1993), 383-414.

⁴⁹ Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' pp. 97-109.

⁵⁰ John Trenchard, *Cato's Letters* (1721), 3rd ed. (1733), ll, 41. See Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' p. 106.

⁵¹ Margaret Hunt, 'Wife Beating, Domesticity and Women's Independence in Eighteenth-Century London', *Gender and History*, 4 (1992) 10-33, p.27. See also Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' p.101.

⁵² In regards to architecture, see Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, Charles Saumarez Smith, *Eighteenth-Century Decoration* (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1993). According to Vickery in 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres', p. 385, the separate spheres formula was developed by N.F. Cott, in *The Bonds of Womanhood: Women's Sphere in New England, 1780-1835* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977). This model has also been widely used by art historians, and in this respect becomes an even more striking, by using visual representation of feminine presence in the home. See Deborah Cherry, 'Picturing the private sphere,' *Feminist Art News*, v, (1982), 5-11; Linda Nead, *Myths of Sexuality: Representations of Women in Victorian Britain* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) and Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: men and women of the English middle class, 1780-1850* (Routledge, 1987). For nineteenth-century France, Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference: Femininity, feminism and the histories of art* (Routledge, 1988).

⁵³ 'Of the Characters of Women: An Epistle to a Lady', in *Alexander Pope*, ed. by Douglas Brooke-Davies, (J.M. Dent, 1996) p. 70, ll. 199-206.

⁵⁴ Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 'Emile, ou de l'éducation' *Oeuvres Complètes*, 5 vols (Paris, 1969), p. iv; Colley Britons, pp. 254, 258, 286-8; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 463-4, 604-7.; Amanda Foreman, *Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire* (Harper Collins, 1998).

⁵⁵ Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' p.102.

⁵⁶ Miles Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity: London Geographies 1680-1780* (New York: Guildford Press, 1998), p.78.

⁵⁷ Ogborn, p.89.

⁵⁸ Both Linda Kerber's 'Separate Spheres, Womans World, Woman's Place' and Amanda Vickery's 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres' articles provide comprehensive surveys of the use of the 'separate spheres' approach.

⁵⁹ Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres,' pp. 383-414. For an application of 'separate spheres' to the eighteenth century see Mendelson and Crawford, pp.205-210.

⁶⁰ Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter*, p.7. The author states that in effect the condition of 'separate spheres' exists today. See also pp. 222-3; 288-90.

⁶¹ Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure*.

⁶² Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure*, p.12.

⁶³ Kerber, p.16.

⁶⁴ Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter*, focuses on rural gentry; Anne Lawrence and Vivien Jones, *Women in the Eighteenth Century: constructions of femininity* (Routledge, 1990) adopt the 'separate spheres' approach.

⁶⁵ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.110.

⁶⁶ Kerber, p. 38.

⁶⁷ Henri Lefebvre, *The Social Production of Space*, trans by David Nicholson-Smith (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995), p.39.

⁶⁸ Lefebvre, p.39.

⁶⁹ It has been necessary to limit this investigation to those persons who lived in the principal residences on the Grosvenor estate for practical purposes, i.e. finding information and records, and other forms of evidence. The 274 principal residences were located in the Square, and along, Brook, Grosvenor, Upper Brook and Upper Grosvenor Streets and North and South Audley Streets.

⁷⁰ Ann Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition, 1740-1860*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), p.3.

⁷¹ Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology*, p.3.

⁷² Andrew Hemingway, *Landscape, imagery and urban culture in early nineteenth-century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p.15

⁷³ E.H. Gombrich, 'In Search of Cultural History', in *Ideas and Idols: Essays on values in history and in art* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979), pp.53-56.

⁷⁴ Investigations into urban space and architecture has huge voids with regards to female involvement. In regards the marginal historical role of women in the urban setting, see Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon) 1989; Dan Cruickshank and Neil Burton, *Life in the Georgian City* (Viking, 1990); Donald J Olsen, *Town Planning in London: The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, 2nd ed (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982) and *The City as a Work of Art* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1986); John Summerson, *Georgian London* (Barrie and Jenkins, 1945). Investigations have been undertaken by Ogborn and Elizabeth McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London: The development and design of the city 1660-1720* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), and Dana Arnold, *Re-presenting the Metropolis: Architecture, urban experience and social life in London 1800-1840* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

⁷⁵ Katherine Fischer Taylor, 'Architecture's Place in Art History: Art or Adjunct?', *Art Bulletin*, lxxxiii, 2, (June 2001), 342-46, p. 342. The author goes on to define the fine arts as they are defined in the U.S. university system, in which art history surveys include the study of painting, sculpture, and architecture. Although the author also notes that many universities have also created separate architectural history departments, or simply title fine art departments as such – History of Art and Architecture – another separation of the media from its companion arts.

⁷⁶ Fischer Taylor, p. 342.

⁷⁷ Fischer Taylor, p. 345.

⁷⁸ Hillier and Hanson, p. x.

⁷⁹ The prime example is Summerson's *Architecture in Britain*, in which most illustrations of architecture are cropped so that little of its setting is shown. The use of plans, elevations and diagrams further isolated the building from its setting. There have been movements to place architecture, especially the country house in its physical setting. A good example is John Harris's *The Artist and the Country House: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, exhibition catalogue (Sotheby's, 1995).

⁸⁰ Arnold, *Reading Architectural History*, p.177 for a discussion of the eighteenth-century approach in architectural tomes for distancing the object from its context.

⁸¹ Julius Bryant, 'Villa Views and the Uninvited Audience,' in Dana Arnold's *The Georgian Villa*, p.12.

⁸² Holgate, *The Aesthetics of Built Form*, p.151.

⁸³ Scott, Joan W., 'The Evidence of Experience', *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 17 (1991), 773-97, p.780.

⁸⁴ Fisher Taylor, p. 342.

⁸⁵ Pollock, *Vision and Difference*; Cherry, 'Picturing the private sphere,' Nead, *Myths of Sexuality*, and Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes*.

⁸⁶ Pollock, *Vision and Difference*, p.28.

⁸⁷ Hillier and Hanson, p.27.

⁸⁸ John Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth-Century* (Harper Collins, 1997), pp.x, 93-4.

⁸⁹ Brewer, p.50.

⁹⁰ *London in Miniature: Being a Concise and Comprehensive Description of the Cities of the Cities of London and Westminster...* (1755).

⁹¹ Brewer, pp. 69-71; Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Penguin, 1977), p.213-14; Port, 'West End Palaces', p.29.

⁹² *London and Its Environs Described: Containing an Account of whatever is remarkable for Grandeur, Elegance, Curiosity, or Use ...*, 6 vols (Dodsley, 1761).

⁹³ Brewer, pp.50-52.

⁹⁴ *The London and Westminster Guide, Through the Cities and Suburbs*, (W. Nicoll, 1768), introduction.

⁹⁵ Defoe, *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain*, p.ix.

⁹⁶ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through England and Wales in Two Volumes*, intro by G.D.H. Cole, vol.1 (J.M. Dent and Sons, 1928), p.167.

⁹⁷ Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character 1650-1850* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), Introduction.

⁹⁸ Louis Beat de Muralt, *Letters describing the Character and Customs of the English and French Nations. With a curious essay on Travelling*, 2nd edn (1726).

⁹⁹ HL Broadlands MSS, BR13, BR15.

¹⁰⁰ Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, p.172.

¹⁰¹ Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Chatto and Windus, 1973), p.142.

¹⁰² John Gay, *Trivia, or the Art of Walking the Streets of London* (1716) ll 45-58.

¹⁰³ Gay, *Trivia*, ll.143-146.

¹⁰⁴ HL Broadlands MSS, MS 62/BR 16, 1750

¹⁰⁵ HL Broadlands MSS, MS 62/BR 16,

¹⁰⁶ Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, ed. by Gayatri Chakrovorty (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1967), p iv.

¹⁰⁷ Survey, xxxix, Appendix II, pp. 196-7.

¹⁰⁸ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/22.

¹⁰⁹ Mary, Countess of Thanet, PRO PROB 11/789, sig 247 (1751); Duchess of Kendall, PRO PROB 11/726, sig 167 (18 May 1743); Grace, Dowager Countess of Dysart, PRO PROB 11/702, sig 137 (1740); Lucy, Dowager Duchess of Rutland, PRO PROB 11/790, sig 291 (1751).

¹¹⁰ Robert Morris, *Lecture on Architecture*, 2nd edn (1759).

¹¹¹ T.P. Conner, 'Colen Campbell as Architect to the Prince of Wales,' *Architectural History*, 22 (1973), 64-71.

¹¹² The plans and elevations of residences on the Grosvenor estate were recreated for text from the originals in the possession of Westminster Archives.

¹¹³ Hillier and Hanson, *The Social Production of Space*, p.198.

¹¹⁴ Hillier and Hanson, p.3.

¹¹⁵ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through England and Wales*, p.167.

¹¹⁶ Leonard Knyff and Leonard Kip, *Britannia Illustrata*, (1708).

¹¹⁷ Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), p.92.

¹¹⁸ Michel Foucault, 'Panopticism,' in *Visual Culture: The Reader*, by Jessica Evans and Stuart Hall, eds (Sage Publications, 1999), p.64.

¹¹⁹ David Bindman, *Hogarth* (Thames and Hudson, 1989), p79.

¹²⁰ Hillier and Hanson, p.24.

¹²¹ J.B. Harley, 'Maps, knowledge, and power,' in *The Iconography of the Landscape*, by Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p.278.

¹²² GER WA 1049/12/216.

¹²³ Reproduced and reprinted as Plan B in volume xxxix of the *Survey*.

¹²⁴ Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994) p.209.

¹²⁵ Harley, p.278.

¹²⁶ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, p. 12.

¹²⁷ Harley, p.289.

¹²⁸ For a discussion of the influence of Rocque's survey, see Renzo Dubbini, *The Geography of the Gaze: Urban and Rural Vision in Early Modern Europe*, trans. by Lydia Cochrane (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2002), pp. 41-43.

¹²⁹ Carr, pp.12 and 25.

Chapter II

The City

'Idea of the Place'

I believe I may take for granted, that every fine Woman, who comes to Town in *January*, comes heartily tired of the Country and her Husband.¹

The largest ‘stage’ upon which social roles could be enacted in the urban environment was the city itself. Cities are such vast physical and social entities that their dimensions, in terms of society, economy, and cultural relationships need to be ‘brought into scale’ to reveal its rich diversity.² The physical qualities of eighteenth-century London, its architecture and built environment need to be identified and reconstructed in order to achieve a picture of its society. Social mapping will also distinguish those physical locations where the urbanites congregated to perform social rituals and project their various identities. This chapter consists of an investigation into the manner in which the city, and in particular, the Grosvenor estate, was conceived, perceived, and lived in order to reveal the dynamics of its society and built environment.³

London is a City of such great Antiquity, that its original Foundation is hardly to be traced in History: It is the Metropolis of *Great Britain*, and without Dispute, one of the largest most populous, rich and flourishing Cities in Europe.

Under the Word *London*, we comprehend not only the City properly so called, but also *Westminster*, another City contiguous to it, whose late spacious Buildings may, in Time, occasion to vie with the former.⁴

Due to the social complexities and spatial dynamics of London, there is a need in this investigation to literally define the metropolis. In accordance with the author of the above guidebook entry, the term London will be utilized in this work to encompass both the City proper, the city of Westminster, and the adjacent regions which compose what is presently termed as the West End. Furthermore, it is necessary to note the essential differences that existed and still exist between the City and the West End. The City was the heart of commercialism and trade and the West End was the site for material consumption.⁵ The city of Westminster was also the location for the principal royal spaces with its palaces, the Abbey and parks. For many generations the lands around these royal spaces had been

distributed as political favours to court favourites, and occasionally were available for purchase, as was the case with the ancestors of Mary Grosvenor, who purchased 500 acres of the West End.⁶ At one time, this parcel of land extended contiguously from the Thames to Oxford Road, intersected only by the royal highway, King's Road. The scale and juxtaposition of the Grosvenor estate warranted a further investigation into the significant role it played as an urban stage for social performance in early eighteenth-century London.

As previously noted, the city was often defined by its architecture and built environment. Dana Arnold's text on Regency London proposes an interdisciplinary approach to the history of the metropolis, while her latest text puts forward a strategy for new 'readings' of architectural history, by utilizing and extending the established canons.⁷ A dominant text on eighteenth-century London and its architecture over the last 50 years has been John Summerson's *Georgian London*. This work centred on the chronological development of London's West End, noting individual speculative developments, with an elaboration of public works and royal commissions in regards to issues of ownership, patronage and style. According to Summerson, the city developed according to fixed laws and acts, dominated by newly formulated notions of classicism.⁸ As one of the first architectural texts which explored the social implications of the urban environment, Summerson's *Georgian London* has been held up as a model for this historical approach. In addition, an abundance of literature concerning London's history focuses on its social and political conditions and events.⁹ Geo-political histories examine London in regards to its impact on the rest of the nation, in generally every area of culture, including religion, commerce and trade, social mores, the arts, education and class structure, but rarely reflect on the impact of specific locations within the metropolis itself. Paul Langford's *A Polite and Commercial People* explores eighteenth-century Britain in terms of the cultural conditions of society, which were determined by the lifestyle and material possessions achieved through property ownership.¹⁰ This work has adopted Langford's basic premise for historical consideration, since property, in the form of the built environment, is the foundation of this work. Possessing a home, either as a tenant, builder, architect, or owner, was a basic and vital condition for inclusion in this work.

Not only have current histories of London concentrated on its people and buildings, but these were often the key elements in contemporary descriptions of the eighteenth-century city. One phenomenon often noted was the influx of 'new' people into the metropolis. However, novelty was more than simply 'newly arrived' to the city. London's eighteenth-century population was diverse in terms of gender, class and politics; persons attracted to

the city for financial gain, personal freedom and the opportunities necessary to elevate one's social position.

The expansion of the bourgeois mercantile and commercial classes in the eighteenth-century capitol [London] was accompanied by both the appearance of many unclassified people, materially alike but not cognizant of their similarities, and the loosening of traditional social rankings.¹¹

There exists a need to define these 'unclassified' members of society. This work will challenge the misconception that the “‘middling sort’ ... rarely lived in the manner of the gentry, let alone of the aristocracy, or ‘the rich’.”¹² An analysis of the social make-up of the Grosvenor estate should expand the current understanding of Henry Fielding's 'people of Fashion',¹³ especially concerning the estate's builders, architects and women. The diversity of the estate's residents formulated a need to find another way in which to define and identify them. Stereotypical labels of 'aristocracy' and 'gentry' cannot be applied to this new social formation, and certainly not to the society of Grosvenor Square, which included a sampling from every economic level of society, a diversity of political leanings and both men and women.

It can be assured that the common denominator of these diverse people was their life-style and the manner in which they consumed the built environment. This shared aspect was a freedom of choice and its expression manifested itself in terms of luxury goods and lifestyle.¹⁴ ‘The eighteenth century saw an assimilation of taste between the aristocracy and increasingly wealthy lower orders of society: there was an *embourgeoisement* of taste and luxury. We find men of different social origins living side by side in London streets and squares...’¹⁵ An expansion of this definition will reveal that women, in particular, were an integral element of this new society, ‘living side by side’ on the Grosvenor estate.

Economic, technological and social factors produced new concepts of luxury. The principal homes of the Grosvenor estate were created for this leisured class, provided London's West End with an abundance of modern, fashionable housing for the newcomers. The furnishing of the estate, complete with broad pavements, lighted streets and fresh water established the Grosvenor estate as the gem of the city in the mid-eighteenth century, and a highly desirable location in which to reside.

... in short, this Square [Grosvenor] may well be looked upon as the Beauty of the Town; those who have not seen it, cannot have an

adequate Idea of the Place. I should have remembered, that, not far from these Buildings, just within Hyde-park, is a noble Bason supplied with Thames water from Chelsea, from whence is distributed to every House.¹⁶

Court duties, recreation, green space, leisure time and the lack of business pursuits would have been reasons to consider a property on the Grosvenor estate. However, a luxury townhouse in a fashionable square was only one of the necessary ingredients to encourage new residents to the metropolis. Urban spaces, such as parks, coffeehouses and pleasure gardens, were consumed by this leisured class. This chapter will examine and identify those locations in London consumed by these urbanites, the physical and social patterns which existed in these spaces and the manner in which they related to similar patterns evident on the Grosvenor estate in the early eighteenth century.

The influx of new persons into the metropolis was looked upon by contemporaries as a cause for much concern. According to Daniel Defoe, there were ‘new squares, and new streets rising up every day to such a prodigy of building that nothing in the world does, or ever did, equal it, except old Rome in Trajan’s time...’¹⁷ As noted by Defoe, physical patterns emerged out of the ever changing mass of humanity immigrating to eighteenth-century London. Of equal concern was the phenomenon of movement not only **to** the city, but **within** the city itself. Henry Fielding noted the westward migration with a sense of anxiety.

Within the memory of many now living the circle of people of Fascination included the whole parish of Covent Garden and a great part of St Giles in the Fields; but here the enemy broke in and the circle was presently contracted to Leicester Fields and Golden Square. Hence the people of Fashion again retreated before the foe to Hanover Square; whence they were once driven to Grosvenor Square and even beyond it; and that with so much precipitation, that had they not been stopped by the walls of Hyde Park, it is more probable they would by this time have arrived at Kensington.¹⁸

Fielding saw the expansion of the city as warfare. But who was the enemy? Evidence of the rate-payers of the above mentioned squares, shows that the ‘foe’ of Fielding’s ideal and orderly society were members of the merchant class.¹⁹ (Table 3) The once elite urban spaces of Soho, Queen’s and Leicester Squares were being reclaimed by a new breed of persons in the early eighteenth century. The aristocracy and gentry continued their westward movement which finally led them places such as Grosvenor Square. On the other hand, the material wealth of the merchant class provided them with the means to

imitate the upper classes, and the Grosvenor estate was one place in which they actually shared spaces instead of reclaiming them, refuting Fielding's claim that 'people of Fashion' were driven out of Grosvenor Square.²⁰ Evidence points to the fact that families of all classes made the Square their home for many generations.²¹ This chapter will attempt to identify the physical qualities of the Grosvenor estate, which made it both an attractive and desirable place in which to reside, through a comparison with similar 'patterns' of place and people acknowledged in the 'public' spaces of eighteenth-century London.

The City is Many Cities

In 1750, London was the largest city in Europe. The composition of the metropolis included a number of small villages, open fields and the developed estates of the nation's elite. In order to break down the complexities of this city of many cities, Michel Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge* has been utilized as a guide to uncover the layers of historical information hidden beneath the surface. The author suggests questioning the 'familiar' in history and looking beyond conventional thinking to the 'Other'.²² With regards to early eighteenth-century London, this 'Other' can be a new social class, the mercantile bourgeoisie, which was gaining social, political and aesthetic power and credibility. The social make-up of each of London's speculative developments, including the Grosvenor estate, was well represented by the rising merchant class.²³

The physical characteristics of the city could be reorganized for a new group of urban consumers. Single women, especially dowagers and widows, can be considered part of this group. Like the city's merchants, many single women were often rich in capital, but lacked land ownership. In contrast to married women, who were often stripped of their property in the contractual agreements of marriage and jointure, single women enjoyed the same amount of financial freedom as their male counterparts, providing them with the means to purchase and embellish a metropolitan townhouse.²⁴ In his investigation of the moneyed and propertied classes of eighteenth-century Britain, Paul Langford has noted that between one-fifth and one-sixth of all property in the metropolis was owned by women.²⁵ On the Grosvenor estate, this percentage was higher, and consisted in a large part of single women – widows, spinsters and unmarried daughters. (Tables 2, 3 and 11) 'Such women enjoyed complete control of their lives, and unlimited access to the social privileges which property brought, though not for the most part, its political rights.'²⁶ However, Langford failed to acknowledge that political rights can be asserted by less apparent or conventional means. In terms of property, no more clearly was this power demonstrated than by the heiress, who was able to exert her control, either directly or indirectly with the choice of a spouse. The loosening of arranged marriages for the consolidation of titles and estates, empowered the heiress with marital choice.²⁷ On the other hand, the widow was perhaps the most empowered of all females, often times with the ability and freedom to select or reject any new attachments. On the Grosvenor estate, this included a diverse group of women; some who remained widowed, others who remarried and many who retained their townhouses throughout the course of their lives. (Table 11) Financial independence permitted single women to enjoy and consume the

metropolis in their own manner, which included the latest urban forms of pleasure gardens, boulevards and garden squares.

In eighteenth-century London, each of these ‘communities’ developed socially in their own manner. An analysis of the residents of the principal buildings on the Grosvenor, Bedford, Burlington estates and St James’s Square,²⁸ revealed that the class structure of these estates varied immensely. (Table 3) A demographic comparison of Grosvenor estate in Mayfair with another major building project of the 1720s, the Burlington estate, reveals some interesting social variations.²⁹ The Burlington development appears to be both less aristocratic and less feminine than the Grosvenor estate. It is also interesting to note that Lord Burlington’s Piccadilly properties did not attract the same quantities of ‘quality’ residents as the Grosvenor estate. Perhaps the lack of elite residents was due to the fact that Burlington House was centred on the estate development, a large and obvious cultural signpost of ownership and authority. This spatial organization may have prevented noblemen from settling on this estate, since residence may have signified a decrease in rank, shifting the overall composition of class structure towards the middling ranks. The Duke of St Albans had considerable trouble filling his new development with fashionable people, which was in part due to the failure to construct centrepiece houses on the estate.³⁰ The demand for fashionable housing in the metropolis outweighed the supply, which may explain for larger concentrations of the upper classes not only in the Square, but on the entire Grosvenor estate.

A comparison of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair, with the established St James’s Square, indicates that the older development was a seat of established courtiers. During the 1730s, twenty out of twenty-three residents of St James’s Square were aristocrats.³¹ In the 1720s, 13 out of 25 residents of Hanover Square were aristocrats.³² In a similar vein, Grosvenor Square was nearly half aristocratic, with 25 of its first time residents from the titled class.³³ However, the Square accounts for less than one-fifth of all the principal residences on the Grosvenor estate, so that an analysis of the other residents and a primary focus of this work, will provide a broader understanding of the role the Grosvenor estate played in the development of London’s West End. In other words, of the new or revitalized developments in the West End in the early eighteenth century, St James’s Square was aristocratic and courtly, the Burlington estate was military and mercantile, the Bedford estate was gentrified, and the Grosvenor estate was well represented by all of ranks of society. In terms of gender, single women occupied over one-third of the residences in Berkeley and Cavendish Squares. Men dominated the residences of St James’s Square,

whereas the Burlington estate, Hanover and Grosvenor Square were equally composed of approximately one-quarter single women. This work shall propose that the differences in social makeup of these eighteenth-century West End developments was due in part to their specific geographic location in the metropolis and the specific spatial patterns which developed.

In his exploration of the urban history of London in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Donald Olsen has noted that ‘from the seventeenth century onwards, countless town planners ... were engaged in imposing rationally conceived patterns of growth and development on London. For the most part they were not associated with any political body but were connected with one or another of the ground landlords or building speculators who were ultimately responsible for the face which London presents to the world.’³⁴ The Grosvenor estate may be considered an exception. The social composition of the estate in terms of court alliances and responsibilities revealed the dominant presence of supporters of the Hanoverian succession. (Table 4) A significant number of its residents were members of the royal household, held honorary positions such as knighthoods and were directly involved with the workings of government by holding seats in Parliament. (Tables 1, 12 and 13) Many residents of the Grosvenor estate acquired or elevated their titles, denoting the roles they played in the Hanoverian court. Even a certain number of women living on the Grosvenor estate held official positions in the royal household, such as Anne Duchess of Bolton whom was a Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Caroline, and those that held ‘unofficial’ positions, such as the mistress to King George I, the Duchess of Kendal. Although members of the aristocracy and the court were distributed throughout the developments of London’s West End, it appears that Richard Grosvenor had set forth to attract a specific clientele for the Mayfair development, which included those with political links to the Hanoverian dynasty.

Class structure, gender and politics could be reflected in the physical makeup of London’s early eighteenth-century speculative developments. On the whole, the varied social configuration of the metropolis created a chaotic scene. ‘This was due partly to the difficulty of getting from one part of the town to the other, partly to the more rigid lines between classes, trades and occupations, partly to the dangerous character of many districts to those who were at all well dressed, partly to the intense individualism of local government.’³⁵ Planners and speculators attempted to superimposed a sense of order on this urban scene, but generally with regards to their own development, and often with little consideration to the city as a whole. London developed as large-scale chaos, due in part to

the individual needs and desires of the respective building speculators and landowners. Few coordinated efforts for improvement occurred in the planning of individual projects, but as noted before, this transpired with little regard to open lands or the existing built environment. Early eighteenth-century building acts were specifications in terms of fire safety rather than aesthetic issues. The first formal concerns enacted into law were the Westminster Paving Acts of 1762, which placed responsibility for surfaces in the hands of commissioners rather than individuals.³⁶ In respect to lighting, the Grosvenor estate had established this requirement, in addition to paving provisions with its first building contracts, and well in advance of governmental provisions and enforcement.³⁷

The rationally conceived patterns utilized by eighteenth-century planners, which became part of the London cityscape were based upon the town square and the grid. During the early part of the century, a number of these open areas around and adjacent to the metropolis were developed. The source of these urban strategies can be found in ancient and classical cities. As noted by Richard Sennett in his exploration of the interaction between urban spaces and those whom consume them, the Enlightenment desire to rationalize forms, including space, by utilizing the grid actually created social chaos. ‘The grid disoriented those who played upon it; they could not establish what was of value in places without centers or boundaries, spaces of endless, mindless geometric division.’³⁸ No more clearly can this be evidenced that in Thomas Barlow’s planning of the Grosvenor development, evidenced on J. Mackay’s survey map of 1723.³⁹ (Illustration 2) Barlow imposed a grid on a rural landscape, virtually ignoring the topography. The gridded layout of the estate, along with the size and dimensions of the proposed streets were featured in this highly decorative artefact, however, individual houses and their specifications were omitted. On the inscription, directly below the layout of the estate, Mackay inscribed the following definition of the proposed built space:

Grosvenor Buildings or the Fields Commonly called Oliver’s Fields;
being Partly built and a Square and Eleven Principal Streets designed
as per Plan ...⁴⁰

It would appear that Barlow was primarily concerned with a geometric organization of space, rather than the design and dimensions of individual buildings and their function. Barlow’s quest for uniformity was thwarted only by the limitations of land ownership and established boundaries. The irregular shape of the estate, especially to the south and east were Barlow’s only hindrances to a regular grid plan. Other developments, such as the Burlington estate, imposed a similar system of perpendicularly arranged streets within

their own established estate boundaries. The overall effect this created in the eighteenth-century London (which remains to this day) was a patchwork of regular developments, set at obtuse angles to one another, and resembling a Victorian crazy quilt, and the intersection of developments became places of congestion, massing of people and buildings, confusion, irregularity, and occasionally points of contention. (Illustration 9) This spatial phenomenon was clearly evidenced on John Rocque's survey of 1745. Rocque ordered the urban scene into tidy geometric forms, thereby disguising the chaotic environment of the city. One aspect which could not be hidden was the physical character which occurred when estates abutted one another. The orderliness of the Mayfair estate becomes obvious due to the imposition of a regular grid of such large scale onto London's West End. (Illustration 11) The physical feature which drew people away from the confusion of adjoining estates and created individual urban focal points were the garden squares.

The other interesting feature of Mackay's survey was the juxtaposition of the proposed development with its geographic setting. The inclusion of aristocratic homes, including Buckingham House and the Duke of Dorset's townhouse in St James's, and Burlington, Berkeley, Sunderland and Devonshire Houses along Piccadilly, established spatial relationships between the new development and its social aspirations. This survey also delineated the estate's placement with regards to the royal palaces of St James and Kensington, signifying its political and courtly undertones.

Views of properties had obvious ideological and political implications: since they were linked to the history of a prestigious patron, they expressed upper-class control, not just over space, but also over the very image of the city.⁴¹

The fact that this survey did not include any of the constructed squares, clearly demonstrated its 'Otherness'. By drawing spatial and symbolic relationships between the Grosvenor property and the established landowners and the court, this map signifies the upwardly mobile ambitions of the estate's owner, Sir Richard Grosvenor. As the most striking characteristics of Mackay's survey, the reinforced spatial relationships created with the inclusion of noted 'power houses' on the plan of the proposed estate development, validated the significance of the construction of the Grosvenor estate in the metropolis. Mackay's survey clearly delineated the new community in Mayfair, denoting both its value and vitality to the larger metropolitan setting through its geographic and spatial relationships with the established built environment and its society.

Perceptions of the City

The spatial pattern that developed in eighteenth-century London was the clustering of individual communities within the larger realm of the city itself. Some of these communities were residential in nature such as the Grosvenor estate and Hanover Square. Others were commercial, such as The Strand, Covent Garden and Pall Mall. Some districts in the metropolis specialized in government and administration such as Whitehall and St James's, while other regions operated as entertainment venues, such as Vauxhall Gardens, the royal parks and Ranelagh. A person's location in this complex and varied environment could help to determine both the manner in which that person was perceived and their own perception of the space, which in turn helped to formulate a personal sense of identity. '... who you were was read off from where you were, who you appeared to be and where you were seen...'⁴² However, spatial identity can create an ambivalent situation, since that person can disguise their physical appearance, their social status and even gender. This ambiguity poses a difficult situation for social mapping. In order to avoid the pitfalls of this approach, it is vital to look at perceptions of the city from many perspectives and from different individuals. A wide variety of both visual and textual sources were utilized in order to gain a broader knowledge of the manner in which eighteenth-century London was consumed spatially and socially.

Another important aspect of the perception of urban spaces was the manner in which assessments can become clouded by one's experiences and expectations. The perceived image of the city was thus, created by the individual's imagination, possessing elements of that person's past history, present experiences and dreams for the future.

Through fantasy, whether conscious or unconscious, the urbanised subject creates an imaginary urban landscape, which is constructed partly by the material of the city, partly by the modalities of identification, partly by defensive processes and partly by the 'contents' of the unconscious.⁴³

In this way, the 'imaginary landscape', composed of multiple episodes and occurrences in urban space, specifically the space of Grosvenor Square and London in the early eighteenth century, composed the evidence of the manner in which those spaces were consumed as platforms for the performance of vital social roles.

The Country Gentlemen would live in the Country and their Ladys have nor pretence to weary them out of their Lives till they get them to London in order to get them a place.⁴⁴

Gender is one factor which can affect the perception of space.⁴⁵ Men and women have different and similar experiences and perceptions of urban spaces. The city is composed of places specifically created for men, for women, and places that were shared. An investigation of the manner in which each gender expressed their urban experiences will provide clues into how that space was defined and consumed. It is also necessary to reveal the various ways in which men and women expressed their spatial experiences, to understand the applications of gendered spaces. Specifically, ‘...the space of the city ... becomes a text to be read or a space to enter in order to retreat from and subsequently reflect on the social order and cultural significance of its architectural passages and transformations.’⁴⁶ Throughout the course of this work, both male and female accounts of urban experiences have been utilised to understand the manner in which urban spaces could support gender, as well as social and political performance.

A major social concern throughout the eighteenth century was presented by the large number of women living in the metropolis, considered by many accounts as an unfit place for the ‘Fair Sex’. Men asserted their paternal role to protect the woman in the city, and warned them of its inherent dangers and vices.

London! the needy Villian’s gen’ral Home,
The Common Sewer of *Paris* and of *Rome*;
With eager Thirst, by Folly or by Fate,
Sucks in the Dregs of each corrupted State.⁴⁷

Negative descriptions of the city presumed that the female resident would be at extreme risk, prescribing a life in the country as the best and safest alternative. Historians have in turn linked urban women with amoral behaviour. Jane Rendell’s investigation of Regency London, located ‘cyprians’ and prostitutes in the public spaces of the opera, saloons and coffeehouses.⁴⁸ However, in many cases, women had no other choice but to live in the city. The seclusion of rural life would have included many inherent dangers as well. For the single woman, either maid, spinster or widow, the city provided a vast amount of opportunities in terms of social life, political assertion, and financial gain. The city also provided the most diverse arena for the consumption of material culture. For other women, the city provided the primary location for their responsibilities in maintaining a household. Women sometimes occupied the London townhouse in order to prepare and obtain

materials for that and other residences, such as a country seat or seaside cottage. For example, Mrs John Aislabie who was residing in the townhouse in Grosvenor Square, was provided with measurements for paper and fabric by their steward for improvements to the county seat. The steward was helpful to suggest a place to find incidental sewing notions.

Please to order them they are to be Gott in St Martins Lane att the sign of the Bird Cage below the Church.⁴⁹

Many women's letters in the eighteenth century related the location of primary shopping venues throughout the metropolis. London was the principal arena for the assertion of capital consumption, and women networked with friends and family members to obtain luxury and household goods. Shopping provided urban women with a social activity, and the ability to express their freedom of choice, opinion and movement. On a shopping expedition to Ludgate Hill, Mrs Mary Manley writes to the *Female Tatler* of her experiences with the shopkeepers:

These men are positively the greatest Fops in the Kingdom; they have their Toilets and their Night-gowns; their *Chocolate in the Morning*, and their *green Tea two hours after*; Turkey-potts for their Dinner; and their Perfumes, Washes and clean Linen, equip them for the Park Parade.⁵⁰

Mrs Manley noted the shifting of social roles that was evident in the merchant class in the early eighteenth century. These shopkeepers were acquiring the daily routine and manner of the class of persons which they were intended to serve, a characteristic still in evidence with many staff members of Harvey Nichols and Harrods today. According to Mrs Manley, the shopkeepers on Ludgate Hill were not only taking on the guise of a higher class, but demonstrated ambiguous gender qualities by acquiring the feminine routine of tea, 'toilets' and walks in the Park.

Except in the case of morality and safety, the masculine views of the city varied little from the feminine. The correspondence of many eighteenth-century men relayed the advantage of the city for the society it contained. In a letter from Horace Walpole to Horace Mann (3 Oct 1743), the author found solace and privacy in the company of strangers.

Would you know why I like London so much? Why, if the world must consist of so many fools as it does, I choose to take them in gross, and not made into separate pills as they are in the country. Besides, there is no being alone but in a metropolis: the worst place in the world to find solitude is the country: questions grow there, and that unpleasant Christian commodity, neighbours.⁵¹

In contrast to many of Walpole's letters in which he frequently and openly noted the people he contacted and met, the author conveyed his frustration of encounters with persons not meeting his standard. The city became a place in which to withdraw and disappear, which considering Walpole's notoriety, would have been an extremely difficult task.

One element of society that seemed to disappear because of exclusion rather than withdrawal was the spinster. It can be noted that spinsters may have presented a dilemma with their presence in public spaces, who were on the whole considered to be rather 'shadowy' figures in the urban landscape.⁵² Locating the spinster in the public world of eighteenth-century England was difficult. In a reply to a letter which described that the only 'company' in Bath were 'Old Maids', Lady Cecilia West expressed vehemently her own distaste for the situation of these women.

... and if in this Mortal Life Heaven does not please to chain me to a Man that wou'd make even Bondage pleasing, I will never for the sake of change have Mortification in full view...⁵³

Lady West saw a life with even a violent man as more desirable than that of a single woman. As 'social failures,'⁵⁴ spinsters were often scorned for their mere presence in public. A spinster would inadvertently place demands upon family members and friends because of the social expectation that a woman should not venture into public places without an escort of either sex. One place in which a spinster could operate socially without the limitations of social mores was her home, and as previously noted, the Grosvenor estate was populated with many single women, including spinsters.

The case of the spinster points out the need to analyse those urban spaces which were consumed by the 'disguised' or shadowy elements of the population. Gender, social rank, marital status and political leanings could be perceived differently by different individuals in the varied spaces of the city. This work attempts to expand the current perception of the location of under-represented elements of society, such as the spinster and widow, in an attempt to demonstrate the inappropriate application of 'separate spheres' ideology to early eighteenth-century London, and specifically Grosvenor Square.

The Country or the City

It is, in the first place to be observed, as a particular and remarkable crisis, singular to those who write in this age ... that the great and more eminent increase of buildings in and around the city of London, and the vast extent of ground taken, and now become streets and nobles' squares of houses, by which the mass or body of the whole is become so infinitely great, has generally been made in our time, not only within our memory, but even within a few years ...⁵⁵

In the eighteenth century, the expansion of the metropolis in terms of population and physical mass was often described as a 'crisis'. London's growth was in part due to immigration from the countryside, much to the dismay of the moralists who saw this action as representative of the loss of morals and Christian values.⁵⁶ Some such as Horace Walpole, referred to the city as both good and bad. Walpole actually prescribed a stay in the city to many of his friends for whatever ailed them, which was usually a lack of social contact.⁵⁷ However, in a majority of published accounts of life in the metropolis, the impression left was derogatory in nature. Samuel Johnson's *London: A Poem* added fuel to the condemnations of the then largest city in Europe.

How, when Competitors like these contend,
Can surly Virtue hope to fix a Friend?
Slaves that with serious Impudence beguile,
And lye without a Blush, without a Smile,
Exalt each Trifle, ev'ry Vice adore,
Your Taste in Snuff, your Judgment in a Whore;
Can *Balbo*'s Eloquence applaud, and swear
He gropes his Breeches with a Monarch's air.⁵⁸

London was often interpreted as the site of evil and corruption, an aura which surrounds many cities to the present day. Eighteenth-century society was greatly influenced by a 'Protestant ethic of space', based on the fear of pleasure and was most pronounced in Puritan interpretations.⁵⁹ Many people found it difficult to reconcile Christian teachings and beliefs with the social desire to compete materially and politically with others. Eighteenth-century London was populated with persons of varied financial means, but the city's pleasurable aspects and spaces were only open to those who had expendable income. This negative attitude to pleasure could partly explain the wide range of conflicting discourses which arise in the early eighteenth century concerning life in the metropolis. The 'city is good' and the 'city is evil' was a theme constantly debated in contemporary literature and reflected in the letters of its inhabitants and visitors. Natural phenomena, such as the earthquake in London of 1750, was considered by some as God's wrath inflicted on the city for its corrupt inhabitants.

... you may come immediately after Christmas, and enjoy the Pleasures the Town affords. Masquerades are over, Ridalto's out of fashion, the last very thin: for you must know this Second Earthquake fills the Churches and many families are gone into the Country, and more are going, expecting another Visitation from God for the Sinfulness of this Town.⁶⁰

In a singular paragraph, Cecilia de la Warr demonstrates this ‘Protestant ethic of space’ by alluding to the evils of a city, which included parties and other ‘pleasures’. However, for many women, the lure of the city was strong. Despite repeated accounts of the dangers of the city, women were migrating *en masse* to enjoy London’s society. The need to realise familial relationships, the culture of the city and other feminine pursuits, such as shopping, outweighed the unsavoury nature of urban life. The sheer number of women in the city provoked actions and philosophies of urban usage which affected women’s lives. Through the distribution of moralizing sermons and satirical prints, the media attempted to control women’s consumption of urban space.

... whoever considers the Cities of London and Westminster, with the late vast increases of their suburbs, the great irregularity of their buildings, the immense numbers of lanes, alleys, courts and bye-places, must think that they had been intended for the very purpose of concealment, they could not have been better contrived.⁶¹

In this proposition, Henry Fielding recommended government intervention and regulation of building works in the city in order to reduce the amount of criminal activity, which was encouraged by the existent conditions in the metropolis. Space can ‘conceal’ activity, thus creating a threat to civilised society. By contrast, the orderly nature of the Grosvenor estate was attractive because it was open and expansive – the streets were wide and the Square was enormous.

Women often times noted that the city was the site of both physical and mental release from the constricted movement and/or isolation endured while living in the countryside. Feminine voices record relief and excitement on their return to the city.

Surely the Spirits may more justly be said to be set a *Rambling* in *January*, after a tedious six Months Confinement in the Country, than they can be in *May*, after a four Months Evaporation in *London*. I consider *January*, as the General Gaol-Delivery of the Fair Sex: Then they come to Town, flushed with Health, and irritated with the Confinement of the Country: And if ever Constitution or Resentment have any share in a fine Woman’s Transactions, ‘tis then that their Effects are the most dreaded.⁶²

This author found the city as a place of liberation for the woman. Although life in the country could provide one with ‘Health,’ this condition could surely be replaced by the freedom of the city. The country could also be likened to imprisonment by eighteenth-century men as well as women. In a letter to the Earl of Ilchester (1733), John, Lord Hervey expressed that it was ‘...unfortunate to be incarcerated in the country; with demi-human, demi-brutal boobies for neighbours, lived only for a London season.’⁶³ Boredom was a predominant theme in eighteenth-century commentaries on life in the country. In his *Memoirs of a Coxcomb*, John Cleland expressed an opinion which seems to echo many of his contemporaries view of rural life.

Who, indeed, could live in one of those temples of dullness called country seats, where yawns are the form of worship?⁶⁴

Contrasting images and rhetoric of life in the city prevailed in the eighteenth century. The mass print media also confirmed the corruption of persons in urban life, as epitomized in William Hogarth’s satirical works of the social conditions in the early eighteenth-century metropolis. Works such as *Gin Lane* and *Night* were set in specific London locales, illustrating the lurid and exaggerated debauchery perceived to be present in the city’s spaces. (Illustrations 10 and 11) These images can be contrasted with the romanticised notions of rural life as depicted in the early landscapes of Thomas Gainsborough, in which country life was projected as both a visual and moral ideal. (Illustration 12)

With little regard for either the real or perceived dangers present in the city, people chose to make London as their place for entertainment, business and home. In fact, contemporaries felt the countryside was invaded by ‘urban mores’.⁶⁵ People in rural areas and provincial cities were aping the habits and customs of London. The metropolis served as the venue for ‘polite transformation,’ but not as the actual determinant of taste or fashion.⁶⁶ London was the crucial social and political site in eighteenth-century Britain, and its urban forms became the stages on which the urbanites performed the key roles of gender, class and political alliance.

Public spaces in the City

The spaces of the urban are analogous to the spaces of the mind: conscious, preconscious; with shifting, positioning and fighting between them in a struggle for control and expression.⁶⁷

Every consumer of urban space perceives, uses and appreciates it differently. How a person perceives, appreciates and uses space can be dependent upon their gender, ethnicity and social standing.⁶⁸ The ‘public’ and ‘private’ spaces in London, including Grosvenor Square, reveal aspects of the spatial ideology during the metropolis of the first half of the eighteenth century, which identify key urban forms which acted as platforms for social performance.

In Richard Sennett’s *Fall of Public Man*, the author explored the manner in which the rising ‘mercantile bourgeoisie’ in eighteenth-century London brought about new urban experiences and relationships.⁶⁹ The author identified this period as one in which definitions of ‘public’ and ‘private’ were taking on new dimensions.

‘Public’ behaviour is a matter, first, of action at a distance from the self, from its immediate history, circumstances, and needs; second, this action involves the experiencing of diversity.⁷⁰

Sennett went on to argue that the ‘private’ becomes the realm of the domesticity, by alluding that the ‘public’ was constructed by man, the ‘private’ by nature. Since nature requires nurture, the site for the ‘private’ is set within the home.⁷¹ However, Sennett identified this change as a subtle progression throughout the course of the eighteenth century, and initiated by quest for individual freedom and liberty as expressed in the words and actions of persons such as John Wilkes and the Hell Fire Club.⁷² The author implied that the ‘separate spheres’ ideology was not applicable to the early part of the eighteenth century, but failed to identify the spatial ideology in operation at the time.

Lawrence Klein defined the three types of public spheres evidenced in his research as: the magisterial public sphere, concerning with state and world views, the economic public sphere concerning commercialism and economic consumption and vital in regards to this work, that of the ‘associative public sphere of social, discursive and cultural productions’.⁷³ Two key factors in the dynamics of the associative public sphere are perceptibility and accessibility. ‘Public’ matters were exposed, ‘while “private” matters were generally imperceptible, or kept from the perception of others. The “public” and the “private” were, thus aligned with the difference between openness and secrecy, between transparency and opaqueness.⁷⁴ An analysis of the public places of eighteenth-century

London will expose the manner in which those urban spaces permitted open admission and exposed gender, political and social roles.

'Public Places of Pleasure' in the City

Capitalizing upon the diversion of walking, the city's pleasure grounds catered to a person's need to expose his/her public self. During the course of the eighteenth century, there were about 60 to 70 pleasure gardens in the city of London, although some were no more than open air tea rooms.⁷⁵ The largest amount of contemporary evidence surrounding these pleasure gardens belongs to the two largest and most popular – Ranelagh and Vauxhall Gardens. Ranelagh Gardens opened in 1742, created upon the grounds of the Thames villa formerly belonging to the Earl of Ranelagh, and adjacent to Sir Christopher Wren's Royal Hospital at Chelsea. (Illustration 13) *London and Its Environs Described* of 1761 noted that the pleasure grounds were 'one of those public places of pleasure which is not to be equalled in Europe, and is the resort of people of the first quality.'⁷⁶ In fact, Ranelagh was considered by contemporaries to be the more upscale of the two major pleasure gardens and Horace Walpole remarked that 'you can't set your foot without treading on a Prince or Duke of Cumberland.'⁷⁷ With his remarkable habit for creating lists, Walpole took an inventory of the fashionable society on opening day, which included princes, princesses, nobility, and 'much mob.'⁷⁸ Part of the attraction of Ranelagh was this opportunity to encounter greatness. As noted by Kathleen Wilson in her *The Sense of the People*, there was a concerted marketing effort on the part of the Hanoverian dynasty to legitimise their accession to the British throne.⁷⁹ Public appearances in the Mall, Hyde Park and at Ranelagh not only improved their public face, but humanized the German monarchs and helped to break down social and class structures. The frequent presence of the royal family at Ranelagh would have provided and elegant social venue for single women negotiating a coveted place in the Hanoverian court.

William Jones's aerial view of Ranelagh rendered the pleasure gardens as formally composed series of walks, focusing on the water features – the Thames, a canal, and a large basin – and the primary attribute of the gardens – a 185 foot circular pavilion known as the Rotunda. (Illustration 14) Gendered spaces were conceived by Ranelagh's architect. As noted on Jones's plan of the site, a colonnade created to the west of both the Rotunda and Ranelagh House was intended as 'Boxes for Gentlemen to Smoak In'. The other gendered reference can be found in the 'Lady's Walk', along the western boundary

of the pleasure grounds. These designations of gender signified that specific urban spaces were created for the intentional use of one sex or the other. Their nomenclature, however, may not have prevented the utilization of these spaces by both sexes, but denotes the desire for gendered spaces in the public arena.

As a focal point of the pleasure garden, the Rotunda drew the attention of many contemporary artists. Canaletto's view of the interior of the Rotunda at Ranelagh, by its inclusion in his selection of defining views of the city, demonstrated its role and impact on the urban scene. (Illustration 15)

Although the Gardens be exceedingly beautiful, yet the Amphitheatre
[Rotunda] is the more attractive Object of our Admiration...⁸⁰

Circular architectural and urban forms are rare, often times perceived as spaces of supremacy and authority.⁸¹ Prototypes for the circular building include the Roman Pantheon created as the home of the ultimate authority – the gods. In Christian architecture, the dome, symbolic of Heaven, was the dwelling place for another God. In Britain, the circular building took other authoritative guises, such as centres of learning, as demonstrated James Gibbs's Radcliffe Camera at Oxford, and an adopted form for theatre, with sources from antiquity and including the medieval Globe on London's South Bank. In this respect, the Rotunda at Ranelagh can be thought of as a large-scale impromptu theatre, with the pedestrians creating the visual drama, music emanating from its centre and the audience tucked away in elevated boxes.

The spatial configuration of the interior of the Rotunda dictated its usage for the circular promenade and the elevated view. Musical entertainment was provided in the Rotunda, with the orchestra, organ and a large fireplace located at its centre. However, according to many contemporary sources, the chief entertainment was intended for the pedestrian.

... the amusements, consisting of concerts, vocal and instrumental, contributed in no small degree to enliven the promenade, at once the resort of fashion and the display of splendor.⁸²

As illustrated in Canaletto's view of the interior of the Rotunda at Ranelagh, the upper levels of the space contained boxes for an elevated view of both the orchestra and the people strolling. (Illustration 15) Ranelagh was not the only public arena which featured this unique public demonstration. Another location for the circular promenade in the metropolis was at a location known as 'The Ring' in Hyde Park. As noted in *The London*

and Westminster Guide (1768), Hyde Park was considered ‘westward of the city’ and a location for London’s elite society.

There is to be seen in it [Hyde Park] the Place formerly called the *Ring*, which according to the Fashion then prevailing, was wont to be frequented at stated Times by the Nobility, Gentry &c. in their Coaches. The Usage was to drive round and round, but when they had turned for some Time round one Way, then, as if tired with the Sameness, they were to face around and turn the other during some Time also, for variety sake...⁸³

‘The Ring’ may have been created in the public spaces of Hyde Park as a duplication of the then fashionable *carrousel*, found in most French cities. In a similar fashion, the circular promenade at Ranelagh and ‘The Ring’ at Hyde Park, replicated the townhouse’s circuit of public rooms, such as those found in Grosvenor Square. It may have been this quality of Ranelagh which attracted its female clientele. For those women who neither owned their own home or a large and well-furnished home in which to hold an assembly, Ranelagh provided an enclosed, decorated and illuminated environment for their demonstrations, expanding their public role in the urban scene. In addition, a stroll around Grosvenor Square or through its central garden was another example of the circular promenade. Likewise, the drawing rooms of the townhouse surrounding the Square became the elevated boxes to enjoy the view of the consumers of this social space.

The gardens at Ranelagh created an interesting juxtaposition of the built and natural characteristics. The presence of Ranelagh House, the gardens and water features created a spatial configuration similar to that of a country house or a suburban villa. In this setting, the Rotunda can be viewed as a giant garden pavilion, further enhancing the authoritative nature of the structure. This type of landscape would have been familiar to Ranelagh’s audience, and the ambitious size of the amphitheatre would have been appropriate for the urban setting. On the other hand, the Rotunda has been described as a ‘vast assembly room’,⁸⁴ a necessary urban feature and common to fashionable provincial cities such as York and Bath, but clearly absent from the metropolis. The first official assembly room in London was Carlisle House in Soho Square, opened in 1761 by German-born Teresa Connelys, and noted for its ability to attract persons of all levels of society.⁸⁵ The obvious absence of assembly rooms in the early eighteenth-century metropolis, meant that other structures needed to perform this vital social endeavour. Ranelagh was the ideal setting to encounter pageantry, with all its glorious effects of lighting, movement and sound. The decorative architectural effects of the Rotunda were referred to as ‘exquisite

performances' which provided a backdrop for the social roles played out in its boxes and promenade.⁸⁶

Contrasting the formal, classically inspired setting of Ranelagh, Vauxhall Gardens on the south bank of the Thames, was referred to as 'Watteauesque,'⁸⁷ containing wooded gardens and walks embellished with replicas of Roman temples, which recalled the master's fantastic imagery of the Arcadian life of leisure. The gardens contained a constructed picturesque ruin to enhance these rustic qualities. (Illustrations 16 and 17) An excursion to Vauxhall often included a river crossing by ferry, a theme recalled in Watteau's *Departure for the Island of Cytheria*. The Thames crossing was an attraction for some and a horrific experience for others. According to Horace Walpole, going to Vauxhall Gardens 'by water' was what made the experience preferable to Ranelagh.⁸⁸ By contrast, Lydia Melford in *Humphrey Clinker*, found the journey exciting, but the landing terrifying.

At nine o'clock, in a charming moonlight evening, we embarked at Ranelagh for Vauxhall, in a wherry so light and slender that we looked like so many fairies sailing in a nutshell ... The pleasure of this little excursion was, however, dampened, by my being sadly frightened at our landing; where there was a terrible confusion of wherries, and a crowd of people bawling, and swearing, and quarrelling; nay, a parcel of ugly-looking fellows came running into the water, and laid hold of our boat with such great violence, to pull it a-shore; nor would they quit their hold till my brother struck one of them over the head with his cane.⁸⁹

Lydia's description brings to the forefront the inherent dangers faced by women in the city. These conflicting gendered responses of the river crossing to Vauxhall provides evidence of the varied attitudes of pedestrian movement through the metropolis. For the man, ferry travel was 'the' reason to make the trip to Vauxhall, and for the woman, this excursion may have been the reason to find another route or even another location to perform her public image.

In 1730, Vauxhall Gardens reopened as a *ridotto al fresco*, with triumphal arches, extensive walks, and buildings enhanced with paintings of the Roman city of Palmyra created by Francis Hayman. The Music Room took on a circular form, echoing the functioning of the Rotunda at Ranelagh. (Illustration 18) The popularity of Vauxhall Gardens surpassed its rival Ranelagh, in part due to the lower admission charge. James Boswell thought the gardens 'an excellent place of public amusement ... particularly adapted to the taste of the English Nation.'⁹⁰ This 'taste' included a love of imported and

foreign concepts, including settings borrowed from French painting and the gardens of Italian villas, iconography and mythological subjects in painting, Roman triumphal arches and ruins, and designs borrowed from the Orient, depicted on treasured household objects, such as porcelain and cabinets. In concurrence with the contemporary ‘taste’ in foreign objects, the most highly valued item in a woman’s household was often her ‘japaned cabinet’.⁹¹ The most highly assessed item in Lady Strafford’s household inventory was ‘a fine old India Japan Cabinet on a rich carved and gilt frame’ located in her dining room.⁹² (Table 6) The Chinese pavilions at both Ranelagh and Vauxhall catered to this feminine taste, providing an actual physical setting of the scenes represented on the panels of the cabinet. (Illustrations 19 and 20)

A feature of both Ranelagh and Vauxhall Gardens frequently commented upon was their use of lighting. Throughout a series of government-regulated improvements, lighting the city at night was a priority in the early eighteenth century.⁹³ Lighting created a safer and securer environment, with which to enjoy the pleasures of urban space.

As soon as Night comes on, the Garden near the Orchestra is illuminated instantaneously, as it were, with an amazing Number of Glass Lamps, whose glittering among the Trees, gives a Lightness and Brillancy to so anumate a Scene.⁹⁴

The walks of Vauxhall Gardens were primary attractions for its society and from contemporary sources, people often frequented these gardens at night. Understandably, lighting was fundamental for the site. For the early eighteenth century, Vauxhall was unique not only in the amount of lights provided, but also in the manner in which they were used. In its extensive entry for Vauxhall Gardens, *London in Miniature* described the unique lighting of ‘The Grove’.

At a little distance from these Buildings [Musical Temple, et al] and fronting each Face of them are four triumphal Arches (as they are termed) of Lamps. Here the Splendor is so great, as well as in the *Temple of Pleasure* ... that the juvenile Part of both Sexes may enjoy their darling Passion; - the seeing others and being seen by them.⁹⁵

Paul Langford has argued that the pleasure gardens at Vauxhall were not considered appropriate places for ‘marriageable women and unmarried men.’⁹⁶ The ‘public’ and open access to the gardens allowed undesirables such as prostitutes and thieves to infiltrate the polite surroundings. The nocturnal activities at Vauxhall Gardens could blur the lines between ‘public’ and ‘private’ spaces and roles. Perhaps the ‘French’ qualities of Vauxhall enhanced its bad reputation. The picturesque composition of the gardens,

contrasting to the orderly and contrived nature of Ranelagh, provides evidence of the way society could be structured by the built environment. The wooded promenades and secluded boxes at Vauxhall Gardens could provide cover for illicit activities. (Illustration 21) On the other hand, the broad avenues at Ranelagh structured the pedestrian's movements and permitted an unobstructed view for the observer. This formal setting was echoed on the Grosvenor estate by the massive and open qualities of the garden in the Square, laid out with walks and benches, and the generous size of its well-lit principal streets.

Despite the inherent dangers in these public spaces, contemporary views of Ranelagh, Vauxhall and Grosvenor Square confirm the fact that women consumed these urban spaces. As revealed in contemporary illustrations, women and girls were depicted walking through the gardens and Rotunda of Ranelagh and the garden in Grosvenor Square, alone, in pairs or in groups. (Illustrations 15 and 22) Although it may be argued that the artists used conventional groupings of figures in their images, it can also be said that the artist would not venture outside the norms of representation. Thus, lone, paired and grouped females enjoying public spaces were an accepted social more.

As arenas for public demonstrations, pleasure gardens were vital platforms for displaying gender and social roles. Pleasure gardens, like assembly rooms and garden squares, were configured to enhance public performance. The manner in which the gardens were laid out, with walks, lighting and triumphal arches were essentially made for the use of the parade – not military parade, but for the demonstration of material wealth and a life of leisure. These pedestrian movements created space and helped to define the city as the primary platform for social performance.⁹⁷

The Opera

A vital and thriving public arena in the eighteenth century was the opera. As the only art form widely commissioned and enjoyed by George II, the opera became a 'public place of pleasure' in which to demonstrate one's loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty. The royal family was often in attendance in one of the metropolis's many theatres to be entertained by the latest of George Handel's operas. These events provided an ideal opportunity to be seen as an advocate of the court. A commonplace occurrence in eighteenth-century theatre was an active interaction between the performers and their audience. Members of the audience often openly expressed their criticism or appreciation of the performance

with active participation including hissing, laughter or indifference. ‘The theatre is inherently ambiguous: it can emancipate … by liberating passions and imaginations or by creating a community out of its spectators…’⁹⁸ However, there were instances in which the ‘liberated passions’ of the audience alienated them from their peers. An account of a disturbance in a performance of *Romeo and Juliet*, which involved hissing, rioting and the throwing of fruit, was initiated by the laughter of four female theatre-goers (Lady Rockingham, Lady Coventry, Mrs Watson and Miss Pelham) during the poisoning scene.⁹⁹ Occasionally, the audience would try to steal the performance from the stage. Whilst in attendance at the opera in 1748, Jane Hamilton relayed the following experience to a correspondent:

The Company in that Box [Lady ?] was so unreasonably noisy that it got the better of the Patience of the Audience, and tho’ the Beauty and Wit are powerful advocates, Handel’s friends prevail’d and preffer’d his music, unaccountably to be sure when two senses were to be charmed by not attending to his Oratoria.¹⁰⁰

The women involved in this disturbance had tried to create their own performance and in a sense, momentarily captured this public space. As with many social activities in eighteenth-century London, the opera and theatre evolved around the concept of visibility. This public venue originated from the Greek word *theatron*, which literally means a place of seeing. In terms of gender performance, the theatre was a public venue in which women went together. Many urban places were clearly created for both sexes, but as is demonstrated in the following observation of concerts in London by Louis Beat de Muralt, one sex may feel more at ease in a specific space than the other.

I am often pleased at these Meetings [Operas] to observe the Confusion among the Men, who seem’d astonish’d to find themselves in a Place where they could neither game nor drink, and there being none but modest Women, they durst take no Liberties, nor could they find any Subject for Discourse. The women on the other Hand, were highly pleased with gaining Respect (the other Thing in the World they like best) and looking on one another.¹⁰¹

De Muralt was quite amused that men seemed to be ill at ease in this public venue. The author noted the female pastime of maintaining an appearance, which extended to the feminine purpose of walking to and within the concert hall. The acknowledgement women sought, ‘Respect’, demonstrates their desire to control of this social public space.

The Coffeehouse

In terms of social standing, the coffeehouse was an exceptionally public and egalitarian space, but its admission was limited to men. ‘The wholeness the Enlightened man looked for what he too sought to hear; he believed in the beneficent powers of freely flowing discourse; his coffeehouse was where he sought to hear unity.’¹⁰² This aspect of English society was quite varied from the French version of ‘Enlightened discourse,’ which centred on the *salons* and their hostesses. English women may not have enjoyed the same level of shared unity as their French counterparts.

They represent these Coffee-houses as the most agreeable Things in *London*, and they are, in my Opinion, very Proper Places to find People that a Man has business with, or to pass away Time a little more agreeably, perhaps, than he can do at Home...¹⁰³

This foreign observations of the coffeehouses constantly highlight them as a masculine domain. Entrance to the coffeehouse was not encumbered by class differences, although many had specific political associations.¹⁰⁴ As noted in the following passage distinctions of class normally displayed in the public realm were left at the door of the eighteenth-century coffeehouse.

Here you will see blue and green Ribbons and Stars fitting familiarity with private Gentlemen, and talking the Same Freedom as if they had left their Quality and Degrees of Distance at home; and a Stranger tastes with pleasure the Universal Liberty of Speech of the *English* nation. Or if you like rather the Company of Ladies, there are Assemblies at most People of Quality’s Houses.¹⁰⁵

In the same fashion as the theatre the ‘actors’ of the coffeehouse adorned themselves with ‘Ribbons and Stars,’ costumed for their public performance. These embellishments were a type of code, visible symbols for the audience to identify with the actors’ social standing and political leanings. This description also located the ‘private Gentleman’ in the public realm of the coffeehouse, thereby highlighting the flexibility of these terms. However, the author placed men and women in different venues for social interaction. Noting that the ‘Company of Ladies’ could be found in the home, the townhouses of the Grosvenor estate would have met this social requirement with large public rooms capable of handling large assemblies.

One of the first buildings completed on the Grosvenor estate was a coffeehouse, a public arena significant to the potential social and cultural aspects of the Grosvenor estate. The Mount Coffee House was constructed on a site of political significance; a civil war site

more commonly known as ‘Oliver’s Mount.’ Located at the eastern boundary of the Grosvenor estate, the construction of the Mount Coffee House highlights the thoughtful planning of the estate’s potential as a social, rather than commercial centre in Westminster. It also signifies the Grosvenor estate’s role in the political climate of the development, since coffeehouses were political venues, and the Mount Coffee House was a political site with historical significance.

Throughout the city, coffeehouses were often located on busy thoroughfares, with the largest concentration located on Pall Mall. The activities of the coffeehouse would have extended to the street through large windows on the ground storey. Oliver Goldsmith relayed the common practice of the ‘dandy’ Beau Nash, who would ‘wait the whole day in the Smyrna Coffee House in order to receive a bow from the Prince of Wales or the Duchess of Marlborough as they passed where he was standing and he would look around the room for admiration and respect.’¹⁰⁶ The windows of the coffeehouse projected the performances played out in their interiors onto the broader public spaces of the street.

These coffeehouses are the constant Rendezvous of Men of Business as well as the idle People, so that a Man is sooner asked about his Coffee-house than his Lodgings ... Here that treat of Matters of State, the Interests of Princes, and the Honour of Husband, &c. In a Word, ‘tis here the English’ discourse freely of every Thing, and where they may be known in a little Time; their Character, likewise, may be partly discover’d, even by People that are Strangers to the Language
...
¹⁰⁷

This passage demonstrates the ‘classless’ aspects of the coffeehouse which was open to both ‘Men of Business’ and ‘idle People.’ In a similar fashion to the theatre, the atmosphere of the coffeehouse could be both congenial and contentious given the freedom with which one was permitted to speak. On the Grosvenor estate, a second coffeehouse, built at No 9 Upper Brook Street in 1730, emphasizes the importance of the coffeehouse’s sociable and egalitarian nature to its residents.

Each of these public venues, the pleasure garden, opera and coffeehouse, relate not only to the social activities of the Grosvenor estate residents, but also to the physical makeup of the estate. The circular promenades and round buildings of public parks and pleasure grounds were replicated in the Square’s garden and the public rooms of the townhouses. Coffeehouses and public houses on the estate served its residents and visitors and provided venues in which the estate could act as its own self-serving community. The activities of the theatre, assembly rooms and opera were reproduced in the home with great frequency,

so that Grosvenor Square was a microcosm of the metropolis with scaled down versions of the city's public venues, vital for the enactment of vital social, political and gender performances.

Performance and the City

Richard Sennett has noted that ‘a capital should reverberate with symbolic power.’¹⁰⁸ This characteristic can only be exhibited in a city entirely reliant upon a singular political entity. Westminster is organic and random in its spatial organization, indicative of the Parliamentary and ministerial control placed on the English monarchs. However, during the Hanoverian dynasty, rival courts emerged, due in part to the contentious and competitive nature between the monarch and his heir. This phenomenon drained not only the political power of the monarch, but their roles as arbiters of taste diminished. In contrast to conditions in France, especially during the reigns of Louis XIV and Napoleon, at no time did the Hanoverian court exert the same level of control over the government and its people. Likewise, English courtiers did not exert control the same influence in cultural arenas as their French counterparts. London was a city in which success in commerce could also mean success at court.

Yet it would be misleading to suggest that London’s intellectual and cultural life, or even its fashions, its sports and entertainment, were solely dictated by the nobility or gentry or by ‘the polite end of town ... London was ... quite different from Paris and other continental cities, whose cultural and social life was dominated by the Court and landed classes; whereas in London, the ‘life of the town’ bore almost as much the stamp of the City, with its commercial and middle-class values, as it did that of the Court of St James’s.¹⁰⁹

The shared and democratic qualities of London’s society was echoed in its buildings. Architectural space can be a powerful visual icon of political policy and the use of classical forms has been the preferred manner of representation as a trip to Napoleonic Paris or Washington, DC would prove. ‘From the eighteenth century on, every discussion of politics as the art of government of men necessarily includes a chapter or a series of chapters on urbanism, on collective facilities, on hygiene, and on private architecture.’¹¹⁰ However, in contrast to the republican qualities of France or the United States, Britain, and England in particular, could not assert the governmental authority to construct large-scale architectural feats to the glory of their nation.¹¹¹ The lack of improvements to the capital city of London was a consequence of the shared power between the king, his ministers and the people, which included the merchants from the City. Rather than the assertion of national power with huge civic buildings, London was the site of individual power, so that the street, garden square and townhouse became the key sites for political performance.

Court and Commerce

Crucial factors for residing in the metropolis were the duties one needed to fulfil in service to the government and the court. As a capital city, London was the physical arena for both court and commerce. In the early eighteenth century, the metropolis served as a platform upon which many persons, especially, but not exclusively, the Whig party, asserted authority, which was initiated during the reign of William and Mary, ebbed during the Tory control in Queen Anne's reign and reasserted with the ascension of George I. The endorsement of the Hanoverian succession was an endorsement of English liberty, with the casting off of the chains of monarchical power. Englishmen and women were in essence creating a new court, one not directly related to the new monarch, but associated with those persons responsible for George I's power and place. (Table 12) Throughout the first half of the century, the Grosvenor estate maintained a dense concentration of persons directly associated with both the court and Parliament. Families and extended families occupied the new and modern spaces on the Grosvenor estate for the performance of their political roles which were enhanced in part due to the estate's significant geographic location in Westminster. Although the Grosvenor estate was distanced from both Whitehall and the palace of St James's, its western boundary was shared with Hyde Park and the royal palace and gardens of Kensington, made it a prime location for political and personal advancement.

'Political' men made conscious decisions concerning the form of their dwellings, encouraged and educated by their appreciation and consumption of architectural tomes. (Table 10) An extreme example of the manipulation of the built environment for overtly political purposes was Robert Walpole's country estate at Houghton, which took its form from Burghley, reviving medieval concepts of feudalism and land ownership for a new landlord.¹¹² In terms of the metropolis however, the distinguishing features between the commercial aspects of the City's architecture and the West End's entertainment and residential housing, was the size and scale of the built environment. London's West End included many diverse spaces for its leisured citizens. These spaces were open and spacious, not congested and cramped like conditions in the City.

There has formerly been a great emulation between the court end of town, and the city; and it was once seriously proposed in a certain reign, how the court should humble the city; nor was it so impracticable a thing at that time, had the wicked scheme been carried on: indeed it was carried farther than consisted with the prudence of a good government, or of a wise people; for the court

envy'd the city's greatness, and the citizens were ever jealous of the court's designs ...¹¹³

The antagonism which existed between court and commerce had a physical manifestation in the form of the cities of Westminster and London, respectively. In a reversal of roles, the author Daniel Defoe noted that the 'citizens' of the City were also 'princes.' The spatial properties belonging to a prince are 'principalities,' and the eighteenth-century country house estates of the aristocracy and landed gentry can be thought of in these terms. In the same sense, the palatial townhouse, such as Burlington, Somerset, Devonshire, Northumberland and Spencer House, were essentially urban versions of the politicised spaces of country house estates. For the merchant classes, who were lending money to the 'rich', the competition for titles, honours and political favours, encouraged a spatial 'struggle' in the West End. The emulation of aristocratic lifestyles extended to the competition for space in the city, which can be noted in the continuous westward movement of the inhabitants of the metropolis, which ultimately resulted in the settlement of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair.

The antagonism between court and commerce also existed within the Hanoverian court. During the reigns of George I and II, there was a constant struggle for places in the new court. In addition, the contentious Hanoverian nature led to the construction of rival courts. This phenomenon was especially pronounced during the reign of George II, in which Queen Caroline, Princess Amelia, Prince Frederick and after his death, the Dowager Princess of Wales, Augusta, all held separate courts. In her article on Frederick, Prince of Wales activities as a patron of the arts, Kimerly Rorschach loosely connected the Palladian style of architecture with the Prince and his court.¹¹⁴ However, as the author herself noted, Frederick had not established a 'fashion' in architecture, collecting or patronage. The stated arbiters of the new taste in architecture and culture were Lords Burlington, Cobham and Baltimore. Essentially, Prince Frederick was courting his courtiers, by imitating their 'taste' in the arts. The royal aping of their subjects' taste and fashions was prolific during the first two Hanoverian reigns. Queen Caroline paid favour to members of her court by employing their favoured architect, William Kent, to improve the public spaces in the royal parks and palaces.¹¹⁵ She was particularly keen to demonstrate the power and influence of her individual court through architectural works. There were precedents for feminine royal architectural commissions with the Stuart consorts, Mary II and Anne. Daniel Defoe noted that the court surrounding Queen Anne were in part responsible for the beautification of London.

... the city outliv'd it all, and both the attempts turn'd to the discredit of the court party, who pushed them on: but the city, I say, has gained the ascendant, and it is now made so necessary to the court (as before it was thought rather a grievance) that now we see the court itself the daily instrument to encourage and increase the opulence of the city, and the city again, by its grandeur, made not a glory only, but an assistance and support to the court, on the greatest and most sudden emergencies.¹¹⁶

There is sufficient evidence that Queen Caroline provided a role model for her subjects, both male and female alike. Although courtiers may have been seeking approval through imitation or through the sincere appreciation of her activities, Caroline's endorsements and achievements were significant. Each of her commissions have far-reaching implications, especially for women. Upon her arrival in her new role as the Princess of Wales, Caroline was the 'principal lady of the English court.'¹¹⁷ Her role in court was expanded due to the imprisonment of George I's wife, Sophia Dorothea of Celle, in Germany for adultery. The king's mistress, the Duchess of Kendal was in many ways only 'tolerated' by the court, so many courtiers turned to Caroline, then Princess of Wales, for acceptance and favours.¹¹⁸

Caroline's patronage of the arts was diverse, including commissions in architecture, painting, sculpture and landscape design.¹¹⁹ She was responsible for refurbishing or embellishing each of the principal royal properties: the library at St James's Palace, the apartments at Hampton Court, restoration of the staircase paintings at Windsor, and the gardens at Kensington Palace and Richmond Park.¹²⁰ Many of the works Caroline commissioned projected strong implications to other members of her sex. Her patronage of the arts and architecture seems to be based upon a personal devotion to education and the reinforcement of the Hanoverian legacy with British nationalism. Caroline commissioned William Kent to design the Hermitage (c.1731-2) and Merlin's Cave for the royal park at Richmond. (Illustration 23) Landscape historians have capably attributed these works to Kent, but ignored the implication of the patroness.¹²¹ The Hermitage acts as a visual celebration of Britain's intellectual achievements with the inclusion of busts of Boyle, Newton, Locke, Wollaston and Clarke. Significantly, this large scale composite architectural and sculptural ornament was created prior to the much celebrated 'Temple of British Worthies' at Stowe, reinforcing Caroline's role as an arbiter of taste. It is important to note that the political and social implication of the Hermitage's precedence in British architectural history has never been either noted or explored. There is a ripe field of exploration available regarding Caroline's precedent set for the queenly patronage of hermitages, perhaps leading the way for other women and their works, such as Catherine

the Great's Hermitage in St Petersburg and the hamlet at Versailles commissioned by Marie Antoinette.

A comparison of the works of George II, which were primarily military in focus (the Royals Mews and the Horse Guard), with those of Caroline reveals her patronage of works often related to broader public issues and expression. The creation of Kensington Gardens and the Queen's Walk in Green Park were made for public access and enjoyment. Caroline was creating settings in the urban environment for the essential royal responsibility of 'public' appearances.¹²² It has been noted that the Hanoverian court was a 'parasite' on the metropolis, due to the fact that the royal family lacked modern and fashionable spaces for large entertainments.¹²³ In contrast to the self-sufficiency of Versailles, the Hanoverian court was reliant on public venues, such as assembly rooms, pleasure gardens, public parks and private townhouses for the performance of court rituals. Queen Caroline's commissions of these public gardens and walks denotes both the need and the desire to expand the politicised spaces of the palace into the 'public' realm.

Conclusions

'Tis the gay *London* Scene, where successive Pleasures raise the Spirits, and warm the Imagination; which prepares the fairest Breasts to receive the tenderest Impressions.¹²⁴

Eighteenth-century London provided specific public spaces upon which its residents and visitors could act out their social and political roles. A significant societal pattern which emerges in the metropolis, and specifically on the Grosvenor estate, was a mass of persons with both the time and means to profit from the city's public venues - a leisured class. This class was not of a singular gender, social rank or political affiliation, but could be defined by their location in and consumption of specific spaces located in the city, which included pleasure gardens, coffeehouses, the opera, walks and gardens. These urban spaces provided opportunities for their consumers to act out their varied social, gender and political roles, whose performances in turn shaped the physical character of the city.

¹ 'Beware the Ides of January; or Advice to the FAIR, on their return to London', *Common Sense*, 14 January, 50, reprinted in *Gentleman's Magazine*, viii, (January 1738), p.30.

² Dana Arnold, ed, *The Metropolis and Its Image: Constructing Identities for London c1750-1950* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), p.1.

³ Steve Pile, *The Body and the City* (Routledge, 1996), pp. 153-8. In the comparison of Lacan and Lefebvre's theories, these are the three ways in which space is produced.

⁴ *London in Miniature* (1755), p.1.

⁵ Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 71; John Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination* (Harper Collins, 1997) pp. 28-55; Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1900* (Penguin, 1990) pp. 98-9.

⁶ *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 1-4.

⁷ Dana Arnold, the introductions to *Re-presenting the Metropolis* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2000), and *Reading Architectural History* (Routledge, 2002).

⁸ John Summerson, *Georgian London* (Barrie and Jenkins, 1988), p.34

⁹ See M. Dorothy George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (Penguin, 1965), Christopher Hibbert, *London: The Biography of a City* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980), Liza Picard, *Dr Johnson's London* (Phoenix Press, 2000), George Rudé, *Hanoverian London 1714-1808* (Secker and Warburg, 1971), Maureen Waller, *1700: Scenes from London Life* (Sceptre, 2000), Hugh Phillips, *The Thames about 1750* (Collins, 1951) and *Mid-Georgian London* (Collins, 1964).

¹⁰ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.6.

¹¹ Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*, (Faber and Faber, 1986), p.49.

¹² Rudé, p.58.

¹³ See Rudé, p.9. See also M. Dorothy George, 'London and the Life of the Town,' in *Johnson's England*, ed. by A.S. Turberville, 2 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933), I, p. 163.

¹⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, trans. by Richard Nice (Routledge, 1989).

¹⁵ M.H. Port, 'West End Palaces; The Aristocratic Town House in London, 1730-1830,' *The London Journal*, 20, no. 1 (1995), p.17.

¹⁶ John Stow, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, 6th ed, 2 vols, (1754), ii, p.668.

¹⁷ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, ed by Furbank, Owens and Coulson (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), p.133.

¹⁸ Rudé, p.9. See also M Dorothy George, 'London and the Life of the Town,' in *Johnson's England* ed by A.S. Turberville, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933), I, p. 163.

¹⁹ Rate payers of these squares are published in the appendices of Hugh Phillips's *Mid-Georgian London*.

²⁰ Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth Century* (Arnold, 1997), pp. 108-118.

²¹ *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 83-102.

²² Michel Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge* trans by Sheridan Smith (Tavistock, 1972), pp. 2 and 22.

²³ Information compiled from rate-book information provided in the *Survey*, xxxix, Appendix 1, and xl, and Hugh Phillips's *Mid-Georgian London*.

²⁴ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.110.

²⁵ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 110.

²⁶ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p. 110.

²⁷ Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, p. 217.

²⁸ Each of these estate developments were developed in the eighteenth century, with the exception of St James's Square, which was constructed in the seventeenth century, and almost completely renovated in the eighteenth century.

²⁹ These statistics were derived from an analysis of the information provided in *The Survey*, xxxix (St James's Westminster, Part I, 1960); xxxi (St James's Westminster, Part 2, 1963); xxxiii (St Anne Soho, Part I, 1966), pp.45-50; xxxiv, (St Anne Soho, Part 2, 1966) and xxxix and xl.

³⁰ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.247.

³¹ The aristocratic residents of St James's Square during the 1730s were: the Dukes of Norfolk and Chandos, the Earls of Bristol, Pembroke, Clarendon, Chesterfield, and Portmore, the Countess of Bradford, Viscount Palmerston and Lady Betty Germain. See Rudé, *Hanoverian London*, p.41.

³² This included the Dukes of Bolton, Roxburgh and Montrose, the Earls of Essex and Pontefract, and Lords Hillsborough and Londonderry. See Rudé, p.41.

³³ The first aristocratic residents of Grosvenor Square were the Dukes of Norfolk and Manchester, Dowager Duchess of Rutland, Duchess of Kendal, the Marquess of Blandford, the Earls of Coventry, Clinton, Albemarle, Rockingham, Thanet, Mountrath, Cornwallis, Shaftesbury, Inchiquin, Scarbrough, and Dysart, Viscount Weymouth, Lords Baltimore, Carpenter, Glenorchy, Montford and Powlett, and Lady King, Lady Gowan, and Lady Mary Saunderson. See *Survey*, xxxix, Appendix 1.

³⁴ David Olsen, *Town Planning in London* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), p.5.

³⁵ George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 77.

³⁶ Dan Cruickshank and Neil Burton, *Life in the Georgian City* (Viking, 1990), pp.6, 13.

³⁷ *Survey*, xxxix, p. 15.

³⁸ Richard Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye* (Boston, MA: Faber and Faber, 1990), p.58.

³⁹ Thomas Barlow, a carpenter by trade, was chosen by Richard Grosvenor as the estate surveyor. As noted in the *Survey*, there were many references to Barlow's grand plan, but as of yet, nothing has surfaced of this document. A sketch book belonging to Barlow and contained in the Grosvenor family archives at Eaton Hall, Cheshire, makes many references to this plan and may have been used for preparing preliminary drawings of the estate. GER WA 1049/12/216.

⁴⁰ GER WA 1049/12/216.

⁴¹ Renzo Dubbini, *The Geography of the Gaze* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 53.

⁴² Pile, *The Body and the City*, p.235, referred to the gender mapping in the work of Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Virago, 1992) and Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1988).

⁴³ Pile, p.236

⁴⁴ Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, 'An Expedient to put a stop to the spreading Vice of Corruption' in *The Nonsense of Common-Sense 1737-1738* by Robert Halsband, ed. (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1947), p

⁴⁵ Pile, pp.168-9.

⁴⁶ Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994), p.211.

⁴⁷ Samuel Johnson, *London: A Poem*, (1738), ll. 93-96. See also H.T. Dickinson, ed, *Politics and Literature in the Eighteenth Century* (J.M. Dent, 1974), p.101.

⁴⁸ Jane Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure* (Athlone Press, 2002), pp.110-114.

⁴⁹ West Yorkshire Archive Service, Vyner MSS, VR 288. Letter from William Hallot to the Hon Mrs Aislabie, Grosvenor Square, 27 April 1736.

⁵⁰ See Alison Adburgham, *Women in Print*, (George Allen & Unwin, 1972), p.60.

⁵¹ Horace Walpole, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, ed. by W.S. Lewis, 48 vols, (Oxford: Oxford University Press and New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), xviii, p.25.

⁵² Bridget Hill, *Women, Work and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Blackweel, 1989) p.225.

⁵³ HL Broadlands MSS 62/BR 16; letter to Frances Poole, 1758.

⁵⁴ Hill, *Women, Work and Sexual Politics*, p.225.

⁵⁵ Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, p.295. Also Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*, p. 56.

⁵⁶ Rudé, *Hanoverian London*, p.5. Raymond William's enjoyable and insightful analysis of the social implications of urban and rural life as explored through contemporary verse and prose, *The Country and the City*, has provided ample evidence of the perceived polarity of these spatial entities.

⁵⁷ Walpole, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, xxxv, p.391.

⁵⁸ Johnson, *London*, ll. 144-151.

⁵⁹ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.42.

⁶⁰ HL Broadlands MSS 62/BR 16.

⁶¹ Henry Fielding, 'An Inquiry into the Cause of the Late Increase of Robbers,' (1751). See Williams, *The Country and the City*, p.76.

⁶² 'Beware the Ides of January; or Advice to the FAIR, on their return to London', *Common Sense*, 14 January, 50, reprinted in *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. viii, (January 1738), p.30.

⁶³ Elizabeth Burton, *Georgians at Home* (Longmans, 1967), p.272.

⁶⁴ Burton, p.273.

⁶⁵ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.71.

⁶⁶ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.71.

⁶⁷ Pile, *The Body and the City*, p.243.

⁶⁸ Ann Bermingham, *Landscape and Ideology* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), p.3.

⁶⁹ Sennett, *Fall of Public Man*, pp. 48-9.

⁷⁰ Sennett, *Fall of Public Man*, p.87.

⁷¹ Sennett, *Fall of Public Man*, pp 95-99.

⁷² Sennett, *Fall of Public Man*, p.96

⁷³ Lawrence Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 29, no 1 (1995), pp.103-4.

⁷⁴ Klein, 'Gender and the Public / Private Distinction,' p.104.

⁷⁵ Burton, *Georgians at Home*, p.268. See Warwick Wroth, *The London Pleasure Gardens of the Eighteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1896).

⁷⁶ *London and Its Environs Described*, v, p.234.

⁷⁷ Burton, p.271.

⁷⁸ Walpole, *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, xvii, p. 434.

⁷⁹ Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 90.

⁸⁰ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p.28.

⁸¹ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.68.

⁸² *London and Its Environs; or the General Ambulator, Pocket Companion for the Tour of the Metropolis and its Vicinity...*, (1820), p.265.

⁸³ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p.15

⁸⁴ Hugh Phillips, *The Thames about 1750*, (London: Collins, 1951), p.158.

⁸⁵ Phillips, *The Thames about 1750*, p.233.

⁸⁶ Tobias Smollett, *Humphrey Clinker*, (1771), p.123. This description of Ranelagh was provided by the young female character, Lydia Melford.

⁸⁷ Phillips, *The Thames about 1750*, p. 161.

⁸⁸ Walpole to Mann, May 26, 1742. Henry B. Wheatley, *London Past and Present* (John Murray, 1891), iii, p. 148.

⁸⁹ Smollett, pp.123-4.

⁹⁰ James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed by Arnold Glover (J.M. Dent, 1925). Burton, *Georgians at Home*, p.268.

⁹¹ Refer to the wills of Grace, Dowager Countess of Dysart, PRO PROB 11/702, sig 137 (1740); Lucy, Dowager Duchess of Rutland PRO PROB 11/790, sig 291 (1751).

⁹² 'Inventory of the Right Honourable Henrietta Wentworth, Countess Dowager of Strafford', PRO PROB 3/32/71.

⁹³ The Building Acts of 1707 and 1709 had provisions for the paving and lighting of the city's streets, which continued with a series of acts in the 1740s; see Cruickshank and Burton, p.6.

⁹⁴ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p.32.

⁹⁵ *London in Miniature*, p.235.

⁹⁶ Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, p.110.

⁹⁷ Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986), p.97.

⁹⁸ Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory*, p.75.

⁹⁹ HL Broadlands MSS, BR 16. Letters to Frances Poole, 1756.

¹⁰⁰ Vere Birdwood, ed., *So Dearly Belov'd, So Much Admired* (HMSO, 1994), p.80.

¹⁰¹ Beat Louis de Muralt, *Letters describing the Character and Customs of the English and French Nations. With a curious essay on travelling*, 2nd ed. (1726), p.33.

¹⁰² Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.88.

¹⁰³ Beat Louis de Muralt, *Letters Describing the Character and Customs of the English ...*, p.82.

¹⁰⁴ Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination*, pp.34-40.

¹⁰⁵ J. Mackay, *A Journey through England in Familiar Letters from a Gentleman Here to His Friend Abroad*, 3 vols, (1724), i, p.195.

¹⁰⁶ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London* p.61.

¹⁰⁷ de Muralt, p.82.

¹⁰⁸ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.51.

¹⁰⁹ Rudé, *Hanoverian London*, p.76.

¹¹⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Foucault Reader*, ed. by Paul Rabinow (Penguin, 1984), the article titled 'Space, Knowledge and Power', p.240.

¹¹¹ For an examination of nineteenth-century attempts at glorifying London, see M.H. Port, 'Government and the Metropolitan Image: ministers, parliament and the concept of a capital city, 1840-1915, in *The Metropolis and Its Image*, ed by Dana Arnold (Blackwell, 1999), 101-26.

¹¹² Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978), pp.161-2.

¹¹³ Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, p.144.

¹¹⁴ Rorschach, Kimerly, 'Frederick, Prince of Wales (1707-51) as Collector and Patron', *The Walpole Society*, 55, (1989/1990), pp. 1-76.

¹¹⁵ Howard M. Colvin, gen. ed., *The History of the King's Works: Volume V 1660-1782* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1976), pp.127, 175-6, 203, 221, 224, 240, 242, 457.

¹¹⁶ Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, p.144.

¹¹⁷ Susan Jenkins, 'Queen Caroline's taste: The furnishing and functioning of the Queen's private apartments at Hampton Court', *Apollo*, cxliii, no 411, (May 1996), 20-24, p.20.

¹¹⁸ Jenkins, p.20.

¹¹⁹ Jenkins, p.22.

¹²⁰ Howard Colvin credits Caroline with the design of the gardens at Richmond Lodge and the design of the Serpentine in Kensington Gardens; *The History of the King's Works*, pp. 203, 221, 224, 457.

¹²¹ Christopher Thacker, *The History of Gardens in Britain and Ireland* (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1994), pp.185-89; illustration 20, p.29; John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis, eds, *The Genius of the Place* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), p. 28; Tom Williamson, *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and society in eighteenth-century England* (Stroud: Sutton, 1995), pp.65.

¹²² Noted in Jenkins, p.20, that the Prince and Princess of Wales 'dined in public' everyday at Hampton Court Palace. They were also known to repeat this duty with appearances in St James's Park and the Mall. See Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p. 45, for an account of these activities by Baron de Pollnitz in 1733.

¹²³ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging a Nation* (Vintage, 1996), p.214.

¹²⁴ 'Beware the Ides of January,' p.30.

Chapter III

The Garden Square

The Role of the Garden Square

Enlightened planners sought to address human complexities and discontinuities by using two strategies, one treating the city as a special domain of its own, the other seeking to link this socially unified square within the city to larger unities, those of city and country, mankind and nature.¹

In *The Conscience of the Eye*, Richard Sennett investigated the patterns developed in the urban landscape and the manner in which society was patterned by them, echoing the theoretical approach proposed by Hillier and Hanson.² The author noted the basic concern of eighteenth-century urban planners was the creation of a unified environment, which was ultimately shaped into a square. Sennett's exploration was primarily concerned with the concept of the square in the generic sense, whereas Elizabeth McKellar investigated the historical variations upon this urban theme.³ This work will propose that Grosvenor Square was a hybrid of the models set forth by these authors. The urban square will take on many physical formats, some of which can barely be called a 'square'. The garden square was a new and unique urban form in the early eighteenth-century metropolis. The development of blocks of terrace housing surrounding an ornamental, walled garden had its origins in London's West End, with an early and massive example of the form expressed in Grosvenor Square. This innovative urban form becomes the principal site for physical and social integration, with its penultimate expression expressed in the circuses and crescents created by John Wood the Elder in the city of Bath. The achievements of Wood were significant, however the architectural historian's preference towards 'narratives' of classicism may have overshadowed the important changes which occurred in the speculative developments in London's West End, specifically Grosvenor Square.⁴ This chapter will explore the unique qualities of this novel urban form, its society and the manner in which the garden square staged social, political and gendered performances.

Patterns in the Garden Square

The urban expansion of London from the time of the Great Fire was determined in part by patterns of landownership. Vast tracks of the City and Westminster were owned by individuals, and speculative development of these parcels of land required approval through legal means, such as an Act of Parliament, royal favour or both.⁵ In 1720, Sir Richard Grosvenor acquired the necessary legal requirements to develop the Mayfair portion of his mother's estate, one hundred acres of fields extending from Lord Scarborough's Hanover Square development in the east, to the boundary of Hyde Park in the west, Lord Berkeley's undeveloped lands to the south and the turnpike road, later Oxford Road to the north. (Illustration 1) The Grosvenor Square development of open fields into residential housing was the largest urban expansion to date in the history of London's West End.⁶ The massive dimensions of this property provided estate planner, Thomas Barlow, with a broad canvas on which to experiment with new patterns of urban design.⁷ (Illustration 2)

Physical changes to the urban environment were reflecting shifts in the social ordering brought about by capitalist and political opportunities in Britain's new Hanoverian regime. The reinforcement of land ownership was the model for post- Great Fire urban developments. Squares such as Bloomsbury, Soho, Red Lyon Square, and the development of Lord Burlington's Piccadilly property, were key examples of landowners visually asserting their power and authority by centring their palatial townhouse on the improved land. However by the 1720s, a new form of urban development was taking shape in the form of the garden square.

The garden square was a venue for the leisured urban classes, and its development in the eighteenth century mirrored that of its upwardly mobile inhabitants. As London grew in the eighteenth century, a 'new kind of landscape [and] a new kind of society' evolved.⁸ In contrast, many seventeenth- and early eighteenth- century squares were either commercial in nature, such as Covent Garden, or focused on the palatial townhouse of the estate owner, as in Bloomsbury, Soho and Cavendish Squares.⁹ Grosvenor Square was created in an original manner, with the garden as the centre of both its collective and material ordering, which signalled unique patterns in the society which consumed its spaces.

Order or Chaos

Urban planners, from the time of the Restoration and the rebuilding of the City after the Great Fire, strove to create a harmonic and orderly urban landscape. Sir Christopher Wren's design for the City proposed linking architectural monuments and places of commerce with long avenues and urban squares. (Illustration 24) Wren's plan centred on a series of squares and piazzas, with radiating avenues linking these public spaces together. The primary focus of the proposed development was St Paul's Cathedral, symbolically linking the commercial nature of the City with both Church and nation. However, the fiscal need to re-establish the commercial practices of the City thwarted any planned redevelopment proposed by Wren and others. Earlier, Inigo Jones classicised the chaotic nature of an urban market with his design for Covent Garden. As a joint effort between king, landowner and architect, Covent Garden was a new example of cooperative urban development conceived for both royal and public favour.¹⁰ Successive changes to London's urban landscape will echo this political manoeuvring throughout the course of the eighteenth century, with the Grosvenor family gaining both favour and capital through land development.

These legal and political ramifications meant that late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century metropolitan expansions generally developed from two models: the communitarian and the authoritarian.¹¹ Lincoln's Inn Fields provides an example of the communitarian model, developed in a piecemeal manner with individual freehold residences, and maintaining a constant struggle to retain the adjacent open public fields. The lack of a decisive plan for Lincoln's Inn Fields led to a sense of spatial ambiguity, reinforced by the fact that only three sides of the square were fronted with housing. The ambiguity of the space was echoed in the society which consumed it.¹² This quality was revealed in John Gay's epic poem *Trivia, or the Art of Walking the Streets of London*, which warned of the inherent dangers found in this urban locale.

Where Lincoln's-Inn, wide space is rail'd around,
Cross not with vent'rous step, where oft is found,
The lurking thief, who while the day-light shone,
Made the walls echo with his begging moan.¹³

The freedom of movement afforded in Lincoln's Inn Fields provided an ample stage for the performance of undesirable nocturnal activities. Open spaces, which could be approached through narrow and winding lanes and alleys were breeding grounds for urban crime. A lack of spatial ordering could signal available space for social unrest. Bloomsbury Square was the scene of the 1765 Gordon Riots, and continually the locale

for robbers who could easily escape through adjacent slum streets.¹⁴ Seven Dials and the St Giles area, with their small, random streets, were notorious for their corrupt character. William Hogarth chose to set his fictitious *Gin Lane* by the real Church of St Giles on Oxford Road. (Illustration 10) Open and ill-defined spaces changed nature in darkness. The fashionable shops around Charing Cross and Northumberland House vanished under cover of darkness, providing a venue for the ambitions of London's 'working girls'. In another attempt to spatially locate the metropolis's vices, William Hogarth chose this urban locale for his engraving titled *Night*. (Illustration 11) By contrast, the orderly nature of the Grosvenor estate provided scarce opportunities for the criminal element of urban society. Although Grosvenor Square was not crime-free, as evidenced by the vandalism of the statue of George I in the garden, the spatial organization of the estate underplayed this inevitable characteristic of urban life.¹⁵ Henry Fielding was concerned that the rise in London's crime was directly related to both the increase in population and irresponsible speculative building.

... whoever considers the Cities of London and Westminster, with the late increases of their suburbs, the great irregularity of their buildings, the immense numbers of lanes, alleys, courts and bye-places, must think that they has been intended for the very purpose of concealment, they could not have been better contrived.¹⁶

Barlow's plan for the Grosvenor estate would have satisfied Fielding's requirements for a safe urban environment, with a scarce amount of broad streets, and regular plan, characteristics so often unfulfilled by developments which followed the communitarian model of expansion.

On the other hand, Covent Garden epitomized the authoritarian model of urban expansion, which arose from an aristocratic speculative development, which presented a formally unified urban setting. The integration of St Paul's Church in the market square provided another authoritative element to Jones's design, thereby linking commerce and nation. The conventional understanding of the manner in which late seventeenth-century squares developed, which were from '... the traditional great house courtyard layout reworked within the context of an expanding, commercialised city,' has been challenged by Elizabeth McKellar.¹⁷ The author noted in her study of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century expansion in London, this analysis neglects the communitarian form, the model out of which many early eighteenth-century squares developed, including Cavendish Square (c.1720), Hanover Square (1717-1719), and Grosvenor Square (1725 on). Few of London's urban developments were not based upon a landlord's private

mansion as its centrepiece, which denoted a continuation of the feudal system adapted to the expanding city, with tenants living in full view of the landlord's home. The early eighteenth century signalled a change in London's urban development, in which the landlord's mansion was eliminated from the estate plan, thereby breaking down the feudal qualities of the urban landscape. However, both Cavendish and Hanover Square retain qualities of the aristocratic and authoritative model, with the inclusion of St George's Church and the proposal of a palatial mansion for the Duke of Chandos on each of the respective estate plans.¹⁸ (Illustrations 25 and 26) Grosvenor Square was an exception, in that the estate was not an aristocratic holding nor contained a palatial mansion, thus producing a hybrid of both the communitarian and authoritative models. The Square was the centrepiece of the urban design, with a regular system of arteries leading into the garden square, so that the focus of the development shifted from commerce and land ownership to the democratic characteristics of the formal considerations of the estate and its society.

A dominant feature of earlier London squares was the irregularity of their shape, size and arteries. Hanover Square assumed a funnel configuration, with the streets leading into the square varied in direction and size. (Illustration 27) This lack of ordering of the available urban space was also evident in Soho and Bloomsbury Square. 'This lack of clarity was paralleled by an uncertainty as to what and for whom the square was intended.'¹⁹ The migration out of squares such as Golden, Leicester and Red Lyon, was due the fact that these urban plans did not conform to the needs of their inhabitants. On the other hand, the Grosvenor estate featured a rational and orderly system of streets and blocks, and may have been a feature which helped to retain its residents. Although the estate developed over a period of many decades, Barlow's original plan was revealed in the end. (Illustrations 28, 29, and 30) Even in its earliest history, Grosvenor Square was named as a prototype for West End developments. In *London and Westminster Improved*, John Gwynn named Grosvenor Square as the model in layout and size for proposed squares in further expansion of the city.²⁰ The comprehensibility of its form, and thus usage, made Grosvenor Square the ideal of new West End developments.

Grosvenor Square was centred on the estate – physically and socially the focal point of the development. As one of the largest squares built in London's West End, the Square measured 680 by 530 feet. Its form was unique in that it was the first square in the metropolis in which eight major thoroughfares led into its confines, passing through the Square and constructing an overall grid pattern to the landscape. Another unique feature

was that each of the streets were equal in width, creating a sense of static formality. Barlow's grid was enhanced by the massive scale of the buildings and the generous breadth of the streets, thus establishing an ideal environment for the demonstration of its inhabitants' social roles.

The enormous scale of Grosvenor Square was one of its superlative attributes, emphasized by the recessed placement of the corner buildings, so that the open space of the garden was accentuated and views down the primary streets were enhanced. This characteristic of the Square was highlighted in Sutton Nicholls's bird's-eye view of c.1730-35.

(Illustration 31) This image demonstrates the dehumanising sense of space in Grosvenor Square, which is at once massive, aloof and incomprehensible. The elevated point of view accentuates its voyeuristic qualities, not only of the image, but of the space itself. The strict adherence to a one-point perspective heightens the sense of anonymity, while strengthening its oneness and singularity. The realisation of this vast open space by the pedestrian could have produced diverse feelings from awe to fear. However, other elements in the design of the Square humanized its experience and appreciation. The use of diverse ornamentation in building construction would have provided individual focal points, diminishing the anonymity of the space. Engravings often marginalized these building details, creating an illusion of similarity and order. As a result, the buildings in the Square rendered by Sutton, look plain and quite similar to one another. In fact, contemporaries had developed a taste for order and regularity in terrace housing.

Criticism was made of the diverse building styles and ornamentation of Grosvenor Square in 1734, shortly after the completion of the last homes on the Square. Benjamin Ralph noted that the homes of Grosvenor Square were 'little better than a collection of whims, and frolics in building, without anything like order or beauty.'²¹ Ralph and many critics since, have neglected the 'beauty and order' of Grosvenor Square, evident in its rationalization of the available space, favouring instead the superficial application of decorative classical ornaments to blocks of terrace housing.

Although visual unification was not evident in architectural form, many early eighteenth-century squares were organized in terms of space and the society they attracted. The significance of this spatial ordering was demonstrated in the following description of St James's Square.

...though this square appears extremely grand, yet this grandeur does not arise from the magnificence of the houses; but from their

regularity, the neatness of the pavement and the beauty of the basin [sic] in the middle...²²

The author of this guidebook took particular note of the environment of St James's Square, stating that the beauty of the place was created in the space of the garden, and the surrounding townhouses performed as a negligible backdrop. According to Elizabeth McKellar, 'the increasing ornamentation and design of the [early eighteenth-century] square was partly the outcome of the beginnings of the square as a garden but also a practical, physical means of effecting social exclusion and control.'²³ Keyed gates and perimeters walls barred the general public from enjoying the gardens in these squares. Most people were excluded from these spaces, in which entry was solely based upon one's place of residence, irregardless of gender, social rank or political allegiance. Here again, Grosvenor Square was an exception, with its garden open to the public. The enclosing the garden with gates and keys came at a later date, but this original characteristic of the estate development emphasizes the democratic spatial qualities of Grosvenor Square.²⁴

Urban or Rural

Many early eighteenth-century squares, including Grosvenor, were developed from open fields and pastures. Antagonism occurred when these previously accessible rural spaces were consumed by the expansion of the metropolis. 'Conflicts arose when these open areas became engulfed by new buildings and it was the process of this interchange between urban and rural, built and unbuilt, that both new and intermediate types of spaces evolved.'²⁵ Eventually garden squares, including Grosvenor Square, were incorporated into the urban fabric, but in their original settings, most were both urban and rural. The following description of Lincoln's Inn Fields illustrates the appreciation for nature in the urban setting.

Lincoln's Inn ... where the Gentlemen of the Law have handsome Apartments, and are well accommodated. This Inn may reasonably boast of having one of the neatest Squares in Town; and tho' it is imperfect on one Side, yet that very Defect produces a Beauty, by giving a Prospect to the Gardens, which is large and pleasant, and fill the Space to abundantly more Advantage.²⁶

As noted in the previous chapter, eighteenth-century society often sought parks and garden settings for the demonstration of social roles. Garden squares became yet another venue for these performances. On the Grosvenor estate, residents and visitors were

provided a natural backdrop with the garden in the square, the open fields to the north and south, and Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens to the west. Grosvenor Square enjoyed a unique setting in the growing metropolis during the first half of the eighteenth century, and its rural and urban qualities may have been part of its popularity. In *The Country and the City*, Raymond Williams defined these modern urban landscapes as ‘intermediate’ spaces – places that were of both the country and the city.²⁷ Early depictions of Grosvenor Square illustrate the interesting juxtaposition of the contrived green space of the Square, the formal blocks of housing, and the vast and open countryside adjacent to the estate. (Illustration 31) This fresh approach to urban design drew the attention of many contemporary writers and critics. As noted previously, John Gwynn named Grosvenor Square as the model for future West End developments and its rural qualities certainly enhanced its desirability.²⁸ Others marvelled at the size and ‘magnificence’ of the garden and the surrounding buildings. By far the most frequent comments made about the estate were in response to its geographical and physical positioning in the metropolis.

Grosvenor Square...that stands at the farthest Extent of the Town Westwards, upon a rising Ground, almost surrounded by Fields; which with the fine Air it is by this Means enjoys, renders the Situation delightful, and makes it reckoned the finest of all our Squares in Town.²⁹

For many decades the countryside surrounding the Grosvenor estate remained intact. The writer of this guidebook noted that what made ‘the Situation delightful’ was the Square’s rural qualities. Often times, cities were depicted as an unhealthy places- both physically and morally corrupt.³⁰ By contrast, nature was noble and moral, as illustrated in the following contemporary passage.

O GLORIOUS *Nature!* Supremely Fair, and sovereignly Good. All-loving and All-lovely, All-divine! Whose works are so becoming, and of such infinite Grace; whose study brings such Wisdom, and whose Contemplation such Delight; whose every single Work affords an ampler scene, and is a nobler Spectacle than all that ever Art presented! – O mighty *Nature!*³¹

For the author of these observations, the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, ‘Nature’ was a woman, ‘Supremely Fair.’ The feminine aspects of ‘Nature’ could improve the viewer’s knowledge and appreciation of beauty, thereby enriching his/her moral being. As evidenced by the dominating need to implement gardens into the urban space morality was superimposed on the urban landscape. As Grosvenor Square proved to be a model of the built urban environment blended with the positive qualities of the countryside, namely its ‘fine Air’ and fields, perhaps these urban and rural qualities helped to attract residents,

and in particular, women to a location which was perceived to be moral, safe and beautiful.

Conflicts over usage of these intermediate spaces centred on the divergent issues of country and city. Throughout the eighteenth century, ‘Londoners of all classes still considered open space, in and around the city, to be theirs to use and enjoy.’³² From the time of its initial construction, the developers of the Grosvenor estate attempted to limit access to the land by the establishment of boundaries. The parameters of the estate were essentially the first areas to be developed. Buildings went up along Brook Street and Grosvenor Street in the early 1720s and within a few years the southern boundary of South Audley Street and the western boundary of King’s Row on Tyburn Lane were established. (Illustration 28) Two sides of the development were fronted by major urban thoroughfares – to the north Tyburn Road (later Oxford Road) and to the west, the turnpike road known as Tyburn Lane (later Park Lane). To the north and east of the estate, were the new building developments of Cavendish and Hanover Squares. Immediately to the north and to the south of the estate were open fields, since the Berkeley estate was not developed in the 1730s and 1740s. However, there was ample opportunity to commune with nature on the Grosvenor estate, with its direct access to the royal parks, the meadows of Highgate and Hampstead and Marylebone Gardens to the north. These venues provided ample refuge from the crowded and congested nature of the metropolis, with plenty of space in which to appreciate the ‘fine air.’ The lack of development north of Oxford Road until the later part of the eighteenth century, meant that residents of Cavendish, Hanover and Grosvenor Square had direct and immediate access to open fields and pastures, as confirmed by this contemporary guidebook.

Cavendish Square ... is large, neat, and commendable for its fine Situation, enjoying a clear Air, and open Prospect over the Fields.³³

In fact, the residents of Cavendish Square emphasized its rural qualities in an extreme measure, by purchasing sheep to graze in its central garden, which unfortunately didn’t flourish in this urban setting.³⁴ The picturesque and Arcadian qualities of urban squares were reinforced in Bowles view of Leicester Square. (Illustration 5) This view depicts a man driving animals through the Square, in the opposite direction of Smithfield Market!

The view, or ‘prospect’, was another selling feature for many eighteenth-century developments. Mme D’Arblay’s observation on Queen’s Square, which at the time of her visit consisted of three sides of terrace housing and to the north ‘the beautiful prospect of

the hills, ever verdant, ever smiling of Hampstead and Highgate', demonstrated the importance of preserving the natural setting surrounding the metropolis.³⁵ The noted topographical features of Hampstead and Highgate figured into many illustrative views of London's squares. (Illustrations 32-35) In Nicholls's views of both Hanover and Bloomsbury Square, 'Highgate' and 'Hamstead' were annotated on these engravings. The engraving of Grosvenor Square for the same publication, however, did not indicate these rural features. (Illustration 31) Perhaps this was a mere oversight on the part of the engraver, or perhaps because of Grosvenor Square's apparent and abundant rural characteristics, there was no need to reference its 'intermediate' qualities. Nicholls's aerial perspective heightened the rural qualities of the Grosvenor estate. However, in actuality, much of the estate was composed of stone and brick. Additionally, there were no trees lining the streets and the private gardens were hidden from public view. The 'nature' of the Square was bounded, defined and controlled, with its garden enclosed with walls and gates. The English have long defined and tamed nature with boundaries in the form of enclosures. These enclosures were not only a manner of controlling nature, but also a signifier of ownership. Garden walls and gates authoritatively define the ownership of space, producing terms of admission to these urban spaces, which was based on one's location in the city, and specifically the garden square.

Points of Intersection / Points of Conflict

The Grosvenor estate was not an isolated village set amongst open fields and meadows, but a unique planned community imposed upon the outer most reaches of the sprawling metropolis. Privately owned property can create a situation in which the fluid or harmonious transition from one part of the city to another was impeded. The shared usage or the multi-functional capabilities of various parts of the city could cause the implementation of both real and implied barriers to impede violators of the space. As stated previously, there was a concerted effort on the part of the Grosvenor estate planners to establish physical barriers on the estate in the form of both streets and housing. It can be noted in the estate development, and especially in the Square, that its buildings were erected relatively early in the process, encasing the garden in brick and stone, both between home and between the home and the street. (Illustrations 28, 29 and 30) Private and privileged spaces were delineated with walls and fencing. The establishment of two sets of Guards Stables along Mount Street and Woods Mews, provided boundaries in terms of state sanctioned authority. In those locations where specific boundaries were not in place, conflicts could arise due to the ambiguous nature

of the space's purpose and function. Open spaces, such as fields and squares, provided freedom, but also created an uncertainty as to their admission. An instance of this sort of conflict could be found in the banishment of the gate of the Foundling Hospital, in order to provide a more humane method for dealing with this social ill. (Illustration 36)

Mothers or guardians applying to leave their children at this facility created a disturbing scene outside the gates. These gates were subsequently removed by concerned citizens, and a waiting room was created to remove the visibly public nature of this traumatizing experience.³⁶ As previously noted, squares were also the scenes of unruly crowds and riots, such as the Gordon Riots of 1765 in Bloomsbury Square, the licentious behaviour as in Covent Garden, or the current annual New Year's celebrations in Trafalgar Square.

It is one of the great ironies in the history of urban form that these structures [squares] meant to organize a crowd of people evolved so that the edge became their point of development, and the centre became of ever less value. In that dispersion towards the empty edge, the design avoids the otherness concentrated at the centre.³⁷

The emptiness of Grosvenor Square was depicted in many early engravings. (Illustrations 22, 35 and 37) There are few characters in these images, and most appear to be 'in transit.' Congregations of persons were not encouraged in these new garden squares and the vacancy of Grosvenor Square was a result of people moving away from its centre. But what was beyond it? As noted in the previous chapter, people were drawn to the public spaces of Kensington Gardens and Hyde Park to the west and the open fields and Marylebone Gardens to the north. In terms of the estate's residents, a major migration on the estate did not occur until the construction of large houses along Park Lane approximately 40 to 50 years into the improvements. Initially, westward movement was harder to detect and may have been only in the form of a pedestrian, seeking refuge momentarily in Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. After about 1760, the movement of residents became more profound, but one constant of the Square itself was the endurance of its residents. The homes of Grosvenor Square passed from one generation of a family to the next, demonstrating the power of the Square to concentrate 'otherness' at its centre.³⁸

The intersection of the private development of the Grosvenor estate with the location for executions, Tyburn, was often times a point of conflict for residents wishing to enjoy the rural qualities of the estate. As the physically closest form of public entertainment to the Grosvenor estate, the public hangings at Tyburn, were a venue where privileged members of the public could view the executions from a constructed grandstand. This type of

entertainment steadily increased during the eighteenth century. At the beginning of the century there were no more than fifty capital offences; by the end there were nearly two hundred and fifty, and the ‘...public executions at Tyburn were maintained by Parliament as an instrument of policy until 1783...’³⁹ Social mixing was an important ingredient of these public affairs, blending various ranks, gender and social positions, by taking on an almost carnival –like atmosphere as indicated in Hogarth’s illustration of the young apprentice being taken to Tyburn from his *Idleness and Industry* series. (Illustration 38) The open and unstructured spaces of Tyburn permitted the gathering together of this diverse society.

On the other hand, the formal setting created for military executions denoted a privileged and somewhat private space. As indicated on John Rocque’s map, the site of military executions, ‘where soldiers are shot’, was located in the northeast corner of Hyde Park, and the location of Speakers’ Corner, today. (Illustration 9) A tall wall would have provided the backdrop and barrier along the length of Hyde Park. Although these demonstrations of military justice were not an open arena such as those at nearby Tyburn, residents of the Grosvenor estate were afforded entry to the park, through the Grosvenor gate as a royal favour from George II.⁴⁰ The long avenue of trees along the western edge of Hyde Park opened into a semi-circle at its northernmost point, into a natural amphitheatre, which provided a dramatic and formal setting for the enforcement of capital punishment. This was a place of gathering for both moral and religious purpose, thus imposing a new sense of social ordering onto the urban fabric, not according to class, gender or privilege, but according to one’s place of residence. The development of Grosvenor Square signalled changes in social ordering by obscuring the distinctions between country and city, public and private, open and restricted, privileged and common spaces.

The Berkeley estate to the south of Grosvenor Square, may have been a point of conflict. In 1672, Lord Berkeley failed to deliver the sizeable settlement necessary to secure a marriage contract between himself and the young Mary Davies.⁴¹ This proposal would have consolidated their estates and provided a contiguous parcel of land from the Thames to Oxford Road, for Lord Berkeley and his heirs. The subsequent failure of this endeavour may have prevented the necessary capital to invest in improvements to the Mayfair property. The slow development of the Berkeley estate would have also provided problems for the pedestrian trying to reach the fashionable places to the south, such as Piccadilly, Green Park and St James’s. Although many of the streets of Berkeley

Square were laid out by the time of John Rocque's survey (1745), the inhabitation of the estate progressed slowly through the 1750s and 1760s. Thus, the activities of the building trades on the Berkeley estate could have hindered a fluid transit from the Grosvenor estate to the rest of Westminster.

The Society of the Garden Square

It has been argued that the trend in the early eighteenth century of enclosing squares led to their becoming ‘socially segregated spaces.’⁴² But what were the factors determining this exclusivity? Demographic studies of the Grosvenor estate reveals a rich and diverse population in terms of gender, class and political alliance. (Illustrations 4 and 39) The populace of the estate varied such that members of gentry lived next to aristocrats, single women beside newly-weds, and Walpolean Whigs living along side members of the Prince of Wales’s household. The most striking social variable discovered in this investigation was in terms of gender, however, the Grosvenor estate was in no way unique in London’s West End. (Table 3) Nearly one third of all first time rate-payers and over half of all rate payers during the period from 1720 to 1760, were single women.⁴³ (Illustrations 3 and 39) As indicated by these maps, single women were broadly distributed throughout the Grosvenor estate, with greater concentrations along Upper Brook Street. The sheer number of women living on the estate during this period was quite formidable, especially considering the rarity of single men. It appears that of the occupants of the principal residences on the estate, only one in every 200 men was single. In regards to the Square alone, there are only two bachelors in residence during the forty-year time span from 1720 to 1760, Lord Clinton, and Charles, 5th Duke of Bolton, in contrast to nearly 30 single women.⁴⁴ The requisite of residency in the metropolis appears to be the determining factor in the construction of the society of the garden square. For different reasons, ambitions and goals, people settled in the newly developed garden squares in London’s West End, since maintaining a residence could provide opportunities for personal and public advancement. The remainder of this chapter will investigate the manner in which the garden square of the Grosvenor estate moulded its diverse society into a consistent and unified entity, providing a lively stage for the performance of social roles.

Next of Kind – Next Door

The reinforcement of the family connections appears to be an important role of the London townhouse and a predominant aspect of the society of the Grosvenor development. Members of immediate families were living within close proximity of one another on the estate. (Table 14) In regards to aristocracy, families were consolidating urban space, with large numbers of both immediate and extended families letting homes on the Grosvenor estate, with the Dukedoms of Marlborough and Bolton commanding the largest presence. The mobility of the residents of the primary streets was high. Many

persons took a home for a year or two and many others for 5 to 10 years.⁴⁵ The drive to find a house in the city was at times determined to be so urgent that the specific location was not a deciding factor, as indicated in the following passage of letter to Frances Poole:

We had a great deal of talk about houses; they seem to me positively resolved to take one as soon as they can and are not so fixt to a spot as you seem to think, for we named several Streets near St James's and they objected to none, even Spring Gardens was mentioned and they said they would like a house there very well...⁴⁶

Many factors could account for the presence of multiple family members in an urban development such as Grosvenor Square. Perhaps this direct and immediate contact while living in the metropolis was to compensate for those times of the years when families were far apart. Often, family members were living within a few doors of one another. Lucy, Dowager Duchess of Rutland, who resided at No 25 Grosvenor Square, lived within a five-minute walk of a married daughter, a widowed daughter, a married son and a married grandson. The compact and concentrated nature of the estate afforded accessibility to one's family and friends. Families would often cluster around single women, such as widowed mothers and unmarried sisters. As noted previously, single women made up a significant proportion of the city's population, and the townhouse was oftentimes their primary place of residence. For others, life in the metropolis could be transient, with residency occurring during key times of the social and political year.

Court or Commerce

As noted previously, many early eighteenth-century squares were either communitarian or authoritarian in nature, with Grosvenor Square essentially a hybrid of the two models. The banning of most commercial practices on the Grosvenor estate, shifted the focus of this vital urban space from capital pursuits to a location for the performance of court and political duties. Commercial practices on the estate were essentially limited to the building trades. So few retailers were allowed to operate on the Grosvenor estate, that it would be impossible to maintain a household from the scarce range of purveyors. The shortage of retail choices within close proximity to the Grosvenor estate meant that its residents would have to go elsewhere to furnish and maintain their home, increasing the overall mobility of the residents and places them in locations throughout the metropolis. Ironically, and as previously noted, the first building constructed on the estate was a business, the Mount Coffee House at the intersection of Grosvenor and Maddox Streets.⁴⁷ It is significant that the first structure built on the estate was a public place and one in

which the various classes of male society could meet and converse freely. ‘When British Whigs proclaimed theirs to be an empire of liberty [Glorious Revolution of 1688], they were certainly conjuring up images of personal freedom, commercial prosperity and constitutional government.’⁴⁸ The construction of the Mount Coffee House may allude to desire to promote the new development as a place of liberty and free speech, but this commercial enterprise was situated within a residential development, the main purpose of the estate.

The Hanoverian succession may well have produced a need to provide housing for the members of the new court. Hanover Square was developed by Lord Scarbrough. As a Lord of the Realm, a title which granted him and other peers the power to act as agents of the Crown, Lord Scarbrough was one of these men directly responsible for placing George I on the British throne after the death of Queen Anne. (Table 12) In addition, the residents of Hanover Square were clearly in support of George I, but it appears that St James’s Square continued as the locale for long-standing courtiers of Queen Anne.⁴⁹ Grosvenor Square, on the other hand, contained a mixture, but was predominantly inhabited by supporters of George II, so that by the middle of the eighteenth century, Grosvenor Square was the primary location for his supporters. A clear indication of this support is indicated by the number of Grosvenor Square residents who were recipients of honours. (Tables 4 and 12) Additional proof of the allegiance shown to George II by residents of the Grosvenor estate can be marked by the significant increase of subscribers to the third volume of Colen Campbell’s *Vitruvius Britannicus*, dedicated to the monarch when he was still Prince of Wales.⁵⁰ (Table 10)

As indicated, many residents of the Grosvenor estate participated in the political system, either through direct involvement in Parliament or through court favours. The mapping of the Parliamentary duties of the residents of the Grosvenor estate revealed a dense concentration of members of both houses. (Illustration 4) The identification of court responsibilities of residents of the Grosvenor estate enhanced the overall picture of a locale with heavy political leanings. (Table 4) Men, women and families had taken refuge in this new development to enhance their political and capital influence, since the estate’s close proximity to the leisured court of Kensington placed them in direct contact with the royals and their ministers. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 had brought about significant changes to the operations of court favours, in some respects shifting the focus of attention from the monarch to his ministers. ‘Although the checking of the power of the crown represented a considerable accomplishment, the beneficial effects of these

limitations did not extend to the actions of the king's ministers, but extended to the manners and mores that governed behaviour in the wider political nation.⁵¹ Playing a prominent role in court was still an effective way to wield power, and a specific and opportunist location in the metropolis, such as Grosvenor Square, could enhance this performance.

A clear indication of the political aspirations of Sir Richard Grosvenor was the commissioning of the monumental survey of his mother's estate in 1723. (Illustration 2) Mackay's survey of the Grosvenor estate was a highly decorative and formalised object, which not only provided information about the proposed layout, but also placed the estate within the geographical setting of London's West End.⁵² The massive scale of this survey (approximately 6 foot square) denoted the aspirations of its patron, Sir Richard Grosvenor. Maps are potent symbols of landownership, providing credence and visual proof of authority and power. 'Cartography remains a teleological discourse, reifying power, reinforcing the "status quo" and freezing social interaction within charted lines.'⁵³ As previously noted, Mackay's survey draws attention to the geographic location of the proposed Square with its physical relationship to existing structures, including St James's and Kensington Palaces, the townhouses of Lords Dorset, Devonshire, Berkeley, Burlington and Sunderland and the royal parks, thus linking the proposed development with established locations of political and court power.⁵⁴ The 'visual hierarchy of signs' produced on this survey was pronounced by the use of distortion in terms of scale.⁵⁵ The illustrations of the Manor of Ebury (the Grosvenor home at Millbank) and Grosvenor Square were exploded in scale compared to the other noted residences illustrated on the survey. The intentional distortion of both scale and perspective depicted on this map denoted a form of political propaganda utilized by Richard Grosvenor to align himself with the nobility and the court.⁵⁶ The spatial and political connections this map created by the inclusion of noble palaces, may have been necessary for the upward mobility of a new landowner, such as Richard Grosvenor, just as the use of a coat of arms on the survey was an extension of feudal power granted to his ancestors.⁵⁷

Another indication of the political aspirations of Sir Richard Grosvenor was the commissioning of the new Hanoverian monarch's likeness to adorn the garden in Grosvenor Square. Both Maurer's and Bowles's engraved views of Grosvenor Square picture the bronze equestrian statue of George I centred in the garden. (Illustrations 22 and 37) Clearly illustrated in Maurer's image was the elevated terrace of ground and large platform on which the bronze figure rested, thereby heightening its prominence in the

Square. This commanding placement of the likeness of the first of the Hanoverian kings confirmed the national and political importance of the Grosvenor development. This view also demonstrates how the placement of the church of St George's, Hanover Square was along a direct line with Grosvenor Street.⁵⁸ The alignment of Grosvenor Street with the façade of the parish church provided another link between the Grosvenor estate and the Hanoverian kings. This metaphoric linkage was echoed in the society of the Grosvenor estate and neighbouring Hanover Square.

With the Hanoverian Succession, however, Covent Garden, Leicester Fields and Soho Square began to be deserted by the more elegant society: Hanover Square, built in 1717-19, soon replaced Golden Square as the centre of aristocracy...⁵⁹

Besides societal links with the court, Grosvenor Square was physically linked to the throne, geographically located between Lord Scarbrough's celebration of the Hanoverian dynasty, Hanover Square with St George's Church, and the royal spaces of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens and Palace. The allegiance and physical intersection of the Grosvenor estate with the court was demonstrated through legal means, specifically a royal warrant permitting a gate into Hyde Park. This document contains the specifics of how the early development of the estate was officially described.

Whereas we are given to understand that a large road has been lately made directly from the Square called Hannover [sic] Square by the Mount called Olivers Mount to the wall of Hyde park and that it would be greatly for the Convenience and Accommodation of the Inhabitants in the said Square and all other the new Buildings adjacent in case a gateway or passage was permitted to be made from said road into our park called Hyde park.⁶⁰

Lord Weymouth, the author of this declaration and Ranger of Hyde Park, was also a resident of the Grosvenor estate, personally improving both his social and personal position with increased accessibility to the monarch. The Grosvenor Gate at Hyde Park was to be maintained and built at Sir Richard Grosvenor's expense, providing another opportunity to increase his standing with the Hanoverian court. The construction of the gate into Hyde Park meant that the Grosvenor estate was extended to play a larger role in the city as a whole because of this privileged entry. The advantages of living on the Grosvenor estate reached beyond the entrance to the Square's garden to the liberty of enjoying the royal green space of Hyde Park. Greater accessibility to royal property could also mean easier accessibility to the royals themselves. Residents of the Grosvenor estate could take advantage of this privileged entry by making themselves more visible to the

court, thereby increasing the likelihood of receiving court favours. Entry was not restricted to pedestrians, but included carriages and sedan chairs as well.

The inhabitants of this Square [Grosvenor] have the liberty of driving through Hyde-park, to the Palace of Kensington, from whence they are distant but little more than a Mile, and about half a one from the Palace of St James's.⁶¹

This passage demonstrated the spatial privileges extended to residents of the Square, which went beyond the bounds of the estate, to royal property. Space expanded impressively for the residents, adding more controlled green space. The royal space of Hyde Park thus becomes an extension of the Grosvenor estate and a vital venue for the performance of political roles for men and women alike. In this case, royal barriers and boundaries broke down, but not by class, gender or even political alliance. The determining factor for admission into this privileged space was the location of one's residence, so that the space in which one inhabited was as vital to one's social value as to the manner in which one lived.

Sacred or Secular

There were spatial and architectural features on the Grosvenor estate which linked its residents with the broader issues of church and state. As provided by Elizabeth McKellar, the authoritative and communitarian models of urban expansion can also be expressed in terms of their sacred and secular functions. Historically, one of the most fundamental urban forms was the town square, and its use and functions have changed significantly since its origins. The Roman forum, a place for the administration of government, is an ancient example of the authoritative model. The commanding characteristics of its space were enhanced by the emphasis in Roman town planning on the *decumanus* and the *cardo* – the main thoroughfares of a grid city. The Roman use of these urban forms to demonstrate authority and power, continued as a formula adopted by urban planners to this day. Michelangelo's design of Capitoline Hill in Rome, provided a humanist solution for the organization of civic space. Significantly, the embellishment of this civic space with the ancient equestrian statue of the Roman emperor, Marcus Aurelius, transformed the square into a form of monument. Roman authoritarianism was echoed in Grosvenor Square with the inclusion of the similar mounted figure of George I. In addition, stylistic elements of Michelangelo's buildings on Capitoline Hill, were included in Campbell's proposed design for Grosvenor Square. (Illustration 40) This rejected proposal for the east end of the Square shared many features with Roman and Florentine townhouse

design, including alternating ovate and triangular pediments, rusticated and arcaded ground floor, and a heavy cornice embellished with a balustrade and statuary.

Noteworthy is the fact that many of the same Renaissance stylistic considerations were adopted for terrace housing later in the eighteenth century. Campbell's proposal projected a commanding and authoritative appearance, and its construction would have changed not only the appearance, but may have also altered the society of the Square.

An historic example of the communitarian model is the medieval cloister, a sacred space for reflection and contemplation provided in self-contained religious communities. As monastic communities evolved into educational communities, and then ultimately developed as separate entities as a result of royal patronage, the quiet and meditative cloister evolved into the clustering of students and fellows around the quadrangle. In a comparison of the historical models based upon the square, the quadrangle bears more similar characteristics to the eighteenth-century garden square than any other. In terms of its physical qualities, the green spaces of the quadrangle can be likened to the garden in the square. These organizing urban forms are comprised of communities of persons with common goals and desires. However, there are significant differences. Academic communities were closed, elitist and male dominated, whereas the garden square, and in particular Grosvenor Square, entry and participation was not restricted by class or gender.

Physical aspects of the Grosvenor estate indicate its multiple roles as both sacred and civic spaces in the metropolis. A prime example of the combined sacred and secular qualities of the estate was the workhouse on Mount Street, erected as a requirement of the parish of St George's, Hanover Square.

As soon as the Church of this new Parish [St George's, Hanover Square] was finished, the two first Churchwardens, being persons of Distinction and Compassion, took an early Care, with the Consent of the Vestry, to provide for the Poor; and in 1726, erected a large, plain, commodious Edifice in Mount-street near the Burying Ground, fit for the reception of several hundred Persons, which being a Model worthy of the Imitation of other Places, a Plan of it was afterwards engraved on Copper, and printed for the service of the Publick.⁶²

The workhouse exemplified the hybrid qualities of the Grosvenor estate, linking together commerce with the church. As with so many aspects of the Grosvenor estate, the Mount Street workhouse was praised for its design, and held up as a model for subsequent constructions in the metropolis.

The Grosvenor estate plans did not include a church, but only a chapel to supplement the activities of St George's Hanover Square, which was located at the end of Chapel Street and adjacent to the cemetery. One of the vital aspects of every day of life of the city dweller was that person's relationship to the local parish church. The parish church was part of the social aspects of the city, in which people of all classes would amass for weekly services and for important celebrations and rites of passage such as weddings, christenings and funerals. The inclusion of the workhouse and chapel on the Grosvenor estate meant that its residents had direct contact with its operations and maintenance, especially significant for the female residents of the estate. A manner in which women could assert power through capital means and for the public good was in the form of charitable donations. Often times, women would provide annuities and donations in the contents of their wills, as indicated by the following passage from Lady Lucy Temple's will of 1733.

For the Relief of Poor Debtors out of Prison, that are there for loss, not owing to their own extravagance, one Hundred pound. To put Six or Eight Children Apprentices one Hundred pound⁶³

The evidence of women as donors and subscribers to these organizations, expressed the expansion of their public roles through charitable acts. The official documents which appealed for the construction and maintenance of these institutions constantly referred to their function in the public sphere.

Workhouses then being Charitable Foundations, as well as Hospitals, and under good Regulation, of greater Advantage to the Publick; they are a National Concern...They may be properly speaking, Nurseries of Religion, Virtue and Industry, by having daily Prayers and the Scriptures constantly read, and poor Children Christianly instructed. And as the Publick will certainly benefit from their Work, so the Poor can have no occasion to complain, because every one has therein Food and Raiment suitable to their Circumstances; their Dwelling is warm, sweet and cleanly, and all proper Care is taken of them in Age and Sickness.⁶⁴

In this manner, residents of the Grosvenor estate, and in particular, the female residents, through the act of charitable donations and endowments, participated in national issues, exhibiting patriotism through their sponsorship of these institutions. With the inclusion of the workhouse and chapel on the Grosvenor estate, the individual community qualities of the estate have been expanded to play a role in the nation since the Christian associations of these features provide another link between its sacred and secular qualities.

Community or Authority

As stated previously, Elizabeth McKellar provided two formats for the development of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century squares of either the communitarian or authoritarian model.⁶⁵ The physical characteristics of the Grosvenor estate have already been shown to demonstrate hybrid qualities of both of these models, indicated in its population, with a core of powerful citizens, surrounded by a cross section of the city's populace. The Grosvenor estate appears to be set up with its own terms of class structure consisting of concentric rings around the apex, which on the Grosvenor estate was the Square. The most privileged in terms of capital and political influence were permitted to live in the Square, but nearly anyone was permitted to enjoy its physical surroundings. In regards to the labouring class, the Grosvenor estate had plenty of economy housing to suit their needs, and may have been a model for estate development for this reason. John Gwynn suggested in his proposed changes to the city's design, that urban features should be altered so they could become safe and moral places to live. The author did not believe that a healthy city could be created by segregating the classes.

In settling a plan of large streets for the dwellings of the rich, it will be found necessary to allot smaller spaces contiguous, for the inhabitations of useful and laborious people, whose dependence on their superiors requires such a distribution; by adhering to this principal a political advantage will result to the nation; as this intercourse stimulates their industry, improves their morals by example, and prevents any particular part from being the habitation of the indigent alone, to the great detriment of private property.⁶⁶

On the Grosvenor estate, the domestic architecture was arranged in a hierarchic manner, with the commercial buildings and fourth class housing at the perimeters of the estate and the more fashionable housing at its centre. This physical arrangement may have been the attraction of the space, which was such that rarely did anyone move out of the Square. Families resided in the same homes generation after generation, throughout the course of the eighteenth century. Some actually married into a home in Grosvenor Square, such as Lord North, the 1st Earl of Guildford, with his betrothal to the Dowager Countess of Rockingham, who had inherited the Grosvenor Square townhouse from her first husband. This does not infer that the Grosvenor Square was entirely aristocratic, because its residents were privileged, all wealthy, but some were in political fields, some military, some high church, others in the court, and also containing a mixture of both genders. With this diversity of demographics, the residents of the Square became the authoritative core to the community.

The orderly nature of the society of the estate was maintained through the implementation of the building restrictions and regulations placed on the estate's builders, which preserved some sense of order to the building progress. It was also probably an effort by Richard Grosvenor to control the environment of his estate and provide a fashionable, clean and commodious environment. There were provisions in building contracts regulating the size of the buildings in the Square to be at least 30 feet wide, although this policy was not enforced and there were quite a few buildings built that were smaller.⁶⁷ There were aesthetic implications to many of the building restrictions and provisions. Some dealt directly with sanitary issues, such as the restrictions of stables and mews fronting the main thoroughfares of the estate. Other restrictions were in line with safety codes created by the Building Acts of 1707 and 1709, that dealt primarily with fireproofing the homes. There were no restrictions made on the designs of the homes themselves, which provided the builders and architects the opportunity to demonstrate their notions of domestic urban architecture. *The Survey of London* negates the authority of individual builders and their desire for planned terrace blocks by stating that the smaller terraced house was preferred and built according to the noble lessee's wishes.⁶⁸ This statement ignores the fact that many of the houses on the Grosvenor estate were in fact quite large in comparison to buildings being built elsewhere in Westminster, but also falsely places the control of the building's design with the tenant. The *Survey* also states that this fashion had already been established in Hanover and St James's Square. Additionally, this statement ignores the fact that many 'fashionable' people were moving from those estates to Grosvenor Square. The manner in which Grosvenor Square became a desirable place in which to live was more reliant upon its society and other physical characteristics than the planned terrace block.

An attractive feature of the estate which highlights its communitarian qualities was the lack of retail and commercial space on the Grosvenor estate. Commercial buildings were very limited in scope due to the restriction placed on the number and type of businesses which were permitted on the estate by Richard Grosvenor.⁶⁹ This consideration for the potential residents, their welfare, ease and quality of life was achieved thorough the limitation of commercial buildings to small retail shops and public houses. The Grosvenor Market in the northeast quadrant of the estate was constructed in the later eighteenth century, so that the nearest available market was located on Piccadilly near present day Hyde Park Corner. However, the construction of two separate complexes of guards stables presents an enigma given Sir Richard Grosvenor's attention to the careful

placement of stabling and mews throughout the rest of the estate. The two sets of Guard's Stables, in the northwest and southeast corners of the estate, were strategically placed to add a sense of authority and protection.⁷⁰ (Illustration 9) The presence of the military was significant to the safety of the estate's residents, since their location was on the edge of the development. These guards units essentially created an authoritative wall of protection for the separate community of the Grosvenor estate, while creating a vital link between itself, the metropolis and nation.

The Garden in the Square

Elizabeth McKellar has noted that the qualities of urban space, especially with regards to gardens, began to change into private and exclusive spaces.⁷¹ The author noted these changes began around 1720 as a result of a culture of ‘politeness.’ However, McKellar failed to note that some garden squares, and in particular, Grosvenor Square, were specifically created as public spaces. Certain characteristics of Grosvenor Square’s physicality point to this aspect. The Square was a massive enclosure of space, reinforced by the towering townhouses, which enhanced the insular and communitarian qualities of the estate development. Many early illustrations of the Square portray the colossal open space, which was seemingly devoid of any activities except for the itinerant person. People depicted in these images were rarely lingering to enjoy or consider their spatial surroundings. The Continental traveller de Muralt, whose understanding of squares as physical manifestations of civic and national pride was disappointed with the examples he found in Westminster.

There are several Squares in *London*, some of them are very fine, and surrounded with Palisadoes and Rails, but they are generally far short of what they might be made. They are not much adorn’d, and few People stop to amuse themselves about them, which would be the very proper for this great City, and would shew the Number, Wealth, and the leisure Time of the Inhabitants. I believe, indeed, that the Park makes People neglect these Places, and they are not spacious enough for those who walk fast.⁷²

Urban spaces, such as garden squares, were to be reflective of its citizens, however those encountered by this visitor appear to have disguised their content. De Muralt referred to St James’s Park, the principal location in the metropolis for the parade, as an explanation for the vacancy of the city’s urban squares. Another reason for the ‘neglect’ of these new urban forms may have been the exclusiveness attached to their gardens. Instead of creating a backdrop for the palatial aristocratic home or a centre of commerce, the garden square was an restricted enclave. Gardens were encircled by walls and fences, which contained keyed gates for select admission. These features all imply exclusivity, but their diminished size and impermanence lacks the authoritative characteristics which lead to the square becoming a private space. Grosvenor Square was an exception. The garden in the Square was constructed and ornamented a public space, and contemporary guidebooks presented the Square as part of the public domain and encouraged its consumption by the general population.

The Area in the Midst is surrounded with Rails, in an octagonal Form, different from all the Squares in *London*, and agreeably

planted with Dwarf-trees, intermixt with fine Walks: It is certainly laid out in a very expensive Taste, and kept with great Decency and Neatness; and the making it octagonal is new in Design and happy in effect.⁷³

So unusual was the octagon form of the garden that this author mentions it twice. Novelty was often noted in guidebooks, and a characteristic which attracted attention. Two guidebook descriptions alluded to the octagon layout of the garden in Grosvenor Square, however no visual record remains of this feature. The shape was harmonious with the eight streets filtering into the Square, directing the visitor to the heart of the estate. Specific to Grosvenor Square was the placement of the John Nost's equestrian statue of George I at the very centre of the garden. There was no other private development in the metropolis which contained such a specific political and visual assertion of royal patronage. This public feature may have been created for personal reasons, as Richard Grosvenor needed to create an assurance to the monarch for his support, due to the family's past Jacobite associations.

In the Middle of it is a large Garden fenced round with Pallisado-Pales, that are fixed on a circular Dwarf Wall. The enclosed Garden is laid out in to Walks, and enjoys the additional Ornament of an Equestrian Statue of King George the First, which stands upon a Pedestal in the Centre, is gilt all over; but is by no Means an Object to be admired, or cried up for the Excellence of its Execution.⁷⁴

The political overtones of this description are striking. The author could be critical of either the manner in which the statue of George I was constructed or of the subject itself. An earlier incident in the Square in which the statue was defaced, demonstrated the turbulent political atmosphere of the time.⁷⁵ In contrast to the earlier description of the Square, this interpretation levels criticism over its design and ornamentation, which point to changes in attitudes towards George I. The strong assertion of 'Augustan' authority as depicted in the equestrian statue was criticised, and marks the later removal of the piece from the public garden. However initially, the decoration of Grosvenor Square indicated its purpose as a monument to the Hanoverian succession. In contrast to the communal functions of Grosvenor Square, Richard Sennett has noted that the purpose of the eighteenth-century square denied its role as a public space.

The great urban 'places' were not to concentrate all activities of surrounding streets; the street was not to be a gateway to the life of the square. Rather than a focus as all the architecture of Versailles is a focus, the square was to be a monument to itself, with restricted activities taking place in its midst, activities most of passage or

transport. Above all, these squares were not designed with a lingering, congregating crowd in mind.⁷⁶

The key element of Grosvenor Square which reinforced its role as a public arena was the equestrian statue of George I, which accentuated the monumental qualities of the space. Sennett's analysis also failed to recognize the role the architecture of the square plays in reinforcing its purpose. The large scale of the Square and its buildings heightened its authoritative qualities. A square is not just the void or open space in the centre, but also that which surrounds it. The buildings of Grosvenor Square were not only a backdrop to the Square, but also played an important part as part of the stage where the activities of the home filtered out into the Square through windows and doors.

The bounding of the space of the garden square reinforced its purpose as a monument. In the countryside, nature was controlled with boundaries in the form of enclosures, which signified authority, exclusion and ownership. In the urban landscape, walls, gates, fences and terraces of buildings formed boundaries and barriers, which act commandingly to enclose space and define ownership. As noted previously, Elizabeth McKellar saw the changes to the eighteenth-century design of urban squares as an indication of their transformation from public to private spaces, marked by the use of gates and walls in their gardens.

The lack of enclosure of the early squares, both physically and socially, began to change in the early eighteenth century as the capitol expanded and became more regularized and privatised. It was this trend which led towards the enclosing and railing in of squares resulting in the more contained and socially segregated spaces of the 1720s onwards.⁷⁷

However, demographics indicate that Grosvenor Square was not segregated, according to class, gender or political alliance. The varied demographics of the Grosvenor estate confirm that residence on the Square was the determining factor for admission, so that the physical, actual and symbolic ownership of the garden square was shared by its diverse residents.

Conclusions

The Swiss traveller, Louis Beat de Muralt discovered that walking was a favoured diversion of English women.⁷⁸ He went on to comment that those urban spaces created for this purpose, squares, failed to fulfil one of its basic functions.

I am likewise of Opinion, that the great Number of Coffee-houses where People see one another conveniently, is one Reason that these Squares are so little frequented. But whatever 'tis, to be sure to remember this is a very remarkable, that there are a great many Places in *London* called Squares, where People may walk, and few do.⁷⁹

According to this author, London's squares were sparsely populated with pedestrians. Contemporary views also confirm their meagre consumption. (Illustrations 22 and 31) However, both images reveal that these spaces were not entirely deserted. McKellar and Sennett both imply that garden squares were dead spaces in the city, which has in part led to a lack of understanding the role these spaces played for social performance.⁸⁰ Especially for the urban woman, walking was an important activity and the garden square was one location in the vast palette of spaces from which she could choose to assert her social and public dimensions. The experience of urban spaces could expose the symbiotic relationship between the performer and their audience, as illustrated in the following contemporary passage.

We set in one of the grand allées for an hour and a half and saw all the fine people pass in review before us. The Ladies walk vastly well and dress the same except those of the highest rank, that wear such a quantity of rouge that its down right shocking. But their way of holding themselves and walking is what sets them off the most...⁸¹

As a young woman of the court, Lady Jane Cathcart was well aware the vital purpose of public performance. Her experience in the Tulleries in Paris revealed the dynamics of eighteenth-century viewing, with the observer as the observed. The pedestrians Lady Cathcart noted passed 'in review', seeking acknowledgment for their activities. Performance was contained within the setting of contained nature. The same viewing experiences would have occurred in the garden of Grosvenor Square, supplied with benches for the observation of the consumers of both the garden and the Square. The physical and social contents of the garden in the Square would have been framed by the terrace housing, creating a stage which enhanced the varied public roles performed in its midst. The assertion of these social roles of class, gender and political alliance were symptomatic of social value and the residents of Grosvenor Square chose its immense and diverse physical environment to stage these performances. The spatial dynamics of Grosvenor Square, with its diverse blocks of housing, lack of commercial enterprise, military installations and a monument to the King in its garden, together with a diverse society of residents determined an ideology of space indicative of an authoritative community.

¹ Richard Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye* (Boston, MA: Faber and Faber, 1990), p.91.

² Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*.

³ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, pp. 49-54 and Elizabeth McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp.191-207.

⁴ Dana Arnold ed., *Reading Architectural History*, (Routledge, 2002), p. 99. Architectural historians have given greater coverage to Wood. See Summerson, *Architecture in Britain*, pp. 359-65.

⁵ John Summerson, *Georgian London* (Barrie and Jenkins, 1988), p.40.

⁶ Later in the eighteenth century, a larger portion of the Grosvenor estate, consisting of portions of Belgravia, Chelsea and Millbank, will be developed by the 1st Earl Grosvenor, making it the largest urban speculative development in the history of London. See *Survey*, volumes ii (Chelsea, Part I), iv (Chelsea, Part II), and vii (Chelsea, Part III).

⁷ Records of Barlow's intent for the development of the estate are contained in a notebook held at Eaton Hall (item 1193) and Mackay was commissioned to record this plan in his elaborate survey. Barlow's original design has been lost, but his intentions were revealed in the 1723 Survey by John Mackay.

⁸ Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Chatto and Windus, 1973), p.142.

⁹ McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London*, p.197.

¹⁰ Summerson, *Georgian London*, p.30.

¹¹ McKellar, p.201.

¹² McKellar, p. 204.

¹³ John Gay, *Trivia, or the art of walking the streets of London*, (1716) iii, ll 133-36.

¹⁴ Hugh Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London* (Collins, 1964), p. 211.

¹⁵ *Survey*, xl, p.113 (March 1727).

¹⁶ Henry Fielding, 'Inquiry into the Cause of the Late Increase of Robbers,' (1751). See Williams, *The Country and the City*, p.145.

¹⁷ McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London*, pp.199-201.

¹⁸ Although the Duke's home was never completed on Cavendish Square, many letting agreements were based on this proposal and residents were finally compensated with the construction of two large homes on the north side of the Square.

¹⁹ McKellar, p.204.

²⁰ John Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved, Illustrated by Plans* (1766), p.77.

²¹ Benjamin Ralph, *A Critical Review of the Public Buildings ... in and about London*, (1734), p.108. See Summerson, *Georgian London*, p.104.

²² *London and Its Environs Described*, vi, p.217.

²³ McKellar, p.205.

²⁴ *Survey*, xxxix, p.16.

²⁵ McKellar, p.191.

²⁶ *London in Miniature*, pp.212-13.

²⁷ Williams, *Country and the City*, p.142.

²⁸ Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved*, p. viii.

²⁹ *London in Miniature*, p.197.

³⁰ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.90.

³¹ Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, *The Moralists* (1709). Reprinted in Dixon Hunt and Willis, eds., *The Genius of the Place* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), p.122.

³² McKellar, p.214.

³³ *London in Miniature*, p.198.

³⁴ Liza Picard, *Dr Johnson's London* (Phoenix Press, 2000), p.16.

³⁵ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.208.

³⁶ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.205.

³⁷ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.95.

³⁸ Refer to the rate book information contained in the *Survey*, xl, pp.112-70.

³⁹ George Rudé, *Hanoverian London* (Secker and Wrarburg, 1971), p.75.

⁴⁰ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/22.

⁴¹ *Survey*, xxix, p. 6

⁴² McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London*, pp.191 and 214.

⁴³ These statistics were compiled from the rate book information provided in the survey of London and includes only those residence in the Square and along the primary streets – Brook and Upper Brook Street, Grosvenor and Upper Grosvenor Streets and North and South Audley Streets. I was limited to these locations because rate book information was scarce and less reliable for the rest of the estate.

⁴⁴ Statistics compiled from rate book information provided in *Survey*, xxxix, pp.172-195 and GER WA Grosvenor Lease Books, 45 vols, 1721-1834.

⁴⁵ These statistics were derived from an analysis of the information provided in the *Survey*, xxxix and xl.

⁴⁶ HL BR 16 Correspondence of Frances Poole 1758-59.

⁴⁷ *Survey*, xxxix, p.12.

⁴⁸ Eliga Gould, *The Persistence of Empire* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), p.3.

⁴⁹ M Dorothy George, 'London and the Life of the Town', in *Johnson's England* ed by A.S. Turberville (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933) 2 vols, I, p.41.

⁵⁰ Colen Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, 3 vols (1715-1725) dedication page to the third volume, 1717 and 1725 editions.

⁵¹ Gould, p.16.

⁵² GER WA 1049/12/216.

⁵³ J.B. Harley, 'Maps, knowledge and power,' in *The Iconography of Landscape* ed by Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 303.

⁵⁴ GER WA 1049/12/216.

⁵⁵ Harley, p. 292.

⁵⁶ Harley, p. 287.

⁵⁷ Harley, p. 293.

⁵⁸ St George's Hanover Square was not built at the end of Maddox Street which will continue as Grosvenor Street on the Grosvenor estate. The church was built about 150 feet from the intersection of Maddox Street and St George's Street.

⁵⁹ Rudé, *Hanoverian London*, p.41. See also *Survey*, xxix, p.79-81; xxxi, pp.143-5; xxxiii, pp.45-50; xxxiv, pp.428-31.

⁶⁰ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/22.

⁶¹ John Stow, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, 2nd ed, 6 vols. (1754) ii, p.668.

⁶² *An Account of Several Work-houses for Employing and Maintaining the Poor; Setting forth the Rules by which they are Governed, their great usefulness to the Publick and in Particular to the Parishes where they are erected*, (1732), pp.26-27.

⁶³ HL BR 7/13. Copy of Lady Lucy Temple's will, 1733.

⁶⁴ *An Account of Several Work-houses for Employing and Maintaining the Poor*, p.iii.

⁶⁵ McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London*, p.197.

⁶⁶ Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved*, p. viii.

⁶⁷ *Survey*, xxxix, p.16.

⁶⁸ *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 103-5.

⁶⁹ *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 14, 30.

⁷⁰ *Survey*, The Guards to the north were located between Woods Mews and Green Street, and designed by Roger Morris, c1735 for the Second Troop of the Horse Guards, xxxix, p.32; and the southern Guards Stables (c1734) were located on either side of Chapel Street, with the northern range occupied by the First Troop of the Horse Guards, xl, p. 330.

⁷¹ McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London*, p.214.

⁷² Beat Louis de Muralt, *Letters describing the Character and Customs of the English and French Nations. With a curious essay on travelling*, 2nd ed. (1726), pp.78-9.

⁷³ *London in Miniature*, p.197.

⁷⁴ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p12.

⁷⁵ *Survey*, xl, p.113 (1727).

⁷⁶ Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man*, p. 53.

⁷⁷ McKellar, p.214.

⁷⁸ de Muralt, p.35.

⁷⁹ de Muralt, p. 78-9.

⁸⁰ Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (Faber and Faber, 1986), p. 53.

⁸¹ Vere Birdwood, ed., *So Dearly Belov'd, So Much Admired* (HMSO, 1994), p 86. June 1752.

Chapter IV

The Street

The Role of the Street

Streets are an integral element of urban space. They act as networks that physically link together other urban elements, such as the city, garden square and the townhouse.

Evidence of Londoners' perception and usage of its streets can reveal social and physical patterns. The relationships between persons and their environment can expose a street's functioning as stages for social performance.

...streets become a map of visible and invisible relations of meaning, identity and power into which the subject is placed and has to find their way around...¹

Chance encounters and impediments to progress can reveal the physical environment. An investigation of London's streets, and particularly those of the early Grosvenor estate, will disclose its early eighteenth-century spaces in a linear manner and provide proof of the direction to the pedestrian's journey. Furthermore, the streets of the metropolis cannot only direct one physically, but also metaphorically and ideologically. This exploration will utilize an analysis of 'streets' in the proper sense, and their adjacent pavements, as well as constructed walks. As will become apparent, walks, such as those created in the city's parks, imply a directed sense of linear movement in a similar fashion to a street. Footpaths, on the other hand, are generally randomly created by pedestrians seeking a shorter distance to travel. Paths adhere to the 'straight line theory' of the distance between two points and lack a sense of permanence. This phenomenon can be evidenced in modern public footpaths in rural areas, in which a sign may direct you in the general direction, but no definite path exists. This impermanence is implied on Ordnance Survey maps, with dotted lines as an indicator of a public footpath. Paths are thus the most liberal of all avenues and offer the most options for the pedestrian, but function differently to the constructed walks and streets of eighteenth-century London and Grosvenor Square.

As noted previously, streets act as networks in the urban environment. The street can unify urban design in two ways: first, by integrating the architecture with the street, and second, by improving the physical conditions of both.² Streets of an inadequate size and lacking a definite sense of direction could not only threaten the appearance, but the

appreciation of the buildings situated adjacent to them. This impression of carriage ride through pre-Napoleonic Paris demonstrates the vital interplay between these urban features.

We were surprised with the narrowness of the streets, Darkened too with the hight of the houses and frighten'd too with the concourse of the people we seem'd to be driving over but they are most alert in getting out of the way.³

The sensations of this urban space have evoked an emotional response. In this case, the compression of space, which was enhanced by the size of buildings, motivated feelings of anxiety in the young woman who experienced this space. Disbelief was also provoked by the perceived expectations of the city and its spaces. Personal recollections and visual representations of London's streets will be utilized to relay the manner in which they acted as vital stages for social performance.

London, and the City in particular, has long been criticized by urban planners and politicians alike, for its tangled web of narrow twisting streets. Efforts to create a planned city, after the Great Fire of 1666, were thwarted by the interests of the city's merchants to re-establish trade and commerce after such a devastating loss. Despite the efforts of John Evelyn and Christopher Wren, who presented proposals for the reconstruction of the city with grand avenues and 'eye-catching' architectural focal points, the City developed in the same manner as its medieval predecessor. (Illustration 24) Although land distribution of London was in part the reason for its haphazard development, the continuing criticism of this urban environment in the early eighteenth century, provided urban planners with the initiative to seek alternative sources of inspiration. One possible source was Italian Renaissance architect, Andrea Palladio. His *Four Books of Architecture*, was first translated in the seventeenth century and widely consumed and appreciated by those in both the building trades and the educated classes. His *Four Books* provided a ready-made formula for the design of urban streets. Palladio's concerns for urban planning went beyond his native country, and his prescription for a city with a climate such as London, was to provide 'ample and broad' streets.

In the compartment or disposition of the ways within a city, regard ought to be had of the temperature of the air and to the region of heaven, under which the city is situated. For those in of a temperate or cool air, the streets ought to be more ample and broad; considering, that by their breadth, the city will be much wholesomer, more commodious, and more beautiful...⁴

The size of the street was directly linked to function, ‘commodious,’ to aesthetics and to personal safety, ‘wholesomer’. The primary streets of the Grosvenor estate were some of the widest built in the metropolis by the middle of the eighteenth century. The fact that the estate planner Thomas Barlow, through the support of Sir Richard Grosvenor, formulated an estate development which was based primarily on large, broad streets, demonstrates that the focus of the development was not for purely fiscal reasons. By contrast, Barlow could have planned the estate development much as his predecessors in Westminster had done, by planning a network of single-track lanes, and densely packing homes along their frontages. However, what was conceived by Barlow and what materialized on the Grosvenor estate were streets that were ‘commodious’ and ‘beautiful’.

Palladio also recognized the vital relationship between the street and its consumers. The author suggested the streets should be broad so that the viewer can stand back and admire the grandeur. This echoes the previous statement regarding the important relationship between the architecture and the street. For Palladio, the street was an extension of the building, important to the appreciation of architectural elements. The discussion of the role of the street in the development of the provincial town and its relationship to the architectural surroundings has been investigated by Peter Borsay.⁵ However, the investigation only looked at those architectural works which fit into the ‘classical’ mode of expression, and all others were laid aside as second rate. The diverse nature of the original home on the Grosvenor estate would have been deemed unworthy for further investigation using this criteria for inclusion. In Borsay’s discussion, classicism was responsible for the integration and improvement of provincial streets. The author’s discussion ignored the implications those changes to the appearance of streets had for their cultural context, as well as relating their construction and use to that of the metropolis. On the other hand, Dan Cruickshank and Neil Burton’s investigation centred on the political regulations imposed in order to change the physical appearance of city streets.⁶ This exploration varies from either of these approaches in order to note the manner in which changes and construction of new types of streets in London created unique venues for social performance.

A street’s direction can signal purpose, as its dimensions and materials can designate specific usage. A specific problem occurs with regards to women and their use of urban streets. Often times, discussions are limited to the location of the ‘streetwalker’ in the urban scene. With an historical focus centring on the prostitute’s gendered use of city streets, persons with more mundane and less sexy uses of the street have been

marginalized.⁷ Discussions which focused on public and private aspects of the street, noted that the only women located in the public realm were prostitutes, with all others confined to the domestic sphere.⁸ As noted previously, this work attempts to broaden the understanding of the roles women played in eighteenth-century London's public spaces.

Mapping Movements

The pedestrian is a key player in determining the functioning of a street. 'The act of walking is to the urban system what the speech act is to language...'⁹ However, encounters with both physical and social impediments can determine the functioning of these urban environments. The movement of pedestrians in and about the city will help reveal the patterns created in the urban scene via the streets and paths they use, as well as the social patterns which emerge from the places they frequent and the routes they determine via the act of walking. The street becomes the platform upon which to act out social roles, so the pedestrian was a vital performer on the urban stage.

Although many aspects of London's urban fabric have changed since the eighteenth century, its streets have remained a constant with few exceptions.¹⁰ Throughout most of the metropolis, finding oneself a pedestrian could be less than desirable situation.

Traversing London on foot in the eighteenth century could be a harrowing experience, which is why many urbanites preferred the protection of a sedan chair or carriage for movement about the city. The physical conditions of the city's streets were filthy, and provoked a number of urban dwellers to seek legislation for their improvement.

Throughout the century, numerous improvements were made in terms of paving materials, and regulations concerning their maintenance and cleanliness.¹¹ In many of these concerns, the planners and builders of the Grosvenor estate were setting the standard.

Miles Ogborn provided an effective argument regarding the improvement of London's city streets in which the 'bourgeois public sphere' took control of the city's appearance.¹² The author utilized the theories of Shaftesbury, Mandeville and Hume to prove that the 'private' individual was responsible through their actions and beliefs for changes to the physical appearance of London's streets. Ogborn only touched on the gendered use of the streets, utilizing contemporary evidence from both Hume and John Gay to demonstrate these 'modern' aspects.¹³ The author paralleled the following guidebook description of London with Hume's location and role of women in the public sphere as signifiers of virtue, which reinforced civilized behaviour.

The women here have the most engaging charms, the most wit and the most beauty of any women in the world; yet the greatest latitude and behaviour is indulged to them. They frequent all public places of entertainment; make parties of pleasure; pay and receive visits to and from those of either sex without restraint...; and all this with perfect innocence and an irreproachable character.¹⁴

The author of this guidebook apologized to the reader for the actions of the city's women, first exalting their physical appearance and character, but then noting that these roles were carried out 'with the greatest latitude' thus highlighting the masculine role as overseer of their women. However, 'to be indulged' implies that the power of choice was within the women, and these women could proceed in the public arena 'without restraint'. Early eighteenth-century London possessed a multitude of public spaces in which the female pedestrian could proceed freely, including streets, walks, pleasure grounds and gardens squares. Contemporary accounts of the use of London's streets, will help to reveal the story of the female in the city, and in particular, on the Grosvenor estate.

A Walk in the City

A fundamental method by which one can appreciate and consume urban space is via the act of walking. In the eighteenth century, strolling in public urban spaces was a characteristic of a person's everyday life. For both men and women of the leisured classes, however walking was not only a pastime, it was a fundamental activity in which to express 'one's own sense of social value', thereby laying claim to the physical space.¹⁵ Peter Borsay examined the 'custom' built spaces in provincial cities where 'walks were understood to be one of the specially demarcated areas in which competition [social climbing] took place.'¹⁶ The streets and walks of eighteenth-century London signified an individual's social roles and provided platforms for the performance of those roles. "Walking affirms, suspects, tries out, transgresses, respects, etc., the trajectories it 'speaks'."¹⁷ This investigation will look for the 'trajectories' on both the Grosvenor estate and in eighteenth-century London, to determine the manner in which avenues of movement may project avenues of power and assertion. As an important eighteenth-century urban pattern, the street could be vital form for the projection of upward mobility, female power and civility, and the reinforcement of political aims and aspirations. In addition, the street was a public venue where performance defined its function and value, as well as its consumer.

In the eighteenth-century metropolis, urban features, such as garden squares, long boulevards and parks provided the venue for the pedestrian. London in general, and the West End in particular, was the place to see and to be seen. The city's gardens and parks were the arenas for women to demonstrate their self-assuredness with their physical and social environment.

Walking is likewise a great diversion among the Ladies, and their Manner of doing it is one way of knowing their Character; desiring to be seen, they walk together, for the most part, without speaking: They are always dress'd and stiff; they go forward constantly, and nothing can amuse or put them out of their way ... They are strangers to walking in the cool of the evening; and it may be said that they have no pleasure but in being seen ...¹⁸

This candid description by a Continental visitor, revealed that the intention of the female pedestrian as the object of the 'gaze'. These women's active participation in their own objectification, which was not exclusively for the male onlooker, was a manner in which to assert their self-confidence and 'ownership' of the streets. They had developed their own 'style of use' of the city's streets.¹⁹ Women utilized the social spaces of the metropolis in their own fashion, which demonstrated their patronage of material culture, their role in the public sphere as arbiters of taste and luxury, as physical consumers of the built environment, and in total, as civilisers of the urban scene.²⁰

This work will illustrate the manner in which Grosvenor Square would have provided the ideal setting for the 'stroll' and the long avenues of Grosvenor and Upper Grosvenor Streets and Brook and Upper Brook Streets were the promenades for the show casing of a person's finery. Walking proposed many social relationships to the pedestrian, from the snub and glance to the gaze and flirtation. The urban space upon which this relationship was conceived determined the type of relationship which developed, so that the patterns of the street determined the patterns of society.

Patterns and the Street

A pedestrian in eighteenth-century London would find a multitude of streets and walks of varying quality and materials, many of which could be quite intolerable.²¹ Civic-minded individuals and politicians, such as John Spranger, Henry Fielding and John Gwynn, proposed numerous formulas for the improvement of London's streets.²² In 1754, Spranger noted the vital need for changes to the condition of the metropolis's streets, metaphorically and morally linking these urban conditions to the general public.

In all well-governed Countries, the first Care of the Governors hath been to the Intercourse of the Inhabitants, as well as of Foreigners, sojourning in the Country, safe, easy and commodious, by open, free and regular *Highways*.²³

Spranger appealed to the patriotic responsibilities of the members of Parliament in his criticism of the construction and maintenance of the city's streets. Great Britain, with London as its capital, could not be 'well-governed' unless the infrastructure of the nation was taken into consideration and amended, still a much debated topic. An investigation of the physical characteristics of the Grosvenor estate and London's public spaces will assist in the identification of the cultural indicators projected through their form and organization. In particular, these physical characteristics may have provided a safe and hospitable environment for the city's society, especially those women inhabiting and frequenting the Grosvenor estate.

The Grid

It is the disaster of London, as to the beauty of its figure... [the streets and mass of buildings] has spread the face of it in a most straggling, confus'd manner, out of all shape, uncompact, and unequal; neither long or broad, round or square; whereas the city of Rome, though a monster for its greatness, yet was, in a manner, round, with very few irregularities in its shape.²⁴

The physical elements which created Defoe's 'disaster of London' were the gnarled and random nature of the metropolis's streets. As in other examples, the perception of the city was one of confusion as created by its physical layout. The streets lacked direction and purpose, and generally failed to function according to their intent, which was to direct and transport persons through the city. The comparisons between eighteenth-century London and ancient Rome were numerous and reinforced by contemporaries such as Defoe. As with many urban analysts, Defoe turned to Rome for solutions. The Romans built roads

with an understanding of the integral nature of the nation's byways possessed in reinforcing and administrating its goals, conquests and government policies.

As noted earlier, there were attempts in the late seventeenth century to standardise the urban space of the City. In the West End, there were also attempts to homogenize new estate developments.²⁵ The use of squares as an organizing urban device by seventeenth-century planners, brought about many variations in the actual layout of their streets.

Although squares were often created with pure geometric portions of a 'square' such as Soho, St James's and Russell Squares, the communicating avenues seldom maintained a regular pattern. Modified grid layouts were created at Soho Square with consistent east/west arteries, but only one street coming into the centre on the north and two from nearly the corners on the south (Illustration 27) Hanover Square utilized an unusual adaptation of the grid with two parallel east/west streets, and the north/south divide was accentuated by George Street's widening like a funnel into the garden square. (Illustration 27 and 41) This format would have proved much more effective in terms of urban organization had there been a centrepiece in the garden or a prominent home opposite the widened street. St George's Church was sited one block south of the Square, so its imposing façade lacks the widest portion of the street for its appreciation.

In contrast, the layout of streets on the Grosvenor estate stands out from the chaotic streets of its neighbours, a feature easy to distinguish even in present day maps. (Illustrations 1 and 9) Although the space of the Grosvenor development was not a pure grid, since many of the streets and blocks vary in size, the development can be defined as a grid in that all of the constructed streets meet at right angles. One of the reasons the gridded character of the Grosvenor estate stands out against the rest of the urban landscape, was the fact that it was the largest estate in London's West End to be developed, to date. The estate planner Thomas Barlow essentially had a clean canvas on which to place his design, opting for a regular network of streets and lanes regardless of the terrain and topographical features. (Illustration 2) Barlow was a bulldozer, and imposed a geometric pattern on a natural landscape. 'The grid can be understood...as a weapon to be used against environmental character – beginning with the character of geography.'²⁶ As will be revealed, Barlow was not insensitive to the geographic location of the estate and its streets in relation to the adjoining estates.

Essentially, Barlow proposed a gridded and planned community, centred on a square. It is obvious from Mackay's survey that the creation of the streets and the square were of

primary importance since individual building and their dimensions were omitted from the plan. In *The Conscience of the Eye*, Richard Sennett proposed the concept of an orderly, grid form city planning, reminiscent of the Roman and Greek prototype, was necessary for the assertion of power, control and authority.²⁷ The author appears to contradict the authoritative nature of the grid by stating that its functioning was impartial to those who used it, so that 'the grid neutralises space and disorients the observer'.²⁸ The space of the grid cannot be neutral in order to assert itself. Although it is true that the observer can be disoriented by the repetitive nature of the grid, this analysis ignores the relationship between the streets, the grid and the surrounding architecture. The only manner in which the grid can truly disorient the viewer at street level would be the case in which all the architecture is consistent and unvaried, as in 1970s suburbia in the United States or the nineteenth-century streets of Bayswater or Belgravia. The housing on the Grosvenor estate and in early eighteenth-century London in general, was never unified, so that it can be safe to assert that the observer of this environment would be perfectly aware of their relationship to the space.

The diversity of the dimensions of streets and blocks on the Grosvenor estate developed a hierarchy. The narrowest streets on the development were the passages to the mews and stabling. Buildings and population amassed at the intersection of adjoining estates, but on the whole the streets of the Grosvenor estate lack of congestion or compression. This quality can be noted in John Rocque's survey of 1745, which clearly delineates the massing of streets with the bordering Hanover and Berkeley Square estates. (Illustration 9) The regular grid of large streets, opposed with parallel secondary streets, created a startling contrast to the haphazard spatial qualities existent in the rest of the West End. The hierarchy evident in the streets of the Grosvenor estate generally signifies their function, with the widest streets bearing the least amount of traffic and the most amount of social value. Richard Sennett has noted that 'the grid is a geometry of power',²⁹ In the same physical format as a chessboard, power can be played out in the blocks formed by the intersection of streets. On the Grosvenor estate, the power that was asserted on its grid appears as the triumph of luxury over need. The main streets of the Grosvenor estate provided platforms for people engaged in 'polite' activities such as strolling, as opposed to avenues for commerce, labour and general servicing of the estate. Restrictions placed on the types of businesses located on the main streets of the estate, and the subsequent location of stabling and its access to secondary streets, meant that the broad avenues of Grosvenor, Upper Grosvenor, Brook and Upper Brook Streets functioned as important public venues for the projection of one's social roles.



Points of Intersection

To walk is to lack a place. It is the indefinite process of being absent and in search of the proper.³⁰

This strategy provided by Michel de Certeau identified the vital link of the pedestrian as a consumer of the urban environment through the way in which the city itself gained definition from their activities. De Certeau concentrated on the social qualities of walking, but there were also physical aspects of the urban environment which could enhance or detract from the experience of finding one's way in the city. This part of the investigation is concerned with that 'search for the proper' and how the streets of London either enhanced or deterred the search. In addition, the social relationships created by traversing the city could take on physical form. De Certeau extended his argument by relating in broad terms those aspects of the city that could formulate the pedestrian's experience.

The moving about that the city multiples and concentrates makes the city itself an immense social experience of lacking a place – an experience that is, to be sure, broken up into countless tiny deportations (displacement and walks), compensated for by relationships and intersections of these exodus that intertwine and create an urban fabric, and placed under the sign of what ought to be, ultimately, the place but is only a name, the City.³¹

Spaces and places intersect one another. As streets intersect one another, the juncture opens space, creating an important meeting place, acting in a sense like a mini-square. On the Grosvenor estate, most of the shops, pubs and coffee houses were located at the intersections of the secondary streets on the estate. The practice of placing public houses at intersections was the norm since medieval times. A walk through London today, one will discover that many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century public houses located at the intersection of its streets. Additionally, the society of these public houses can literally consume the spaces of the street, so that the intersection itself becomes an important social venue. On the Grosvenor estate, at the intersection of Upper Brook and Park Streets, were a cheesemonger and the Barley Mow public house, and the other corners along this thoroughfare included another public house, a coffeehouse, two apothecaries, a tailor and a wine merchant.³² Essentially, intersections could become vital social and commercial gathering points, if only momentarily while traversing through the intersection.

The intersection of the entire Grosvenor estate with the neighbouring properties created interesting connotations to both its physical and social relationships. Two sides of the development were fronted by major urban thoroughfares – to the north Tyburn Road (later Oxford Street) and to the west, the turnpike road known as Tyburn Lane (later Park Lane). To the north and east of the estate, were the new building developments of Cavendish–Harley and Hanover. Immediately to the north of Grosvenor Square were open fields as illustrated in Sutton’s Nicholls’s aerial view of the Square, c1730. (Illustration 31) As noted previously, this intersection of the private development of the Grosvenor estate with the location for executions, Tyburn, was often times a point of conflict. In London, people would breakfast together and then traverse to Tyburn to watch the victims hung. Was the route through the Grosvenor estate, or did they go around, utilizing one of the turnpikes road to the north and west of the estate? An indication of the route appears on John Rocque’s map. (Illustration 9) Footpaths are in evidence, originating at the termini of Green and Park Streets, and traversing to Tyburn Road, to the east and west. These paths are an indication that the public still had access to this portion of the estate.

Another important intersection occurs with the Berkeley estate to the south of the Grosvenor estate. Here the streets are clustered and random in their distribution. Originally, homes faced Bourdon and Mount Street, and it wasn’t until the development of Berkeley Square that the homes changed their frontage towards the south and the new development. The significance of a street can be determined by its relationship to the buildings that front it. A street fronted by buildings denotes a superior function to those which have their backs turned to it. A striking example of this phenomenon were the first buildings placed on Tyburn (Park) Lane, which John Gwynn subsequently condemned for the disparaging view they created for visitors to Hyde Park.

Boundaries and Barriers

Whereas the difference did arise relating to a fence ... shall agree that there shalt be 3 feet of waste Ground betwesct ye house of ye sd James foxton James Spourner and Daneal Burton and ye Ground wheare formerly a house did stand of ye sd madm Batemans and that 3 mark stones shall be sett att an Eaqual distince and itt is further agreed that if James foxton James Spourner or Daneal Burton or aney of them shall have aney open windows looking into ye Grounds of ye sd madm Bateman that they shall be obledged to put Iron Bars into ye same not exceeding a foot one Bar from an other.³³

Intersections can be defined with hard fast boundaries and barriers. Conflicts could arise from various estates abutting one another, as well as from the intersection of individual properties as the preceding ‘An Agreement on a Fence’ scenario demonstrates. Although there were no indications of streets in this conflict, or a reason for the severe sanctions placed on the male property owners, barriers and boundaries were established through ‘waste Ground’, ‘mark stone[s]’ and ‘Iron bars’ on the windows of their homes. Barriers do not have to be solid or even visible to be effective. As evidenced by early views of the estate, bollards were placed between the pavement and the open space of the Square to protect pedestrians from carriage and chairmen, creating a ‘dotted’ line barrier between the street and the pavement. But in the case of a street, how does a form which is meant to transport actually hinder or prevent progress? Naturally, a street implies movement, but as will be evidenced, its social function and physical format can also inhibit physical progress. These barriers can be both visual and implied; physical and social.

The lack of large scale planning of the city of Westminster provided a picture of the characteristic clustering of individual communities on London’s West End, which were ‘carefully planned within themselves but [had] little reference to the adjoining villages.’³⁴ Evidence of the spatial planning of the Grosvenor estate and its neighbours confirms that there was an effort to limit movement between these urban spaces. In the north-eastern portion of the Grosvenor estate, the low rent, mean housing of South Molton Land and South Molton Street created a physical and social boundary with the Hanover estate. (Illustration 9) These streets did not open directly unto the Hanover estate, which created a barrier to fluid movement between the estates. The lack of communication between the Berkeley estate to the south and the Cavendish-Harley estate to the north can be determined by the lack of substantial streets provided from one locale to the other. On the other hand, there was no barrier created in the traffic flow from the ‘polite’ streets of Brook and Grosvenor Streets. These broad avenues provided free passage from one estate to the other. It can be noted through visual evidence of eighteenth-century maps, that a lack of cooperation between estate developments was indicated by the location of small and tightly packed streets were located at the intersection of these estates. (Illustration 1) The periphery streets on the Grosvenor estate served as boundaries, indicating their lack of stature in terms of scale and function.

I proceed now to the Description of Grosvenor, or Gravenor Square, which is bounded on the North by Oxford Road: on the East by the Hanover-buildings, by May-fair on the South and by Hyde-park on the West; the Area, whereof contains about five Acres of Ground; in

the Middle whereof is a large Garden laid out into Walks and adorned with an Equestrian statue of King George the First gilded, and standing on a pedestal in the Centre of the Garden, the whole surrounded with Palisado Pales on a Dwarf wall: the Buildings generally are the most magnificent we meet in this Town. Though Lincoln's-inn fields and other Squares and Streets may have some that equal these.³⁵

As noted in this early survey of the Grosvenor estate, the north and west boundaries were established with turnpike roads. The proposed layout of the estate centred on a large square within the available space, virtually ignoring the perimeter of the estate. Grosvenor Square was essentially treated as a separate unit, generally lacking any consideration of the surrounding thoroughfares and various parts of the city of Westminster, demonstrated by the principal streets of the estate, which have neither political nor national importance or purpose. None of the main thoroughfares provided direct links to Westminster, Whitehall or St James's Palace. The closest physical connection with the Hanoverian court was Kensington Palace, adjacent to the estate, through the green expanses of Hyde Park.

Names of streets play a predominant role in the indication of land-ownership and the implication of barriers between properties. In fact the naming of streets on the Grosvenor estate was a reason for the landowner to publicly celebrate.

The several new streets designed in Grosvenor Buildings lying between New Bond Street and Hyde Park were lately particularly named: upon which occasion Sir Richard Grosvenor, Bt, gave a very splendid entertainment to his tenants and others concerned in these buildings...³⁶

Another definition of the boundaries on the Grosvenor estate was demonstrated in the name given to the southernmost, east-west street – South Street. The name of this street implies that it is 'the' boundary, thus defining the Grosvenor estate as a community in itself. Another manner of emphasising and designating ownership, but also of locating oneself in the urban scene was the use of street names, carved into the stone tablets on corner houses. This visual marking of territory can also be seen as the construction of a barrier, since the identification of a certain street could mean either prohibited or risky entry. Most of the names of the new streets on the Grosvenor estate were taken from family associations, i.e. Davies and Audley. However, the creation of Charles Street and James Street were curious choices, since these newly added streets did not connect with any existing streets or appear to have any direct familial relationships. Considering the

family's earlier implications in Jacobite associations, the choice of these names seems rather precarious.

The change of a thoroughfare's name in London often times is an indication of passage from one estate to another. Travelling south along Eversholt Street across Euston Road indicates passage into the Bedford estate, with the same street denoted as Upper Woburn, Tavistock, Woburn Place, Russell Square, and ending with Southampton Row, thus crossing Holborn and becoming Kings Way. The use of the family names of Tavistock and Russell, along with the place name of Woburn identify this thoroughfare with its owner, the Duke of Bedford. Within the walls of the City, name changes of the same thoroughfare indicated generally a change in function; i.e Newgate, Cheapside, Poultry Street, Cornhill, Leadenhall Street to Aldgate, signifying the commercial interests of the city, its medieval fortifications, as well as its lack of major landed interests by a few individuals. On the Grosvenor estate, a southern passage along Davies Street, begins as Stratford on the Cavendish-Harley estate and ends as Berkeley Square and Fitzmaurice Street on the Berkeley estate. Streets became public venues denoting private ownership. The same transition of property ownership can be demonstrated by travelling west along Noel Street, later Great Marlborough Street on the Duchess of Marlborough's property, then Maddox Street on Lord Scarborough's development of Hanover Square, and finally Grosvenor Street, Grosvenor Square and Upper Grosvenor Street, when all movement is abruptly ended by Tyburn Lane and the walls of Hyde Park. Naming a street with personal and familial associations, locates that family with a civic, public space, empowering subsequent generations.

As the most prophetic example of a hard-fast boundary, a tall, brick wall extended along the entire eastern range of Hyde Park.³⁷ With the buildings on Tyburn Lane actually 'backed' to the park and the substantial walled boundary to the royal green space, the turnpike road would have been an unattractive and insulated thoroughfare along the Grosvenor estate's western course. In *London and Westminster Improved* (1766), John Gwynn condemned the practice of 'backing' houses onto main thoroughfares since it would create 'scenes of confusion and deformity, extremely unbecoming the character of a great and opulent city.'³⁸ The author specifically made reference to the Grosvenor estate's King's Row and later buildings:

An example of this absurdity [the 'backing' of buildings] evidently appears in that heap of buildings lately erected from Oxford-Road to Hyde-Park Corner, whose back-fronts are seen from the Park.³⁹

The lack of stabling restrictions and Tyburn Lane's functioning as a turnpike road, added to the street's disagreeable nature.⁴⁰ These existing conditions, the landlord's imposed restrictions on the principal streets and the clearly defined boundaries created an estate which was inward looking, insular and cloistered.

There were obvious reasons for the estate planners to avoid contact with its neighbours and look toward creating a separate, insular community. Turnpike roads, even in the metropolis were notorious for crime. Tyburn Lane and Tyburn Road, to the north and west of the Grosvenor estate were noted for the activities of highwaymen. Streets themselves could act as a barrier. The commercial nature of Tyburn Road, with its 'noxious' trades and mean housing, may have prevented fashionable society from jumping the boundary to inhabit the Cavendish Square to the north. In 1724, George I signed a royal warrant permitting the construction of a 'Gateway or passage' into Hyde Park.⁴¹ Since this gate was not placed at the end of either Upper Brook or Upper Grosvenor Street, persons making their way into the park needed to travel along the turnpike road. Crossing Tyburn Road on the other hand lent additional hazards and disruptions to one's journey. This turnpike was the primary thoroughfare for driving livestock from the West Country to slaughter in Smithfield Market in the City.⁴² Anyone seeking relief from the city in the open fields to the north of the Grosvenor estate would have to encounter a scene not exactly in keeping with picturesque notions of Arcadian rural life!

The public aspects of these thoroughfares was the main reason for their notoriety. Since turnpike roads were part of the public domain, the estate owners of the adjacent properties had no direct or specific involvement in either their maintenance or policing. Inevitably, turnpike roads became unsightly and riddled with crime, due in part to the lack of cooperation between the city of Westminster and its host of individual estates.

The Avenue

I went towards Hyde Park, being told of a fine avenue [Grosvenor Street] made to the east of the park, fine gates [Grosvenor Gate] and a large vista...⁴³

The physical dimensions of a thoroughfare can assert its purpose. Often times, urban space is defined in terms of its means of physical communication via its streets, alleys, roads and avenues. An avenue, by definition, is a 'wide street or road; a way of

approach.⁴⁴ This definition provides for a space, neither restricted by materials nor social privilege, in which to move. Openness is expressed in both physical and social terms. Most streets and walks cannot be termed as an avenue, since they often limit movement and participation. The identification of key avenues in the metropolis and on the Grosvenor estate should demonstrate their functioning in gender relationships and the assertion of authoritative political space.

Andrea Palladio prescribed idealised forms of streets, in consideration of both their dimensions and decoration. The Renaissance master's preference was the 'strait' street, for both its aesthetic and functional qualities.

A strait street in a city affords a most agreeable view, when it is ample and clean; on each side of which there are magnificent fabricks, made with those ornaments, which have been mentioned in the foregoing books.⁴⁵

The straight street clearly asserts its purpose through a definite sense of direction. This urban device lends a sense of authority, by directing its consumers to a specific space. The straight street is hospitable, in terms of exposing its consumers to public view. The straight street contains no mysteries or surprises, and provides a perfect venue for acting out social roles, especially the eighteenth-century performance of 'being seen', which may have made certain avenues in the metropolis especially attractive to its feminine consumers.

Straight and broad streets were the prescription for many social and urban ills. The introduction to John Gwynn's proposal for confronting the urban sprawl of eighteenth-century London began with an imagined view of the city from a distant approach.

... an entrance into a large city, after a distant prospect. Remotely we see nothing but spires and temples, and turrets of palaces, and imagine it the residence of splendour, grandeur, and magnificence; but when we have passed through the gates, we find it perplexed with narrow passages, disgraced with despicable cottages, embarrassed with obstructions, and clouded with smoke. *Rambler*.⁴⁶

Gwynn took issue with the metropolis's 'narrow passages' to assert his criticism of London's lack of urban planning and the disappointing view the city impressed upon the visitor. Part of Gwynn's solution to the random sprawl of London's streets was in the creation of broad passageways and avenues, which were in short supply in the capitol city, due in part to the fiscal interests of the city's landowners. A dense population meant a

large margin of profit in the form of land rent. It is not surprising then that the largest avenues in the city were constructed on royal property, which since the Glorious Revolution were openly consumed by the public. One of the most important of these avenues in eighteenth-century London was The Mall. Extending from the façade of the 3rd Duke of Buckingham's home (built c.1703) to Whitehall in the east, The Mall was literally a dividing line between the royal spaces of the St James's Park and Palace, a public avenue sandwiched between privileged spaces.⁴⁷ (Illustration 42) The Mall was open admission for nearly all ranks of society, but was especially noted as a space dominated by fashionable society.

The grand walk they call the Mall is full of people every hour of the day, especially in the morning and evening, and their Majesties often walk in it with the Royal family, who are attended by only half a dozen Yeoman of the guard, and permit all persons without distinction of rank or character to there at the same time with them, for which reason the crowd is sometimes too great, and it forms one of the most diversified scenes imaginable. The ladies and gentlemen always appear in rich dresses, for the English, who twenty years ago did not wear gilt lace but in their army, are now embroidered and bedaubed as much as the French. I speak of persons of quality, for the citizen still contents himself with a suit of fine cloth, a good hat and wig, and fine linen.⁴⁸

This foreign traveller was struck not only by the diversity of the society congregating in The Mall, but also with the impression of the civil order present in this scene, due to the noticeable absence of a heavy guard for the royal family. The situation created a levelling of class differences, since anyone present essentially had open access to the royal family in this public arena. This traveller made an interesting distinction between 'persons of quality' and the 'citizen', which was based totally upon appearance. In this observation, it was the qualities, not quantity of fine materials that was deserving of his compliment, which reinforced the democratic qualities of this urban space, which continue into the present day. At times of royal pageantry, The Mall ceases to act as a public arena, although the avenue may switch between privileged and public space with amazing flexibility. This phenomena can be observed in traditional processions, in which The Mall serves as the primary avenue for the display of royal ceremony and authority. A striking example was the Queen Elizabeth II's Golden Jubilee procession, in which the Household Guard, standing at arm's length from one another along the entire length of The Mall, formed a human barrier between the public and royalty. Throughout the course of the day's celebrations, The Mall switched countless times between public and private spaces, as carriages and royals returned from the City and as the public moved across the avenue.

The termination of The Mall with the palace and Admiralty Arch physically reinforced the links between the Queen and the nation.

On the other hand, the fact that St James's Palace does not have a grand boulevard to direct you to its façade diminished its power metaphorically and spatially. This device in situating a palace at the end of a long avenue was used successfully in the royal palace of Versailles and the 'palaces' of the Whig landlords of the late seventeenth century, evident in country houses such as Chatsworth, Badminton, Stansted Park and Blenheim. The changes created at Hampton Court Palace for William and Mary echo the authoritative nature of the French palace, but its full authoritative impact could never be realised due to the rural setting. On the other hand, the urban setting of St James's Palace reinforced the diminished power of the monarchy. The Palace only asserted a minor amount of authority from its slightly elevated position. St James's Palace served as a backdrop, rather than the focal point of the social and court activities of The Mall. A tall, unbroken wall provided a moderate amount of privacy and security for the royal family, and physically separated the space of the court from public spaces. (Illustration 42) Instead, Buckingham House became the architectural backdrop for the public gatherings on The Mall. In a similar fashion, the townhouses of Grosvenor Square were the architectural scenery for the stage of the garden square. Later George III took advantage of the spatial dominance of Buckingham House and its radiating avenues, by purchasing it as a dower house for Queen Charlotte, and then designating it as the primary royal residence, an opportunity unavailable to his grandfathers.⁴⁹

In contrast, the only buildings on the Grosvenor estate which acted as focal points were religious in nature— St George's in Hanover Square and the Grosvenor Chapel. Grosvenor Street, and its extension through the Square and Upper Grosvenor Street, were aligned to the façade of St George's, although Maddox Street on Lord Scarbrough's estate angled off to the north to meet up with Hanover Square. Grosvenor Chapel was situated at the end of Chapel Street, which created a framed view. The only palatial detached home on the Grosvenor estate, Gloucester (later Grosvenor) House, had a restricted vista due to its perpendicular location in relation to Upper Grosvenor Street, thus reinforcing the ambiguous nature of the estate's streets in terms of privileged space. This home failed to act as an eye-catcher, thus asserting a sense of presence and power, reinforcing the democratic qualities of the Grosvenor estate.

Additionally, the diminished authority of St James's Palace was spatially emphasized by the fact that the residence was situated between two public avenues – The Mall and Pall Mall. Pall Mall was a long, broad public promenade, created by Charles II in 1660, forming a visual and ideological link between the site of his father's execution at Charing Cross and the primary urban royal palace of St James's.⁵⁰ Pall Mall also linked the royal space of Westminster with the government situated in Whitehall and the commercial aspects of the Strand. The entire length of Pall Mall was a highly politicised space with the inclusion of a number of coffee and chocolate houses. John Mackay described Pall Mall as:

the ordinary residence of all strangers, because of its vicinity to the King's Palace, the parks, and the Parliament House, the theatres, the chocolate and coffeehouses, where the very best Company frequent.⁵¹

The architectural commissions of George II, through the Royal Works, demonstrated an effort on the part of the monarch to clearly provide definition to the open spaces at the end of Pall Mall and The Mall. (Illustration 43) An early view from Whitehall reinforces the park-like setting created on the eastern end of these two streets prior to the construction of the Royal Mews at the end of Pall Mall and the Horse Guard on the eastern end of The Mall. The public were invited to use these spaces as many contemporary views will confirm. (Illustrations 44 and 45) However the broad, undefined spaces of the Royal Mews were known to attract a criminal element. Horace Walpole was robbed in broad daylight while crossing the exercise yard.⁵² On the other hand, the open yard of the Horse Guards, which created the 'Parade' adjacent to St James's Park, was the scene of social and courtly performances. The Horse Guard actually acted as a thoroughfare in itself, containing an open arcade on the ground storey which physically linked Whitehall with St James's Park.

In a similar fashion to urban changes to the St James's area, a major concern for the earliest development of the Grosvenor estate was the establishment of the grand east/west boulevards. Priorities in planning were placed on both the traffic flow and appearance of these arteries –Grosvenor, Upper Grosvenor, Brook and Upper Brook Streets. As noted previously, limitations were also placed on the size and types of buildings constructed on these avenues.⁵³ Provisions, such as these, were a demonstration of the early importance placed on these thoroughfares as avenues of display.

The north/south streets leading into Grosvenor Square were as generous in size as their east/west counterparts. However, these streets lacked fashionable housing. A factor which may have discouraged early large-scale domestic construction along North Audley Street and Duke Street to the north of Grosvenor Square was the fact that these streets essentially lead to the turnpike road and open fields, whereas Charles Street to the south of the Square was impeded by a cemetery. A walk along South Audley Street would not lead to any place of significance; there was a rather unfashionable mix of trades and lower class housing right up to the Square. However, the lower end of South Audley Street was populated with some ‘persons of Quality’ and the Grosvenor Chapel.⁵⁴ The creation of major east/west streets on the estate defined their intent of providing passage of persons from the parish church and activities of Hanover Square, through the open, decorative and courtly surroundings of Grosvenor Square to the leisured activities and privileged entry of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. The direction of these primary avenues on the Grosvenor estate assumed their usage as political and social stages.

The Society of the Street

Streets can act not only as the physical means of transporting a person from one arena to another, but can also act as the platform for social performance in its own right. In this instance, the relationship between the street and its consumer warrants an investigation. Recently, urban historians have looked for cultural information unearthed by tracing the movements of the pedestrian.⁵⁵ According to Michel de Certeau, the pedestrian creates space with his/her movements. Patterns in the street could be created not only by its physical characteristics, but also by the person who consumes them.

The long poem of walking manipulates spatial organizations, no matter how panoptic they may be: it is neither foreign to them (it can only take place within them) nor in conformity within them (it does not receive its identity from them). It creates shadows and ambiguities within them. It inserts its multitudinous references and citations into them (social models, cultural mores, personal factors). Within them it is itself the effect of successive encounters and occasions that constantly alter it and make it the other's blazon...⁵⁶

This passage reveals an approach to the movements of the pedestrian as a narrative, which revealed not only their relationship to the space, but also to the society encountered. This strategy will provide a manner of investigating the way in which eighteenth-century Londoners related to their physical and social world from street level, and illustrate how the city's streets in turn provided the vital platforms for social performance.

The importance of the metropolis's streets in the enactment of social roles was reinforced in contemporary guidebooks which encouraged spatial consumption. The following guidebook entry was keen to note the physical qualities of the city's streets and thoroughfares, which were made 'spacious' and 'pleasant' for their consumers.

The Streets here are rendered very commodious for Foot Passengers being paved a convenient Breadth on each Side with large smooth Stones, and barred with great Posts, at some distance from each other, to keep off Carts and Coaches: And the Squares are made spacious, pleasant, encompassed with beautiful Rows of Buildings, and several of them ornamented with a Statue, Obelisk, or Fountain, in the Middle.⁵⁷

The guidebook entry noted the streets of London were actually made for the pedestrian, prioritising the act of walking over all other modes of transportation. This idealised view of the busy city implies that all traffic would defer to the pedestrian, whereas in actuality only certain streets and thoroughfares would accommodate the 'Foot Passenger' in this manner. However, streets were not static containers of space. Streets can direct people to

specific places and people. The patterns of streets would in turn pattern the society which consumed them, including, polite, mean, male or female, open, restricted or politically engaged spaces.

Polite or Mean

Walks and streets can be characterised by their physical appearance, the people who use them or both. People and their use of the streets can define the nature of an urban space as its outward appearance can determine its consumers.⁵⁸ A dominant characteristic of eighteenth-century society was the concept of politeness.⁵⁹ Polite activities and persons appear to govern the urban scene. As the most public of urban platforms, streets created a fluid and ever-changing environment for social performance. This investigation has utilised contemporary sources to determine the polite and mean spaces of the city. Sometimes there was not a clear definition between the two, and the social qualities of the space could change drastically during the course of the day. The fashionable spaces of the city were mainly concentrated on the city's walks. 'Walks were part of the increasing provision of fashionable public space.'⁶⁰ The author of the following guidebook entry was quite concerned that his audience get a peak at how the better half of society lived, presented in a similar fashion to a Hollywood tour of stars' homes, and was even specific to the appropriate time to 'see' the beautiful people on The Mall.

In this Walk the Company is very often numerous and brilliant on a Summer's Evening, when the *Beau-monde* resort hither, to enjoy the cool Air and Conversation of the Place. The Hours of walking here, for the People of Distinction, are generally from Eight in the Evening till Ten in the Summer Time and from Eleven of Twelve, till Three in the Afternoon in the Winter, if the Weather is fine.⁶¹

The specificity of this description with regards to season and time demonstrates its cultural significance as the location for the city's beautiful people. The author Peter Borsay interpreted these walks as battlefields in the war to achieve social prominence. 'The instruments of battle, the means used by individuals to acquire status on the walks were twofold; aspects of behaviour ... and various types of accoutrements...'⁶² In respects to the diversity of persons living on the Grosvenor estate, this interpretation appears to exaggerate the relationships between the classes.

As previously noted, The Mall was the location for fashionable society and an extension of the Strand, the metropolis's major retail street. These two streets were in a sense the

physical extension between the City and the West End. At the point of intersection of The Mall and The Strand, in front of Charing Cross and adjacent to the statue of Charles I, was the site of public whippings and a pillory.⁶³ This site was a fantastic mixture of fashionable shops, the dominating presence of Northumberland House and a significant site of national history. (Illustration 46) This intersection of two significant thoroughfares provided a huge social stage for the display of notions of nationalism, limitations of royal power, justice and retribution for crime, pride in commerce and consumerism, and arena for the display of rank and social standing. The notorious after dark activities around Charing Cross were captured by Hogarth's depiction of *Night*, and a prime example of the manner in which the artist utilized actual spaces to interject authenticity into his criticism of eighteenth-century society. (Illustration 11) It is significant that the artist chose this setting as the epitome of the all the social ills inherent in a public space, and an irony that its location was adjacent to the 'polite' avenues of St James's, and strongly contrasts with the contemporary view by Canaletto.

Increasingly in the eighteenth century, streets and walks were purposely built for the enjoyment of the pedestrian. The following description of Kensington Gardens notes the manner in which its walks were created and for what purpose. This description praised Queen Caroline's work in the gardens of which she was personally responsible their construction and the design of the Serpentine.⁶⁴

There is a number of well laid out and delightful Walks and spreading Lawns to range about, with Seats at proper distances. And to rove sheltered in Safety from the fiery Rage of a Mid-day Summer Sun, there are, imperious to his Rays, several winding Paths under the friendly and intervening Covert of the Wood, where associating leafy Boughs form an impenetrable Shield. Here also at proper Distances are placed Seats for reposing...⁶⁵

Throughout the city, public parks became venues for social performance, providing a balance of man-made and natural elements. The only dangers were environmental posed by the sun and the scale of the gardens, however protection could be found with trees. As noted earlier, Andrea Palladio's *Four Books of Architecture* was a popular and influential source for architectural design, but may have also provided city planners and urban designers with guidelines for a city's infrastructure. In part due to his exposure to the Mediterranean sun, Palladio considered trees as both functional and aesthetic attributes of streets.

As in cities beauty is added to the streets by fine fabricks: so without, they are adorned with trees; which being planted on each side of them, by their verdure, enliven our minds.⁶⁶

Palladio points to the important of the physical materials of the environment and provides an alternative to the environment already built, which could be enhanced and improved with the addition of green spaces. Contemporary views of the Grosvenor estate indicate a lack of trees either along the streets or within the garden square. (Illustrations 22 and 37) Perhaps, as Palladio had suggested, the beauty of the place was created by the ‘fine fabricks’ used in the construction of the estate’s townhouses.

Open or Restricted

As previously noted, streets can be either open or restricted through physical means such as barriers, such as gates and bollards. However, these boundaries can also be implied through restrictions imposed by social class, gender or political affiliation. Bowles’s view of Grosvenor Square indicated that the street and the pavement were separated by bollards. As a result, the pavement was restricted to pedestrians, but the street was open.

(Illustration 37) The provisions established by Richard Grosvenor, whereby only residential housing was constructed on the Square and its principal streets, formalised and restricted the functions of these streets and the open paved spaces of the Square.

Contemporary views confirm the pedestrian usage of these spaces, and their commodious nature, which present an ideal concept of an agreeable relationship between those on foot and those in carriages and sedan chairs. As a unique urban form of transport in the eighteenth century, the sedan chair provided efficient and sheltered mobility through the city streets. As indicated in Lady Strafford’s household inventory, the sedan chair was a mundane household item which could express wealth and influence. (Table 6) The interior of her sedan chair was fitted with velvet coverings.⁶⁷ The exteriors of these urban conveyors were often gilded and ornamented with coronets and heraldry. The compact nature of the sedan chair made it a more convenient and safe transport through the city, however chairmen were noted for their assertive nature.

Let not the chairmen with assuming stride,
Press near the wall, and rudely thrust thy side:
The laws have set him bounds; his servile feet
Should ne’er encroach where posts defend the street.
Yet who the footman’s arrogance can quell,
Whose flambeau gilds the sashes of Pell-mell,
When in long rank a train of torches flame
To light the midnight visits of the dame?⁶⁸

The laws that governed where people could and could not go were quite explicit, however as indicated by this passage from John Gay's *Trivia*, exceptions could be made for the feminine traveller or a person of rank. Laws were also enacted which changed traffic patterns and restricted movement through specific spaces and along certain thoroughfares. As noted in Hugh Phillips's *Mid-Georgian London*, the carriageway to the north of The Mall, was reserved for the king and his friends. As a result of a difference in political ideology, three of the entrances to Marlborough House were blocked. Certainly, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough held a privileged location, using her influence with Queen Anne to obtain land adjacent to the royal palace of St James's for the construction of her townhouse. This direct and immediate spatial access to the monarch was diminished with the ascent of the Hanoverians and the rise of their first minister, Sir Robert Walpole. Phillips deduced that Sir Robert Walpole was seeking revenge against the Duchess of Marlborough for her ill treatment of the architect of Blenheim, Sir John Vanbrugh, subsequently creating legislation to impose restrictions on this thoroughfare.⁶⁹ After Walpole's fall, the Duchess was granted free passage through the park. This episode provides a prime example in which right of way and movement can be prevented by political alliances.

On the Grosvenor estate, right of movement was actually enhanced by political affinity. As early as 1724, King George I signed a royal warrant permitting a gate to be built at Hyde Park for the 'convenience and accommodation of the Inhabitants of Grosvenor Square'.⁷⁰ Sir Richard Grosvenor was financially responsible for constructing and maintaining the gate into the royal park and the residents of the estate were responsible for the lodge and its gatekeeper. In 1745, Viscount Weymouth, Keeper of Hyde Park and resident of the Grosvenor estate, appointed a new gatekeeper for the Grosvenor Gate:

Know ye that I, the said Thomas Visco. Weymouth, reposing special trust and Confidence in the Fidelity and Diligence of Thomas Turner ... do nominate constitute and appoint him the said Thomas Turner, to be the Keeper of that Gate into the said park, which opens toward Grosvenor Square ...⁷¹

Viscount Weymouth asserted his spatial authority as a resident of the Grosvenor estate, in addition to the fulfilment of his political duty as Keeper of this royal park. In the case of 'Grosvenor Gate,' the privileged use of a privileged space was exclusively available to residents of the Grosvenor and Hanover Square estates. The royal warrant signed by George I, clearly stated this privilege and honour.

Whereas we are given to understand that a large road has been lately made directly from the Square called Hanover Square by the Mount called Olivers Mount to the wall of Hyde park and that it would be greatly for the convenience and Accommodation of the Inhabitants of the said Square and all other new Buildings adjacent in case a gateway or passage was permitted to be made from the said road into our park called Hyde park.

The language used in this legal document obviously rewards the residents of the two major Hanoverian urban developments of Hanover and Grosvenor Squares for their loyalty. The King repaid the honour granted him with the dedication of these developments with entrance to the privileged confines of the royal park. This document shows the break down of barriers between royal family and his subjects. The open access to the park may have provided a more open access to the royals themselves thereby creating a stage for the residents of the Grosvenor estate to enact their political roles.

Performance and the Street

The Street as Theatre

How many times have the city, its architecture, and the theatre been intertwined, for the theatre is often a foil for the representations of public life, and public space frequently is arranged, as if for a theatrical performance.⁷²

In her *City of Collective Memory*, Christine Boyer explored the shared qualities of eighteenth-century ‘public’ life and the theatre. People would consume these spaces as a means of projecting their identity, or even as a means of reinventing themselves. Boyer noted that until the end of the eighteenth century, these public performances took place in spaces that were designed as places of honour for king or aristocracy.⁷³ The author’s approach utilized contemporaries’ perception of their urban environment as a method of identifying both the public and the public sphere. Boyer noted the similar characteristics between the city and theatre, which she imagined as ‘...places of representation, assemblage and exchange between actors and spectators, between the drama and the stage set.’⁷⁴ Contemporary descriptions of public spaces in eighteenth-century London often communicated their purpose of this performance by indicating the people and activities that would take place.

I enter a long and spacious walk they call the Mall. It is now mid-day and I find it thronged with the *beau monde* of both sexes, who pass hastily along. The ladies here wear a kind of *neglige*, in which they appear still more charming than in their most laboured dress. Every part of their apparel is extremely neat; instead of a large hoop they have short petticoats, and their gowns are elegant but not gaudy, they have short cloaks trimmed with lace and little hats of either straw or beaver, or else feathers in their hair, which gives them a lively air. It is in this walk that we always meet some of our friends, and here we see the ministers, the courtiers, the *petit maîtres*, and the coquettes; here we learn the news of the day, and make our parties until it is time to dress for the Court or for dinner.⁷⁵

The Mall has been transformed from a meagre thoroughfare into a large-scale stage with a multitude of performances taking place in its midst. A striking attribute of these descriptions was the constant referral to the apparel and appearance of the ‘actors’. As in theatre, the urban dweller could assume a new personality and identity on the stage of the street, and their physical appearance could be a signifier of the social roles performed as an impostor or otherwise. John Gay warned the urban visitor of the disguise a ‘whore’ could assume, in this case, as that of a pious woman.

With empty bandbox she delights to range,
And feigns a errand from the Change;
Nay, she will oft the Quaker's hood profane,
And trudge demure the rounds of Drury-lane.
She darts from sarsnet ambush wily leers,
Twitches thy sleeve, or with familiar airs
Her fan will pat thy cheek; these snares disdain,
Nor gaze behind thee, when she turns again.⁷⁶

The prostitute was empowered by her disguise and her performance. Her gaze can capture the passer-by, in a reversal of fortune. The conventional understanding of the controlling male gaze over the passive female is refuted in this episode.⁷⁷ The voyeur himself can be victimised by his gaze, so that the power lies in the observed, rather than the observer. Far too often the characterization of women and the street is that of a prostitute. The term 'street walker' implies a power and control of the space. In Steve Pile's analysis of the urban figures of the prostitute and the *flâneur*, the author concluded that their respective use of the street varied, but that both figures were essentially 'out of place'.⁷⁸ 'Neither figure is fully private nor fully public, their identities are played out *in situ*: the social masquerade of the streets.'⁷⁹ It must be noted that these women were in control of many public urban spaces, in particular Vauxhall Gardens and certain streets at night.⁸⁰ The nocturnal activities of the prostitute highlighted the flexible qualities of the city's streets for social performance, which were both mean and polite dependant on the time of day.

Contemporary evidence points to the fact that the female pedestrians were regular features of the urban scene.⁸¹ Public spaces, and in particular, walks and streets were specifically created for this activity. The confines of Green Park were improved in the first half of the eighteenth century as part of the efforts of the royal family to expand public green spaces in the city.

The Agreeableness of this Park occasions it to be much frequented by Gentlemen and Ladies, who here, either on Horseback, or in their Coaches, ride for the Benefit of the Air; and indeed, the neighbourhood of the Gardens, the Canals, its Situation, and the natural Beauty of the Whole, is a very great Advantage to this polite End of Town.⁸²

Increasingly, the West End was marketed as the 'polite' end of the city, which was due in part to its affluent residents, as well as the variety and quantity of public spaces located west of Charing Cross Road. One of the major contributors to the improvement of public spaces in and adjacent to the royal palaces was Queen Caroline, who was responsible for the creation of walks in both Green Park and Kensington Gardens. The Queen's Walk in

Green Park became as thoroughfare which linked together all three of the royal parks. St James's Park and The Mall to the south-east and Hyde Park to the north-west. It may be possible that residents of the Grosvenor estate utilised this walk as a means of reaching St James's in a pleasant and attractive manner.

Her late Majesty Queen Caroline caused other Walks be made here, and a little before her Death, erected an elegant Library, to which she would retire when she took the Diversion of walking, an exercise she much used. The Queen's new Walk passes from St James's Park, by the back of the Houses in Arlington-street, (than there cannot be a finer Situation for Health, Convenience or Beauty) to the Upper End of the Park, where a fine Reservoir of Water, surrounded with Trees, &c for the service of the Chelsea Company; and from hence the Walk leads through the Wilderness that is in this Park, to the Gate next to the West Country Road.⁸³

The direction of the Queen's Walk signifies the importance both the natural and built surroundings were for the urbanite. The most direct route across Green Park would have been in a diagonal direction, but this walk was planned to frame specific views for the pedestrian which included the large townhouses on Arlington Street and the reservoir for the water works. (Illustrations 47 and 48) Through the creation of these walks, Caroline could assert her own identity and ingratiate herself to her subjects. From the time of her arrival in England as Princess of Wales in the late 1710s, Caroline was thrust into public view with daily appearances in public spaces from The Mall and the Opera, to public dining while in residence at Hampton Court Palace. The commission of walks and thoroughfares by Caroline can be seen as a way in which this powerful woman was creating more complementary and agreeable spaces for these encounters which continued on a regular basis throughout her reign. The creation of these public spaces provided a venue upon which both the Queen and her subjects, and in particular the women, could act out their political aspirations through encounter and exchange.

Democratising the Street

As mentioned previously, throughout the course of the eighteenth century, there were attempts by politicians and moralists alike to improve the situation of the city's streets. John Gwynn's proposal suggested a plan which would provide an urban environment with a combination of the rich and working class, living next to one another and mutually benefiting from this arrangement.

In setting a plan of large streets for the dwellings of the rich, it will be found necessary to allot smaller spaces contiguous for the habitations of useful and laborious people, whose dependence on their superiors requires such distributions; by adhering to this principle a political advantage will result the nation; as their intercourse stimulates their industry, improves their morals by example, and prevents any particular part from being the habitation of the indigent alone, to the great detriment of private property.⁸⁴

Gwynn's solution to the distribution of streets echoes the constructed scene on the Grosvenor estate. The primary streets of the estate, which contained the larger dwellings, were complemented with secondary streets, such as Mount and Chapel, containing smaller, yet modern homes for merchants and working class persons.⁸⁵ In the manner of its street layout and distribution, the Grosvenor estate established a plan of streets which anticipated Gwynn's proposal for a prosperous and moral community.

On the whole, the Grosvenor estate had established a system of streets, alleys and passages which became the model for future urban developments. The direction, dimensions, and materials were fundamental to the street's functioning. The broad, east/west avenues on the estate were paved Portland stone, setting a standard for latter developments, and designating their function as 'polite' spaces for social performance, which included walking and being seen. These physical characteristics would also determine who would use the streets, and appears that nearly anyone could if they dared. The number of 'private' thoroughfares in the city were minuscule and generally related to royal power, with most streets and walks acting as public venues.⁸⁶ The Grosvenor estate had facilitated contemporary legislation for street improvement with the implementation of sewers and lighting and its design and layout became the ideal for the Georgian city. These characteristics all helped to establish the streets on the Grosvenor estate as important public platforms for a variety of social performances. In addition, the orderly pattern of generous and well-fashioned streets acted as the physical and social link between the city, garden square and the townhouse.

¹ Steve Pile, *The Body and the City* (Routledge, 1996) p.245.

² Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), p.61.

³ Vere Birdwood, ed., *So Dearly Belov'd, So Much Admired* (HMSO, 1994), p.85. Lady Jane Cathcart to Hester Grenville, 20 June 1752.

⁴ Isaac Ware, *The Four Books of Andrea Palladio's Architecture*, (1738), Book 3, Chapter 2, p.59.

⁵ Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance*, p.61-79.

⁶ Dan Cruickshank and Neil Burton, *Life in the Georgian City* (Viking, 1990), pp.6-13. For an exploration of the streets of Regency London, see Dana Arnold, 'Rationality, Safety and Power: The street planning of later Georgian London', *The Georgian Group Journal* (1995) 37-50.

⁷ For information on prostitutes' use of urban spaces, see Randolph Trumbach, 'Sex, gender and sexual identity in modern culture: male sodomy and female prostitution in Enlightenment England in John C Fout, ed, *Forbidden History: The state, society and the regulation of sexuality in early modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

⁸ For other discussions of gender and the public/private issue, see Vivien Jones, ed, *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Lawrence Klein, 'Gender and the Public/Private Distinction', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 29, no 1 (1995), 97-109; Phillip Carter, 'Men about Town; representations of foppery and masculinity in early eighteenth-century urban society,' in *Gender in the Eighteenth Century: Roles, representations and responsibilities*, ed by Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (Longman, 1997).

⁹ Michel De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, (Berkeley, CA, 1986), p.97.

¹⁰ The streets as built on the Grosvenor estate, have not changed significantly since their original construction and most follow Barlow's plan with consistency.

¹¹ Survey, xxxix, pp.16-7.

¹² Miles Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity* (New York: Guilford Press, 1990), pp.73-115.

¹³ Ogborn, pp.111-112.

¹⁴ *A Brief Description of the Cities of London and Westminster* (1776), p. xxiv. See Ogborn, p.111.

¹⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Routledge, 1989), p.474.

¹⁶ Peter Borsay, 'The Rise of the Promenade: The Social and Cultural Use of Space in the English Provincial Town, c1660-1800,' *The British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 9 (1986), 125-40, p.130.

¹⁷ De Certeau, p.99.

¹⁸ Beat Louis de Muralt, *Letters describing the Character and Customs of the English and French Nations. With a curious essay on travelling*, 2nd ed. (1726), p.35.

¹⁹ De Certeau, p.100.

²⁰ De Certeau, p.100; and Silvana Tomaselli, 'The Enlightenment Debate on Women', *History Workshop*, 20, (1985), pp.105, 120-2, utilizes William Alexander's *The History of Women*, (1782) to demonstrate the eighteenth century belief that through their conveyance of politeness and manners, women were civilising creatures.

²¹ For a thorough discussion of the physical characteristics of London's streets, see Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity*, pp. 91-104 and Liza Picard, *Dr Johnson's London* (Phoenix Press, 2000), pp. 9-10; for the conditions of provincial streets, see Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance*, pp. 61-74.

²² For a look at the plans and improvements for streets in the early nineteenth century, see Dana Arnold, 'Rationality, Safety and Power'.

²³ John Spranger, *A Proposal or Plan for an Act of Parliament for the Better Paving, Cleansing and Lighting of the City and Liberty of Westminster* (1754). See Ogborn, pp. 93-98.

²⁴ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, ed by Furbank, Owens and Coulson (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), p.133.

²⁵ Elizabeth McKellar, *The Birth of Modern London* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1999), p. 205.

²⁶ Richard Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye* (Boston, MA: Faber and Faber, 1990), p.52.

²⁷ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, pp. 55-60.

²⁸ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.64.

²⁹ Sennett, *The Conscience of the Eye*, p.68.

³⁰ De Certeau, p.103.

³¹ De Certeau, p.103.

³² Survey, xxxix, p.85.

³³ WYAS Vyner MSS, VR 302/5.

³⁴ David Olsen, *Town Planning in London* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), p.5.

³⁵ John Stow, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, 2nd ed, 6 vols. (1754), ii, p.668.

³⁶ *The Daily Journal*, July 12, 1725. See Arthur I. Dasent, *The History of Grosvenor Square* (Macmillan, 1935), p.18.

³⁷ Survey, xxxix, p.13.

³⁸ John Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved, Illustrated by Plans* (1766), p.x.

³⁹ Gwynn, p.x.

⁴⁰ Survey, xxxix, p.13.

⁴¹ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/22.

⁴² Picard, *Dr Johnson's London*, p.16.

⁴³ Applebee's *Journal* (1725). See Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.252.

⁴⁴ *Oxford Dictionary*.

⁴⁵ Isaac Ware, *The Four Books of Andrea Palladio's Architecture* (1738), Book 3, Chapter 1, p.58.

⁴⁶ Gwynn, title page.

⁴⁷ Parts of St James's Park were restricted to the entry of royal and officers of the park, such as the wooded area to the south of the Mall known as Duck Island, and the entire length of the Birdcage Walk. See Hugh Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London* (Collins, 1964), p.45.

⁴⁸ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.45.

⁴⁹ The land on which Buckingham House and its gardens stood was a combination of freehold and leasehold land granted originally by Charles II to his second illegitimate son by Barbara Villiers, the Duke of Grafton. See Brian Masters, *The Dukes: The Origins, Ennoblement and History of Twenty-six Families* (Pimlico, 2001), pp. 71-88. This land was purchased by John Sheffield, 3rd Duke of Buckingham in 1760s, but due to discrepancies of ownership, Sheffield's heir decided to offer the property to the Crown after the expiration of the 99-year lease. See Howard Colvin, *The History of the King's Works* (HMSO, 1976), vol v, p.134.

⁵⁰ Prior to the construction of Admiralty Arch at the end of The Mall, Pall Mall progressed east to the site known as Charing Cross and currently is marked by the equestrian statue of Charles I.

⁵¹ John Mackay, 1722. See Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.58.

⁵² November 30, 1749; see Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.99.

⁵³ Survey, xxxix, pp.14-16.

⁵⁴ Two of the first time residents along South Audley Street were estranged wives of noblemen: Mrs Catherine Sloper, at No 10 from 1739-99, and Barbara Cavendish, at No 15 from 1738-50.

⁵⁵ De Certeau's *The Practice of Everyday Life* and Pile's *The Body and the City* were used for this investigation

⁵⁶ De Certeau, p.101.

⁵⁷ *London in Miniature*, p.6.

⁵⁸ Bill Hillier and Julianne Hanson, *The Social Logic of Space* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 27.

⁵⁹ For authors which look to define the cultural concept of polite society see John Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination* (Harper Collins, 1997), Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), Chapter 3; Frank O'Gorman, *The Long Eighteenth-Century* (Arnold, 1997), pp. 96-118; Lawrence Klein, 'Berkeley, Shaftesbury and the Meaning of Politeness,' *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 16 (1986), 57-68.

⁶⁰ Borsay, 'The Rise of the Promenade,' p.130.

⁶¹ *London in Miniature*, p.180.

⁶² Borsay, 'The Rise of the Promenade,' p.131.

⁶³ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.105

⁶⁴ Colvin, *History of the King's Works*, pp. 203, 221, 224, 457; and Williamson, pp. 61-65.

⁶⁵ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p19.

⁶⁶ Ware, *The Four Books of Andrea Palladio's Architecture*, Book 3, Chapter 1, p.59.

⁶⁷ PRO PROB 3/32/71.

⁶⁸ John Gay, *Trivia, or the art of walking the streets of London* (1716), Book III, ll. 153-160.

⁶⁹ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.45.

⁷⁰ GER WA 1049/10/Box4/22.

⁷¹ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/21.

⁷² Christine Boyer, *The City of Collective Memory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994), p.74.

⁷³ Boyer, p.7.

⁷⁴ Boyer, p.74.

⁷⁵ Phillips, *Mid-Georgian London*, p.45.

⁷⁶ Gay, *Trivia*, Book III, ll.277-284.

⁷⁷ Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity*, pp. 148-50: Griselda Pollock, *Vision and Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1988), p.87; Jane Rendell, *The Pursuit of Pleasure* (Athlone Press, 2002) p.118.

⁷⁸ Pile, *The Body and the City*, p.235.

⁷⁹ Pile, p.235.

⁸⁰ For a discussion of prostitutes and London's streets in the Regency period, see Rendall, *The Pursuit of Pleasure*, pp.132-7.

⁸¹ de Muralt, *Letters Describing the Customs and Characters.....*, p.35.

⁸² *London in Miniature*, pp.195-6.

⁸³ *London in Miniature*, pp.194-5.

⁸⁴ Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved*, p. xviii.

⁸⁵ WA Grosvenor Lease Books, 45 vols, 1721-1835.

⁸⁶ It should be noted that the King's Road actually dissected the Grosvenor estate, and was treated as a public thoroughfare.

Chapter V

The Townhouse

The Role of the Townhouse

As noted previously, the coverage of the history of domestic architecture has been slight in comparison with studies of civic architecture. The primary type of domestic architecture popularly under investigation in Britain has been the country house, whereas its urban cousin, the townhouse is rarely even acknowledged.¹ One of the main reasons that the townhouse may lie outside the architectural history canons is that in most cases an architect cannot be identified in its construction and design. Architectural historians can often take the approach that architects assumed that the urban domestic architectural consumer ‘would settle for the common look of community and produce buildings in this accepted local way.’² The townhouse is ‘common’, thereby discrediting any further investigation into either its aesthetic qualities or social functions. Even the *Survey of London*, the most comprehensive study of the individual buildings on the Grosvenor estate, focuses its discussion of the earliest homes on authorship and stylistic considerations.³ The ambulatory approach utilized in Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Buildings of England* series provides objective information concerning an individual building’s date of construction, architect, if known, and original features.⁴ Pevsner’s epic work brought to the attention of government and individuals alike the need for preservation of architecture and urban spaces. In a similar vein, Dan Cruickshank and Peter Wyld’s study of London’s domestic architecture focused on the materials and format of exterior and interior features with ‘new and painstakingly measured drawings’ in an attempt to elevate the role of architecture in order to ‘lend a sense of continuity and grace to the increasingly ravaged wastes of Britain’s cities.’⁵ This work attempts to extent the knowledge domestic housing in London to insure the preservation of its many and varied histories, not only in the manner in which its form and spatial organization functioned and was consumed, but also as a platform for social performance.

An Appendage to the Country House?

It has been previously noted that the conventional understanding of the occupation of the metropolis as vacant after the London ‘season,’ in which most persons retreated to their pastoral environs of the country house needs to be challenged. Due to this perspective,

architectural historians have constructed an inflated significance of the country house in day-to-day eighteenth-century life, which has done much to diminish the role played by its urban counterpart.⁶ Eighteenth-century perceptions of rural living as clean, healthy, and safe, were often times asymmetrically opposed to impressions of life in the city, as dirty, disease-ridden, and crime filled. In reality, many persons had the option of choosing either the country or the city, thus making a conscious choice between their townhouse and country house. Other elements of the population, such as single women and the wealthy merchant class had no other housing option excepting their townhouse. In both capacities, the townhouse played as vital a role in the construction of political and social dimensions of daily life as the country house.

The role of single women and the merchant class had in the use and consumption of the metropolis has been largely ignored. Specifically with regards to the home, historians have noted that the townhouse was often sub-let during the ‘season.’⁷ This analysis eludes the fact that for many the townhouse was their primary place of residence, and for dowagers and wealthy merchants the financial need to sublet was negligible. For all urbanites, there would certainly exist a desire to remain in the city when its society was at its most populous and diverse. There is evidence that many widows sub-let portions of their homes to travellers and contract workers. In the 1720s, Benjamin Franklin, the later American statesman, rented a room from a widow in Duke Street on the Grosvenor estate. Franklin was considered an exemplary tenant, thus he received a reduction in his rent.⁸ In this manner, the townhouse fulfilled a two-fold function, as a source of necessary income for the widow and comfortable, affordable housing for the working single man.

For other urbanites, their townhouse was only one of their many residences, performing varied roles and functions as the host space for public activities. A nobleman could have as many as five or more homes, including two or more country estates, a London townhouse, a suburban villa along the Thames, and perhaps a home in the fashionable resort cities of Brighton, Bath or York. Dividing time between the homes was determined by court and political responsibilities as well as family needs and social contacts. With the duration of the London ‘season’ extending six months from New Year’s to June, even the nobleman/woman was spending the majority of their time in the London townhouse.⁹ With numerous properties at ready disposal, a nobleman/woman could afford to sub-let one or more of their homes. In 1763, the Earl of Hertford had an inventory of possessions and a schedule of fixtures of his home at No 16 Grosvenor Street drawn up before letting the house to the Duke of Portland.¹⁰ (Table 9) An analysis of items left behind for the

rental of this home indicates a marking of territory and signalling of ownership. The inclusion of household objects such as family portraits and objects embellished with family heraldry, were constant reminders that the tenants should never forget to whom the home belonged, even if their rank was higher.

... it is also mutually agreed that the said Duke of Portland shall quit the said premises in less time than three years if the Earl of Hertford or Lady Hertford shall give six months notice to occupie the said premises.¹¹

Thus the letting of an urban townhouse could signify a political or court favour. In addition, this document implies that Lady Hertford shared in the ownership of the house, signalling her power in the household, an aspect which highlights the role of the townhouse in the life of a married couple.

As evidenced in previous chapters, London and in particular Grosvenor Square were constructed of public spaces for the performance of vital social roles. The microcosm of this space was the townhouse. Although the townhouse consisted of private and intimate spaces for the urban dweller, it also had a vital role in the public sphere. Often times the townhouse was the backdrop for the social activities in the metropolis, including political meetings, marriage settlements, the levée, drawing room gatherings, assemblies, balls, gaming and other various forms of entertainment. The functional needs of the house did not always meet with the designer's concept of organizing space, as indicated in the following passage by Isaac Ware.

Our forefathers were pleased with seeing their friends as they chanced to come, with entertaining them when they were there. The present custom is to see all at once, and entertaining none of them; this brings in the necessity of a great room ... this is the reigning taste in London, a taste which tends to the discouragement of all good and regular architecture.

According to Ware, the changes apparent in the social life of the city provided a dilemma in the quest for artistic expression. However, this passage does highlight the significance of maintaining a London home. The three dominating factors for requiring a home in London, even on a short term basis, were for attendance of the social season, Parliamentary sessions and court activities, including weekly 'drawing room' parties at St James's Palace. This investigation has involved analysing the demographics of the residents of the Grosvenor estate according to these factors. A home in the city appears to be a primary need of those newly married as evidenced by the number of newlyweds

residing in Grosvenor Square. (Table 15) The metropolis was the primary arena for publicly pronouncing newly formed family alliances. Newlyweds would flock to London for its social activities and for formal presentation at court. One of the most talked about marriages of the first half of the eighteenth century was that of John, 1st Earl Spencer, and grandson of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, who secretly married his childhood sweetheart, Georgiana Poyntz, in December of 1755. This union of two dynasties provided much excitement in court circles that London season.

Nothing is the Subject of Discourse but Mr Spencers generosity and her Finery, the day they were presented [at St James's Palace] the Drawing room was more crowded than ever I saw it on any occasion and so pretty a Couple I hardly ever beheld, his Coat was white and silver velvet, the Waistcote and Sleeves, silver Stuff trim'd with very Rich Silver... and the finest pair of Diamond Buckles in his shoes...her gown was white and Silver Stuff, on her head she had a Cap intirely made of Diamonds...¹²

This passage specifies the important role the space of the royal palace, specifically the drawing room, upheld in this pageant of union and material display. The townhouse, as well, established public space within the home for large entertainments, which varied from courtly acceptance as exhibited in the weekly royal 'drawing room' sessions, parties for political deals and bargaining, and smaller gatherings of families and friends for meals, games and at times, sexual intrigue.

Luxury or Necessity

... because of all the parts of architecture there is none so necessary to mankind, nor that is oftener used than this, I shall therefore first treat private houses...¹³

Isaac Ware began his translation of Palladio's *Four Books of Architecture* with the master's primary issues with domestic architecture. His concerns were based upon need and the frequency of use. On the other hand, architectural historians have rarely seen the primacy of the 'ordinary' townhouse. Public buildings and country houses dominate the pages of architectural surveys. Those times when the townhouse was taken into consideration, the 'insulated mansion' gets more attention than the terrace house.¹⁴ The commonality of the terrace town house may be one reason for its neglect. The massive quantity and variety of terrace housing which existed in eighteenth-century London poses a daunting task for any type of analysis. The nearly 300 homes on the Grosvenor estate, which were taken into consideration for this investigation, vary in size, shape, style and

decoration, and spatial organization. However, all fulfilled the same function; these terrace houses were first and foremost, homes, which helped to shape and define the spaces for the performance of gender, class and political roles.

For many persons, the London townhouse was their only residence.¹⁵ For others, it could be the primary residence, spending far more time in the townhouse than the county seat.¹⁶ So for some, the townhouse was a need, others a luxury, and for many, both. An element of the populace in which the townhouse was often times a necessity was the single woman, which on the Grosvenor estate were predominantly widows, but also included unmarried daughters of peers, estranged wives and royal mistresses. On the south side of the Square, the Duchess of Kendal resided after the death of her long time liaison, George the First. From her drawing room windows, the Duchess would have been able to appreciate the golden equestrian effigy of the former monarch gracing the centre of the Square's garden. With the entry of Frederick, Prince of Wales into London society in the 1720s, the Prince interacted with the native female populace, taking on mistresses, an assumed monarchical role. Over the course of its history, the Grosvenor estate played host to several of Frederick's mistresses and confidantes, thus providing a feminine role in the politics of the Opposition.¹⁷ In 1734, agents for Frederick, Prince of Wales purchased Number 50 Grosvenor Square for his mistress, Lady Anne Vane.¹⁸ After the Prince tired of Miss Vane's company and took another companion, the house and its contents were settled upon her and their illegitimate son.

Unlike the social mobility of royal mistresses, the manner in which women acquired their townhouses was determined by their social standing. Widows of peers were more likely to acquire the Grosvenor Square residence on the death of their husband.¹⁹ (Tables 11 and 16) Enlightenment concepts of female roles relaxed the long-standing notions of primogeniture and insured – at least for wealthy women – property ownership throughout their lifetime.²⁰ Lucy, Dowager Duchess of Rutland owned land in the metropolis, including properties on Brewer, Sherard and Marylebone Streets and the home in Grosvenor Square.²¹ Women of financial means, dowagers, were generally ensured a portion of their jointure upon marriage, which would secure a dower house if their husband preceded them in death. In 1727, as George II ascended to the throne, he settled Richmond Lodge on Queen Caroline as her dower house, in which the Queen carried out improvements at her own expense.²² In addition, many women had the financial resources to purchase their homes and businesses, and two of the public houses on the estate were owned and operated by women.²³ Occasionally a Mayfair property would

pass from a mother to a daughter. (Table 16) In 1740, Grace, Dowager Countess of Dysart bequeathed her home on Grosvenor Street to her eldest daughter Catherine, the Dowager Marchioness of Carnarvon.²⁴

...to daughter Lady Catherine Marchioness of Carnarvon Widow of John Marquess of Carnarvon deceased 'house situate on the south side of Grosvenor Street in the parish of Saint George' together with all my goods, furniture and household stuffs²⁵

In fact, widows appear to be a dominant urban feature in the early eighteenth century.²⁶ Horace Walpole remarked in the summer of 1733 that his only companions for an evening's entertainment were 'abandoned women of quality'.²⁷ With the lack of single men and the abundance of both married and single females, this evidence leads to the conclusion that for much of the year, the majority of residents on the Grosvenor estate were women.

Another group of persons for which the townhouse was oftentimes their primary residence were the later sons of peers, who took careers generally in military service of the clergy.²⁸ Their income would not permit large expenditures on a home and their careers made them the most mobile of all of London inhabitants, at least until their retirement from active service. The construction of a modest home on the Burlington estate for a retired military man, captured the attention of architects, critics and casual observers alike. Most of the comments on General Wade's house were complimentary and demonstrate contemporary taste in 'modern' urban architecture.

... though small, and little taken Notice of, is one of the Best Things among the new Buildings; The General Design, or Plan, is entirely chaste and simple...²⁹

General Wade's home went beyond the conventional townhouse form and this guidebook expressed the keen interest in its existence. The author's use of the descriptions of 'chaste and simple' for this home reveals its role not as a site for display and pageantry, but as a tasteful solution of a basic need.

By contrast, the homes on the Grosvenor estate were noted for their physical presence. These homes were generous in comparison to the more domestic scale utilised by speculative builders elsewhere in the city.³⁰ An example of the magnitude of a Grosvenor Square home can be illustrated by Lady Anne Vane's home, which had over 7000 square feet of living space, plus service areas and servants quarters.³¹ (Illustration 49) In

comparison to other homes on the Square, this house was not even particularly large.

Even today, the terraced house can be deceptively generous in size, disguising commodious living quarters behind narrow frontages.

For other residents of the Grosvenor estate, their townhouse was yet another home in their ‘collection.’ In this manner, the townhouse was a luxury, becoming a container of objects and activities signifying this expression. Donald Olsen underestimated the importance of the townhouse as a container of luxury items, by stating that people preferred to display their social position in the country house.³² The courtier, Paul Methuen housed his collection of Old Masters paintings in his townhouse on Grosvenor Street and for single, wealthy women, the home was the primary site of display. (Tables 5 and 6) However, the author’s observation may have some credence, since it may have been easier and safer to openly display one’s power and wealth in the country, since it was familiar territory, with the landowner as the ultimate authority, thus insuring a certain degree of security. The city, today as then, was filled with persons ready to take advantage of conspicuous consumption. On the Grosvenor estate many of those who openly displayed their wealth, especially in terms of adopting the new ‘style’ in architecture were members of the *nouveau riche*, including the Earl of Thanet, John Aislaby, and the Earl of Rockingham.³³ Established wealth and influence had no need to openly display their taste and may have chosen to internalise their expressions of luxury in the interiors of their townhouses.

Schedules of fixtures and inventories can provide proof of interior décor and furnishings of the townhouse. Lord Hertford’s beautiful document, which includes a schedule of fixtures, an inventory of household good and furnishing and a plan of all floors of the house, carriage house and stables at No 16 Grosvenor Street, revealed the material aspects of this exceptionally large townhouse.³⁴ (Table 9 and Illustration 50) John Summerson utilised this document, along with Lord Chesterfield’s schedule of furnishing for his home on Grosvenor Square, as examples of ‘typical’ homes on the estate.³⁵ In addition to these important, but not typical, documents, this investigation has located and utilized three other inventories belonging to two women, Lady Elizabeth Cole and Henrietta, the Dowager Countess of Strafford, and a male member of the gentry, who also held the position of Royal Surveyor under George I, William Benson, esq. The contents of these documents highlight the functioning of the house, which specifically delineates their purpose as a need or a luxury. Even the physical elements of the home could also signify luxury. Lord Hertford’s house was built with indoor plumbing and had two water closets.³⁶ Lady Strafford’s home included tapestries and fireplaces in the garret storey and

other objects which propose a comfortable and embellished environment for the household staff. (Table 6)

The furnishing of the home was directly linked to the function it needed to perform. An important public arena for elite society, which was evident in the fashionable provincial towns of Bath and York, but clearly absent from the capital, was the assembly room. In eighteenth-century London the townhouse became the public venue for gatherings such as assemblies, masquerades and other social events. This contemporary noted that the townhouse was also the location for women.

Or if you like rather the Company of Ladies, there are Assemblies at most People of Quality's Houses.³⁷

In 1756, the Duchess of Norfolk, residing at No 4 St James's Square, silenced critics of her cloistered life and accordingly, 'open'd her home to the whole Town, which were divided into five Assemblies and the finest sight that was ever seen.'³⁸ The expectant feminine role of entertaining in the grand environment of the townhouse was an integral part of urban life and a vital aspect to her public image.

As indicated by accounts of the Duchess of Norfolk, the maintenance of a London townhouse was a necessary fixture for the promotion of one's social prominence, which in itself could also be an indicator of luxury. The cost and upkeep of a London townhouse as a second or third home, was an important gauge of social rank and a signifier of a leisured lifestyle. The household account books for Lord Hertford's property in the city demonstrate the annual cost of operating a townhouse of this rather large size averaged about £3000 per annum in the 1740s.³⁹ It should be noted that during this decade there were no major improvements to the property indicated in these records. Most of the expenditures were for food, clothing and household supplies, i.e. coal and hay, and a skeleton staff who lived in and secured the house throughout the course of the year. These expenditures, which were part of the commitment of a homeowner on the Grosvenor estate, included the 'watch rate,' 'relief of the poor,' and a payment for 'Pews in St Georges Church'.⁴⁰ These expenditures highlight the financial commitment one faced with the maintenance of a metropolitan townhouse, which were justified by the manner in which home performed for its inhabitants. The varied roles of the townhouse,

as both a need and a luxury, shaped the society which consumed them, who in turn fashioned the physical environment of the townhouse into spaces suitable for the performance of their social, gender and political roles.

The Society of the Townhouse

This work has expanded on the social character of the Grosvenor estate as provided in the *Survey*.⁴¹ The information concerning past residents of the estate was compiled from the estate's rate books, which provided only minimal information concerning the residents and generally focused on male members of the aristocracy. This investigation has involved the application of the variables of gender, social class, and political alliance to the early eighteenth-century population of the principal homes on the estate.⁴² These demographics revealed specific patterns created by the shared social characteristics of the Grosvenor estate, which included a common interest in architectural appreciation, and a diverse society which included women, builders and architects.

Architecture as a Polite Pursuit

One of the social patterns which developed on the early eighteenth-century Grosvenor estate was a shared interest in both the practical application and artistic appreciation of architecture. The study of architecture and its principles was considered an important aspect to a gentle education. Throughout the early part of the eighteenth century classical building designs were introduced to English builders and architectural enthusiasts with the translation and distribution of the designs and writings of Renaissance architect Andrea Palladio.⁴³ One vehicle for distributing his ideas and those of influential native designers such as Jones, Wren and Vanbrugh, was the publication of *Vitruvius Britannicus* by architect Colen Campbell, of which many Grosvenor residents were subscribers.⁴⁴

The number and diversity of residents of the Grosvenor estate who were subscribers to Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* was impressive. (Table 10) This list included persons with which Campbell had commissions, such as John Aislaby, esq. or had proposed new buildings, such as Sir Paul Methuen, and finally illustrated existing structures, such as Eaton Hall, seat of Sir Richard Grosvenor, and Marble Hill House, designed in part by estate resident and colleague, Roger Morris. The subscription lists for the first three volumes also included women of the nobility, such as the Duchess of Montagu and significantly in regards to the Grosvenor estate, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, who purchased two copies of each of the first three volumes. The Duchess was involved with the selection and decoration of two homes on the Grosvenor estate for her grandchildren, and the list included many residents who would have had either marital or familial ties to the subscribers. In addition, the subscribers included a significant number of persons who comprised the household of the Prince of Wales, later George II.⁴⁵

It is significant that the dedication to Volume III of *Vitruvius Britannicus* was made to the Prince of Wales, whereas the first two volumes were dedicated to his father. Volume III had the largest increase in subscribers, both in total as well as in regards to the Grosvenor estate, which may indicate a political and spatial alliance behind the heir to the throne. Other authors have noted that the change in dedication in Volume III may have been a political ploy by Campbell to increase his role in the future monarchy. With the publication of the third volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, Campbell actually began to formally fashion himself as the ‘architect to the Prince of Wales.’⁴⁶ Campbell attempted to establish a link with the Hanoverian dynasty and may have been attempting to propose a new visual form for the Prince and his supporters. There is evidence that the relationships established between Campbell, residents of the Grosvenor estate, and fellow architects demonstrated a cooperative effort to establish a new style of architectural expression in the early part of the eighteenth century. In fact, the relationship Campbell had with John Aislaby appears to be more friendly than businesslike. In this brief letter written shortly before his death, Campbell evaluated the improvements made at Aislaby’s estate in Yorkshire, Studley Royal.

... And am glad to hear you are so farr advanced in yr Building. When R. Morris returned from the North he [illeg] me he had talked at Studley and brought me three different designs for the arcade of which two were very ugly, the third with diagonal Grooves, which I ordered him to correct but when he brought them to my home I was not able to see him by reason of my illness, this is the only letter I have wrot in 5 weeks and for what I know it may be the last I ever shall. However I make the best answer I can, I sincerely think the original design is by much the best myself but shall [illeg] now the towers are carried up as to the Slenderness of the piers [illeg] are tho I am with those practiced by Paladio and Jones, and if his ignorance has led him to think they are French, I venture to say there is no one instance of those [illeg] in France. You wld be so good to excuse this confused and short answer...⁴⁷

Significantly, the person assigned to carry out the changes at Studley Royal was fellow architect and estate resident, Roger Morris. This letter proposes that Aislaby was seeking Campbell’s advice for these amendments, which was in turn relayed to Morris. The shared concern of all three men was the creation of an architectural form that was beautiful and pleasing to all those involved.

As demonstrated in the previous letter, a shared language was necessary for the transference of architectural ideas and meaning. The appreciation of the architectural principles by the ‘non-professional’ meant that the architect and client needed to share a

common language, which may in turn have elevated the social standing of the architect. The following passage illustrates the commonality between an architectural consumer, Sir Edward Turner and his architect, Sanderson Miller, in which the client congratulates himself on his knowledge of the complex principles inherent in the surroundings of his new home in Grosvenor Square.

I have Cornices ... which would draw you eyes out of their sockets! I have proportions which would command your attention during two courses [of a meal], in short, a House, on the glimpse of which you would pronounce I'm satisfy'd!⁴⁸

Additionally, the appreciation of architecture's abstract terms in the form of tomes, could translate into the realisation of form. Perhaps these tomes became pattern books for the potential home builder. Campbell presented idealised forms to potential clients, and included in each of the volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus* examples of past architectural works which the author felt expressed the nature of the British architecture.⁴⁹ Campbell drew his inspiration from the past works of Inigo Jones, Sir Christopher, Vanbrugh and Andrea Palladio, borrowing elements and forms from each of the masters for his proposals.⁵⁰ An excellent example of this exchange of ideas was evident in Campbell's proposal for a three-house block for Grosvenor Square with the Marquis of Lindsey's home in Lincoln's Inns Fields by Inigo Jones, which was illustrated in Volume I of *Vitruvius Britannicus* and accompanied by the following description.⁵¹ (Illustrations 51 and 52)

...the Front, which has a good rustick Basement, from which riseth a regular Ionic Pilastrade, including the principal, and Attick Story: The Windows are well proportion'd, gracefully dress'd, without affectation. The Fabrick is cover'd with a handsome Balustrade; and in a word, the whole is conducted with that great Harmony, that shines in the production of this great Master, who design'd it *Anno 1640*.⁵²

The formula of elements used by Jones was reflected in Campbell's design, with the use of alternating triangular and ovate pediments on the principal story. Lord Lindsey's home possessed five bays and square attic windows, a formula adopted for the central house of Campbell's plan and a parallel with John Aislabie's home in Grosvenor Square.

(Illustration 53) Campbell often looked to Jones for solutions in the design of urban architecture. There are striking similarities in the visual vocabulary used by Jones in the design of the piazza of Covent Garden, with Campbell's proposal for the east end of Grosvenor Square.⁵³ (Illustrations 40 and 54) Although the particular design elements used by each of the architects were varied, i.e. Jones employed the giant Tuscan order

whereas Campbell used the Corinthian, both men look towards the palazzos of the Florentine Renaissance for solutions to designing urban spaces. Significantly, one of the existing engravings of Campbell's proposal for the east end of Grosvenor Square was located in the back of the third volume of one of the two sets of *Vitruvius Britannicus* housed in the British Library.⁵⁴ This volume also contained an engraved view of the back parlour of Campbell's home in Brook Street.⁵⁵ (Illustration 55) It appears as though this particular edition of Volume III was compiled for a specific audience, perhaps as an appeal for endorsement of his designs or as a compliment to a patron. Other inclusions of designs and inscriptions were sensitive to the audience. The plate inscribed for Marble Hill House, home of the Countess of Suffolk, mistress of George II, was mentioned very discreetly as 'A New House in Twickenham.'⁵⁶ In this manner, Campbell could create stronger court ties with himself and his ideas. Throughout these volumes, Campbell created a visual architectural language to be both appreciated and realised. The author instructed the viewer in the elements and spatial arrangement of a re-invented form of 'Palladian' and classical architecture created and adapted by British masters. Through the politicised aspects of the subscription list, many of which were directly involved in the Hanoverian succession or held positions in government and court under George I and George II, to the inclusion of proposed and built works of contemporary and historical nature, leads to the conclusion that Campbell attempted to create a visual and architectural repertoire of 'patterns' which would house the new society evolving in the early Hanoverian dynasty.

Builders and Architects

It is the disaster of London, as to the beauty of its figure, that it is stretched out in buildings, just at the pleasure of every builder, or undertaker of buildings...⁵⁷

Important ingredients in the social mixture of eighteenth-century London were the builders and architects responsible for actual design of the metropolis. Spatially and financially, these craftsmen were in a similar situation to single women and members of the merchant class, since their primary residence and place of business was in the metropolis. The Grosvenor estate had a large concentration of noted builders and architects, and continued as a residence and business locale for noted architects throughout the eighteenth century.⁵⁸ Many, such as William Benson, Roger Morris, Thomas Archer and Colen Campbell, had connections with the Royal Works and public

commissions. In addition, Campbell had contact with other builders on the estate through his involvement on the panel established to settle the estate's building disputes and contracts.⁵⁹ Although it appears as though Campbell was not directly involved with any of the buildings on the estate, excepting his own, his influence may have played a significant role in the physical appearance of some of its buildings.⁶⁰ There were a large number of professional men involved with the building of the Grosvenor estate, including Benson, Roger Morris, Henry Flitcroft, John Simmons, and Edward Shepherd.⁶¹ In all probability, ideas flowed between these men, since elements of Campbell's *œuvre* can be noted in the design of some buildings.⁶²

The sharing of ideas and formats was accompanied by the frequent and public exchange of compliments and criticism of completed works. As noted previously, Colen Campbell proposed a unified block of houses for the east side of Grosvenor Square. (Illustration 40) In this excerpt from Robert Morris's *Lectures on Architecture*, in a criticism of the final construction of the east end of the Square, the author placed Campbell on a pedestal.

... [the] Architect did compose a regular Range for that whole Side, in which he has shewn a Nobleness of Invention, the Spirit and Keeping of the Design, is not unworthy of the greatest *British* Architect...⁶³

Morris alluded to *Vitruvius Britannicus* in this appraisal by alluding to its frontispiece – ‘greatest British Architect.’ The use of ‘nobleness’ in reference to Campbell’s design, demonstrates the linking together of architecture and its principles with the higher order of things. Essentially, architects and builders were attempting to align themselves and their craft with their noble clients.

There is ample evidence to suggest that the early eighteenth century was a major turning point in the social status of builders and architects. On the Grosvenor estate, the social climbing of builders and architects took many physical manifestations. Significantly, Roger Morris built a large detached home for his own residence on the northern reaches of the estate.⁶⁴ His home assumed the form of a ‘villa,’ and bore similarities to the Countess of Suffolk’s Marble Hill House in Richmond, of which Morris was directly involved.⁶⁵ A great deal of questions still surround the purpose and functioning of Morris’s home, which may have been constructed as a showcase of the architect’s talents. One thing made evident by the scale of Morris’s villa, was that he had the capital to invest in such a large scale project. This marks a significant change in the social positioning of the architect. The architect was no longer only catering to the needs and egos of his

clientele, but had elevated his own social position with the size and character of his home. Metaphorically, Morris had placed himself in the same social space as his clients. Further evidence was provided by other builders such as Edward Sheppard who lived in at least three different homes on the estate, subsequently moving on as they sold. Mrs Simmons, who assumed her husband's business after his death, resided in No 51 Grosvenor Square, was faced with the financial hardship of trying to sell her husband's properties and resorted to a raffle in order to sell one of the largest houses on the estate, No 4 Grosvenor Square.⁶⁶

By the middle of the eighteenth century there were efforts to standardize the practice of architects. John Gwynn tried to conventionalise the role of the architect in his *London and Westminster Improved*. The author expressed his displeasure of what he saw as an infringement on the responsibilities of the 'architect.' He expressed that 'bad taste' occurred by permitting builders to furnish homes, but he was also specific in regards to furniture.⁶⁷ This involvement was not only considered 'bad taste,' but beneath the elevated role of the architect.

... it is beneath the profession of architect to undertake the several professions of a cabinet making, upholsterer, brasier, &c. these are distinct employments and by no means his proper business, so far as the mere designing part is concerned, it may be allowable; to design and superintend ought to be his sole business.⁶⁸

However, Gwynn's criticism was written forty years after the initial constructions were undertaken on the Grosvenor estate, and may have been directed at persons such as James Paine and Robert Adam. This initial period of building speculation was marked by a small amount of 'architects,' complemented with an abundance of experienced and gifted craftsmen. The Grosvenor estate was similar to other developments in the eighteenth century, in which craftsmen and architects alike took advantage of the continued growth of the city.

One of the physical characteristics manifested on the Grosvenor estate was a variety in building designs, due in part to the large number of speculative builders involved with the development of the estate.⁶⁹ These craftsmen were working to sell their product in a very competitive market and a building's appearance from the street was a major selling point. They were also involved in the high-risk business of pleasing a demanding clientele and coping with changing notions of fashion. The builder's responsibilities did not end with the exterior and basic structure of the home, but extended to the interior fittings. This

building aspect often times left the stamp of the builder's specialty: i.e. mason, carpenter or plasterer, and the construction of a new home provided the opportunity to showcase their special talents. At No 45 Grosvenor Square, Thomas Richmond expressed his expertise as a carpenter in the staircase hall:

The Hall wainscotted compleat, Two Ionic Pillasters with the Entablature carved around the Hall (The Staircase Painted) A Wainscot Staircase with Twist Rails and Balusters, Carved Bracketts, also the Caps of Columns and Pillasters....⁷⁰

This description highlights the builder's skills in handling the visual language of classical ornamentation. Thomas Ripley, carpenter, was responsible for the fitting up of one of the earliest and largest homes on the estate, No 16 Grosvenor Street.⁷¹ The 1763 'Account of Fixtures' outlines the craftsman's talents as expressed in the interior finishing. Each of the windows on the first and second floors were equipped with mahogany shutters.⁷² All of the doors of this home were also constructed from mahogany. These elaborate and precious expenditures convey the huge financial risk taken by the builder, who had to assume this cost and hope to recoup it during a sale. Ripley's talents embellished the house in an extravagant manner, with special attention paid to the public rooms of the house, as indicated by the following description of the Parlour.

Ionick columns fully enriched to center doorway, Room wainscot to frieze ... caps and friezes over the doors.⁷³

In addition to the carved decorations and the lavish use of mahogany for mundane objects such as shutters and doors, the home was also equipped with a water closet and indoor plumbing.

Mahogany seat and riser Marble basin and brass handles Room wainscoted to the Ceiling.⁷⁴

Besides sharing a residence on the estate, the builders and architects of the Grosvenor estate in Mayfair could share the physical expressions of a genteel lifestyle as manifested in the interior furnishings of the townhouse.

Women and the Townhouse

As noted previously, the primary residence for many women, especially single women, was their townhouse. On the Grosvenor estate, the manner in which women acquired their homes may have been partially determined by their social standing. Widows of

peers were more likely to acquire the Grosvenor Square residence on the death of their husband. (Table 16) However, for a member of the gentry living in the Square, it was likely that the residence would be bequeathed to the eldest son. However, spatially, women were the dominant sex on the Grosvenor estate. An account of the large number of single women, combined the married and the nearly total absence of single men, indicates that the feminine gender is at least in physical control of this urban space. One of my few criticisms with *The Survey of London*, was in regards to women and their analysis of the social aspects of the estate. Much of the author's information came from estate's rate-books and parish poll-books of 1749. Women were denied the vote and rate book provided minimal information, regarding the person who paid the rent, which in the case of a privileged person may have been an agent or steward. However, some facts cannot be disregarded. More than one-third of the first time lease holders on Upper Brook Street were single women. The average building frontage of first time rate paying women was approximately 27 feet; a figure significantly higher than the that of the principal buildings on the rest of the estate of 22 feet. In the Square alone, over 95% of the men were married.⁷⁵ Women were also dominating the commercial aspects of the estate. The Wheatsheaf pub on Upper Grosvenor Street was run by a woman, and the Albemarle Arms on South Audley Street was owned and operated by Elizabeth Jones.⁷⁶ Women were also involved with purchasing ground leases. Elizabeth Alleyne is listed in the 'Alphabetical Schedule of the Ground leases belong to Grosvenor Buildings' of July 5, 1728.⁷⁷ Barbara Cavendish, a resident of South Audley Street, took up a lease on property on South Street. As noted previously, John Simmons's widow lived on the Square for one year.⁷⁸ Grace, Dowager Countess of Dysart who left her home on Grosvenor Street to her widowed daughter, owned country estates which were bequeathed to her grandson, Lionel, the 4th Earl of Dysart.⁷⁹

... to grandson Rt Hon Lionel Earl of Dysart the 'mansion house' and furnishings stuffs and outhouses at Warrington in county of Northampton ...⁸⁰

The young Earl was included in his grandmother's will and it appears that his removal from the Grosvenor estate coincided with his grandmother's death and his inheritance of the country house in Northamptonshire.

The spatial occupation of women on the Grosvenor estate may appear quite dramatic, but in actuality, was merely representative of their distribution throughput the West End.

(Table 3) The social and cultural roles of eighteenth-century women provided them with

the capacity for political involvement. The space they occupied, as a politically charged environment, meant that women were both directly and spatially involved in the political discourse of the time. Personal letters can reveal the feminine interest in political as well as social events.⁸¹ Within this environment of the highly politicised Grosvenor Square, women would have a ‘sense of being entitled to be concerned with politics.’⁸² These women may have found influence in their feminine royal counterpart, Queen Caroline. Historians have noted that Caroline’s contacts with both the first minister, Robert Walpole and the Lord Chamberlain, Lord Hervey, influenced the politics of the day.⁸³ Queen Caroline’s enormous control over her husband, which included taking on the responsibilities of Regent in his annual absence, an activity often satirized in the daily press. During the Excise Crisis of 1733, effigies of Walpole and Caroline, not George II, were burned in protest, thus reinforcing the perception of the Queen’s role in government workings, and her influence may have extended to other arenas. In the realm of architectural works and improvements during George II’s reign, Caroline’s achievements outnumber that of the monarch.⁸⁴ George’s military concerns were enhanced by the construction of two stables during the course of his reign – the Horse Guards and the Royal Mews. On the other hand, Caroline’s architectural interests were in the royal palaces and her dower house at Richmond Park. These commissions included a library at St James’s Palace (1730s), the Queen’s Temple in Kensington Gardens (c1734), the Hermitage (c1731-32) and Merlin’s Cave (1735) at Richmond Park, proposed alterations to the terrace and the restoration of the paintings in the two great staircases at Windsor Castle (1729), in addition to alterations made to the Queen’s state apartments at Hampton Court.⁸⁵

At times, Caroline would authorize improvements to the royal residence while acting as Regent in the King’s absence. Kent’s restoration of the paintings at Windsor took place while George II was in Hanover.⁸⁶ However, Caroline’s power could be usurped by one person, the King himself. After an annual visit to his homeland, George returned to Kensington Palace to find that Caroline had removed his favourite paintings and replaced them with ‘more suitable’ images. The King subsequently made Lord Hervey change them back.⁸⁷ However, this account appears to be a singular example of the manner in which Queen Caroline’s power, judgment and position were questioned, since George otherwise showed little interest in the changes and alterations Caroline made to the royal properties. In most instances, the Queen and her female subjects could assert their personal authority through home ownership, and the responsibilities of maintaining and furnishing that home. The freedom women could assume with their property was

particular to their position in society and thus reflected the power afforded them. Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough was another woman who was justifiably concerned about the lives of her daughters and granddaughters, which many historians have perceived as meddling.⁸⁸ Her granddaughter, Lady Bateman, whose husband had just received the Order of the Bath (1733) was unwilling to give up their home in Soho Square since Lord Bateman felt the home was too large. The Duchess encouraged Lady Bateman through her father, the Earl of Sunderland, to purchase the house ‘which would be a great advantage to her, for she is to let it and to do what she pleases with it.’⁸⁹ This transaction identifies that property purchase and management could take place outside the bounds of matrimony, thus empowering the woman with property ownership, which in turn could secure a home and/or income for her in her later years.

New Money and New Ideas

There was an abundance of contemporary criticism concerning the adaptation of classical form to architecture and the decorative arts. The newly developing style, a blending of the ideas of Renaissance architecture with classical ornament, may have been considered risky in terms of fashion and taste. On the Grosvenor estate there were originally just six buildings built which exhibited classical form and ornamentation. In fact each of these homes were purchased by persons who could be considered ‘new money.’⁹⁰ This taste for classicism by the *nouveau riche* continued throughout the early development of the estate with the adoption of classical form in the domestic interior.⁹¹ As Hogarth so graphically illustrated in many of his narrative series, Palladianism could be associated with eighteenth-century social climbers. The first image of the *Marriage A La Mode* series, ‘The Marriage Contract,’ the viewer can identify through the window, behind the principal figures of the negotiating fathers, a house being constructed in the classical style. (Illustration 56) Evident in much of Hogarth’s satirical work, was a biting criticism of modern society firmly planted with a definite sense of place in the metropolis. The engraving ‘Chairing the Member’ (1754) utilised a Venetian window and a Chinese style door to frame jubilant politicians, and in the second piece in the *Marriage A La Mode* series, the newlyweds were placed in an interior in the style of William Kent. Repeatedly, Hogarth used classical forms to represent the aspirations of a certain level of social structure, that of new money. The expansion of trade through colonisation and diplomatic treaties had enriched the coffers of many of the City’s merchants since the Stuart era, which included the ancestors of Mary Grosvenor. The shifting of Britain’s power structure from the monarch to his ministers had provided fiscal opportunities to members

of the gentry and merchant class, where an element of the aristocracy was in dire need of capitol due in part to poor investments in stock, new technologies and land.⁹²

An important ingredient in the advancement of the gentry and merchant class throughout the course of the eighteenth century, was the heiress. Frequently, a young woman's inheritance was pursued in order to prop up an ailing and misdirected family and their estates.⁹³ Often times the physical expression of the capital an heiress brought to the marriage contract was in the form of a house. On the Grosvenor estate, many young woman provided the financial means and titles for their husband's advancement. (Table 13) Two of the most notable examples were the Earl of Thanet, who assumed the title through his uncle, and then married Mary Savile, one of four daughters and heirs of the Duke of Dorset, and Hugh Smithson, later the Duke of Northumberland, who will reap all the benefits and titles by marrying the sole heir of the Percy estates. Interestingly, both these men chose homes on the estate which exhibited classical exteriors, an indication that the newly rich chose architectural patterns which were considered innovative and perhaps a bit risky.

Patterns in the Townhouse

The primary spatial element for the individual in the urban environment was their home, and in no other locale in the city were the platforms for social performance more vital for the projection of one's 'public' persona than their 'private' home. The need to project one's public image through their home can be evidenced in part by the visits made to courtiers' homes by Queen Caroline and the Vice Chamberlain, Lord Hervey. Caroline expressed a desire to please her supporters (often to the displeasure of the King) by making periodic visits to their London townhouses.⁹⁴ Members of the court and high society competed materially in the construction and furnishing of their homes, which were placed on display during royal visits or social gatherings. This section explores the manner in which the physical qualities of the exterior décor and interior embellishments, collections, and the organization of space of the townhouse acted as a platform for political pursuit, social contracts and feminine empowerment.

What is in a Façade?

A building can project and conceal different functions and consumers. The part of a building which is exposed to the public's gaze and criticism is its façade. The townhouse is unique in terms of its physical configuration since generally only one face of the building is exposed. As noted previously, an integral relationship is created between the home and the street, so that the façade of the building provides for the viewer visual clues to the relevance of this interaction. One 'pattern' which emerged on the Grosvenor estate in the early eighteenth century, was a diversity of decoration and style. Architectural historians have long looked to common and shared forms to determine patterns, both in terms of creating an architect's *oeuvre* and stylistic considerations, but diverseness can also be an indicator of shared qualities and social patterns.⁹⁵ For purposes of identification of the building and its society, guidebook entries often detailed the decoration and embellishment of the building's façade.

Grosvenor Square is ... entirely surrounded by buildings, which are very magnificent, though the fronts are far from being uniform, some of them being entirely of stone, others of brick and stone, and others of rubbed brick, with only their quoins, facios, windows and door cases of stone. Some of them are adorned with stone columns of several orders, while others have only plain fronts. Indeed there is the greatest variety of fine buildings that are anywhere to be met in so small a compass, and are so far from uniform, as to be all sashed and to be pretty near of an equal height...⁹⁶

The author of this description was very careful to note that the buildings of Grosvenor Square were magnificent, even though they were diverse in decoration and style. Residences were defined by decorative stone quoins, an individual marking of territory. Doors and their ornamentation could physically and symbolically project ownership, and as the aperture to its treasured contents. Those of the Grosvenor estate took many forms, ranging from heavy and ornamental Baroque creations to the simple, formal classical motifs. The emphasis of individuality in building ornamentation was further evidenced by the fact that a large number of buildings were altered by subsequent owners.

An appreciation of the rich diversity of buildings on the Grosvenor estate, and other urban improvements was short lived in the eighteenth century. The preference for simple uniform blocks of terrace housing evolved throughout the course of the century until its crowning achievements were realised in the Belgravia and the Regent's Park improvements in the early nineteenth century. The fashion for the display of obvious 'Otherness' had diminished by the middle of the century as expressed by this description.

Grosvenor Square (near Oxford Road) has Buildings on every Side, in the erecting of which there has been lavished more Expense, than Proofs given of Taste. Uniformity is banished by the Diversity of their Fronts; some are entirely of Brick, some of Stone, some are of rubbed Brick, and have only their Quoins, Facios, and Windows of Stone: Others are ornamented with Stone Columns of every Order; while Plain fronts only have fallen to the Lot of others...⁹⁷

This criticism of the Square may have as much to say about the physical qualities of the built environment as well as the people who inhabited the Square. The preference for the ordered and composed terrace block has been realised in 1760, according to this description of the Square. Earlier descriptions praised the 'Diversity' of the buildings in the Square, a physical characteristic which continues to the present. Although the appreciation of uniform blocks of terrace housing was codified by the travel literature by the mid-eighteenth century, the prestige of living in Grosvenor Square continues to the present.

Varied shapes, forms and textures create a dynamic urban environment.⁹⁸ The visual rhythms created by varied windows and decorations made for excitement in Grosvenor Square. Uniformity in buildings can express a sense of anonymity, however this was never a characteristic of the Mayfair estate. On the other hand, the early visual representations of Grosvenor Square tried to rationalise the space. (Illustration 31 and 37) The bird's eye perspective of these views presented an ordered space, which barely

resembled the actual situation, because of its physical distance from the subject and the lack of colour. *Stow's Survey of London* used these elevated views of the city's squares as the primary means of illustrating the text. These views may have been created on a template, in which a banner with the name of the square was inscribed at the top. (Illustrations 32 and 34) There is very little to differentiate one site from another due to the lack of detail provided by the distanced view. A prime example of the manner in which coloured images change the visual characteristics of a scene was illustrated in Thomas Malton's view of Hanover Square. (Illustration 26) Colour accentuated the diversity, thus providing evidence of the built environment of the same time as the development of Grosvenor Square. In addition, earlier images superimposed a sense of order on Grosvenor Square due to the lack of detail in the building facades. The artists manipulated the building dimensions and window placement to provide an illusion of an ordered environment.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, there appears to be a change in tone in acceptance of diversity in building design and a push for uniformity. This description of Hanover Square noted the search by critics and commentators for uniformity in townhouse design.

Hanover-Square... which was the first of the new-built Squares in these Parts. The Houses here are very handsome, and principally inhabited by Dukes, Earls, Ambassadors, or Persons of Distinction. The West Side is very uniform, argues Taste in the Architect, and deserves a good deal of Approbation.⁹⁹

The buildings of Hanover Square were 'handsome' not due to their formal elements, but because of the people who lived there. This change in attitude towards diversity reflects changes in ideas concerning proportion and harmony, both in the built form and in society in general. Grosvenor Square continued both as place to aspire and a place which exhibited varied architectural form and embellishment. The same author argued for regularity in Grosvenor Square as well.

This Square is surrounded with fine Houses, but the East Side being the only regular one of the four, is undoubtedly, for that Reason, the most elegant.¹⁰⁰

Colen Campbell attempted to impose a sense of order on the landscape, with his proposal for the east end of the Square. (Illustration 40) His intent to unify the space may have been influenced by Continental urban design, where *hôtels* were the norm.¹⁰¹ However, the planners of Grosvenor Square were not prepared to make such a bold statement,

perhaps because of its French connotations, the cost of construction, or their potential clients' preference for individuality. Another indication of attempts to unify the design of terrace housing can be seen in the three-block home constructed by Edward Shepherd on the north side of the Square, which employed elements of Campbell's design. (Illustrations 52 and 57) The participation of the landlord in the rejection of Campbell's original design can be confirmed by the preface of Robert Morris's *Lectures in Architecture*:

impolite Taste of several Proprietors of that ground prevented so beautiful a Performance from being the Ornament of that Side of the Square...¹⁰²

Morris's indignant reaction to the rejection of Campbell's proposal demonstrated his authority in the 'polite art' of architecture, while he chastised the ground landlords of the east side of Grosvenor Square for their lack of aesthetic judgement. Morris spoke of the proposal as a 'Performance,' uniting architecture with its companion arts of theatre and music. The unified and harmonic elements of Campbell's design bears a striking resemblance to Aldrich's design for the Peckwater Quadrangle at Oxford and John Wood the Elder's proposal for Queen's Square in Bath. (Illustrations 58 and 59) Perhaps the lack of individuality and illusions to institutionalised living made Campbell's design unacceptable at the time it was proposed. Later, John Gwynn was highly critical of unified terrace housing, or as he termed the 'modern taste' which lacked a sense of distinction.

... it has now become the fashion not to make the least distinction between the doors and windows, and it is not without difficulty the way into such a house can be found...¹⁰³

Gwynn was an advocate for the older fashion of creating very distinct and individual entrances for the urban dwelling.

Formerly a nobleman's house was marked by a large entrance, and the decorations generally proclaimed to whom they belonged...¹⁰⁴

Throughout his analysis of the city, Gwynn advocated the ordering of the urban environment. However, the author also saw the need in domestic architecture for the creation of a distinction between one building and another. Gwynn found it vital to avoid ambiguity, and a necessary element in design was to 'mark' one's territory in an obvious way by boldly defining the entrance to one's home. No more clearly was the vague nature of portals evident than in Campbell's proposal. The rhythmic pattern of the arcade

of windows and doors on the rustic storey, concentrated visual attention on the whole, rather than on individual elements.

Spatial Organization is Essential

This house being intended for elegance and magnificence must have the parts great. On this depends the distribution of the rooms, or compartition of the space: that is not to be thrown into a great number of small rooms, for this would disgrace the external form: and if, as may naturally be imagined, the rooms upon such a disposition would be too few in a house whose ground-plan was proportioned to the centre of the Space, there is a remedy without deviating from the principles we have discussed.¹⁰⁵

The architect Isaac Ware had a number of spatial and social concerns in mind when he designed Lord Chesterfield's home in Mayfair.¹⁰⁶ His statement noted the townhouse functions as integral to the manner in which to arrange the space, and a consideration of the 'human' element was necessary for determining the usage of the home. Ware noted the primary importance of the relationship between the external form and internal spaces of the home, stating that interior layout needed to suit the façade otherwise it 'this would disgrace the external form.' In contrast to the villa and country house, the vertical arrangement of the townhouse would pose specific problems to the architect. By virtue of the precious qualities of urban space, the townhouse was arranged in a vertical manner, in contrast to the horizontal qualities emphasized in eighteenth-century country house design. In one respect, each of the floors of a townhouse can be condensed into separate apartments, which in later centuries will provide flats for the densely populated metropolis. But due to the townhouse's unique vertical configuration, the staircase became the primary feature of its interiors. Nearly all townhouse design in London warranted the construction of multiple staircases in order to provide for the social functioning of the townhouse, its traffic patterns and increased notions of privacy. The back staircase, often times secreted behind a green baize door, permitted the discreet and efficient movement of servants throughout the house. However, it was the formal staircase that added a sense of drama and pageantry to the interior space and the events it hosted. A typical evening's visit to a London townhouse during the early eighteenth century would involve a momentary greeting in the hall, removal to the second floor drawing room prior to dinner, back down the staircase for the meal in the dining room and then again to the drawing room for coffee, conversation and perhaps a game of cards. The grand, yet dysfunctional parade of guests from one level of the home retained the

courtly pomp of an earlier era, and was an opportunity for the host or hostess to display their good taste in the opulent surroundings of the staircase.

The formal staircase was a spatial tool, which provided access to the home's circuit of public rooms and an important element in the performance of political and ceremonial roles. The enclosed space of a staircase could be considered 'epic', as characterised by "heroic" architecture set amidst the ordinary and diminutive.¹⁰⁷ In the case of Norfolk House in St James's Square, which was considered by contemporaries to be the paradigm in terrace housing, the exterior was described as 'bland, but handsome'.¹⁰⁸ This analysis suggests that visitors' expectations of the house were lowered with its exterior appearance, so that entrance into the soaring space of the staircase would have produced impressions of awe. This spatial organization would also play upon the sensations of compression and expansion. The visitor experienced the small and congested spaces upon their first encounter with the interior, only to sense this space expanded in the epic surroundings of the staircase. The alternation of small personal spaces with gigantic and dehumanizing public spaces in domestic design accentuated the political role of the home, in the manner in which these effects operate in public buildings such as churches and government structures.

The decoration of staircases enhanced this impression. On the Grosvenor estate, many were decorated with mythological and historical themes. The staircase at No 44 Grosvenor Square rose for three stories, with the second level embellished with painted figures in Renaissance dress framed by a balustraded arcade.¹⁰⁹ (Illustrations 60 and 61) In many of the grand townhouses of the Square, the staircases were 'painted in History and Architecture', whereas the smaller homes were painted with picturesque themes. The staircase at Number 9 South Audley Street was open for two storeys and painted with a view of a bend in the River Thames and an illustration of Orleans House.¹¹⁰ The influence for the embellished staircase found its roots in Italian palazzos and the soaring interiors of the Palace of Versailles, and included the employment of Continental artists such as Laguerre and Vertue.¹¹¹ These highly decorated spaces acted as metaphors for individual power and authority, which can be evidenced in the interior décor of highly admired contemporary country houses, such as Chatsworth, Burghley and the royal palaces of Kensington and Hampton Court.

Typically the townhouse's public rooms, the drawing rooms and dining room, were sited at the front of the house. Builders and craftsmen were responsible for the interior fittings

of chimneypieces, plasterwork, staircases, doors and window ornamentation. From here, the owner provided their own additions to the decorative prominence of the public rooms. With the recommendation of her experienced grandmother, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, the newly married Lady Diana Russell decorated the drawing room of her home at No 34 Grosvenor Street with red damask wall coverings, mahogany furniture and gilded plaster ornaments.¹¹² From this frontal elevated position, residents and their guests were permitted to gaze upon passers-by and neighbours. The ‘street value’ of the house was heightened by the interior décor. The use of crystal chandeliers, gilded surfaces, reflective taffeta wall coverings and large mirrors would have provided luminous qualities to the room. The activities taking place within the home could have been observed by those on the street below via the large windows at the front of the house. Thus, the public space of the home was projected onto the larger sense of urban space of the street or the Square. In contrast, bedchambers, closets and dressing rooms, located at the rear of the townhouse provided both visual and physical accessibility to the town house’s private garden. In this respect, the spatial organization of the townhouse was similar to the country house with its formal public front and a private garden façade.

Townhouses were vertically arranged from front to back as well, with important public rooms situated on the street facade and bedchambers and dressing rooms located at the back. This configuration changed with corner lot homes, where the long side of the home (side street) provided more public exposure and thus the availability for more public spaces in the home. On the Grosvenor estate, few homes had this advantage, with nearly all of these type of homes located on the Square. Throughout the rest of the estate, corner buildings were predominantly associated with commercial ventures such as pubs and vendors.¹¹³ One home of this type on the Square was the one belonging to Lady Anne Vane, mistress of Frederick, Prince of Wales.¹¹⁴ The plans of Lady Vane’s home demonstrate the advantages of additional street frontage on a townhouse. (Illustration 49) Additional exposure was provided through west facing windows, an outstanding feature for a north facing home. Light was permitted into a large oval staircase (about 25 by 18 feet) and filtered to both the Hall on ground floor and the Great Room on first floor. This building was located next to the recessed corner house, so that only the front two rooms of the building projected beyond the neighbouring home. The rooms at the back of the house had windows facing the garden, permitting a certain level of privacy to bedchamber and dressing rooms. A secondary entrance was also located there, which probably permitted Lord Hervey to continue his relationship with Miss Vane hidden away from the exposure of the Square.¹¹⁵

As delineated in the plan of Lady Vane's home, the dining room on the first floor was fitted with a colonnade, which created a portal reminiscent of a Roman triumphal arch and the three arched doorways of medieval hall design. The meal was a pageant, paraded ceremoniously through the public spaces of the home. This elaborate performance was a way of '...denying the meaning and primary function of consumption which are essentially common, by making the meal a social ceremony, an affirmation of ethical tone and aesthetic refinement.'¹¹⁶ The simple act of eating could be elevated to an art form in the dramatic and decorative surroundings of the eighteenth-century dining room.

As demonstrated in both the staircase and the dining room, the courtly functioning of the home was dependent upon spaces created for certain performances. The drawing room was a twice-weekly event in the royal palaces. The daily performance of the morning levée was increasingly becoming an element of everyday life, so that the dressing room thus became the key site for the public exhibition of a private daily routine.¹¹⁷ The general public placed themselves on the same platforms as those that had been historically established for the monarch. William Hogarth mocked this imitation of performance in two of his series, *Marriage A La Mode* and *The Rake's Progress*, with each of the dressing rooms depicted in the new 'classical' style. (Illustrations 62 and 63) The assimilation of privileged space formerly created for royal performance into the domestic interior demonstrates the changes in the political ordering of life, but also points to the continued influence of royalty in day to day living. The drawing room and dressing rooms thus became key public spaces linking the home to court duties and political agendas.

Although the public face of one's home could be directed towards the garden square, there was a strong desire to possess a garden of one's own. Space has always been at a premium in the metropolis, and residents sought ingenious solutions to take advantage of the little land available for the garden. Often times, urban dwellers had to decide between extending their interior living space at the cost of their garden. Lord Berkeley advised the Duke of Portland in 1713 to reject an addition to his home in St James's Square, because 'such a piece of ground in a town crowded with buildings is such an advantage that it is a pity to lessen it.'¹¹⁸ However the generous size of lots on the Grosvenor estate mean that the private gardens of its residents were more generous in comparison to other West End locales.¹¹⁹ (Illustration 64) Walls separated the gardens of adjoining properties, and were frequently backed with stable blocks, garden pavilions and privies, creating a separate

private space which acted as an extension of the home. In Grosvenor Square, garden walls were constructed of brick, enhancing the permanence and exclusivity of these spaces.¹²⁰ The vital importance of the individual terrace garden played a part in the initial plan of the estate, in which Mackay illustrated the garden design rather than the architecture. (Illustration 2)

The consumption of material culture extended the activities of the terrace garden to the public arena. Garden enthusiasts, many of whom were women, exchanged ideas and plants. Horticulture and garden were another form of collecting, in which persons of varied circumstances could express their social roles. In this sense the terrace garden can be likened to a closet, containing the prised possessions of the owner, and in which access was limited to only the most intimate of guests. The private garden served many functions as a platform for social performance, most importantly as a venue for creative expression on the part of the urbanite. In particular, some women on the Grosvenor estate were keen to point out the advantages of the terrace garden. Misconceptions of urban life lead some to believe that private gardens were not available to the townhouse dweller. Mrs Mary Delaney, a resident of No 48 Upper Brook Street and an impassioned gardener who advised others on garden design, was quick to point out the vitality of her terrace garden.

You may think madam [Mrs Delaney's sister] that I have no garden perhaps, but that is a mistake. I have one as big as your parlour in Gloucester and in it groweth damask roses, stocks variegated and plain, some dead and some alive, and honeysuckles that never blow.¹²¹

The space of Mrs Delaney's garden was compared to the dimensions of her sister's parlour, however this analogy can be extended to the functions of the garden. Townhouse gardens were an extension of the home, providing another private space to the dwelling. The terrace garden was the primary site for the privy, so privacy would have played a concern, as well as the need for disguising unpleasant odours.¹²² Fragrant flowers and plants were strategically placed in terrace gardens to hide offensive aromas. The leading landscape designers addressed this concern including John Spence, who chose lilacs, laburnum, honeysuckle and geraniums for his 1743 design of a terrace garden on Bond Street.¹²³ In an ironic and humorous twist, these small ornamental gardens could house a privy styled as a classical temple and dedicated to Cloacina, the goddess of sewers.¹²⁴ By contrast, Spence conceived a design for Lady Falmouth's London home of 1744, a 'conveniency' and a separate 'little study.' This large urban garden of 40 by 50 feet was

centred on a circular stone table surrounded by four Windsor chairs, alternated with cherry trees and laburnum. This design reinforced the notion that terrace gardens were treated as rooms, additional spaces for private entertaining and relaxation. Efforts were made to enclose these ‘rooms’ with natural and fragrant embellishments, to act as barriers to adjacent properties, as Mrs Edward Boscowen planted laburnum and lilacs against the garden walls of her home on South Audley Street to act ‘as a screen against her neighbours.’¹²⁵ In general, nearly one half of the townhouse’s rooms faced the garden, most of which could be considered the ‘private’ spaces of the home, including bedchambers and dressing rooms. Thus, the private qualities of the home were extended to the garden.

Treasured Objects

An ongoing debate raged throughout the course of the eighteenth century regarding consumerism, and its moral and nationalistic positions. Bernard de Mandeville and Joseph Addison represented opposing viewpoints in the early part of the century.¹²⁶ Mandeville saw the consumption of luxury goods as a way in which to keep desire under ‘check’, whereas the authors of the *Spectator* were harsh critics of the nobility and their ‘excessive consumerism.’¹²⁷ Often times the primary consumers were women, so that it would be fair to say that this criticism was directed towards them in an effort to keep their spending habits under control. Consumerism is empowerment and women could assert their capital influence with purchasing of household and luxury goods, and an additional stage for the performance of an integral social role. Several authors have approached eighteenth-century history from the viewpoint of consumerism. Paul Langford’s entire argument in *A Polite and Commercial People* hinges on the codification of manner to create a ‘polite society’, brought on by changing class structures and newly acquired wealth. John Brewer links consumerism with taste and admission into ‘polite society’ was directly related to socially constructed concepts of beauty and the consumption of material culture.¹²⁸ However, neither author looks specifically at consumerism and the home. Michael Snodin and John Styles survey of the decorative arts in Britain approaches the material culture of the ‘Georgian era’ from stylistic and authorship viewpoints. The authors were primarily concerned with ‘who led taste’ in the eighteenth century, noting the well documented achievements of artists such as Robert Adam, Thomas Chippendale and Josiah Wedgwood.¹²⁹ John Gwynn noted the role women played in the décor of the domestic interior, but was critical of what he interpreted as a preference for imported objects.

With the utmost respect to the taste of English Ladies, nothing can be more trifling or ridiculous than to see a modern chimney-piece set out with josses and such horrid monsters which have no other charms to recommend them than deformity, a high price and their being the production of a very remote country.¹³⁰

Women were important consumers in the eighteenth century and a primary role was the embellishment of the family home. However, as in most aspects of architectural history, their role has been marginalized, left ‘invisible’¹³¹, or in the case of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, vilified.¹³² The Duchess, along with Queen Caroline and Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk were powerful, political women with definite opinions and ideas, which could be far-reaching and influential. Often times, the wisdom and judgement of these women was sought from political matters to the furnishing of a home. A letter from Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough to her granddaughter, demonstrates how everyday objects were converted into aesthetically pleasing forms.

I hear my Lady Pembroke told the Duchess of Bedford today that all the cases for knives or anything of that nature at the toy shops are now in the shape of a pillar of some order, which she thought wonderful pretty, for she, I mean Lady Pembroke, is not only very knowing in the stars, but she is a great architect herself.¹³³

Everyday objects became works of art that ‘would give rise to the virtuous pleasures attendant upon the exercise of the fancy and the imagination.’¹³⁴ Significantly, the knife case assumed the form of an architectural element, although the Duchess could not be specific on its ‘order,’ she playfully elevated the consumer to a the title of a ‘great architect,’ perhaps an indication of the contributions Lady Pembroke had in her husband’s craft.¹³⁵

Objects of desire could be motivated politically or in some cases, lacking availability due to political acts, such as wars with suppliers and tariffs. In 1721, the British government abolished heavy duties on woods imported from the colonies and West Indies.¹³⁶ This act may have made the construction of No 16 Grosvenor Street complete with mahogany doors, panelling and window shutters economically feasible for the builder.¹³⁷ (Table 9) However, instead of the government implementing sumptuary laws which would possibly slow down economic growth, ‘manufactured objects could be ennobled by artistic elevation...’¹³⁸ Inventories point to the fact that imported goods were highly desirable. (Tables 6, 7 and 8) Lady Strafford’s home contained an ‘India Trunk’ on a ‘Japan frame,’ Flemish tapestries and needlework, chairs covered with red Moroccan leather, and a

‘Dutch’ table. Although Lady Cole’s home contained modest furnishings, its contents included a sampling of Indian prints and leather screen, all of which reinforced the role women played in consumption of imported goods. Since government policies controlled the amount and type of imported goods, the consumption of these items constructed a platform within the home for political performance.

A private home could become a public space by virtue of its contents. Paul Metheun’s collection of old masters paintings in his home on Grosvenor Street, and a catalogue of these images was included in a noted guidebook, provided access to a large audience.¹³⁹ (Table 5) A visit by Queen Caroline and the Vice Chamberlain, Lord Hervey, secured political favours for Metheun.¹⁴⁰ The reciprocal benefits of this use of domestic space can be evidenced by the fact that Caroline expressed a desire to please her supporters (often to the displeasure of the King) by making periodic visits to their London townhouses.¹⁴¹ Significantly, Metheun chose to display his collection at his London home, rather than his country estate. Unlike the ‘prodigy homes’ of the Elizabethan era in which owners embellished their homes for a respite on a royal progress, the focus had shifted in part to the urbanization of royal patronage. Spaces, such as galleries and closets, were created in townhouses specifically to house collections. Galleries such as the one created in Colonel Ligionier’s home on North Audley Street, were often times epic and highly decorative, providing an environment more akin to a museum, than a home. However, in Metheun’s home, nearly the entire house was developed to his collection. The irony of arrangement of this collection was demonstrated in the first painting one would encounter which was an allegorical work of ‘Vanity’, thus superimposing an apology for the richness of the collection upon entry to the home. This moralizing theme was repeated upon entry to the parlour with a work depicting ‘The folly of spending our lives in the pursuit of love, wine, music and play’. Metheun’s collection was criticized as being primarily based upon creating a sense of symmetry in the room. This analysis underestimates the manner in which Metheun chose to display his collection as a reflection of the setting. The cultural significance of the collection was reduced to a description of ‘the usual mixture of schools and subjects within each room.’¹⁴² Defining the arrangement of this collection as ‘usual’ denies the size and scope of Metheun’s achievement as well as the collection’s political and social connotations. The collector’s sorting of paintings for subject, type, or even size was an aspect of enlightened notions of rationality and this criticism fails to recognize this important aspect of display in the early eighteenth century. The assignation of objects to interior spaces was in a sense the building up of a stage for performance. The objects, as well as the space could project one’s social class, gender and even

political goals and affiliation. The townhouse provided unique and varied spaces which exhibited public dimensions, as exhibited in rooms designed for entertaining and display, and including the décor and spatial arrangement which projected these activities onto the street.

Conclusions

Young men and women in the country fix their eye on London as their last stage of hope... the number of young women that fly there is incredible.¹⁴³

For many, the allure of the metropolis was strong. The city provided opportunity in its public spaces, including coffeehouses, pleasure gardens, the theatre and opera. These places were vital urban patterns in which urbanites could express and expand their public role through social and political interaction and exchange. London's public venues were large and varied, and included the innovative pattern in eighteenth-century urban design – the garden square. As an essentially separate community set within the metropolis, the garden square could disguise ownership with the omission of the landowner's home, thereby establishing its own terms of admission based on shared social and political ambitions. The flattening of class distinction and a lack of gender inequality for the residents of the garden square provided for the democratisation of urban space in the privileged setting of London's West End.

The case of Grosvenor Square provided an example which was both typical and unique in eighteenth-century London. Its society was a cross section of the city's population, although the city in general appears to have more feminine residents. The design and execution of Grosvenor Square established a new ideal in city planning, and its geographic location reinforced a spatial ideology of a leisured class of individuals possessing strong political and court responsibilities. With an advantageous position adjacent to the royal green spaces of Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens, Grosvenor Square was suitable for persons looking to advance their social place under the new Hanoverian regime, and specifically acted as a platform upon which women and architects could assert their political aspirations. The scale of the development, its buildings and streets all focused on Grosvenor Square's private garden, dedicated to the Hanoverian succession reinforced the authoritative nature of this unique community. Its streets were the veins of the metropolis, providing direction and purpose to their consumers while staging public activities for the pedestrian and others. The townhouse was the microcosm of the city, exhibiting a spatial arrangement akin to the layout of the city, in which staircases provided passage for guests and visitors, dressing and drawing rooms acted as public entertainment venues, and terrace gardens were secure and private hideaways. In particular, the homes on the Grosvenor estate were important venues for public displays, ranging from collections of Old Masters paintings and consumer goods

such as china and books, formalised spaces for assemblies and dinner parties, to the construction of a large detached ‘villa’ in order to increase one’s visibility and social value. The possession of a home was an indicator of social value, and those of the Grosvenor estate served as both political and social stages for a significant number of single women.

One of the vital functions in which women engaged in modern society was as civilisers.¹⁴⁴ Feminine consumption of public urban spaces such as parks, the opera house and gardens squares, shaped and defined gender and social roles. The physical environment in turn patterned the performance men and women would enact in these varied spaces, enhancing the overall picture of gender relationships in eighteenth-century London. A benchmark of a civilised culture is the manner in which that society provides comfort, entertainment, security and a general ease of life for its members. Garden squares, pleasures grounds, townhouses and boulevards were just a few of the physical manifestations of civilisation evident in early eighteenth-century London. Through the consumption of the established patterns evident in the built environment, as pedestrians, homeowners, and patrons of the arts, luxury goods and material culture, Londoners and in particular, the residents of Grosvenor Square, were able to assert their urbane qualities onto the landscape of the city, constructing a setting for ‘so beautiful a performance’.

¹ Each of the following fundamental works of British architectural history focus on the significance of the country house: H Avrey Tipping and Christopher Hussey, eds., *English Homes* series, 12 vols, (Country Life, 1924-8); James Lee Milne and Christopher Hussey, eds., *The English Country House*, 6 vols (Country Life, 1958); a range of works separated by county such as *The Country House of Dorset* and *The Country Houses of Warwickshire*, by Nicholas Kingsley, gen. ed. (Chichester: Phillimore, 1994); Malcolm Airs, *The Tudor and Jacobean Country House* (Stroud: Sutton, 1995).

² Spiro Kostoff, *The Architect: Chapters on the History of the Profession* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. v-vi.

³ Survey, xxxix and xl. Detail was added to the discussion of homes of John Aislaby, the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl Thanet, because of a known or assumed builder or architect. Joseph Rykwert’s *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth-Century* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1980) creates a history based on architects, their relationships to each other and their clients in an attempt to create an *oeuvre* for each architect.

⁴ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962-). Pevsner does not diminish the description of the building if the architect is unknown.

⁵ Dan Cruickshank and Peter Wyld, *London: The Art of Georgian Building* (The Architectural Press, 1975), p.17.

⁶ Besides the afore mentioned texts which focus on the country house, it is a prominent feature in surveys, such as Giles Worsley’s *Classical Architecture in Britain* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995) and John Summerson’s *Architecture in Britain*, 9th ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁷ H.M. Port, ‘West End Palaces: The Aristocratic Town House in London, 1730-1830’, *London Journal*, vol 20, no 1 (1995), 17-46, p.29.

⁸ M. Dorothy George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (Penguin, 1965), p.101.

⁹ Lawrence Stone, *The Family Sex and Marriage in England* (Penguin, 1990), pp.213-4.

¹⁰ WRO CR 114A/254, 1763.

¹¹ WRO CR 114A 254, 1763.

¹² HL BR 16. Letter to Frances Poole from the 2nd Viscount Palmerston, dated Jan 17, 1756.

¹³ Ware, *The Four Books of Andrea Palladio's Architecture* (1738), Preface.

¹⁴ Port, 'West End Palaces,' p. 20. This bias in favour of the isolated mansion is evident in John Summerson's *Architecture in Britain*, and *Georgian London* (Barrie and Jenkins, 1988), and Mark Girouard's *Life in the English Country House* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978). The detached house and style are the focus of Horace Field and Michael Bunney, *English Domestic Architecture of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth-Centuries* (G. Bell, 1928).

¹⁵ This would include single women – spinsters, unmarried daughters of peers, widows – and younger sons of peers, and of course member of the commercial and merchant classes.

¹⁶ Port, 'West End Palaces,' p.29.

¹⁷ Lady Abergavenney, Lady Guildford, Anne Vane, and Lady Deloraine were Frederick's mistresses who resided on the Grosvenor estate during this period. See Lucy Moore, *Amphibious Thing: The Life of a Georgian Rake* (Penguin, 2000), p. 180.

¹⁸ Survey, xl, p.164.

¹⁹ Compiled from the published rate book information in Survey, xxxix, Appendix 1, and xl.

²⁰ Stone, *The Family Sex and Marriage*, p.167. See also Linda Colley, *Britons* (Vintage, 1996), pp.253-4.

²¹ PRO PROB 11/790, sig 291, 1751. These properties, including the house in Grosvenor Square were bequeathed to her son, Lord Robert Manners.

²² Howard Colvin, *The History of the King's Works* (HMSO, 1976), v, p.221.

²³ Survey, xxxix, pp.84-85.

²⁴ PRO PROB 11/702, sig 137, 1740.

²⁵ PRO PROB 11/702, sig 137, 1740.

²⁶ H.J. Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt and the Estates Systems. English Landownership 1650-1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 291.

²⁷ W.S. Lewis, ed., *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, (Oxford, 1937-), xx, 454.

²⁸ On the Grosvenor estate there was an immense number of military men which included Lord Kerr, Field Marshall Sir George Howard, Lieutenant-General Henry Hawley, and Rear Admiral Charles Knowles.

²⁹ *London in Miniature*, p.200.

³⁰ Port, 'West End Palaces,' pp.20-24.

³¹ Plan published in Survey, xl, p.165.

³² David Olsen, *Town Planning in London* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982), p.4

³³ Aislaby made his money through the South Seas Company, and Rockingham and Thanet achieved their titles through uncles, subsequently marrying heiresses.

³⁴ WRO CR 114A/254, 1763. Plans reproduced in Survey, xl, p.37.

³⁵ Summerson, *Georgian London*, pp.82-83. See Survey, xxxix, Appendix II, for the schedule of fixtures at Chesterfield's home, No 45 Grosvenor Square.

³⁶ WRO CR 114A /253.

³⁷ J. Mackay, *A Journey through England in Familiar Letters...*, 2 vols (1724), i, p.195.

³⁸ HL MS 62/ BR16. Letters to Frances Poole 1756.

³⁹ WRO CR 114A /253.

⁴⁰ WRO CR 114A / 253. The annual cost of each of these rates in 1746 were £16.

⁴¹ Survey, xxxix, pp. 83-89.

⁴² The principal homes utilized in this study are located along the main east/west arteries, the Square and North and South Audley Streets.

⁴³ Summerson, *Architecture in Britain*, p. 296.

⁴⁴ I have identified 41 first-time residents of the Grosvenor estate as subscribers to *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715,1717). There were only 10 estate residents as subscribers to the first volume, but by the time of the reissue of volume III in 1725, there was a significant increase in the number of subscribers, overall and of Grosvenor residents. It is also interesting to note that the third volume, which was dedicated to the Prince of Wales (future George II), the increase in subscribers may be an indication of political positioning. Isaac Ware's book of the designs and concepts of Palladio was dedicated to Lord Burlington. The subscription list is about 300, which is less aristocratic than Campbell's tome. On the whole there were many more artists and craftsmen including William Kent, Henry Flitcroft, Francis Hayman, William Hogarth, John Vardy and Samuel Johnson. There was only one woman, a Mrs Chandler, on the list.

⁴⁵ For a more detailed discussion of Campbell's direct involvement with the group of persons surrounding the Prince of Wales, see T.P. Conner, 'Colen Campbell as Architect to the Prince of Wales', *Architectural History*, 22 (1973) 64-71.

⁴⁶ Conner, 'Colen Campbell as Architect to the Prince of Wales', p.64. Campbell also used this appellation on the building lease on Brook Street which was to be his residence. Survey, xxxix, p.20.

⁴⁷ WYAS VR 286/ Bundle A/ Part 1/9.

⁴⁸ *Survey*, xl, p.118. See also Port, 'West End Palaces,' p.27.

⁴⁹ See Frontispiece to all three volumes of *Vitruvius Britannicus*.

⁵⁰ Summerson describes *Vitruvius Britannicus* as a manifesto for the Palladian style of architecture in Britain, *Architecture in Britain*, p. 338. This discourse generally neglects the influence of native architects such as Jones, Wren and Vanbrugh.

⁵¹ Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, i, plates 49 and 50.

⁵² Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, i, p.5.

⁵³ I have found two existing copies of Campbell's proposal of the east end of Grosvenor Square, one of which can be found unbound at the Bodleian Library, Oxford and the other is bound into volume III of *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1717), in one of the two sets located at the British Library, and hand numbered in pencil number 100. The provenance of this set (Bookmark 649 b.5 37) was an early purchase for the King's Library (George III). Although it is disappointing that the original owner of the set is unknown, it is significant that Campbell's volumes were deemed so important for the King's Library that a purchase was endorsed – most books in the collection were gifts and donations. This volume also includes an additional plate of an interior elevation of Campbell's parlour on Brook Street.

⁵⁴ Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, iii, hand inscribed as plate 100.

⁵⁵ Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, iii, hand inscribed as plate 101.

⁵⁶ Campbell, *Vitruvius Britannicus*, iii, plate 93.

⁵⁷ Daniel Defoe, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, ed by Furbank, Owens and Coulson (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), p.133.

⁵⁸ Later William Chambers, James Stuart and the brothers Adam reside and set up shop on the estate.

⁵⁹ *Survey*, xxxix, p. 20.

⁶⁰ Campbell's home was at No 76 Brook Street. The *Survey* attempts to link the designs of some buildings on the Square with Campbell (xxxix, pp.20-1), including the east side by Simmons, and the three house block on the north side attributed to Shepherd

⁶¹ See Howard M. Colvin *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840* (John Murray, 1954) for the achievements of each of these men.

⁶² Campbell's influence has been noted in John Simmon's design for the estate end of the Square, the three house block (Nos 18, 19 and 20) on north side of Square by Shepherd, John Aislabie's home at No 12 Grosvenor Square and in Roger Morris's home on Green Street. See *Survey*, xxxix, p.15, and xl, pp.127-9, 132-36, 190-1.

⁶³ Robert Morris, *Lectures on Architecture* (1759), Preface.

⁶⁴ *Survey*, vol xxxix, p.22 and xl, pp. 190-2, No 61 Green Street.

⁶⁵ Julius Bryant, *Marble Hill House* (English Heritage, 1988), p. 3.

⁶⁶ *Survey*, xl, pp.27-28; No 4 was the centre house on the east end of the square which was won by a grocer's wife and boarder, then sold to the Duke of Norfolk.

⁶⁷ John Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved, Illustrated by Plans* (1766), p.130.

⁶⁸ Gwynn, p.130.

⁶⁹ Throughout the course of the construction of the estate, there were 92 separate builders and architects.

Survey, xxxix, p.29.

⁷⁰ *Survey*, xxxix, Appendix II.

⁷¹ Originally this home was built for the eldest son of Robert Walpole, the 2nd Earl of Orford.

⁷² WRO CR 114A/254, 1763.

⁷³ WRO CR 114A/254, 1763.

⁷⁴ WRO CR 114A/254, 1763.

⁷⁵ These statistics were derived from an analysis of the information provided in the *Survey of London*, xxxix and xl.

⁷⁶ *Survey*, xxxix, pp.85 and 193.

⁷⁷ GER WA 1049/10/Box 4/23

⁷⁸ No 51 Grosvenor Square. *Survey*, xxxix, pp. 27-28.

⁷⁹ The 4th Earl lived at No. 38 Grosvenor Square from 1733-39 and appears to have moved from the estate after the death of his grandmother.

⁸⁰ PRO PROB 11/702, sig 137, 1740.

⁸¹ This work has involved an investigation of the published letters of Hester Grenville, Lady Chatham, Mary Granville, Mrs Delaney, Hon Mrs Edward Boscawen and Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, and the unpublished letters of Frances Poole, Viscountess Palmerston.

⁸² Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Routledge, 1989), p.409.

⁸³ Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 126; Anna Clark, 'Queen Caroline and the Sexual Politics of Popular Culture in London,' *Representations*, 31 (1990), 47-68; Lucy Moore, *Amphibious Thing* (Penguin, 2000), pp. 161-3, 238-9.

⁸⁴ Colvin, *The King's Works*, v, p.127, 175, 176, 221, 224, 240, 242, 457.

⁸⁵ Caroline's chief architects involved with these projects were William Kent and Richard Boyle, 3rd Earl of Burlington. See Colvin, *History of the King's Works*, v, pp. 127 and Susan Jenkins, 'Queen Caroline's taste: The furnishing and functioning of the Queen's private apartments at Hampton Court', *Apollo*, cxliii, no 411, (May 1996), 20-24.

⁸⁶ Colvin, *The King's Works*, vol v, p.?

⁸⁷ Lewis Melville, *Maids of Honour* (Hutchinson, 1927), p.51; Moore, *Amphibious Thing*, p. 216.

⁸⁸ See Giles Worsley, 'The Wicked Woman of Marl,' *Country Life*, 14 March 1991, 44-97;

⁸⁹ Gladys Scott Thompson, ed., *Letters of a Grandmother, 1732-35. Being the correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough with her granddaughter Diana, Duchess of Bedford* (Jonathan Cape, 1943), p.78.

⁹⁰ The homes were: No 4 Grosvenor Square by William Watson-Wentworth, Earl of Malton, newly married to the heiress Lady Mary Finch; No 12 Grosvenor Square by John Aislaby, esq, Director of the South Seas Company and Chancellor of the Exchequer during the reign of George I; No 18 Grosvenor Square by Lewis Watson, 2nd Earl of Rockingham, young heir and newly married to the heiress Katherine Furnese; No 19 Grosvenor Square by 7th Earl of Thanet, nephew of the 6th Earl and newly married to the heiress, Lady Mary Savile, daughter of the Earl of Halifax; No 20 Grosvenor Square by Algernon Coote, 6th Earl of Mountrath, Scottish peer who succeeds his brother; No 60 Green Street by the architect Roger Morris.

⁹¹ Best illustrated in the homes of Colonel Ligoni, No 12 NAD; the Earl of Bute, No 75 SAD (Bute House); the Earl of Derby, No 26 GSQ (Derby House); see volume xl of Survey for individual houses.

⁹² Williams, pp.60-1, 146; Stone, pp. 98-9; O'Gorman, pp. 108-113; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, pp. 67-71.

⁹³ H.J. Habakkuk, *Marriage, Debt and the Estates System. English Landownership 1650-1950*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); John Cannon, *The Aristocratic Century: The Peerage of Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

⁹⁴ Moore, *Amphibious Thing*, p. 217.

⁹⁵ See Worsley, *Classical Architecture in Britain*, in which the author investigates a specific architectural form and attributes authorship to that architectural characteristic. An example is the investigation of Campbell's use of a rusticated and arcaded ground storey at Wanstead as a way to attribute Campbell's design or influence to those buildings in which an architect is unknown.

⁹⁶ *London and Its Environs Described*, iii, pp. 82-3.

⁹⁷ *The London and Westminster Guide*, p12.

⁹⁸ Dr. Peter Smith, *The Dynamics of Urbanism*, (Hutchinson Educational, 1974), p.157.

⁹⁹ *London in Miniature*, p.198.

¹⁰⁰ *London in Miniature*, p. 197.

¹⁰¹ Richard Etlin, *Symbolic Space: French Enlightenment Architecture and Its Legacy*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p.124.

¹⁰² Robert Morris, *Lectures on Architecture* (1759), Preface.

¹⁰³ John Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved, Illustrated by Plans* (1766), p.130.

¹⁰⁴ Gwynn, p.130.

¹⁰⁵ Ware, *The Four Books of Andrea Palladio's Architecture*, Book III, Chapter 39, p.431.

¹⁰⁶ Ware, Book III, Chapter 39.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, *The Dynamics of Urbanism*, p.135. Smith applies this description of epic space to urban design, but I feel this type of symbolic space is also applicable to interiors.

¹⁰⁸ Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p.197.

¹⁰⁹ Desmond Fitz-Gerald, 'The Painted Mural at No 44 Grosvenor Square,' *The Victoria and Albert Museum Yearbook*, i (1969), 145-51.

¹¹⁰ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Buildings of England: London I: The Cities of London and Westminster*, revised by Bridget Cherry, (Penguin, 1973), p.656.

¹¹¹ Refer to the article by Fitz-Gerald, 'The Painted Mural at No 44 Grosvenor Square,' for a thorough investigation of authorship.

¹¹² Scott Thomson, *Letters from a Grandmother*, p.78.

¹¹³ Survey, xxxix, p. 84.

¹¹⁴ This home was settled on Miss Vane after her break-up with the Prince of Wales in 1735 along with a cash settlement of £1600. See Melville, p. 253.

¹¹⁵ For discussion of Lord Hervey's renewal of his affair with Miss Vane, see Moore, *Amphibious Thing*, p. 178.

¹¹⁶ Bourdieu, *Distinction*, p.196.

¹¹⁷ Girouard, pp.149-50.

¹¹⁸ British Library Add MS 22220, ff 84,88. See Survey, xxix, p.100.

¹¹⁹ Dan Cruickshank and Neil Burton, *Life in the Georgian City* (Viking, 1990), p.195.

¹²⁰ Cruickshank and Burton, p.195. Most homes in the metropolis had wooden walls to separate gardens.

¹²¹ Lady Llanover, ed., *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Grenville, Mrs Delaney*, 3vols (Richard Bentley, 1861). See Cruickshank and Burton, p.197.

¹²² Cruickshank and Burton, p.193.

¹²³ Cruickshank and Burton, p.193.

¹²⁴ Cruickshank and Burton, p.193.

¹²⁵ Cecil Aspinall Oglander, ed., *Admiral's Wife: The Life and Letters of Hon Edward Boscawen, 1719-61* (Longmans, 1940), see also Cruickshank and Burton, p.197.

¹²⁶ Jules Lubbock, *The Tyranny of Taste: The Politics of Architecture and Design in Britain 1550-1960*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), p.106.

¹²⁷ Lubbock, p.106-110.

¹²⁸ Brewer, *Pleasures of the Imagination* (Harper Collins, 1997), pp. x-xiii, 87-93, 144-6, 149-50.

¹²⁹ Michael Snodin and John Styles, eds. *Design and the Decorative Arts* (V&A Publications, 2001) pp.218-35.

¹³⁰ Gwynn, *London and Westminster Improved*, pp.130-1.

¹³¹ Dana Arnold, *Reading Architectural History* (Routledge, 2002), pp. 199-200.

¹³² See Giles Worsley, 'The Wicked Woman of Marl,' pp. 44-47, and Charles Saumarez-Smith, *Eighteenth-Century Decoration* (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1993), p.233, who describes the Duchess as 'odd and independent' and 'not representative of her sex.'

¹³³ Scott Thompson, *Letters from a Grandmother*, p.78.

¹³⁴ Lubbock, *The Tyranny of Taste*, p.186.

¹³⁵ This was Henry Herbert, 9th Earl of Pembroke, an architect.

¹³⁶ Elizabeth Burton, *Georgians at Home* (Longmans, 1967), p.117

¹³⁷ WRO CR 114A/254, 1763.

¹³⁸ Lubbock, p.186.

¹³⁹ *London and Its Environs Described*, v, pp.84-100.

¹⁴⁰ Survey, xl, p.42.

¹⁴¹ Moore, p. 217

¹⁴² Giles Waterfield, 'The Townhouse as Gallery of Art', *The London Journal*, 20, no 1, pp.47-66, p.53

¹⁴³ Arthur Young, *The Farmer's Letters to the People of England*, 2nd ed, (1771), pp.353-4. See Williams, *The Country and the City*, p.146.

¹⁴⁴ David Hume, *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects* (1758); Ogborn, pp. 68, 90.