

**SERVANTS' PASSAGE:**  
**Cultural identity in the architecture of service**  
**in British and American country houses**  
**1740-1890**

2 Volumes  
Volume 1 of 2

Aimée L Keithan  
PhD

University of York  
Archaeology  
March 2020

## **Abstract**

Country house domestic service is a ubiquitous phenomenon in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain and America. Whilst shared architectural and social traditions between the two countries are widely accepted, distinctive cultural identity in servant architecture remains unexplored. This thesis proposes that previously unacknowledged cultural differences between British and American domestic service can be used to rewrite narratives and re-evaluate the significance of servant spaces. It uses the service architecture itself as primary source material, relying on buildings archaeology methodologies to read the physical structures in order to determine phasing. Archival sources are mined for evidence of individuals and household structure, which is then mapped onto the architecture, putting people into their spaces over time. Spatial analysis techniques are employed to reveal a more complex service story, in both British and American houses and within Anglo-American relations. Diverse spatial relationships, building types and circulation channels highlight formerly unrecognised service system variances stemming from unique cultural experiences in areas like race, gender and class. Acknowledging the more nuanced relationship between British and American domestic service restores the cultural identity of country house servants whose lives were not only shaped by, but who themselves helped shape the architecture they inhabited. Additionally, challenging accepted narratives by re-evaluating domestic service stories provides a solid foundation for a more inclusive country house heritage in both nations. This provides new factors on which to value modern use of servant spaces in historic house museums, expanding understanding of their relevance to modern society.

# Contents

## VOLUME 1

Abstract	2
Contents	3
List of Illustrations	5
Acknowledgements	10
Author's Declaration	11

### 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction	12
1.2 Literature Review	14
1.3 Research Aims	24
1.4 Site Selection	26
1.5 Methodology	29

## PART ONE: THE BRITISH COUNTRY HOUSE 36

### 2. British Service Models

2.1 Introduction	39
2.2 Facilities	53
2.3 Accommodation	59
2.4 Circulation	65
2.5 Outbuildings	73
2.6 Conclusions	78

### 3. Kiplin Hall

3.1 Introduction	80
3.2 Phase One: 1722-1818	88
3.3 Phase Two: 1818-1868	97
3.4 Phase Three: 1868-1904	106
3.5 Conclusions	115

## Part One conclusions 118

<b>PART TWO: AMERICAN COUNTRY HOUSES</b>	121
<b>4. Mount Vernon</b>	
4.1 Introduction	125
4.2 Phase One: 1754-1774	135
4.3 Phase Two: 1774-1799	150
4.4 Conclusions	167
<b>5. Kingscote</b>	
5.1 Introduction	171
5.2 Phase One: 1839-1864	178
5.3 Phase Two: 1864-1880	189
5.4 Phase Three: 1880-1894	197
5.5 Conclusions	209
<b>Part Two conclusions</b>	212
<b>6. Cultural Distinctions – an American Service Model</b>	
6.1 Introduction	215
6.2 Legacy of Enslaved Labour	218
6.3 Impact of Gender Disparity	223
6.4 Adapting for a ‘Classless’ Society	227
6.5 Conclusions	232
<b>Epilogue</b>	235
<b>Bibliography</b>	244
<b>VOLUME 2</b>	
List of Illustrations	271
Illustrations	278

## List of Illustrations

Figure 2.1: Uppark in the early-eighteenth century	278
Figure 2.2: Uppark west façade	278
Figure 2.3: Uppark south façade	279
Figure 2.4: Uppark east façade	279
Figure 2.5: Uppark c1730 Phase 1 basement floor plan	280
Figure 2.6: Uppark c1730 Phase 1 ground floor plan	281
Figure 2.7: Uppark c1730 Phase 1 first floor plan	282
Figure 2.8: Uppark c1730 Phase 1 second floor plan	283
Figure 2.9: An early eighteenth-century view of Uppark by Pieter Tillemans	284
Figure 2.10: Uppark c1750s Phase 2 basement floor plan	285
Figure 2.11: Uppark c1750s Phase 2 ground floor plan	266
Figure 2.12: Uppark c1750s Phase 2 first floor plan	287
Figure 2.13: Uppark c1750s Phase 2 second floor plan	288
Figure 2.14: Uppark c1780 estate plan	289
Figure 2.15: Uppark kitchen building	289
Figure 2.16: Uppark north façade by Henry Repton c1810s	290
Figure 2.17: Calke Abbey east façade	290
Figure 2.18: Calke Abbey south façade	291
Figure 2.19: Calke Abbey west façade	291
Figure 2.20: Calke Abbey c1704 Phase 1 ground floor plan	292
Figure 2.21: Calke Abbey c1704 Phase 1 first floor plan	293
Figure 2.22: Calke Abbey c1704 Phase 1 second floor plan	294
Figure 2.23: Calke Abbey estate map	295
Figure 2.24: Brodsworth Hall east side	295
Figure 2.25: Brodsworth Hall southwest	296
Figure 2.26: Brodsworth Hall service wing east side	296
Figure 2.27: Brodsworth Hall basement floor plan	297
Figure 2.28: Brodsworth Hall ground floor plan	298
Figure 2.29: Brodsworth Hall first floor plan	299
Figure 2.30: Brodsworth Hall estate map	300
Figure 2.31: Calke Abbey c1794 Phase 2 ground floor plan	301

Figure 2.32: Calke Abbey c1794 Phase 2 first floor plan	302
Figure 2.33: Calke Abbey c1794 Phase 2 second floor plan	303
Figure 2.34: Uppark c1873 estate plan	304
Figure 2.35: Uppark c1810s Phase 3 basement floor plan	305
Figure 2.36: Uppark c1810s Phase 3 ground floor plan	306
Figure 2.37: Uppark c1810s Phase 3 first floor plan	307
Figure 2.38: Uppark c1810s Phase 3 second floor plan	308
Figure 2.39: Brodsworth Hall laundry (original brewhouse)	309
Figure 2.40: Calke Abbey c1860 Phase 3 ground floor plan	310
Figure 2.41: Calke Abbey c1860 Phase 3 first floor plan	311
Figure 2.42: Calke Abbey c1860 Phase 3 second floor plan	312
Figure 2.43: Uppark c1730 estate plan with tunnel to original kitchen	313
Figure 2.44: Uppark red baize door in stair hall	313
Figure 2.45: Calke Abbey stables	314
Figure 2.46: Calke Abbey orangery greenhouse	314
Figure 3.1: Kiplin Hall from the east	315
Figure 3.2: Kiplin Hall estate map 2019	315
Figure 3.3: Kiplin Hall east façade	316
Figure 3.4: Kiplin Hall southeastern view	317
Figure 3.5: Kiplin Hall west façade	317
Figure 3.6: Kiplin Hall north façade and reconstructed tower	318
Figure 3.7: Kiplin Hall kitchens east façade	318
Figure 3.8: Kiplin Hall kitchens view from southwest	319
Figure 3.9: Kiplin Hall service link with clock tower	319
Figure 3.10: Kiplin survey map c1723 (detail)	320
Figure 3.11: Kiplin Hall conjectural plan c1625	320
Figure 3.12: Portrait of Cecil Calvert	321
Figure 3.13: Kiplin Hall c1740 Phase 1 ground floor plan	322
Figure 3.14: Kiplin Hall c1740 Phase 1 first floor plan	323
Figure 3.15: Kiplin Hall c1740 Phase 1 second floor plan	324
Figure 3.16: Kiplin Hall c1780 by George Cuit the Elder (detail)	325
Figure 3.17: Kiplin Hall first floor ‘servants’ corridor	325
Figure 3.18: Kiplin Hall c1820 Phase 2 ground floor plan	326

Figure 3.19: Kiplin Hall c1820 Phase 2 first floor plan	327
Figure 3.20: Kiplin Hall c1820 Phase 2 second floor plan	328
Figure 3.21: Kiplin Hall estate map 1857	329
Figure 3.22: Kiplin Hall from the southeast c1867	330
Figure 3.23: Kiplin tithe map	330
Figure 3.24: Kiplin Hall c1890 Phase 3 ground floor plan	331
Figure 3.25: Kiplin Hall c1890 Phase 3 first floor plan	332
Figure 3.26: Kiplin Hall c1890 Phase 3 second floor plan	333
Figure 3.27: Kiplin Hall north tower c1867	334
Figure 3.28: Kiplin Hall ‘housekeepers link’ in 1976	334
Figure 3.29: Kiplin Hall north tower staircase demolition 1976	335
Figure 3.30: Kiplin Hall estate map 1893	335
Figure 3.31: Kiplin Hall stables	336
Figure 4.1: Mount Vernon entrance and Circle Drive	336
Figure 4.2: Mount Vernon Mansion north façade, Palladian window	337
Figure 4.3: Mount Vernon Mansion from southeast	337
Figure 4.4: Mount Vernon modern estate map	338
Figure 4.5: Mount Vernon servants’ hall (right) and gardener’s house (left)	338
Figure 4.6: Mount Vernon kitchen (left) and storehouse (right)	339
Figure 4.7: Mount Vernon north colonnade	339
Figure 4.8: Mount Vernon gardener’s house east side with half-hipped and half-gable roof	340
Figure 4.9: Mount Vernon salt house	340
Figure 4.10: Mount Vernon smokehouse	341
Figure 4.11: Mount Vernon spinning house	341
Figure 4.12: Mount Vernon washhouse	342
Figure 4.13: Mount Vernon stable	342
Figure 4.14 Mount Vernon greenhouse and enslaved peoples’ quarters	343
Figure 4.15: Mount Vernon c1759 Phase 1 ground floor plan	344
Figure 4.16: Mount Vernon c1759 Phase 1 first floor plan	345
Figure 4.17: Mount Vernon c1759 Phase 1 second floor plan	346
Figure 4.18: Mount Vernon c1775 Phase 1 estate map	347

Figure 4.19: The ‘Vaughan Plan’ of Mount Vernon by Samuel Vaughan c1787	348
Figure 4.20: ‘East Front of Mount Vernon’ by Edward Savage c1787-1792 (House for Families, right)	349
Figure 4.21: Mount Vernon conjectural plan c1752	349
Figure 4.22: Mount Vernon c1793 Phase 2 estate map	350
Figure 4.23: Mount Vernon c1799 Phase 2 basement floor plan	351
Figure 4.24: Mount Vernon c1799 Phase 2 ground floor plan	352
Figure 4.25: Mount Vernon c1799 Phase 2 first floor plan	353
Figure 4.26: Mount Vernon c1799 Phase 2 second floor plan	354
Figure 5.1: Kingscote from the southwest	355
Figure 5.2: Kingscote 1969 estate map	355
Figure 5.3: Kingscote south elevation	356
Figure 5.4: Kingscote east elevation	356
Figure 5.5: Kingscote McKim, Mead and White addition	357
Figure 5.6: Kingscote service wings (left)	357
Figure 5.7: Kingscote carriage house	358
Figure 5.8: Kingscote c1859 Phase 1 ground floor plan	359
Figure 5.9: Kingscote c1859 Phase 1 first floor plan	360
Figure 5.10: Kingscote c1859 Phase 1 second floor plan	361
Figure 5.11: Kingscote c1839 preliminary sketch by Richard Upjohn	362
Figure 5.12: Kingscote 1850 estate map	362
Figure 5.13: Kingscote servant door (detail)	363
Figure 5.14: Kingscote family door (detail)	363
Figure 5.15: Kingscote 1878 Phase 2 ground floor plan	364
Figure 5.16: Kingscote 1878 Phase 2 first floor plan	365
Figure 5.17: Kingscote 1878 Phase 2 second floor plan	366
Figure 5.18: Kingscote painted glass window, original dining room	367
Figure 5.19: Kingscote 1878 south elevation, laundry addition left	367
Figure 5.20: Kingscote c1880 painting by John Newell	368
Figure 5.21: Kingscote c1839 watercolour by Richard Upjohn	368
Figure 5.22: Kingscote c1882 Phase 3 ground floor plan	369
Figure 5.23: Kingscote c1882 Phase 3 first floor plan	370



Figure 5.24: Kingscote c1882 Phase 3 second floor	371
Figure 5.25: Kingscote McKim, Mead and White dining room	372
Figure 5.26: Kingscote McKim, Mead and White dining room	372
Figure 5.27: Kingscote dining room moveable screen from the east end	373
Figure 5.28: Kingscote dining room east end 'corridor' created by closing moveable screens (left)	373
Figure 5.29: Kingscote 1893 estate map	374
Figure 5.30: Kingscote 1876 estate map	374
Figure 5.31: Kingscote 1883 estate map	375
Figure 5.32: Kingscote 1921 estate map	375

## **Acknowledgements**

My profound gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr Kate Giles for her guidance, patience and confidence in the value of my research.

I truly appreciate the numerous people and organisations that have supported my work through fellowships, research assistance and funding: Fred W. Smith Library for the Study of George Washington, Caroline Spurry, Tom Reinhart, Steve Stuckey, Luke Pecoraro, Mary Thompson and Samantha Snyder; Preservation Society of Newport County, Caitlin Emery Avenia, Laurie Ossman, Jeff Moore and Christine Pickens; Kiplin Hall, Dawn Webster and the North Yorkshire County Record Office; Yorkshire Country House Partnership and York Graduate Research School.

I'd also like to acknowledge the generosity of the people I've met throughout this project who have shared their expertise and passion with me: my Attingham '15 colleagues, Laura Levitt, Patricia Silence and Lydia Mattice Brandt; Hannah Philip and Dr Sarah Burnage; Sarah Salem and Arriane Morgan.

The tremendous personal growth I've experienced through the process of completing this thesis would not have been possible if not for the continuous support of my mom Betsy, Marcy, Constance, Ritch, Jimmy, Dennis, Lurah, Vicky, and my family in Maine who made it possible to complete a thesis whilst in quarantine in the middle of a pandemic. Thank you all for believing in me even when I didn't.

## **Author's declaration**

I declare that all information in this thesis is original except where expressly noted. No portion has been previously submitted for award of a degree to any university in the United Kingdom or overseas. The views in this thesis are my own and do not represent that of the University of York.

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction

Imagine you are planning a day out in the country. You seize the opportunity to escape the pressures of everyday life, touring a nearby country house. You step through a set of heavy wood doors into the cool air of a stone entrance hall. Your eyes are immediately drawn up to high ceilings, covered with intricate plasterwork. Plush velvet carpet on a wide central staircase beckons. As you continue, family portraits line the walls, intimidating yet intriguing. Their names are familiar – you have visited her boudoir and toured his study. As you make your way through other finely-decorated rooms, you wistfully imagine the luxury that life in such a house would afford. In the parlour a small porcelain handle near the fireplace catches your eye – a servant bell pull? You carry on, the route well-marked by stanchions and velvet ropes, which guide you through the ubiquitous green baize door and into the service wing. The hush is palpable. It is another world: closer, less vibrant, devoid of ornamentation save a large board of bells on coiled wires. You make your way through a labyrinthine corridor lined with numerous doors. Only a few are open, cordoning off vignettes of service equipment. In one, a placard with a generic silhouette tells you about the many responsibilities of ‘Mr Butler’. In another, a card set in front of a pleasant, sunlit rocking chair recounts the duties of ‘Mrs Housekeeper’. Your tour ends in a large, double-height kitchen, where ‘Cook’ prepared elaborate dinners for dozens of people. A blackened range runs along one wall with shiny copper pots above and pristinely-scrubbed tiles cover the floor. Your attention is captured by the Exit sign and you think, ‘Ooh cake!’

Sitting in the café after your tour (perhaps in the repurposed stables) you think about the people that inhabited the service spaces you have just seen, wanting to learn more about how they might have experienced them. Perusing a colourful guidebook you are left wanting, confronted with only a few back pages remarking on the kitchen’s contents and giving a generalised description of the jobs performed there. This boilerplate ‘behind-the-scenes’ experience and presentation is commonly used by country house museums, in an attempt to convey the invisible presence of country house servants. Indeed, it does acknowledge their necessity, a defining aspect of

country house life. However, the experience is largely the product of what has been termed ‘the Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD), an unspoken set of preconceived values communicated to and absorbed by country house visitors (Smith 2006). This raises questions about what is actually being conveyed about servants. What have we really learned about service spaces? And whose story has really been told?

This thesis is explicitly concerned with service spaces in country houses. But more than this, it seeks to undertake a comparative study of service spaces in British and American houses between c1750-1890. This encompasses a period of prolific country house construction on both sides of the Atlantic. Furthermore, elite houses and families throughout this time were dependent on domestic servants. Within such houses it is frequently assumed that American domestic service practices followed those previously established by British households. Consequently, American houses and their service architecture are widely believed to be minimally-adapted versions of their British counterparts. Here I intend to argue that first, the story of British country house service spaces is much more complicated than has been previously understood. This requires new ways of viewing such spaces and a new methodology to unpick prevailing suppositions. Second, I argue that existing scholarship reflects a lack of cross-cultural historical understanding. The variety and nuance in the history and relationship between Britain and America is too often underplayed or ignored altogether when examining country houses. With my knowledge of the American country house servant experience I will investigate the intricacies of Anglo-American relations and how they played out in the country house. Through the lens of service space architecture we begin to see a different story of the country house emerging, one that responds to current concerns within heritage management questioning the continued relevance of country houses, and opens up exciting new avenues of inquiry.

The thesis begins with a review of existing literature in order to establish what the stories of service architecture are and what underpins them. An examination of country house literature and servant literature reveals the dominant narrative and also what is missing from the stories told. This then leads into my methodology, which presents a new way of interrogating country house service architecture. The methods are subsequently tested through a series of case studies – both in Britain in Part I and in

American houses in Part II. A final discursive chapter will draw together my findings before reflecting on the wider impact and further implications of the study.

## 1.2 Literature Review

The field of country house literature is vast and varied. Works range in scope from sweeping surveys like Cannadine and Musson's *The Country House: Past, Present, Future* (2018) to niche works like *The Country House Library* (Purcell 2017). They span from studies on medieval castles and manor houses like *The English Castle: 1066-1650* (Goodall 2011) to mid-twentieth-century houses like Aslet's (2012) *The Edwardian Country House*. Studies examine many elements from construction (Wilson and Mackley 2000) to destruction (Strong et al. 1974) and everything in between. Servants are only rarely and selectively included. But they played an essential role throughout, not just servicing the lives of the elite, but inhabiting, working, structuring and negotiating a sense of identity from their connections to these places. Whilst the lives and stories of individuals are considered in fields like labour and gender studies, where their contribution to society and economy is explored, their lived experience and agency within the spaces they inhabited is largely unexplored. The goal of this section is not to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the fields of country house and servant literature, which exist in many other studies. Rather, it is a selective review of moments in their historiography where new approaches provided opportunities to investigate the intersection of the story of the country house and its servants. It critically examines key works of country house literature in Britain and America to identify if and in what context servants appear. It also explores parallel trajectories in servant studies to assess how they are portrayed and connected to country houses.

World War II marked an important turning point in the history of the British country house. The economy was devastated, the empire dying, and morale suffered. Many country houses were forcibly requisitioned during the war and interiors, fixtures and fittings were damaged during the process (Robinson 2014). After the war, changes in society and economy transformed the lives and expectations of both the aristocracy and the lower classes who, in previous generations, had sought careers in service. Long-term changes in inheritance tax also took their toll on families and houses, whose heirs no longer wanted to shoulder the burden of maintaining an historic building.

Some fell into decay and ruination; others were demolished. Others were ‘museumised’, as historians like Hussey (1945, 1950) argued for their potential as the foundations of heritage tourism industry, thereby aiding national recovery. Bequests to organisations such as the National Trust offered families a way of off-setting death duties whilst they remained in portions or buildings on site. Some houses were also left to the nation and came into guardianship to be managed by English Heritage. Gradually these organisations became adept at providing visitor experiences that spoke to a sense of nostalgia for a lost age, showcasing the architecture, landscapes, collections and lifestyles of the elite. This sense of nostalgia and invitation to the wider public to help care for country houses was furthered by the landmark 1974 V&A exhibit ‘The Destruction of the Country House’, which highlighted the plight of what by this time had become a national cultural symbol. Works like Mandler’s (1997) *The Rise and Fall of the Stately Home* and Harris’ (1998) *No Voice from the Hall* more fully explored the social and cultural implications of country house decline and decay. A particular perspective of the country house was firmly fixed within national identity due to such experiences and works. This viewpoint is underpinned by acceptance of the value of elite lives and the highly-stratified nature of British society and class structures in the past. It informs what heritage studies have termed ‘the Authorised Heritage Discourse’ or AHD (Smith 2006), and significantly impacts how servants are portrayed and perceived, by the public and academics alike.

These values were shared by early country house scholars, many of whom were drawn from upper-middle-class and upper-class contexts, and who employed art historical methods and constructed particular kinds of discourse that privileged certain kinds of values and forms of knowledge. Such approaches were built on nineteenth-century foundations which sought to taxonomise and typologise architecture and art (Leach 2010, 22). However, in so doing, they reproduced and reinforced concepts such as connoisseurship and aesthetics, even though most people do not perceive buildings as works of art (Fernie 2006, 21; Leach 2010, 41). Early country house studies by the eminent architectural historian Sir John Summerson (1953; 1959) follow this pattern, identifying historical principles and dominant design factors, which are then tied to houses exemplifying these ideals (see Arnold 2002 for a critique of this approach). Works that focus on specific stylistic eras like Hussey’s (1955; 1956; 1958) Georgian *English Country Houses* series, followed by Girouard’s (1979) *The Victorian Country*

*House* heavily use contemporary-period ‘design guides’ to identify appropriate case studies. These were usually houses built during the period as exemplars of architectural style or interiors, which reflect the work of particular patrons, architects, artists and fashions of the day. As Arnold (1998) notes, this prioritises the stories of elite (usually male) figures in British architectural history. But the lasting impact of this approach is also evident in American country house literature (Moss 1990), which uses the works of historic British architects like Colen Campbell and Roger North to evaluate the success of American buildings. It also removes attention from the structures themselves. In all these works, houses that are not neatly attributable to a single time period, style or architect are routinely absent, leaving little room to appreciate change or variation within buildings. Likewise there is no room for detailed consideration of how country houses actually *functioned*. The complete absence of servants and service spaces in this literature reveals an intellectual and cultural agenda disproportionately valuing elite interests. Servants do not appear because they are not necessary to what these disciplinary traditions considered to be of interest or value in country houses.

The move towards social history therefore provided an important opportunity for architectural historians to move beyond their focus on biography and style, to ask new questions about relationships between buildings and people. Few country house studies are more ground-breaking than Girouard’s (1978) *Life in the English Country House*. Connecting architectural design trends with social trends laid the framework for expanded art historical understanding of the meaning of country houses. Girouard applied social history methods to a group of people and their houses for which he could find abundant surviving evidence. But as a result, once again the focus was on the aristocracy. The houses chosen for his study therefore remained bound to stylistic ideals and elite biographies. Perhaps more insidiously, because Girouard made extensive use of the writings of, and design guides aimed at the elite, his account reproduced contemporary historic concerns to minimise servant presence, both architecturally and socially. Through his work, servants were further marginalised, intellectually. Scholars following Girouard’s model likewise miss an opportunity to explore the more complex social and architectural relationships in country house life. For example, Cooper’s (1999) examination of gentry houses also overlooks the important symbiotic relationship between servants, masters and the spaces at this lower social level of housing. Relations between these communities of society and



class were closer, and spatial constraints were greater, and so should have been a particularly interesting issue to explore. A more successful example of social history approaches to the country house can be seen in Cliffe's (1999) study of seventeenth-century gentry houses. His critique of works like Girouard's acknowledges the limitations of the ingrained social bias of studies of aristocratic houses (Cliffe 1999, 207n1). Consequently, Cliffe's work examines more typical houses with less stratified social hierarchies, where servants played bigger roles and were a more visible part of gentry households. The work therefore shows a greater awareness of the role of servants and the potential for social history methodologies for examining servants.

Arnold's (2002, 127-128) critique of social history approaches highlights the connection between presentation of elite architectural histories and the values assigned to them. The social group most connected with social histories of country houses is the upper-class, therefore servants are included in such narratives in relation to their servicing or facilitation of elite lifestyles. This poses a particular issue when it is applied to houses and cultures where servants would have been more visible. This should have been a good point for American scholars to enter the field, asserting the unique development of country houses in response to the nation's distinctive cultural and social development (an issue which I return to in my case studies below). Instead, works by Aslet (1990) and Craven (2009) continue to focus disproportionately on the elite, using the wealth and status reflected in late-nineteenth-century Gilded Age mansions to validate America's architectural history. Mooney's (2008) work on eighteenth-century Virginia prodigy houses is an even more disappointing example of this selective approach. It takes the viewpoints and vocabulary of established British studies like those of Girouard to explain early American elite homes. In doing so, the distinctive history and archaeology of American service is overlooked, with only a short discussion of enslaved domestics – the largest servant pool in eighteenth-century America (Mooney 2008, 248-54). A lack of consideration of the issue of race within country house studies remains a huge deficiency in the field, and again is an issue that I return to later in this study (Young 2017, 173).

Other kinds of social historians, however, have found a rich source of information in servant lives. Many studies use servants as a lens through which to explore wider social and economic issues. Their contributions to broader themes of labour (Stedman 2004;

2009) and economics (Field 2013; Schwarz 1999) provide valuable information about lower socioeconomic groups. They are of limited use for this thesis since they are predominantly quantitative studies of statistical data, which obscures individual experiences. Studies concerned with servants of a particular time period can also rely heavily on this kind of data. However, they also sometimes acknowledge critical differences in service practices that can be used to locate servants temporally and geographically. Hecht (1956) and Hill (1996) remain the definitive sources on eighteenth-century British servants. Enslaved servants were the predominant labour force in America and are largely absent in servant literature. Nineteenth-century servants are better represented in both countries (Britain – Horn 1975; America – Sutherland 1981) due to the availability of large-scale surveys like national censuses, which provide demographic data for quantitative methods of analysis (Wrigley 1972). However, as noted in Sarti's (2014, 282) exploration of domestic servant historiography there still remains a dearth of comprehensive studies on American servants, with Dudden (1983), Katzman (1978) and Sutherland (1981) remaining key works. America's significant immigrant labour force therefore has provided a useful focus for scholars. Studies on Irish (Lynch-Brennan 2014; Urban 2009) and Swedish (Lintelman 1989; Lintelman 1991) domestics reveal vastly different experiences of service. The field of gender studies includes investigations of servants since such a large percentage of domestics were women. Consequently, female servants are well represented in both American (Dudden 1983; Katzman 1978) and British (Davidoff 1974; Kent 1989) scholarship. However, a consistent limitation of all of these approaches is the failure to connect servants with the environment in which they lived and worked. Urban and country house servants are included in the same studies with little consideration of the very different experiences afforded by these locales. Therefore, the most helpful works for this thesis are those specifically considering country house servants – of which there are many (Evans 2011; Gerard 1994; Horn 2004; Musson 2009; Sambrook 1999). However, these too are problematic, limiting their usefulness. The issues with these works are twofold. Firstly, they exhibit the same bias as country house literature, focusing disproportionately on how servants supported elite lives and presenting a stereotypical, idealised narrative. Secondly, the importance of the architecture they inhabited is unrecognised. How they negotiated space therefore remains an unexplored resource for revealing the nuances of the lived experience of country house servants.

How then, can we hear the voice(s) from the (servant) hall? Oral histories, diaries and memoirs are one important source for this material. By the turn of the twentieth century, working in service was an increasingly rare profession. Former servants were encouraged to publish accounts of their lives in service. Some earlier memoirs were tales of oppression from a bygone era and social system (Horne 1923; Jermy 1934; Powell 1968; Turner 1962). Others were imbued with nostalgia for the professional stability and forms of cultural and social tradition represented by service life (Lanceley 1925; MacDonald 1927; Moran 2013). Modern scholars have used compilations of these anecdotes and oral histories to paint evocative pictures of servant life (Boase 2015; Horn 2012; Lethbridge 2013; McDermid 2008). These works reveal biographical detail and help us hear servant voices, but they are not particularly interested in asking critical questions of the material in the light of more theoretical frameworks such as gender studies, class and race. Moreover, although they seek to evoke the conditions of servant life, they are not explicitly interested in the spatial and material contexts of their lived experiences.

Surprisingly, very few scholars start their examination of the country house with an analysis of architectural plans. Franklin's (1975) examination of the layout and configuration of Victorian and Edwardian country house service wing plans was one of the first studies to do this. It is a comprehensive investigation of what types of spaces houses had and how they were configured. It is effective at connecting prevailing values of the time with architectural arrangements, which she highlights was a considerable concern of homeowners during this time (Franklin 1975, 212). Franklin also argues that social and architectural details of service arrangements were fundamental to overall design in such houses. They are therefore well-represented in her later study of the design and planning of entire houses of this period (Franklin 1981). All illustrated house plans include service spaces (a marked difference from previous works that entirely leave off service wings in reproducing plans) along with a discussion of their contribution to the house. Despite this, Franklin's studies remain heavy reliant on historic design guides (specifically those of Kerr 1865, Muthesius 1904 and Stevenson 1880) meaning that once again, newly-built houses seen to perfectly reflect these guides are preferred over older houses with more complex phasing. Nevertheless, Franklin demonstrated that by looking equally and indeed,

preferentially at service spaces, a more balanced picture of how the household actually functioned can be revealed.

It was not until over a decade later that more analytical approaches to space were applied to architectural plans and structures. Formal spatial analysis encompasses a variety of techniques to examine relationships between areas in order to better understand how people experience space. Such approaches, including access analysis, viewshed analysis and axial analysis were adapted from architectural studies (Hillier and Hanson 1984), often by archaeologists, for example, in Fairclough's (1992) work on castles. Hanson (1998) and West (1999) were the first to explicitly tie these to country houses. Hanson's (1998) is a more focused version of earlier work which tests the idea of the 'theory of space'. It uses a combination of techniques focused on space to try to see what kinds of meaning can be revealed, but there is little exploration of the complexity and phasing of the houses she studies. West's (1999) remains one of the most successful and paradigm-shifting studies of access analysis within the country house, shedding new light on the way in which the organisation and experience of architecture and space both reflected but also structured changing ideas about social class and culture. Both works include service spaces within their analyses, but servants were not the main focus of their studies. These works have provided much of the inspiration for the ways in which I have approached, thought about and categorised particular kinds of configuration of spaces, and particular patterns of circulation and access, in the case studies which follow.

Archaeologists have a particular interest in the relationships between people and space. Whilst well-documented periods have provided historical archaeologists with contextual evidence of cultural and behavioural norms in the use of architecture and space, the investigation of prehistoric and non-literate societies have required and encouraged archaeologists to develop new approaches to the analysis and interpretation of structures and spaces that in turn, has been embraced by historical archaeologists seeking to give voice to communities and individuals unrepresented in the dominant forms of discourse or written record of historic periods, such as servants and enslaved peoples. Methodologies of survey and recording, dendrochronology, and paint analysis enable archaeologists to look at the minutiae of stratigraphy, teasing out minor phases in the construction or alteration of a building which might not shed light

on stylistic or typological development, but nevertheless reflect minor changes in the use and meaning of spaces for their inhabitants. Hicks and Horning (2006, 274) explain how such approaches can enable archaeologists to link the lifecycle of a building with the biographies of its inhabitants (see for example Hill 1999). Minor details such as the direction of wear patterns on a floor, the traces of hinges indicating the way in which a door opened, or the qualitative differences in paint finishes, floor surfaces, light levels and forms of heating, all speak of the conditions and material realities as well as the visual cues that signaled how spaces were accessed, used and actively negotiated by their inhabitants.

To date, these methods have been used predominantly within vernacular and industrial building studies in both Britain and America. This thesis argues that such approaches are particularly useful in studies of American country houses, where early service spaces were housed in separate, vernacular buildings. Olmert (2009) for example, focuses on eighteenth-century American outbuildings like kitchens, laundries and smokehouses, questioning how they functioned. He does not shy away from their connection with slavery, instead acknowledging enslaved servants' critical role as the primary users of such spaces. Chappell (2013) and Vlach (1993) specifically focus on buildings used by enslaved peoples in order to better understand their lives. Both provide much-needed focus on an aspect of plantation history which tends to be both literally and metaphorically whitewashed. Such methodologies are applied far less often to British estates, perhaps because the majority of service spaces were integrated into the houses. However, Drury and Smith's (2010) study of Audley End's stable block illustrates that this approach is equally useful on British estates, as does Tatlioglu's (2010) analysis of the carpenters' workshop at Harewood. Very few studies in either country apply these methods to service spaces *within* country houses, however. Sambrook and Brears (1996) focus specifically on country house kitchens, illustrating the depth of information these methods can yield when applied to a single type of space. Hardyment's (1997) *Behind the scenes: Domestic arrangements in historic houses* is a more comprehensive study of country house service spaces. Unfortunately, although the research is firmly based in archaeological techniques, the book's lavishly-illustrated format tends to overwhelm and obscure its academic content. These studies illustrate that such methods can be effective in investigating service architecture. But they still fail to fully address the complex relationships within

and between service and household spaces, reinforcing and perpetuating the upstairs-downstairs divide.

As Smith (2006; 2009; 2016) has argued, the study of the country house has been at the heart of the construction of the ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ in Britain and elsewhere, since the country house became the subject of scholarly study and preservation efforts in the second half of the twentieth century. Indeed, the historiography of the country house suggests that such elite buildings always functioned as a kind of theatre within which dominant social, cultural and political agendas were both structured by the elite and consumed by the middle classes, from the eighteenth century to the present day. One of the more controversial aspects of the AHD, but one which is gaining more traction and is take up in this thesis, is the subject of inclusivity. The power of British and American country house owners was only possible through the oppression of others. Until relatively recently there has been little place for that story within country house studies since to acknowledge such issues undermines perceptions of the cultural value of county house history. Consequently, the only ‘appropriate’ place for servants within the AHD has been as labourers whose work bolsters the value of elite lives. But as Smith (2006, 119) highlights, ignoring or minimizing issues surrounding social inclusion actively contributes to the perpetuation of bias. Without explicitly acknowledging these issues, the story of inclusivity ‘will continue to be about assimilation, acceptance of the legitimacy of elite history, and misrecognition of or disregard for the diversity of cultural and social experiences (Smith 2009). This critical awareness of the agendas of country house studies offers archaeologists, historians, heritage managers and curators an opportunity to revisit how marginalized communities such as servants and enslaved people are represented within the historic house experience. Useful critical reflections on these issues are being generated. Smith (2010) deepens the discussion in a study exploring the impact of exhibitions commemorating the 1807 abolition of slavery in Britain. Likewise, Pustz’s (2010) *Voices from the Back Stairs: Interpreting Servants’ Lives at Historic House Museums* and Gallas and Perry’s (2014) *Interpreting slavery at museums and historic sites* both specifically address themes of inclusive history within the context of historic house museums.

Heritage studies are therefore beginning to open up spaces in which those involved in the interpretation of country houses can reflect critically on the value and significance of country house museums (Young 2017) and their role in perpetuating – but also problematizing – issues such as nostalgia (Hodge 2011). In so doing, such studies have begun to question how useful it is to study and interpret the American country house through the paradigm of the British country house. Given the commercial success of the British country house experience, it is not surprising that American scholars and heritage professionals have looked to Britain for models of scholarship and curatorial practice. But it is arguable that putting these houses on the map, and aligning them with the narratives of British houses, downplayed their distinctive historical, architectural and social contexts and meanings. This thesis will argue that a closer, more archaeological approach to the analysis of both British and American houses highlights the complexity and the potential of servant spaces to tell much richer and more nuanced stories of the servant experience, and challenges assumptions that American country houses are simply variants of the British country house story. Indeed, I will suggest that servant spaces are the spaces within which the distinctive character and cultural differences between British and American country houses are apparent, raising interesting questions about what further studies of other colonial country house service architectures might also reveal; a subject to which I return in my conclusion.

The wide-ranging literature reviewed in Section 1.2 of this chapter demonstrates that whilst there is scholarly interest in country house servants, much literature lacks consistent critical rigour. In part, this is a reflection of the fact that architectural historiography has consistently prioritised the study of polite architecture and the lives of elite patrons and architects over that of servants. Servant spaces are consigned to the margins and footnotes, discussed largely in relation to their support of elite lifestyles. The field is also diluted with a sense of nostalgia that sanitises and whitewashes the history of service. Social histories of servant life also tend to reinforce architectural tropes of life above and below stairs, failing to explore the ways in which servants moved around the houses and landscapes of their employers. Although the biases of the Authorised Heritage Discourse have been exposed by critical heritage studies, this has not led to a sustained interrogation of the relevant sources and material evidence. For although archaeological approaches offer new ways of thinking about

types of space and stories excluded from dominant architectural narratives, they remain largely unexploited in the context of the country house. This thesis therefore seeks to write an architecture of service, investigating the complex and ever-evolving interplay between service architecture and its inhabitants, not only in Britain but also in America.

### 1.3 Research Aims

The development of British country house studies as a distinctive sub-discipline within the field of architectural history has led to the development of a series of assumptions about the locus of architectural innovation in Britain and its subsequent diffusion to America. Such narratives leave little space for the investigation of the relationship between different kinds of servants and their specific environments. Nor are they interested in the experience of servant lives. This thesis explores the complexities of the lived experiences of country house servants by identifying and analysing the distinctive architectural, spatial and cultural characteristics of British and American service architecture. Three broad research aims are outlined here which underpin the rest of this study: Anglo-American cultural contexts; ideal versus reality in the design of service architecture; and the scholarly significance of the service story and its impact on the interpretation of historic houses.

#### *Re-examining assumptions about Anglo-American cultural contexts.*

Country house scholarship developed within British architectural history and not surprisingly, has been dominated not only by British scholars, but also cultural assumptions about the locus of architectural innovation in the patronage of the British aristocracy and their architects. It has long been assumed that models first developed in Britain were transported to America through processes of colonisation, cultural diffusion, emulation and appropriation. Where they are considered in the context of the British country house, American houses are presented as mere footnotes to their story. This narrative is also perpetuated in the few works dedicated to American country houses themselves. Thus for example, Young (2017, 12) argues that ‘regardless of the specificity of Britain’s country houses to Britain’s history, Britain’s ex-colonies sought to mold (*sic*) their own monuments along the lines of the best of British’. Such assumptions extend to the analysis of servant life, for example in the uncritical use of British household management manuals to analyse American service



practices (Sutherland 1981). This tradition is both misleading and unhelpful, ignoring a critical cultural divide that began well before the American Revolution.

This study challenges assumptions about the adoption and adaptation of the British service model in American country houses. It identifies significant differences in the concept of the 'country house' in Britain and America, in perceptions of domestic service itself and in the social structures of service, especially in America, where servant communities also included enslaved peoples. Re-examining the cultural contexts of service architecture informs the division of my thesis into two distinctive sections. Part I investigates and complicates the story of British country house service spaces through a series of examples and one case study, and Part II builds on the methodologies of Part I to explore two American case studies in depth.

*Ideals versus realities of service space.*

The lack of detailed studies of service spaces in either Britain or America means that current scholars are over-reliant on, and over-trusting of, the idealised standards of service architecture expressed by contemporary period design guides, such as Kerr's (1865) *The Gentleman's House: Or, How to Plan English Residences* and Roger North's (1981) *Of building: Roger North's Writings on Architecture*. Such assumptions underpin studies such as those of Franklin (1975; 1981) and Girouard (1978). Their principles are often imposed onto the plans, access routes and spaces of country houses, but are rarely tested against the reality of these buildings. Moreover, as I have noted above, such studies tend to rely on standard examples of country house 'types' rather than the complex reality of multi-phased country houses which had to adapt and accommodate new ideas within the constraints and possibilities of existing structures and access routes.

This study moves beyond the stereotypical British country house service narrative, questioning how closely service architecture actually resembled contemporary design ideals, and exploring how these ideals were adapted, negotiated and transformed in the context of the architectural and spatial constraints of actual houses, specific family and household structures, and the agency of servants themselves. This theme is explored in Part I at two scales of resolution. First, I re-evaluate the service spaces of three houses that have already been the subject of study, showing how it possible to re-

interrogate these buildings to understand the experience and place of servants within these houses. Second, I pilot a more detailed archaeological and historical analysis of Kiplin Hall, a country house which has received relatively little previous scholarly attention. I demonstrate the potential of this approach to transform our understanding of how owners and architects accommodated and adapted ideals in reality, and how servants themselves navigated and negotiated service spaces and access routes to structure their own relations with the family, and each other. Having demonstrated the potential of this methodology, I apply it consistently in Part II of my thesis to two American case studies.

### *The significance of the servant story?*

The overarching aim of this thesis is to argue that the story of service architecture is one worth telling, not only to visitors of the country house, for whom the social experience of service life connects to their own family history or social background, but also within the academy. Although many country houses have responded to criticisms of the Authorised Heritage Discourse and to a public appetite for stories of life below stairs, historic house museums tend to produce generic ‘behind-the-scenes’ servant experiences, in contrast to the richly-nuanced interpretations of family rooms and biographies of their inhabitants. Large, well-illustrated country house history books reproduce and perpetuate the idea that it is the lives of the elite that are of greatest interest. My aim here is not simply to repeat the observation that this reflects the ongoing dominance of particular kinds of discourse within the academy and heritage industry. For although challenging the Authorised Heritage Discourse is an important component of critical heritage studies, it does not always offer something constructive in its place. In my thesis I want to show that it *is* possible to write complex and nuanced stories of marginalised peoples from the detailed archaeological and historical analysis of country houses. Such stories acknowledge cultural difference and distinctiveness. In my conclusion I consider how my research might inform further research and curatorial and interpretive strategies within historic house museums.

### 1.4 Site Selection

Selecting my case studies required me to look carefully at current definitions of the ‘country house’. Not surprisingly these are dominated by the British model of a large, elaborate home generally built by a member of the aristocracy or gentry and supported

by a landed estate. Whilst such definitions are useful, they can also get in the way of appreciating the diversity of historic houses, especially in America. My selection of case studies are therefore united by a set of common characteristics, rather than rigid definitions. They are all connected in the necessity of a staff to support the household, which is evidenced by the incorporation of service architecture. The houses were owned by influential people, not only members of the aristocracy or gentry. This firmly places the owner in society's upper echelons whilst respecting that 'elite' status is not static but fluid, dependent on time, place and ever-shifting social trends. The houses are also owned by people with multiple residences. Therefore, the lifestyle enjoyed at their country houses contrasts with the pressures of urban life. This also highlights the country house's critical function as a societal tool, a luxury actively used to shape, support and reflect the owner's desired persona. With these connecting threads as a guide, I have sought to explore a range of houses, from largely single-phase buildings which still preserve evidence of household structures at a particular moment in time to those with multiple phases and complex household structures, which changed over time.

This thesis examines four British and two American case studies. In Part I, Chapter 2 I re-examine the accepted service narrative of three British houses, testing what new insights can be gleaned from each house's unique history by applying an innovative methodology. In selecting these sites, I searched for houses that are widely considered typical of the British country house. Each has a full range of service spaces that supported elite families over time. The service spaces in each house are included within the museum's interpretive scheme, but the service areas have not yet been the subject of sustained study. Equally important was the range of dates and locations the houses covered. I wanted houses I could examine through the entire time period of the study to draw out the story of British country house service over time. But it was also important that they overlapped, since Chapter 2 takes a comparative approach in drawing out themes across British country house service spaces. This assemblage of houses therefore spans from the seventeenth to nineteenth century, includes houses from Yorkshire to Sussex, and takes a variety of approaches to presenting the service spaces to modern audiences. The houses are:

- *Uppark House*, West Sussex (c1690). The basement of this rectangular three-storey building was designed entirely for servant use. Service spaces were

subsequently enlarged, added to and included outbuildings. It was the eclectic Fetherstonhaugh family's country retreat.

- *Calke Abbey*, Derbyshire (1702-1704). The ground floor of this three-storey courtyard complex was originally service spaces. Servant rooms were moved and expanded over two centuries to meet the needs of different households. Generations of the notoriously reclusive Harpur-Crewe family used the house to escape societal pressures.
- *Brodsworth Hall*, South Yorkshire (1861-1863). This rectangular two-storey house has a shorter service wing attached to the structure's north side. It was Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson's vision of a modern nineteenth-century country house for family living, entertainment and leisure.

Part I, Chapter 3 investigates British domestic service further by examining the full 150-year service history of *Kiplin Hall*, North Yorkshire (c1622). The main house is a three-storey rectangular building previously connected to an elaborate service wing. The initial eighteenth-century service wing construction marked the beginning of the house's evolution into the country seat for generations of the Crowe and Carpenter families. For this case study it was particularly important to choose a house that had not yet widely contributed to the story of Britain's domestic service. This allowed for deep investigations into the building's history which were then tied to discoveries about the history of its servants. Setting this back into the wider context of British houses and service adds valuable insight into the nuances of service and servants' lives.

Part II, Chapters 4 and 5 build on the success of this in-depth analysis of single sites to examine two American houses spanning the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. America's country house history is less cohesive than Britain's during the time period of this study since it covers both the Revolutionary period when the nation was actively forming its identity, and also the Civil War when the economic and power base shifted from the South to the North. It was therefore important to choose a house for each period that was indicative of what a country house was in America at that time. This meant choosing a Southern plantation house for the eighteenth-century when planters were the ruling class. But it then meant choosing a house located in the North whose

owner was in trade after the Civil War. This allows for service to be examined within the context of the country's shifting social and architectural trends.

- *Mount Vernon*, Virginia (c1743). The two-and-a-half-storey Mansion house is linked to two service buildings by open colonnades. Servants also worked in separate buildings on the estate landscape. Throughout his busy life, America's first president, George Washington continually strove to spend time at this idyllic estate.
- *Kingscote*, Newport, Rhode Island (1839-1841). Asymmetrical in form, the main house includes multiple two-storey service wings attached to the north side. Built by Southern plantation owner George Noble Jones, it was one of the city's first summer retreats, and continued to be used for seasonal entertainments held by Newport socialites, Kings.

### 1.5 Methodology

The thesis builds on well-established methods of researching and analysing architecture in building history and archaeology. Archaeological techniques of stratigraphic analysis were used to reconstruct the phasing and evolution of service spaces, including lost or demolished structures. Archival sources were scoped and critically mined for their information about servants and household management. Finally, techniques of spatial analysis were used to explore how servants and other household members were able to access, move around and interact with each other, over time. This interdisciplinary approach yields new insights about servant spaces and the lived experience of servants.

#### *Archaeological approaches*

The first stage of the project was a desk-based assessment for each case study. Sources of information documenting particular building campaigns or the condition of the building at specific moments in time were scoped and studied. They included maps, site plans, surveys, drawings, historic photographs, digital models, conservation management plans and archaeological reports in the archives and collections of houses, local record offices and national archives.

Cartographic sources were found to be particularly useful sources of information about buildings within the wider country house landscape. Early land surveys commonly

mark the location of buildings in relation to estate boundaries. They are valuable sources through which it is possible to trace the presence or absence of buildings and relationships between them. At a more detailed level, it is possible to trace the shape of British service wings from the early maps of the Ordnance Survey, produced at a scale of six-inches to the mile. The maps created by the Sanborn Map Company afford a similarly helpful and detailed resource for American towns and cities. Since these were created primarily for fire insurance purposes, building footprints were also augmented with details of a building's height and materials.

High-quality information is provided by architectural and archaeological surveys of surviving buildings. Major organisations such as the National Trust and Historic England have often commissioned these studies, or helpfully collated existing reports in the National Monuments Record (NMR) or similar archives. American buildings are recorded in the Historic American Building Survey (HABS). Systematic reports customarily include photographs, scaled drawings, site surveys and building histories. The HABS database is also an invaluable resource for documentation of vernacular architecture like slave buildings which have subsequently been ruined or lost (Vlach 1993, xii). In both countries, independent surveys prompted by planning proposals, restoration and conservation work often contain valuable information. Photographs taken during works are particularly valuable, capturing details of exposed structural elements subsequently demolished or covered over. Historic paintings, sketches and photographs of country houses can be helpful sources, but often prioritise aesthetic viewpoints rather than servant spaces and sometimes require careful interpretation. Comparing photographs taken from similar viewpoints in the present and the past can enable significant alterations to be established (Cabezos-Bernal et al. 2016; Lewi et al. 2019).

Information gathered via desk-based assessment was tested and augmented with fieldwork. Physical examination followed established methods of analysis outlined in the guidance of Historic England (Lane 2016), as well as manuals by Morriss (2000) and Wood (1994). For each of the three detailed case studies a photographic survey of existing structures and architectural features was undertaken. Investigations studied evidence of interior and exterior material changes, past structures and connections between servant and family spaces. Recent scholarship (Palmer and West 2016) has

also highlighted the impact of technological advances on service spaces, underscoring the importance of analysing fixtures and fittings.

The framework for analysis employed in this project diverges from more commonly used British approaches to study country house architecture. It follows approaches to building biographies pioneered in American vernacular architecture studies, using structures to trace the stories of people who often left little evidence in the documentary record (Carson and Lounsbury 2013; Carter and Cromley 2005). Studies like *The Back of the Big House* (Vlach 1993) and the Saving Slave Houses Project (Hill 2020) use standing buildings on plantation landscapes to reveal how enslaved peoples lived. This approach has also been successfully employed in Britain, for example in Guillery's (2004) study of eighteenth-century London townhouses, a building type previously thought too rare and dispersed to offer meaningful information. However, such vernacular inquiries push beyond architectural history's over-riding concern with style, asking questions about location, chronology, form and function (Carter and Cromley 2005, 45-61). Focusing on the 'ordinariness' of service architecture provides a platform for uncovering previously unexplored patterns within and between servant spaces. Comparative analysis is therefore a critical technique, as it allows buildings to be considered over a greater span of place and time, generating more data. Hill's (2020) research includes a comprehensive national database that will allow scholars to compare the residences of enslaved persons throughout America once it is publicly available. Guillery (2004) also demonstrates the benefits of comparative analysis by exploring architectural and cultural connections, not only throughout different parts of London, but between London's maritime areas and select American houses. This thesis employs these methods to compare service spaces in country houses from multiple locations throughout time. Ultimately the patterns revealed elucidate how such spaces 'not only become symbolic representations of [cultural] values but also serve in their own way to enforce those values actively' (Carter and Cromley 2005, xxii).

#### *Documentary research*

Documentary research is a particularly valuable historical tool. However, many resources frequently fail to represent marginalised populations. Therefore, this study looked for both large-scale evidence of servants and more detailed sources as they

related to individual case studies. In this way it mirrors approaches well-established in American vernacular studies, putting a sizeable quantity of information into its larger context in order to understand social and cultural use (Carter and Cromley 2005, 45). Census records provided a useful starting point to identify individual servants. Decennial British and American censuses record biographical information and often household positions beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. The addition of independent interim censuses conducted by some American cities and states provides a quintennial record for several households. Individuals can then be traced through time by combining this basic information with other official records. British servants can also be placed into their wider community through parish records. Enslaved American servants appear in tithe records, placing them on specific estates. Valuable information about household size, status and wealth can be extrapolated from broader records that do not include names, like American slave censuses and British menservant licenses. Personal correspondence, oral histories, memoirs and court records can reveal fine-grained detail of interpersonal relationships. Close master-servant relationships are suggested by bequests. Physical spaces can be deduced through probate inventories, construction records and fixtures and fittings receipts. Household and estate accounts document wage receipts, casual work payments and invoices for supplies used in specific work spaces.

The above methodologies were combined to create building biographies by mapping people into their spaces over time. My methodology was heavily inspired by a variety of spatial analysis techniques. West (1999, 105) asserts that ‘one of the most neglected areas of archaeological thought on housing is the link between inhabiting a building and inhabiting a body, and the processes of creating social meaning between these two categories.’ This thesis specifically aims to understand that link through examination of service space configuration and their users. Since such analysis can be conducted on-site or using architectural plans, these methods are a particularly powerful tool for uncovering the experiential characteristics of space, even when building fabric has been lost. The questions asked by access analysis were helpful for examining how service spaces are connected but also highlights barriers, both moveable (doors and windows) and immovable (walls and fences) that impact how spaces are experienced. Examining how spaces were accessed highlights themes of control and permeability, which are particularly meaningful in country houses designed to enforce segregation



(West 1999, 108). I also considered isovist or viewshed analysis to further understand the experiential qualities of country house servant spaces. This method investigates space by considering the view from a particular point in a given area, which is useful for examining interior spaces as well as estate landscapes (Roffey 2007; Turner et al. 2001; Wheatley 1995). Both Franz et al. (2005) and Hanson (1998) explore the technique's potential to expose the emotional impact of space, useful in this thesis for considering what servants saw, but also crucially who saw them. My analysis of service spaces also investigated circulation patterns to understand how people moved through service spaces. The approach was inspired by current museum practices investigating visitor flow (Stewart 2011; Vagnone and Ryan 2016; Young 2017, 16). Here I analyse the movements of different sets of inhabitants to clarify daily routines and indicate design motivations beyond practical considerations. Employed on a wider scale, circulation pattern analysis considers the movements of multiple users (family and servants), revealing points of intersection.

#### Ways of organising space

All country houses required service spaces for working, sleeping, moving, and household support, regardless of individual personnel arrangements. Yet, the few existing sources that directly analyse service architecture organise spaces in a way that implies the principal design factor was servant hierarchy. Franklin (1981) and Hardymont (1997) both classify spaces under upper-servant departments: as either part of the cook's, butler's or housekeeper's domains, perhaps in an effort to humanise the architecture. However, dairies, laundries and other spaces that fall outside direct supervision zones do not fit with this concept. Likewise, detached servant buildings are all too easily overlooked in this organisational model. This thesis employs an alternative organisation method: grouping spaces into categories according to their role in servants' lives. This approach shifts the perspective away from ideal social hierarchy and towards actual use.

Service *facilities* are the most dominant and recognisable servant spaces. Designed for completing service work, they are often configured and outfitted with equipment enabling specialist tasks. Considering them as a group enables comparisons between separate work areas like kitchens and laundries, whilst also acknowledging housekeeper's rooms and butler's pantries as work places. Similarly, it encompasses

spaces that did not have a full-time servant presence, like smokehouses, knife houses and lamp rooms, but were essential in some households.

Servants' *accommodation* or lodging is infrequently investigated. These areas are habitually overlooked by scholars as they contributed little to elite life. Additionally, their plain architecture makes them seem unappealing for interpretation in historic house museums. However, these facts make exploration critical. Expanding accommodation into a spatial category, rather than specifying 'bedrooms' encompasses arrangements including sleep in work spaces, family bedrooms and buildings outside the main house. They contain much information about master-servant dynamics and interpersonal servant relationships.

*Circulation's* significance is alluded to in the ubiquitous term 'downstairs' but spatial forms remain unexplored. Franklin (1981, 103-104) includes a cursory overview of 'links between house and [servant] wing', covering back staircases, the ever-present servant corridor and bell systems. However circulatory routes were highly individual, adaptable to household preferences and dependent on existing architecture. Also they are principally defined by movement through them. In addition to staircases and corridors, access points like doors, routes shared by family and servants, and exterior pathways all shaped and were shaped by servant movement and household dynamics.

Estate *outbuildings* that directly support household inhabitants frequently remain unexplored in the context of the household due to their physical separation. They are discounted because of inferior materials, disuse or adaptation. However, as part of country house landscapes, outbuildings were part of users' lived experiences (Finch 2008, 512). Furthermore, architecturally sympathetic outbuildings must be considered in the context of the houses they relate to. Consequently, investigating greenhouses, stables and other service outbuildings broadens understanding of servants' critical role connecting country houses to the wider community.

Regardless of size, location or era, all country houses include spaces applicable to these four categories. However, the great variety between houses, with different resources available for study necessitates a creative approach. The methodology therefore relies on the combination of techniques to unpack each house and pull out

the stories. Applying any one technique in isolation provides limited information, leading to informational organisation that lacks meaning. Fully employing the methodology not only exposes wider themes like spatial permeability, privacy, function and social interaction that run throughout, but also provides the means to build individual household biographies from the perspective of a demographic usually overlooked.

## **PART ONE: THE BRITISH COUNTRY HOUSE**

### *Introduction*

In order to understand the eighteenth and nineteenth century British houses examined in this thesis, it is vital to acknowledge their place within a wider country house service context. Although newly-built eighteenth century houses expressing the ideals and principles of Palladian design have tended to be the focus of much art historical study, it is important to remember that such houses are uncommon and that most, including the case studies examined here in Part I, contain earlier building fabric. These inherited spaces both created the framework for, and were then transformed by, attitudes and expectations about service and servants. This section first considers the characteristics of service spaces inherited by eighteenth-century house owners, before turning its attention to the analysis of a series of short case studies.

### *The architectural and social inheritance*

Prior to improvements in eighteenth-century transportation, country houses were often occupied for extended periods (Cliffe 1999, 31). Large estates were not only symbols of status but also enabled houses to be nearly self-sufficient (Hardyment 1997, 18). Owners were deeply invested in the surrounding community. Employing large numbers of locally-sourced servants not only consolidated their local power base, but acted as a stimulus for, and contributed to, the local economy (Cliffe 1999, 87). Social roles and spatial divisions within these large households were less clearly defined than in later periods (Hill 1996, 22). The term ‘family’ often included servants, and some servants were indeed, relatives (Cliffe 1999, 87). The majority of staff were male ‘retainers’ who carried out a variety of serving duties (Hardyment 1997, 13). Owners were directly involved with servants, as masters disciplined menservants, whilst women servants fell within the mistress’ domain (Cliffe 1999, 103-4). Gender divisions were therefore, already apparent at this date.

These close links of family and servants are reflected in the predominance of shared spaces in pre-eighteenth century country houses. Hall-plan houses were built around a great hall, used to meet social and moral obligations to all classes, including dinners for the poor and elderly (Hardyment 1997, 12). Service ranges adjacent to great halls

provided serving and storage spaces like pantries, butteries and beer cellars. If connected to other areas, they formed a central courtyard providing circulatory space for family as well as work space for servants (Hardyment 1997, 11). Cooper (1999, 307) suggests that the development of these service ranges was a move towards the clearly differentiated service wings of later periods. Many houses also had service facilities located completely outside the house in separate buildings.

The late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries saw profound changes in the function and form of the British country house. Improvements in transport networks and technologies allowed country house owners to enjoy shorter visits for pleasure and leisure. The Industrial Revolution created a class of *nouveau riche* country house builders who did not feel the same moral obligations to contribute to the local community, resulting in a decline in hospitality traditions (Cliffe 1999, 146). Instead, and perhaps because of their newly-acquired status, they appear to have desired greater distinction and privacy from their servants (Hill 1996, 41). The gender divide also shifted as more men left service to seek urban employment and better wages (Hill 1996, 38).

These changing social dynamics begin to be evident in spatial planning (Hanson 1998, 191). Newly-built houses were efficiently designed, with fewer communal spaces, incorporating integral secondary staircases and basement kitchens. Such facilities were outfitted with the latest technological improvements, reflecting the owner's status. Older houses renovated during this period demonstrate a conflict between older asymmetrical forms and a new interest in symmetry of appearance and plan (Cooper 1999, 220). This required existing spaces to be reconfigured to accommodate new ideas about servant circulation. Girouard (1978, 120) asserts that the rise of this 'formal plan' was designed to reflect prevailing ideas of social order. However, studies more focused on the servant experience suggest that spatial planning was actively used to shape and reinforce new ideas about social behaviour (Hill 1996, 39; Pennell 2016, 18). As the century progressed, these trends become ever more legible in the design and planning of the country house. The mid-eighteenth century is therefore an appropriate period in which to commence this thesis' story of British service architecture, enabling us to critically explore the dynamics between country house servants and the spaces they occupied.

A key aim of Part I is to interrogate and complicate the domestic service story of British country houses. The section begins by questioning just how accurately the accepted narrative mirrors the reality of houses, through a comparison of the design ideals of contemporary historic design guides (which often form the basis for existing scholarship) and a series of case study houses. Spatial and historical analysis is used to investigate how these ideals were adapted in the light of architectural, spatial and household constraints. My focus throughout is on the nature of the servant experience and the servant perspective. As a result, I have been able to identify a series of distinctive and enduring cultural characteristics of the service experience, which are then used as a benchmark against which American country houses can be considered in a more nuanced way.

The second, related objective of this section is to test the effectiveness of my methodology in revealing new information about the service histories of country houses. By piloting my approach on a series of three reasonably well-studied houses – Uppark (Sussex), Calke Abbey (Derbs), Brodsworth (S Yorks) – I am able to test its usefulness but also its limitations. The architectural phasing of these houses has been largely well-established by previous scholars. Although they are architecturally distinctive, all three have a full complement of domestic service spaces. The biographies of their owners and occupants have also been well-studied, although those of their servants less so. In the analysis that follows I am able to show that it is possible not only to reconstruct the service experience of these houses but also to question the accepted British service narrative, which guides the thesis' subsequent investigations. Rather than simply extending this analysis to further examples, however, I then seek to employ an even more detailed study of a house which has received far less sustained scholarly attention. Chapter 3 focuses on Kiplin Hall, whose complex phasing requires new analysis, including the reconstruction of lost servant spaces. Examining a building with such complex development tests the methodology's potential for use on other houses that do not neatly align with prevailing narratives and provides a foundation for my study of American houses in Part II.

## Chapter 2: British Service Models

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines a series of three reasonably well-studied British country houses through the lens of the service experience. It tests my research questions and methods to show that even within Britain, and in the context of houses which have received existing art historical study, the story of service architecture is more complicated and nuanced than has previously been recognised. The chapter starts by outlining the generally-accepted narrative of development of service architecture, making particular use of design guides which set out the ideals of household management in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It then proceeds to analyse each house in turn. The structure and form of service architecture is explored through the categories outlined in Chapter 1 of service facilities, accommodation, circulation and outbuildings. The conclusion draws my finding together and sets the scene for the more detailed analysis of the less-well known but perhaps more typical country house of Kiplin (N Yorks) in Chapter 3.

#### *The current story of service architecture: A sketch summary*

As noted above, the mid-eighteenth century provides a particularly useful starting point for this study. It was a period of unprecedented and well-documented building and rebuilding of country houses, influenced by waves of architectural inspiration from the Continent and from within Britain, where the close links between patrons and architects have received considerable study from art historical studies (for example Colvin and Harris 1970; Hussey 1955; Summerson 1959). This was a period in which ideas about style and idealised plan forms seem dominant, and functional considerations, including those of service spaces, subordinate to a concern with the principles of Classical order and symmetry. Houses were an important symbol of status but also something of a stage set, concerned with how they appeared to visitors and showcasing *objects d'art* from Grand Tours (Christie 2000, 29). The maintenance of town, as well as country houses, was an important part of fashionable eighteenth-century life, with shorter periods of residence in each. Concerns with the appearance of houses, and with the status of their owners and visitors had implications for service spaces. What was seen and not seen was carefully orchestrated through the

transformation of the designed landscapes of houses, approaches to them and levels of visibility of service buildings, which were often hidden or disguised behind polite façades. Servants too, were part of this performance of the country house, dressed in livery and put on show, or hidden from view.

Advances in travel had implications for how servants were employed and where they were based. While some servants travelled with the family from city to country, the size and complexity of houses meant that a skeleton staff was required to remain and maintain the house in the family's absence. This led to the rise of a cadre of trusted senior servants. The medieval and early modern role of estate steward was divided into two positions – the land agent (who remained permanently on the estate, often closely involved in improving and innovating the landscape) and the butler (who often travelled with the family). The role of housekeeper also developed in this period, as an intermediary between the lady of the house and the servant community. These more defined senior-servant positions required different kinds of spaces for their own accommodation, and in turn oversaw an increasing segregation of space within the servant community as a whole. Separation between senior and junior servants became increasingly important. Older service room types like the buttery and pantry gradually morphed into spaces like the butler's pantry, housekeeper's room and still room. They were often positioned in liminal or transitional areas between the greatly-reduced public space of the hall and service areas such as the kitchen, laundry, dairy and scullery. Careful attention was paid to circulation within and between these areas. Some servants, such as liveried footmen, were permitted to occupy spaces also used by family and guests, whilst new circulation routes, including back stairs and corridors, hidden behind panelled doors, allowed other servants to move around the house without being seen. Additionally, new technologies like bell systems facilitated the summoning of servants from distant service spaces to public rooms when required.

The nineteenth saw even greater social segregation between families and servants, and within and between members of the service community, which was reflected in spatial arrangements (Girouard 1979, 28). This is evident in existing houses, but even more so in newly-built houses, where architects designed sprawling service spaces that were intended to reflect the wealth and status of their builder (Hardyment 1997, 23). Indeed, some of the leading design guides of the day, such as Kerr (1865, 223) recommended



that houses be designed around accommodating the maximum number of servants a family could afford. Although the roles of the butler and housekeeper continued to dominate service communities in this period, gender segregation became increasingly important. Whereas previously the butler's and housekeeper's bedrooms may have been in the same area of the service wing, in deference to their place within the servant hierarchy, such an arrangement offended nineteenth-century country house owners who attempted to instil morality in their servants by separating the sexes (Franklin 1981, 99-100). In the later nineteenth century, more men left service in favour of what they perceived as less demeaning industrial work (Franklin 1981, 105). One method of addressing the resulting labour shortage was sourcing women servants from special charity schools that taught domestic service skills (Horn 1990, 41). These events contributed to a higher proportion of women domestic servants in country houses, which subsequently impacted service arrangements.

Throughout the nineteenth century, family and servant relations continued to be characterised by a concern with maintaining social distinctions. The illusion of privacy for the family was achieved through the ongoing use of circulation routes, new spaces and innovative technologies. This gained more importance as the function of the country house as a site of leisure and entertainment developed. Parties got larger, longer and less formal. Many entertainments, like shooting parties and balls followed a seasonal schedule, requiring a large staff and the need to accommodate visiting guests' servants. During this time it became undesirable for even servants like footmen to remain visible. Consequently, elaborate servant-only circulation routes were designed to enable the servant community to move unseen through the house. Lobbies and waiting areas near key spaces, like a warming area near like the dining room, and housemaid's closets for emptying slop pails, were used by servants to prepare for the jobs they carried out in family rooms.

Throughout the nineteenth century, earlier emphasis on social formality and architectural symmetry decreased. Thus service wings began to be integrated into house design in a manner described by Franklin (1981, 86) as 'Puginesque truthfulness', architecturally harmonising with the main house, but still identifiable as service spaces. Smellier, dirtier and noisier jobs were pushed farther way from family rooms, so as to disrupt family life as little as possible. There were many more rooms,

which were smaller with individual purposes. The spaces themselves became specialised, partially in response to new technologies like lamps. This was not spatially efficient, but it ensured servants had the resources required to facilitate the smooth and seamless functioning of household life. It also helped maintain segregation between servants, ensuring that each servant remained in their appropriate area and did not cross hierarchical or gender divides.

Towards the late-nineteenth century, country houses had to compete increasingly with other sources of employment and opportunity for the working classes, especially at factories in industrialised towns and cities. Decreasing servant numbers enabled those that remained in the profession to push for better wages and conditions. Owners employed a variety of non-servant solutions including adopting new technologies like indoor plumbing and electricity, purchasing more ready-made foodstuffs, and sending some work like laundry out to local commercial firms. Smaller staffs were permanently employed and augmented with temporary labour from neighbouring communities in order to make entertain affordable. Service wings in newly-built houses became more compact in order to continue to operate with reduced staff numbers. Contemporary design guides such as Stevenson (1880, 80) advised against the construction of previously fashionable extensive service spaces, which would require a large staff to maintain them. Although service wings of this period were significantly more compact than those in earlier houses, service arrangements and household management had become highly regulated in an attempt to ensure the continued comfort and enjoyment of Britain's country house owners.

#### *Biography: People and places*

The stories of houses are closely linked to the biographies of their builders and inhabitants, from patrons to family members and servants themselves. The overarching story of the development of service spaces sketched above is necessarily generalising. Contemporary design guides set out ideals that the owners of country houses might aspire to follow in newly-built houses. Such houses often form the focus of art historical study. However, the reality of most country houses was that they were older buildings within which ideals had to be adapted to fit the constraints of existing structures, and the particular social, economic, familial and lifecycles of country house owners.

The three case studies which form the focus of this chapter explore how these factors influenced the design, use and negotiation of service space, by owners and servants themselves. I start with a brief history of each house, considering their location and circumstances of their construction. A brief architectural description helps to familiarise the reader with their phasing and the location of service spaces, which informs the comparative thematic analysis and discussion which follows. In each case, I briefly consider whether and how, the servant story feeds into the modern visitor experience, an issue to which I return in the conclusion of this thesis.

### Uppark House, West Sussex

‘Up-park’ was originally the upper park of the Manor of Harting (Meade-Fetherstonhaugh and Warner 1995, 15). The land’s primary value lay in timber and livestock grazing, until it was separated from the main estate in 1582, sometime after which a house was constructed (Rowell 1995, 8). Since the property is 310 feet above the nearest water source, Uppark’s early building history and water access are inextricably linked. Historical accounts credit Sir Edward Ford, who was instrumental in improving seventeenth-century London’s water supply, with creating a pump to carry water from South Harting to Uppark (Meade-Fetherstonhaugh and Warner 1995, 18). However, the first written evidence of waterworks does not appear until 1727 (Aldsworth 2015, 148-9). Modern scholars assert that since pumping water such a distance was beyond seventeenth-century technology, wells and ponds provided Uppark until the eighteenth century, which is possible since the house was only used sporadically (Rowell 1995, 9). Certainly Ford, 3rd Lord Grey of Warke, Viscount Glendale, and Earl of Tankerville only used the remote property to escape from personal and political scandals when he inherited in 1675. However, after successfully supporting William of Orange in 1688, Grey’s political fortunes changed (Rowell 1995, 10). Around 1690 he constructed the first substantial house on the estate, which is the core of the existing structure. A historical engraving produced at the time by Leonard Kynff and Johannes Kip depicts a three-storey house surrounded by formal and produce gardens, orchards, and symmetrical multi-storey outbuildings (fig 2.1).

Uppark House’s existing west, south and east facades are still recognisable as Grey’s original house (figs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). The original, U-shaped, three-storey brick building

with stone dressings appears to adhere to late-seventeenth-century design principles, although there is no definitive attribution to an architect. It has two principal floors separated by a stringcourse and an implied order articulated by tall sash windows, and a sub-basement level lit by small windows. The hipped roof is enlivened by small dormer windows and prominent chimneystacks. The nine-bay south facade is punctuated with a slightly protruding pedimented central section (fig 2.3). Aldsworth (2015, 142) asserts that the door in this façade, set in an impressive stone surround and approached via a set of stone steps, was the original formal entry. If so it was quickly abandoned and a door in the centre of the seven-bay east facade appears to have become the principal entrance to the complex (fig 2.4). Visitors passed through it into a courtyard, where their horses were stabled in one of two flanking service buildings. The original stables' architecture mimicked that of the house beyond, with protruding central pediments, a stringcourse separating two main floors, and dormers in the buildings' hipped roofs. Central cupolas denoted their utilitarian function. Visitors would then proceed through a decorative gate into a second, inner courtyard, before entering the house via the east door. Applying West's (1999) access analysis methods suggests that Uppark had a carefully controlled visitor experience during a time when such linear processions were becoming less fashionable.

It had long been assumed that the north face was not meant to be seen; a hypothesis confirmed by recent discoveries of substandard brickwork in this area (Aldsworth 2015, 123). The service entrance on this side led into the basement level where the majority of servant spaces were located (figs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8). The kitchen was housed in the northernmost courtyard building, where noise and smells would not impose on the family. Locating services in detached outbuildings posed functional challenges and set a precedent for successive building campaigns. Knyff and Kip's engraving depicts an avenue linking the kitchen building (visible in the lower right corner) to the north side of the house. It was delineated by a wall, which visually separated servants passing from kitchen to house, from visitors who entered the adjacent double courtyard.

Charles, Lord Tankerville, who used the estate for hunting, made alterations as early as 1723. These may have included stables and new kennels. Rowell's (1995, 13) analysis of Tillemans' 'View of Uppark' (painted c1720s) suggests the older buildings

were altered in ways that simplified their appearance but also differentiated them more clearly from the house, through the removal of pediments and dormers (fig 2.9). However, recent archaeological findings suggest the original buildings were cleared away, replaced by an entirely new set of buildings in the same area (Aldsworth 2015, 148). At this time a subterranean tunnel was built connecting the kitchen and basement, an architectural device also used in Uppark's later building campaigns. This essentially removed servants from the landscape, keeping them from view, potentially to maintain the privacy of Tankerville and the mistress who lived with him (Rowell 1995, 14).

In 1747, the estate passed out of the Tankerville family to Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh, marking the beginning of a social ascendance which included a successful petition for a baronetcy and marriage to Sarah Lethieullier, a member of the wealthy and well-connected Lascelles family (Rowell 1995, 17). In order to align their new family seat with their wealth and status, they embarked on a major remodelling of the house in the 1750s-60s. The basement level was expanded by a single-storey addition incorporating a new scullery, larder, servants' hall, and kitchen (figs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13). Moving these spaces closer to the house updated and improved functionality. The original outbuildings became obsolete and were demolished. A new stable complex, greenhouse, and laundry were constructed at the north of the house (fig 2.14). Like the house, the buildings are brick with stone dressings. Each of the two-storey, five-bay buildings are flanked by a single-storey structure to each side (fig 2.15). Large sash windows and central pediments harmonise with the architecture of the house, while high, curving walls physically connected the buildings to it. This new arrangement revitalised the exterior of Uppark. Time spent at Uppark by Sir Matthew's son and heir Harry was marked by a lifestyle reflecting expectations of the upper echelons of British society, which included entertaining, sporting and gambling with the Prince of Wales. In 1810, when his focus shifted to establishing Uppark as his country seat, he hired Humphry Repton to renovate the house and grounds. Repton completely altered the north face of the house and created a model dairy providing guests with the opportunity to observe the workings of the estate like a piece of theatre (fig 2.16). It worked its charm on Fetherstonhaugh, too, who fell in love and married Mary Ann Bullock, a dairymaid 50 years his junior.

Lady Mary made few changes after her husband's death in 1846. She bequeathed the estate to her sister Frances, who also made few alterations to the building, giving Uppark a reputation for faded opulence. In the twentieth century, the Meade-Fetherstonhaughs focused on consciously conserving the house and its contents. Lady Meade-Fetherstonhaugh developed textile conservation techniques, honed at Uppark, used later at other properties like Windsor Castle, Syon Park and Hardwick Hall (Rowell 2005, 96). Therefore, when the family gave Uppark to the National Trust in 1954, it was worn, but well cared for. In 1989 a fire woke the sleeping house and thrust it to the forefront of conservation management. Once again, the house and water were intertwined since the nearest fire station was seven miles away. Although the upper storeys were completely lost, much of the contents of the ground and basement floors were saved (Rowell and Robinson 1996, 10).

Careful recording of fire-damaged fabric alongside archival research and photographic records enabled the house to be restored to its state immediately before the fire (Rowell and Robinson 1996). Inspired by Calke Abbey, repairs aimed to harmonise with the existing time worn fabric (Rowell and Robinson 1996, 173). Authentic craftsmanship and accurate reconstruction were critical to success and the house re-opened to the public in 1995 (Rowell 2005, 98). The Trust deviated from its pre-fire restoration approach in a few key areas, including the basement service spaces. The emergence of an inventory from 1874 provided historical evidence for restoration of the basement service areas to that period (Rowell 1995, 77). Even though the decision 'was justified on historical grounds', the pristine, exemplary spaces are notably at odds with the rest of the house (Rowell 2005, 103). Although this approach contradicts the SPAB philosophy of authenticity, incorporating the inventory in the restoration could be seen as creating a more accurate restoration. Prior interpretations were based on early-eighteenth century inventories, which did not consider the late-eighteenth century basement addition. The decision taken illustrates that 'accurate, scholarly restoration of historic buildings in Britain is a quintessential late twentieth-century architectural phenomenon, drawing as it does on thorough archival research, modern recording techniques and the application of developed archaeological practice' (Rowell and Robinson 1996, 42). However, it raises interesting questions about priorities in perceptions of the significance of family and service spaces in historic house museums, and research, reconstruction and interpretation to the public.

### Calke Abbey, Derbyshire

Calke first appeared in 1132 as Calc, meaning '(place on) the Limestone' (Mills 1991). The house is located in a low, secluded valley in Ticknall, Derbyshire, previously occupied by a twelfth-century Augustinian priory (Colvin 1985, 102). Following the Dissolution, the monastery buildings were converted to domestic use. In 1595, its owner Robert Bainbridge became embroiled in a religiously-motivated conflict with John Harpur. Harpur does not appear to have suffered from this dispute, rising to serve in several legislative roles, and receiving a knighthood in 1603 (Colvin 1985, 30). When his son, Sir Henry Harpur purchased the Calke estate in 1622, the family's position within the gentry was well established. The shrewd purchase of a baronetcy in 1626, even though the estate's annual income did not yet meet requirements, further raised the family's status (Colvin 1985, 34). The strategic investments of estate and title proved valuable when Henry's great-grandson John married Catherine, daughter of Lord Crewe of Steane in 1702. Whereas his ancestors raised the family's reputation via civil and political service, John's contribution to the Harpur dynasty came through conspicuous consumption. Purchase of a London house, furniture, silver and art were physical embodiments of his newly established social position (Garnett 2000, 37). However, it was the erection of a large, modernised house at Calke that signalled the pinnacle of the Harpur family's rise from the gentry, firmly embedding them in the aristocracy.

Sir John undertook a major building campaign between 1702-1704, resulting in the present house. Despite appearances, however, the imposing quadrangular building house was not entirely newly built. Elements of the east, north and west wings all pre-date the eighteenth-century house. Since architects were not yet prevalent, Harpur paid a surveyor for planning work (Colvin 1985, 101). This put the onus on local craftsmen, whose training in historically accurate methods led to successful incorporation of existing structures into the new architecture. Masons constructed the principal façades of sandstone from nearby Pistern Quarry (fig 2.17, 2.18) (Colvin 1985, 99). Corner pavilions are accented with pilasters capped with French-inspired composite-order capitals (Colvin 1985, 102). Two full storeys, separated by a stringcourse rise above a rustic level, which aligns with the top of the pilaster plinths. Carved moulding, including decorative keystones surround sash windows consistently spaced around the

building's perimeter. Similarly decorated but shorter windows on the rustic level appear to sink into the ground, drawing attention upwards. A central door at first-floor level on the south side has a decorative surround, and is capped with a rounded, broken pediment, demarcating the principal floor and façade (fig 2.18). Elaborately carved cornices surrounding the upper storey created a complete structure arguably on par with Chatsworth (Colvin 1985, 102). In form, fenestration and ornamentation the resulting building is easily identifiable as an elite, early-eighteenth-century country house.

Despite the harmonious appearance of the principal façades, the west side has irregularly spaced windows (fig 2.19). Removal of rendering in the 1960s revealed rubble construction and blocked openings (Colvin 1985, 99). Barber (2016, 34) suggests that this is evidence of the original, pre-eighteenth-century service wing. Sir John's 1702-04 rebuilding located the service spaces neatly at ground floor level, arranged around the central courtyard (fig 2.20, 2.21, 2.22). A row of cellars was built into the hillside, abutting the north wing. These provided critical storage space for the wines and imported luxury goods supporting his aristocratic lifestyle. Calke's service spaces eventually migrated to the northwest areas of the house, and into the floors above ground floor level whilst the estate's outbuildings gradually expanded over time. An extensive stables complex was built shortly after the main house (fig 2.23). Sir Harry added a riding school in the 1760s to support what became a longstanding family interest (Colvin 1985, 106). A range of produce and cut flowers were grown in specialised garden buildings enjoyed by family and guests. The different approaches to Calke's renovated and migrating internal service spaces and new-built service outbuildings therefore offers an opportunity to explore the impact of individual priorities on service architecture.

Calke Abbey was not significantly altered until Sir Henry Crewe inherited the estate in 1789.<sup>1</sup> He was an eccentric, who cut himself off from society and family, and is now known as the 'isolated Baronet'. He also flouted the expectations of his position

---

<sup>1</sup> Born Henry Harpur, he changed his surname to Crewe in 1808 in an effort to revive the baronetcy of Crewe of Steane from his great-great-grandmother's family, but was unsuccessful. Colvin (1985, 55) points out the incongruity of his social isolation with his desire for increased rank, attributing it to competition with the Cavendishes, similarly wealthy in capital and land.



by fathering an illegitimate daughter with and then marrying a lady's maid (Colvin 1985, 49). The impact of his reclusiveness on future generations of Harpur-Crewes is well-trodden territory. However, there has been surprisingly little research into the impact of his unusual lifestyle on Calke's service architecture, which is explored throughout the analysis in this chapter. Between 1793-1810, he employed architect William Wilkins to add a Greek revival portico on the south façade and a long balcony on the east side, and to complete the parapet started by Sir John Harpur in 1709 (Garnett 2000, 50). Numerous interior renovations within the existing building envelope altered the building to better suit his lifestyle. His son Sir George Crewe completed Calke's last significant changes in the 1840s. These alterations reflected a paternalistic propensity for order, stemming from his perceived moral duty to improve the estate, where he focused the majority of his resources (Barber 2016, 12). Changes made by the Harpur-Crewes have left a remarkably clear architectural stratigraphy, reflective of dynamic individual personalities, revealing unparalleled insight into relationships between social habits and building development.

In 1984, Henry Harpur-Crewe was living in only two of Calke's 80 rooms (Wright 2009, 36). When he offered the house to the government in lieu of death duties, its significance was disputed. Some felt its only value lay in auctioning the contents, but heritage organisations were intrigued by the house's untouched state (Barber 2016, 21). Nineteenth-century interior photographs showed that it retained a remarkable level of preservation and 'authentic clutter' (Colvin 1985, 78). Its unusual state captured public attention, and the media dubbed it the 'time capsule house' (Young 1989, 12). It was this view, that 'what in the nineteenth century had been a social anomaly, and in the early-twentieth an eccentric anachronism, had by the [1980s] become a unique historic document' that ultimately led to the National Trust obtaining the property, with £4.5 million earmarked by the Chancellor for conservation (Colvin 1985, 77). Often compared to the magnificent, though ill-fated Mentmore, Calke was saved because it challenged established heritage values (Wright 2009, 34). Following a surging national interest in heritage in the 1980s, the National Trust used Calke to pioneer a presentation focused on the spirit of place, which in Calke's case is the decline of the 'un-stately home' (Lithgow and Thackery 2009, 17). Calke was also a pioneering case study for the conservation philosophy of 'preserve as found', further

developed at Brodsworth Hall by English Heritage (Lithgow and Thackery 2009, 17-19).

Calke's distinctive biography and conservation philosophy has paved the way for projects such as the University of Leicester's recent study on loneliness and isolation. This critiques the dominant Harpur-Crewe family narrative of reclusiveness to develop interpretive strategies of 'explore not tell' (MacLeod et al. 2018, 17-18). Calke is therefore both a snapshot of history and a heritage laboratory. This chapter draws on its potential to speak to the individuality of the service experience as it was framed by a typical example of a country house with pre-eighteenth century origins, shifting internal services spaces and newly-built garden and stable complexes, but also the distinctive and eccentric biography of its owners, alongside an innovative approach to conservation and interpretation of the British country house story.

#### Brodsworth Hall, South Yorkshire

Located near Doncaster, Brodsworth's estate landscape afforded its owners agricultural resources, alongside limestone quarries and the profits of mining its underlying seams of coal (Oakley 2005). Investment by George Hay, Earl of Kinnoull in the early-eighteenth century marks the beginning of a rise in the estate's status. Hay rebuilt an older, existing house and improved the park and gardens, creating a country seat for his family (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 38). In the late-eighteenth century, his son Robert Hay Drummond, Archbishop of York used it as his second home, employing Robert Adam to renovate it into an appropriate environment for entertaining when he was not at Bishopthorpe Palace (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 38). Peter Thellusson purchased the estate in 1791, on his retirement from a successful career in banking and investments in the West Indies (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 39). Under Thellusson's 1796 will, his estate, including Brodsworth was not directly inherited but rather managed by a trust for 60 years whilst it appreciated in value (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 40). Like contemporary Benjamin Franklin's Methuselah trust, Thellusson's unusual arrangement sparked national interest.<sup>2</sup> It caused considerable controversy within the

---

<sup>2</sup> Benjamin Franklin's 1790 will set aside £1000 each for the cities of Boston and Philadelphia, not to be touched for 100 years. Although substantial fees and taxes diminished Franklin's projected amount, the cities received \$572,000 in 1891 (Brigham and Ehrhardt 2013, 144). Polden's (2002) thorough history of Thellusson's situation reveals that although his will was upheld, some feared the *nouveau riche* would use the idea to take away aristocratic power by amassing huge fortunes, which

family, plunging Brodsworth into a period of sporadic use with minimal improvements. However, when Charles Sabine Augustus (CSA) Thellusson finally inherited the estate in 1858, he immediately saw potential to establish his own growing family's social status by transforming the out-dated house and estate.

Built between 1861-1863 on a prominent hill, CSA's new home was a compact, two-storey building constructed of ashlar limestone quarried on-site (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 5). The rectangular form of the main house is broken only by a porte-cochere on the east side, supported with Doric columns and capped with a balustrade and urns that match the roof (fig 2.24). Family connections initially led scholars to attribute its design to Italian designer Chevalier Casentini (Girouard 1979, 237). However, a full set of specifications revealed it to be the work of London architect Philip Wilkinson, designed to position the Thellussons as trendsetters. Large windows loosen the boundaries between nature and architecture, reflecting the increasingly informal atmosphere of the country house as a site of leisure and pleasure. The ground floor windows on the south side also functioned as doors, employing state-of-the-art patented wood shutters that roll up when not in use (fig 2.25). The main house was decorated and furnished by the London firm Lapworth Brothers, reflecting cutting-edge taste rather than the accumulated clutter of ancient family heirlooms (YAS DD168 7/1/4-5). Rather than attempting to quietly meld into the Yorkshire gentry, CSA's design decisions unapologetically asserted the modernity of the family.

Whilst the main house boldly advertises architectural and technological innovation, the service wing meets contemporary expectations more modestly. Tucked into the north side, it is lower and minimally ornamented (fig 2.26). Indeed Kerr (1865, 273), writing shortly after its construction could well be describing Brodsworth when he advised that 'exterior architectural design, so far as [services] are concerned, ought to be exhibited with due discrimination; that there may be seen at a glance the one part of the edifice as the superior and the other as the inferior.' Internally too, Brodsworth seems to meet the ideal requirements of Victorian household management, from scullery to butler's pantry (figs 2.27, 2.28, 2.29). However, behind this picture,

---

eventually lead to the Accumulations Act 1800 ('Thellusson Act') prohibiting similar situations in Britain.

Brodsworth's story is more complicated. Much of the material in the service wing was reused from the demolished old Hall. The out-dated, small-paned windows, combined with the hipped roof, give the entire wing an eighteenth-century feel. An undated architectural drawing depicts plans for a conservatory that would shield the east side of the service wing. However, this went unbuilt. This illustrates that while the service-wing architecture certainly reads as 'inferior', Thellusson does not appear to have gone to any pains to disguise it. Brodsworth's outbuildings are also plainly inferior. They are mainly older, eighteenth-century structures positioned at a distance from the house and with few stylistic similarities (fig 2.30). Investigating the reuse of these older structures offers an intriguing opportunity to explore the reality of service space arrangements attached to a house that is usually considered emblematic of a single time period.

Unusually, Brodsworth underwent no significant architectural changes during the nineteenth century. It amply supported CSA and Georgiana Thellusson's large family in suitable style, as it was designed to do. Their son Peter inherited Brodsworth upon his father's death in 1885 (Carr-Whitworth 2009, 16). His wife, Elizabeth St Clair MacDougall had been his younger sisters' governess. Thus far, gender issues have dominated research around Elizabeth's position at Brodsworth (Arrowsmith and Carr-Whitworth 2004, 15). The impact of her transition from servant to Brodsworth's mistress remains a tantalising area for future study. Peter and Elizabeth's primary contribution to the house was confined to redecoration. However, as they had no children and travelled often, Brodsworth's use, management and staffing did subtly alter.

Brodsworth's potential was realised soon after Historic England (then English Heritage) acquired the property in 1990. At the time, the heritage sector was experiencing a drive to preserve and present the spirit of place, and Brodsworth's decayed appearance offered something distinctive to their portfolio of pristine country houses, rather like the National Trust's Calke Abbey (Allfrey 1999, 118; Lithgow and Thackery 2009, 32). The decision to 'preserve as found' presented conservation challenges but also interpretive possibilities, as evidenced by the 'Caring for Brodsworth' project in 2016. A recent study conducted by the University of York

(Chitty 2018) reflected an overwhelmingly positive response by visitors, contractors and employees.

The choice to use the same strategy on servant spaces as the rest of the house at Brodsworth provides a rare example of attempts to include the decline of service as part of the country house story. Many of Brodsworth's service spaces were never updated but had previously been closed up and used for storage, thereby preserving many of the original features (Allfrey 1999, 115). At Brodsworth, these spaces convey the absence of servants, prompting reflection on the problems of attracting and retaining servants in the late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Brodsworth affords the opportunity for curators and visitors to 'consider not only the functional aspects of the house, but also the cultural meanings embodied by the building and the collections it contains' (Allfrey 1999, 116).

This chapter has thus far considered the general phasing, biographies and changes made to the location, form and function of the service spaces at Uppark, Calke and Brodsworth. It now turns to critically analyse how these three houses accommodated the facilities (2.2), accommodation (2.3), circulation (2.4) and outbuildings (2.5) that constituted service architecture over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

## 2.2 Facilities

In the mid- to late-eighteenth century service facilities became an important part of country house architectural design, often located at the margins of the house, in pavilions or partially submerged basement levels. This created clear distinctions between the busy, noisy, smelly mechanics of country house life and the calm, private, curated world increasingly sought by their owners. Throughout the nineteenth century, large multipurpose spaces such as the servants' hall contracted and were pushed further out whilst design guides advocated the construction of smaller spaces for carrying out specific tasks (Kerr 1865, 223). The reduction of service spaces seen in newly built houses at the end of the nineteenth century was directly related to the 'servant problem' and the decrease in numbers of servants. Efficiency became an increasingly important aspect of design at this time, as senior servants were required to supervise a smaller servant workforce more closely. Perhaps because family

members found themselves more reliant on smaller numbers of more familiar servants, there was an increasing concern with the maintenance of social distinction and class boundaries.

#### *Facilities: Kitchens*

Country house kitchens were a suite of spaces worked in by a variety of servants. They included multiple kitchens, still rooms, pantries, pastry kitchens, larders, sculleries and more. In the eighteenth century country house kitchens moved farther away from family spaces, to areas like pavilions. They were connected to the main house by corridors which provided not only practical, but ceremonial routes for food. Over time however, functions contracted back into one large space, which was often the focus of major investment in cooking technologies built into the architecture like roasting hearths, open ranges and spit jacks (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 92). The introduction of the cast iron changed the kitchen and became widespread in the nineteenth century (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 105). Existing kitchens could be easily updated, and new kitchens furnished with pre-fabricated ovens, back boilers for hot water, and closed stoves that were more fuel efficient and reliable, resulting in a more consistent quality of food (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 109).

Calke's original configuration created a set of apartments in the east and west wings. Most of the ground floor was occupied by service spaces (fig 2.20). The kitchen was originally located on the ground floor adjacent to the southwest pavilion (Garnett 2000, 27). Barber (2016, 35) asserts that much of the fabric of the west wing is Elizabethan, with subsequent refenestration, rendering and ornamentation by Sir John Harpur c1702-1704. If accurate, this arrangement builds on an older tradition that often positioned the best bedroom above the kitchen to benefit from its heat. Not satisfied with this arrangement, in 1794 Henry Harpur relocated the kitchen to the northwest pavilion (figs 2.31, 2.32, 2.33). He added a large double hearth to create a functional kitchen out of a space believed to previously have been a chapel (Garnett 2000, 27). The brewhouse, originally located at the north of the pavilion, was refitted into a scullery for washing up facilities close to the new kitchen, whilst the brewhouse itself, together with the bakehouse and laundry were pushed outside the main house. Harpur also relocated the dining room from the southeast pavilion to the southwest, and built a new butler's pantry, creating a dining suite closer to the new kitchen (Garnett 2000,

12). Moving the kitchen marked a shift in Calke's service space organisation. The original, clearly-delineated 'below-stairs' hierarchy was obscured. Relocating the centre of service to the northwest pavilion meant that service spaces radiated north and west, as well as vertically into the upper storeys. However, although the kitchen was now located much farther away from the family spaces, a large clock and 'Waste Not Want Not' sign in the kitchen above the range, reminded servants of their duties. Such distant kitchens were a manifestation of the elite class's growing desire for privacy. However, Henry's extreme reclusiveness included isolation from everyone: society, family and certainly servants. Even the normal service associated with dining was rejected. He allowed servants to set the table and lay out food but would not eat until they were all dismissed (Colvin 1985, 55). This analysis of spatial change in conjunction with actual household dynamics reveals seclusion as the primary impetus for change, not societal expectations, which a less comprehensive examination might suggest.

*Facilities: Senior servants' rooms*

The space between workspaces and family areas was often filled by upper servants' rooms. The butler's pantry, housekeeper's room, and sometimes steward's hall created a physical transition that mimicked the social role of the increasingly important servant hierarchy. From this position, the butler and housekeeper were perfectly situated to fulfil their roles as supervisors to lower servants and intermediaries with employers. The importance of the direct correlation between the parallel development of social and spatial hierarchy in service is often overlooked, potentially due to a misunderstanding of how the spaces were actually used, and a lack of specialty equipment that makes them easily identifiable.

Shortly after purchasing Uppark in 1747, Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh updated its service spaces to support full-time residence. Records indicate that James Paine or Daniel Garrett redesigned the basement space and constructed separate service pavilions (Rowell 1995, 19). Both designers adhered to contemporary Palladian principles advocating that architecture reflect social hierarchy. Uppark's household included 28 indoor servants within which there was a clear hierarchy (Rowell 1995, 25). This was reflected in, but also constructed by, the configuration of the mid-eighteenth-century basement (fig 2.10). The steward's hall, where upper servants

dined, was located in the southwest corner. It was mirrored by a new servants' hall in the northwest corner, where the remainder of servants ate. The kitchen with adjoining scullery was optimally located in the northeast corner, abutting the butler's pantry, near the staircase to the dining room. This configuration apparently worked well as Uppark's chef Muget deftly served 80 people in three days during a visit by the Prince of Wales in 1784 (Meade-Fetherstonhaugh and Warner 1995, 56). Completing the senior servant spaces was the housekeeper's room in the southeast corner, adjacent to the bell passage, and main service staircase used by maids to complete tasks throughout the house, overseen by the housekeeper.

This arrangement functioned well until the early-nineteenth century, when Sir Harry Fetherstonhaugh updated his service spaces in line with new architectural trends. The kitchen was relocated into the east pavilion (which had previously housed the greenhouse) accessed by service tunnels installed by Humphry Repton (fig 2.34) (examined below in 'Circulation'). The former kitchen became the stillroom (figs 2.35, 2.36, 2.37, 2.38). This was a space that typically adjoined the housekeeper's room (Hardyment 1997, 57). However, Uppark's housekeeper's room was not relocated, and was therefore separated from the new stillroom by the butler's pantry. The room was redecorated in 1853, shortly after Sir Harry's death when his widow promoted Mary Faryon to housekeeper (Rowell 1995, 30). Mary was with the family from at least 1841-1880 ('Uppark House' 1841; 1851; 1861; 1871; Boase 2015, 49). It is possible that the incongruous relationship between stillroom and housekeeper's room was not an issue at this time due to the continuity of Mary's service and the respect afforded her by other servants.

Her successor however, was very different. Sarah Wells, housekeeper from 1880-1893 was described by her son, author HG Wells (1934, 82) as 'perhaps the worst housekeeper that was ever thought of'. Her notorious inefficiency and wastefulness have largely been attributed to her inexperience. The number of British housekeepers was rapidly rising, and employers expected more of them (Boase 2015, 51). Uppark's mistress, Frances Fetherstonhaugh, who had inherited from her sister who was a former dairymaid, relied even more on her housekeeper because of her own inexperience in housekeeping (Boase 2015, 57). Neither Frances nor her sister before her updated the house, living a largely eighteenth-century lifestyle, relying heavily on



servants instead of investing in labour-saving technologies like water closets or gas lighting. Frances hired Sarah on the successful basis of their previous relationship as mistress and lady's maid. However, Sarah had no experience running a large household. A particular complaint was her poor management of the maids serving under her (Boase 2015, 52). However, it might be argued that the unconventional configuration of these spaces inhibited Sarah from supervising household matters efficiently. Boase (2015, 83) asserts 'for someone who spent most of her life in the basement Mrs Wells was acutely sensitive of her environment'. Her diaries mention the out-dated, dark and uncomfortable basement spaces (Boase 2015, 49). The stillroom maid worked very closely with the housekeeper, acting almost like a personal maid (1990, 64). But how close could Sarah and the stillroom maid have been when the rooms they inhabited were on opposite sides of the house? Arresting Uppark's eighteenth-century service space configuration, especially the housekeeper's room, can be argued to have played a much greater role in the story of Sarah Wells that has previously been acknowledged, and perhaps prevented her household from meeting the expectations of nineteenth-century service.

#### *Facilities: Laundries*

Laundries were consistently located on the outskirts of service areas throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Washing involved many processes requiring different spaces, tools and specialised skills. Facilities needed easy access to copious amounts of water, a heating source and large indoor and outdoor spaces for drying linens. It then became more common to send laundry to commercial firms in the late-nineteenth century, reducing the need for onsite laundries at country estates (Sambrook 1999, 188). Despite being an essential part of country house life, laundries are frequently overlooked because architectural interest was often sacrificed for functionality.

Like many houses, Brodsworth's laundry was located in a separate building at a considerable distance from the main house, which ultimately led to its present reuse as a private residence (fig 2.30). However, throughout the nineteenth century, the laundry complex was critical to supporting Brodsworth's household. Prior to Brodsworth's construction, the Thellusson family resided in a neoclassical townhouse in Brighton ('54 Old Steine' 1861). There they employed no laundresses and likely sent their

laundry out. After moving to Brodsworth, such urban conveniences were not readily available. The new Hall's plans therefore needed to consider the provision of laundry facilities.

The Thellussons' choice to reuse old materials within service spaces, including windows and woodwork from the old, demolished Brodsworth Hall, indicate a willingness to economise in functional areas. This trend appears even stronger in service spaces located outside the Hall. CSA Thellusson adapted the eighteenth-century brewhouse he inherited with the estate for laundry to service his family and their new home. The building is located near the stables, and the site of the old Hall. The two-storey building is double gabled with a Diocletian window in each (fig 2.39). Four elegant arched bays adorn the smooth, rendered facade. Situated near the pumphouse and already equipped to handle large amounts of heat and water, it was a practical choice. However, reusing an old facility may not have been as economical as anticipated, attested by numerous repair records beginning as early as 1865 (YAS DD168 1/13).

During this time, the Thellussons consistently employed a head laundress and two laundry maids ('Brodsworth' 1871, 'Hall' 1881). Inventories indicate that they lived in the laundry house, which included a bedroom, scullery and sitting room furnished with an additional bed (DD/BROD/13/2). Although Sambrook (1999, 154) states that skilled maids commonly did finishing processes like ironing and starching within the house, the presence of irons in Brodsworth's laundry suggests some of this finishing was completed there (DD/BROD/13/2). However, not all laundry was done on the estate. At its peak, the household included over 36 people consisting of family, household servants and groundsmen ('Brodsworth' 1871). Although the practice of visibly prominent, liveried footmen had largely fallen out of favour, Brodsworth's coachmen, grooms and footmen were all supplied with blue and yellow livery and tweed suits as part of their wages (DD/BROD/12/1). A plethora of gamesmen and gardeners also produced an extraordinary amount of soiled linen. To accommodate this, Mary Smith was regularly paid to wash linen for gardeners between 1863-1881 (YAS DD168 1/11; YAS DD168 1/29). Additionally, laundress Ann Horbury and her 29-year-old daughter lived in an estate cottage in 1881 ('Hall' 1881). Ann was previously the housekeeper at the old Hall and was paid 'for her attendance' whilst it

was unoccupied (YAS DD168 1/7; YAS DD168 1/10). She likely took in overflow laundry, especially when the family entertained. Whilst the laundresses employed full-time by the Thellussons reflect the needs of the family itself, the building, its location, and broader connections to the community indicate the laundry department was not considered part of the household. Scholars frequently point out that the division of labour in country house laundries did not neatly fit into the same hierarchical organisation that house servants adhered to (Girouard 1978, 283; Sambrook 1999, 184). Instead of being accountable to the housekeeper or butler, they formed an insular department that may or may not have had a ranked labour structure, dependent on the household. Their location too, positioned them outside the main household. As the dirtiest, smelliest spaces, situated on the outskirts of house or grounds, the treatment of laundries affords a rare opportunity to examine the liminal divide between country houses and their surroundings, both architecturally and socially.

This section on Facilities has explored how the relationship of key workspaces impacted the location of other service spaces. It has shown that workspaces were not always static, and their alteration and relocation was influenced by a variety of factors including the personality and lifestyle of their owners and their households. It also illustrates that in some areas labour and spatial arrangements were quite individual and complex. Service spaces could be expanded and contracted by rearranging existing spaces in innovative ways, sometimes to achieve greater functionality or efficiency, but also to structure relations within and between senior servants, their subordinates and the family. Thus, although period guides provided important advice for architects and owners, the location, form and function of service spaces was as much a reflection of the distinctive structures and sometimes, the individual personalities of house owners, and the size and hierarchical structures within the servant community.

### 2.3 Accommodation

Throughout the eighteenth century, servants began sleeping in distinctly separate areas of the house, which was a significant change from the Early Modern period. The majority of eighteenth-century servants slept in large shared rooms in attics and basements. However, some body servants like lady's maids and valets continued to sleep near their masters and mistresses for convenience. Others, like scullery maids and laundresses slept in or near their workspaces. Groundsmen and certain privileged

servants like stewards also lived near their work spaces – in separate lodging on the estate landscape. Moving servant accommodation away from family spaces supports Vickery's (2009, 5) assertion that all social classes at this time were becoming increasingly concerned with personal space. These arrangements also removed servants from the watchful eyes of their employers, which heightened the importance of effectively maintaining social and gender divisions amongst servants, pivotal concepts that define the development of British labour structures and service architecture.

#### *Accommodation: Bedrooms*

Maintaining gender division was especially important at night when servants were not working or directly supervised. It posed a difficult problem and effective architectural planning offered solutions. At Brodsworth, the architect solved this problem by making the entire upper storey of the service wing female servant bedrooms, while menservants lodged elsewhere. Ten bedrooms accommodated 11 female house servants (fig 2.29) ('Hall 1881). In contrast, the house was designed with only two bedrooms for menservants, located on the ground floor (fig 2.28). These were used by Brodsworth's two footmen, who would have shared a room and the butler who had his own room across the corridor. Hall boy Charles Wilkinson likely slept in an alcove somewhere within the service wing, or possibly on a pallet unrolled each night ('Hall' 1881). These arrangements reflect an imbalance of male and female spaces evident in many houses. This corresponds to the feminisation of domestic service and drop in the proportion of menservants to female servants due to changing labour relations and more urban employment opportunities (Higgs 1983, 210; Hill 1996, 38).

The only manservant consistently provided with his own bedroom in most country houses was the butler. Although his room was normally located close to the dining room, at Calke Abbey this arrangement would have placed him adjacent to female work spaces (fig 2.20). His bedroom was instead located on the opposite side of the north wing. This was well placed to allow him to supervise the nearby servants' hall and cellars. However, the attempt to maintain gender divisions did not prevent household romances from developing. In 1837 the butler William Sutton married housemaid Mary Dean (Crewe 1995). Interestingly, the census for 1841 shows that Mary remained at Calke, whilst William remained with the family ('Calke Abbey'

1841). This demonstrates that the needs of Mary and William's employers was the priority over their own proximity to one another. This arrangement may even have been a condition of their employment as married servants.

By the mid-nineteenth century, separate accommodation befitting a servant's rank was an essential part of service architecture planning. The lowest servants continued to sleep either in their workspaces or in servant bedrooms tucked out of the way. A folding bed in Uppark's butler's pantry was likely used by a footman who could be called on at all times. Body servants had better-appointed bedrooms within easy access of their employers. Other senior servants had individual bedrooms, usually situated in locations allowing them to oversee junior servants during non-working hours. For example, it was impossible to enter the female accommodation area at Brodsworth without passing the housekeeper's bedroom. Butlers at both Brodsworth and Calke Abbey had bedrooms adjacent to a gunroom, for added security. These hierarchical developments in sleeping spaces mirror the continued evolution of the servant hierarchy itself and are critical to understanding how service worked at this time.

When sleeping arrangements do not fit this model, it raises important questions about individual household dynamics. Calke Abbey does not have a distinct service wing or attic storey, making it difficult to identify specific servant accommodation. However, patterns can be traced through examining interior renovations to the north side of the house. The first floor of the north wing appears to have provided accommodation for senior female servants. However, they may have been relocated here from another area in the early-nineteenth century, when the kitchen was moved to the northwest pavilion. Similarly, the room above the cook's closet was the cook's bedroom. Lower servants like kitchen and scullery maids likely used a small bedroom on the top floor of the northwest pavilion, which was near the kitchen and scullery below. When the bakehouse, brewhouse and wash house were replaced by the scullery and laundry, a floor was inserted above the scullery. This created a bedroom that was immediately adjacent to the laundry, used by the laundrymaid. These changes seem to reflect a desire to impose a sense of order and efficiency aligning with changing ideals on an existing configuration that was designed to facilitate earlier trends in household management.

In newly-built nineteenth-century houses, accommodation supporting the entire, complex servant hierarchy could be designed in the plan. But was it always? Brodsworth had separate bedrooms for both the housekeeper and butler, which reflected their status. However, neither the original building specifications nor the probate inventory completed in 1885 on CSA Thellusson's death list accommodation for a cook, who was usually considered a senior servant (DD/BROD 13/2; YAS DD/168 2). The Thellussons certainly employed a cook, both in their house in Brighton, and throughout their tenure in Yorkshire ('54 Old Steine' 1861; 'Brodsworth' 1891). Anne Eschback cooked and oversaw kitchen and scullery maids for the family for at least a decade ('Brodsworth' 1871; 'Hall' 1881). However, by 1891, during the sporadic residence of Peter and Elizabeth Thellusson, the role of the cook was incorporated into the housekeeper's duties ('Brodsworth' 1891). During this time there was an increase in junior kitchen servants, who may have taken on some of the cook's former tasks. Is the lack of a cook's bedroom in Brodsworth's design indicative that the Thellussons' considered that position not as a senior servant, but part of the rank and file of middling servants?

#### *Accommodation: Nurseries*

Nurseries were generally located in liminal zones, between family and servant spaces. Although nurses and governesses were servants, they had a distinctive relationship with the family, which changed during the lifecycle of the household. This meant that nursery spaces too, were often reused and adapted over time.

Sir John and Catherine Harpur filled the newly-built Calke Abbey with six children (Colvin 1985, 38). Although (in keeping with the conventions of eighteenth-century architectural planning), there is no indication of a dedicated nursery area, the horizontal organisation of the house between ground floor service spaces, first floor apartments and second floor family bedrooms could easily have incorporated a nursery on the second floor. Known nurseries appear to have developed in two stages, beginning in the late-eighteenth century to accommodate Sir Henry and Nanette Harpur-Crewe's eight children. At this time, two second floor rooms in the north corner of the east wing were renovated into a day and night nursery (fig 2.33). Sir Henry's parents previously occupied these rooms, in keeping with Calke's original apartment configuration (Garnett 2000, 23). As discussed above, relocating the kitchen

introduced service spaces into all floors of the north wing. This created a juncture of servant and family spaces in the northeast pavilion at first and second floor levels. Positioning the nurseries here facilitated family access from the east, and servant access from the north. Hamlett (2013, 249) states that similar arrangements seen at the apex of nursery design in the nineteenth century provided children with a secure ‘nest-like’ area but also physically restricted their access to the wider house. This may have been a particular concern of the reclusive Sir Henry.

Throughout the nineteenth century, as segregation between adults and children became increasingly important, Calke’s arrangement endured. When the need for a schoolroom arose c1860, the northeast pavilion’s first floor provided the ideal location (fig 2.40, 2.41, 2.42). A small staircase connected it to the nurseries and children’s bedrooms above, maintaining the boundaries of the nursery suite. Adjacency to servant spaces was critical. Calke’s nursemaid, governess, and schoolroom maid reported to a head nurse like Rebecca Appleby, whose 20-year employment attests to her competency (‘Calke Hall 1861’; ‘Calke’ 1871; ‘Calke Abbey’ 1881). Calke Abbey therefore provides an important example of how an existing house was adapted to meet the needs of the household and expectations about how new service spaces both reflected - and structured - social and familial norms. Nurseries in particular, were crucial to the enculturation of these norms in the next generation of country house owners.

Brodsworth’s original design reflects the later phases of Calke, in its incorporation from the outset of night and day nurseries, a schoolroom, and governess’ room (fig 2.28). As at Calke, the suite radiated from a corner of the house, with the nurseries above the schoolroom, joined by a nearby secondary staircase. Once again, these were separate from family rooms but easily accessible from adjacent servant rooms. The status of Brodsworth’s nursery was signalled by its unified yet distinctive decoration, especially the use of a ‘super Brussels carpet’, not found elsewhere in the house (YAS DD168 7/1/5). Ten-inch plaster cornices differed from both minimal servant room decoration and 20-30” mouldings in family bedrooms (YAS DD168 2). It is easy to overlook the servant presence within these spaces. CSA and Georgiana Thellusson employed up to two nurses (‘Brodsworth Hall’ 1861; ‘Brodsworth’ 1871; ‘Hall’ 1881). The nursery included a small range with a boiler, reflecting the fact that these women

supervised all aspects of the children's lives, including some food preparation (YAS DD168 2). One or both likely slept in the night nursery with the younger children. Brodsworth also provides an interesting example of how the location and function of nurseries developed with the lifecycle of the family. Once the Thellusson children had left the nursery, they were allocated bedrooms on the opposite (west) side of the house to the nurseries. A new servant, Elizabeth St Clair McDougall, was hired as a governess in 1867 and given a room in the nursery wing, decorated with fashionable furnishings like chintz curtains (Arrowsmith and Carr-Whitworth 2004, 12; YAS DD168 7/1/4). By 1881 she was a companion to Constance Thellusson, eventually becoming Brodsworth's mistress through her marriage to Peter Thellusson. A real-life Jane Eyre, Elizabeth reflects the liminal position of the governess between servant and family communities. But the gradual movement of the Thellusson girls out of the nursery and into family space also provides another example of how children learned their place in household spaces and social structures, as they moved from childhood to adulthood.

Brodsworth's nurseries gradually became redundant and were reused as family bedrooms, a sitting room and smoking room. In contrast, when Calke's nurseries became obsolete, they could simply be closed off; the house was so vast that there was no need to adapt them to new functions, preserving a time capsule of late-nineteenth century childhood, rather than an architectural story of household and family lifecycle.

#### *Accommodation: Detached lodgings*

The introduction to this section highlighted the importance of exploring accommodation off-site, especially for male servants. Calke provides an important example of how some menservants were lodged in separate buildings on the estate. While the coachman and head gardener lived in houses with their families, single grooms and gardeners lived in bothies. A cursory study might suggest this arrangement was for convenience, lodging servants near their workspaces. However, in 1891 Brodsworth's butler lived with his family in a separate house, even though he also retained a bedroom at the Hall ('Brodsworth' 1891). As a senior servant and male, he was at the top of the servant hierarchy. His married status was not only tolerated, but accommodated with private accommodation for his family.



The variety of male accommodation within and outside of the house compares starkly with the rigidity of female sleeping arrangements, the majority of which were customarily located within the house, whether remodelled like Calke or newly built as Brodsworth. It indicates a concern with the surveillance and control of female servants, located close to senior servants and the family, and the willingness to relocate male servants at some distance, where behaviours and activities were less-well scrutinised. Whilst this is not perhaps surprising in the context of prevailing concerns about morality, the architectural evidence of this containment and control of female bodies – at work and at rest in the country house – has not been the subject of detailed study. It invites comparison with the treatment of female servants in vernacular buildings and industrial communities, and forms part of the wider story of gender archaeology. However, several of the examples discussed above also reveal the agency of women, able to navigate and negotiate such spatial hierarchies and boundaries successfully, and make marital alliances which contravened not only household advice, but also class boundaries.

#### 2.4 Circulation

Following traditions based in medieval hall houses, servants had previously traversed family spaces as needed, since they were considered a necessary and visible part of the household (Hardyment 1997, 15). West (1999, 107) asserts that separation of circulation and living spaces (for example the stair hall and great hall) occurring throughout the seventeenth century was connected to increasing social distinctions between master and servant. However these changes were not yet aimed at removing servants completely from sight. It was not until the mid-eighteenth century when circulatory features meant for servant use become more prevalent, recognisable by their size, position and configuration (Hardyment 1997, 19). These often included stairs that were noticeably smaller and more winding than secondary or family staircases. They were strategically placed to provide discreet servant access without impinging on formal design principles. However, the nuances of the role servant staircases played during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries is often overlooked by scholars, who spend more time on later high Victorian circulation configurations. Girouard (1978, 206) for example only briefly mentions eighteenth-century servant staircases. In contrast, nineteenth-century servant staircases, although still minimally discussed, are set more firmly into the social context of historical views

on class and gender (Girouard 1978, 285). However service circulation did become more sophisticated and complicated throughout the eighteenth century. The corridors, tunnels and other such interior pathways that connected distant kitchen and laundry pavilions not only contributed to the classical design principles favoured by country house architects and owners of the period, but fulfilled an important social function in removing servants and their industrious labour from the polite gaze. Strategically placed or concealed service doors, which were sometimes integrated into panelling and insulated from sound with baize coverings also impacted household dynamics. In a wider discussion of domestic thresholds, Vickery (2009, 15) asserts that ‘access to privacy was an index of power’ in the eighteenth century. Directing how servants were allowed to access spaces, through the placement and control of service doors, locks and keys upheld the power of employers by regulating their own privacy whilst limiting servant agency. The implications of this on servants is a topic deserving of further exploration, and can be better understood through analysis of access points (after West 1999).

A new fashion for asymmetry and informal planning developed throughout the nineteenth century (Franklin 1981, 100; Girouard 1978, 220). This offered designers the architectural freedom to focus on functionality rather than symmetry, which is apparent in service wing plans. Authors like Stevenson (1880) spent a considerable amount of time exploring how circulation was used as a means of ensuring service departments met the needs of country house owners, even as lifestyles changed. A key component of a successfully functioning service wing was maintaining the family’s illusion of privacy whilst still providing the convenience of service (Franklin 1981, 87). To achieve these aims within existing houses a degree of compromise and innovation was often required. Corridors and staircases were inserted, creating complex warrens for servant movement. But by the 1870s newer houses were more compact, drawing in on themselves, and service blocks did the same (Franklin 1981, 90). Architects aimed to incorporate centralised and more direct circulatory routes in newer and smaller homes (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 74). However, even as servants and families were drawn physically closer together, the maintenance of social distinction became even more critical, and was aided by deliberate circulatory routes and access points (Girouard 1978, 285).

### *Circulation: Staircases*

Like many houses, Calke originally included separate family and servant staircases. While mirroring one another in size and configuration, status was differentiated by construction quality. The service staircase was called the ‘white stairs’, potentially referring to a practical whitewashed finish, contrasting with the carved panelling of family staircases. Colvin (1985, 103) dismisses their location on either side of the great hall as typical. However, closer examination of their relationship to service spaces reveals a crucial circulatory function. As discussed above, Calke’s kitchen and other service spaces were located on the ground floor of the west wing, whilst the original butler’s pantry was on the first floor between the two staircases (figs 2.20, 2.21). The dining room was also on the first floor, in the southeast pavilion. Servants therefore carried food up the service stairs and into the butler’s pantry before it was transferred through the great hall, into an antechamber and then the dining room. If they had been located elsewhere, the staircases and servants would have intruded on family spaces. Sir Henry’s 1794 alterations made use of the placement of the staircase too (figs 2.31, 2.32). The kitchen facilities had been shifted to the northwest pavilion’s ground floor, whilst the dining room moved across the south wing to the southwest pavilion. He installed a floor in the old kitchen, allowing for a new butler’s pantry adjacent to the dining room on the first floor. Food was therefore carried through the ground floor corridor in the west wing, up the servant stairs, through the new butler’s pantry and into the dining room. In this arrangement the polite space of the dining room was located farther away from the kitchen. Furthermore, the configuration no longer required servants to pass through family spaces like the great hall on their way to the dining room, as they had in the original arrangement.

However, rearranging these service spaces also put additional strain on servant circulation. Originally the north wing contained only a diminutive spiral staircase, providing access to first-floor servant bedrooms (figs 2.20, 2.21). But in 1812, the northwest corner of the house was split into a suite containing a laundry, washhouse and accommodation for three laundry maids (figs 2.40, 2.41) (‘Calke Abbey’ 1851; ‘Calke Hall’ 1861). Between 1815-1861, the number of male servants employed by the Harpur-Crewes had decreased from seven to three (‘Calke Hall’ 1861; Spencer 2020). To maintain servant numbers 15 female servants cared for the house, kitchens, laundry, and family in 1861 (‘Calke Hall’ 1861). To accommodate them, rooms in the

west and north wings became servant bedrooms. More servants using these rooms on first and second floor levels put further stress on vertical circulation routes. By this time the white stairs had been replaced with a smaller, stone staircase, so servant circulation was already somewhat restricted in the south wing. Consequently, between 1865-1867 Sir John Harpur-Crewe constructed an additional service staircase in the north wing, which by then had become the firmly-demarcated service hub (2.40, 2.41, 2.42). The three-storey staircase eased circulation, accommodating increased female servant numbers whilst meeting social expectations for gender segregation. Altering Calke's staircases was an effective means to maintain functionality within the existing footprint, without requiring alteration to expensively-decorated family spaces.

#### *Circulation: Corridors and tunnels*

Service circulation continued to become ever more complicated throughout the eighteenth century. Locating kitchens and laundries in distant parts of the house or separate pavilions required a means to access the house. Tunnels, covered walkways, and corridors were the architectural breakthroughs that developed into a 'country house machine', enabling servants to perform all the functions for a smoothly operating household, without being seen. Acknowledging the evolution of these household 'veins' as a separate development underscores the social and cultural changes that prompted them.

Uppark had an early tradition of connecting the basement service spaces to outbuildings by underground tunnels. Sometime in the early-eighteenth century, the kitchen was moved to the south dependency (having previously been the north of the two outbuildings flanking the main entrance). The entrance to the house's basement service facilities remained on the north side. To keep servants from crossing the main courtyard from one area to the other, tunnels were constructed that connected the basement to the kitchen building (fig 2.43). The kitchen was later relocated into one of the outbuildings to on the house's north side. When Humphry Repton altered Uppark's north side, making it the main entrance, this presented a problem. He suggested visually connecting the house and service buildings with covered colonnades (Meade-Fetherstonhaugh and Warner 1995, 74). This would create the impression that the main house had symmetrical flanking wings and was larger than it actually was. However, a more efficient option was chosen, connecting the

outbuildings directly to the basement service spaces by underground tunnels (fig 2.34). One tunnel lead to the kitchen in the east pavilion, while the other tunnel led to the brewhouse and dairy, which were located in the west pavilion. This change illustrates the potential impact of inserting servant circulation into an existing house in order to update the building's function with minimal changes to the architecture. Changing circulatory routes through the insertion of corridors and tunnels enabled existing architecture to be updated without adding new rooms or buildings.

Corridors remained a principal means to effectively direct servant movement. However, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, architects became increasingly more concerned with the efficiency of such circulatory routes. Distant linked pavilions like those at Kedleston and even Uppark fell out of fashion in favour of compact service wings directly connected to the main house. Functional concerns overrode outdated plans that slavishly prioritised symmetry (Franklin 1981, 129). Key to this was consolidating the connection between house and service wing. The single-corridor plan was a popular configuration as it provided functional efficiency whilst still allowing for creative design; the layout could be independently planned and then connected to the house at a single point compatible with the overall design (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 74). This is evident in Brodsworth's service wing. On the ground and first floor levels servant spaces run along a single corridor, which culminates in a cross-corridor at the point where the service block meets the main house (figs 2.28, 2.29). The principal north-south spine provides a direct route from the back entrance, where provisions could be delivered, through to the kitchen. The related spaces of kitchen, scullery and still room are easily accessible from one another. The communal servants' hall is conveniently located on the corridor's western side, adjacent to a service courtyard also used by a variety of servants. On the first floor, female servants' bedrooms lined both sides of the corridor, which was headed by the housekeeper's bedroom. In this case, the simple sightline of a single, straight corridor would have aided the housekeeper's supervision of female servants during off-duty times. Back on the ground floor, where the service spaces of kitchen and butler's pantry encroach into the main house, another straight corridor between the two rooms provides direct access to family spaces. Although the concept of centralised circulation may seem intuitive to the modern eye, it was the compact country house plans of the late-nineteenth

century that drove such efficient service wing configurations (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 74).

The examples in this section illustrate that throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the development of prescribed circulatory routes like corridors and tunnels reflected changing lifestyles. But, whether designed into plans as at Brodsworth, or added later like Uppark, their relationship to family spaces shows that they remained an important enforcer of class segregation.

*Circulation: Access points*

Doorways and openings that allowed servants access to particular spaces hold valuable information about household dynamics. They are represented by the trope of the green baize door, providing a single, neat point of segregation between masters and servants. In reality, the types, numbers and location of entrances to a space reveal complex information about levels of control and permeability (West 1999, 108). This is very valuable within the servant context as it indicates control by one social class over another and therefore the level of agency servants enjoyed, since such points were intended to both allow access and restrict movement. Viewed from a servant standpoint they can also indicate how much privacy and autonomy servants were given within a household. These access points became an important design consideration for newly-built late-nineteenth century houses, but their implications remain largely unexplored in a servant context. Alterations to earlier houses are equally overlooked but add a rich layer of understanding to social relations within the country house.

How servant spaces connected to polite areas can mirror how open or closed relationships between masters and their servants were. Access between Uppark's service spaces and the rest of the house was originally by a single, narrow staircase located to the east of the main stairs, which spanned from basement to attic (figs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8). In contrast, the wide main staircase only connected the family rooms on the ground and first floors. A small secondary staircase to the west of the stair hall may have been added in the mid-eighteenth century in response to additional family bedrooms that were constructed above the saloon (Aldsworth 2015, 132; 157). Careful placement of these three sets of stairs suggests a desire for firm master-servant segregation during Uppark's early years.

This changed in the nineteenth century when Humphry Repton altered the north side of the house, creating a polite entrance with formal portico. He also inserted a staircase at the northeast, which provided direct access between the basement kitchen and the newly built servery, adjacent to the dining room (figs 2.35, 2.36). A staircase across the north corridor connected the ground floor to the basement-level servants' hall. Although these staircases opened into the new north corridor between Repton's formal north entrance and the central staircase hall, it is unclear how often servants would have used this passage (fig 2.36). The ornate crimson baize door (c1810) that demarcates the access point between the corridor and stair hall sends a very mixed message, potentially reflecting Repton's own struggle to design a polite entrance on a side of the house that had been used by servants (fig 2.44) (Aldsworth 2015, 164). Whilst the door's red baize material is commonly associated with entry to the servants' domain, its decorative nailed pattern relates to the house's elite residents. And while travelling through the north corridor may have been a more direct route for some servant activities, it greatly increased the risk of interactions between classes, which was generally considered undesirable at this time. Since the corridor was added during the tenure of Sir Harry Fetherstonhaugh, who married his dairymaid, could the increased yet ambiguous connection points between servant and master spaces be a reflection of less concern over such social proprieties?

The access points between service and family areas at Calke Abbey are considerably messier, demonstrating a much greater level of permeability. Service spaces were more spread out at Calke – over multiple levels and in different areas of the house. The central courtyard, likely an inheritance from an earlier seventeenth-century building allowed servants to move freely throughout the ground floor (Colvin 1985, 98). On the first floor, the lobby at the head of the original southwest service stairs is likewise very open, with four separate doors leading to other service spaces, the formal saloon, and the family stair hall (fig 2.21). Despite Sir Henry's desire for privacy in the late-eighteenth century, and Sir George Crewe's attempts to impose more ordered circulatory routes through staircases and corridors in the mid-nineteenth century, the existing limitations imposed by Calke's early form made it incredibly difficult to create more control out of such an open plan (figs 2.32, 2.41). This therefore shows that points of access between family and service areas may have been one of the places

where owners were willing to compromise due to architectural or social considerations.

Servant access to dining rooms is a particularly interesting place to examine master-servant relationships. The butler and footmen originally accessed Calke's dining room, located in the southeast corner of the first floor through a door in the great hall (later known as the saloon) (figs 2.20, 2.21). Thus, not only the dining room, but also the hall were socially permeable, liminal spaces, used by both masters and servants. When Sir Henry relocated the dining room to the southwest corner of the first floor in 1794, he also changed the way it was entered (figs 2.31, 2.32). Adjacent to the new dining room, in the west wing, he created a butler's pantry. This room had a door directly into the new dining room. This minimised servant presence in the polite spaces in the front of the house. It also tightly controlled access to the dining room, which was of particular concern to Sir Henry who preferred to have his meals brought to table and would not eat until the room was free of servants (Colvin 1985, 55). During his tenure the dining room became less socially permeable, ensuring a stronger master-servant separation that reflected his desire for complete privacy.

In contrast, Brodsworth Hall's dining room has two doors, both of which open onto polite spaces. The east door leads to the grand inner hall, whilst the door at the dining room's west side opens into a corridor leading to the south hall and drawing room (fig 2.28). Neither doors appear to be overt servant entrances. However, directly across the corridor from the west door is a door that opens into the service wing. Within, a small cupboard, which shares a wall with the kitchen has an opening to pass food through. Serving staff in the corridor then picked up the food, before moving to the dining room. This arrangement not only ensured hot meals by minimising the distance food travelled, but also confined cooking odours to the kitchen (Sambrook and Brears 1996, 11). However, the short route outside the service corridor to the dining room was less than ideal because it required servants to pass through the polite space of the south corridor. Whilst this small detail may seem insignificant, mapping historical dining practices onto the space supports Girouard's (1979, 237-238) assertion that Brodsworth's arrangement was a noteworthy departure from the ideal. The mid-nineteenth century saw the rise of the formal Dinner Route, a carefully prescribed pre-dining social ritual where diners would process from the drawing room to the dining



room in ranked pairs (Franklin 1981, 50). During formal dinners at Brodsworth, this procession would have passed through the same south corridor that servants crossed to access the dining room. Avoiding undesirable encounters would therefore have necessitated careful surveillance by servants to ensure they were not in the corridor at the same time that diners were moving through. Considering Brodsworth's plan alongside probable use patterns, as I have done here suggests a more complex social relationship existed between the Thellussons and their serving staff.

This analysis of circulatory spaces and access points illustrates that whilst there were definitive, yet shifting social and architectural ideals throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, these were areas of the country house that were frequently adapted to suit the needs of individual owners. It also shows that arrangements reflected attitudes towards and relationships with servants that also differed by household. Lastly, these analyses illustrate that circulation was a particular area that was impacted by existing architectural limitations. The solutions examined at Uppark, Calke and Brodsworth all suggest that arrangements conformed less to rigid ideals, and instead encompassed an array of acceptable variations, both architecturally and in how these spaces were used.

## 2.5 Outbuildings

Like all other parts of the country house, outbuildings had a hierarchy of style, but are frequently overlooked. Those closer to the house or visible were generally well designed and built, whilst utilitarian buildings were farther away or shielded from sight. Not surprisingly, the buildings most often considered by country house scholars are those with aesthetic appeal. This study seeks once again to provide a more holistic consideration of these spaces in relation to the servant experience, rather than the well-established narratives of art history.

### *Outbuildings: Estate landscape*

Uppark House's earliest outbuildings were located to the east of the house, framing a fashionable seventeenth-century double entrance courtyard (fig 2.43). However, the construction of new service buildings on the north side eliminated the out-dated courtyard entrance, while creating the appearance of modern, cohesive design (fig 2.14). Although the official entrance remained at the east, relocating the stables to the

northwest altered how the house was actually entered. Landscape architect Humphry Repton remarked,

‘when the buildings which formed the due importance of the East or Entrance front were taken down, the Entrance still continued as before on the same [east] side, though it was in fact reduced to a door in one corner of a parlour in the East front, with a great detour to get at it, and a still greater from that door to the stables; in consequence of this carriages often drive into the unsightly court at the back [north] of the house, from whence the access to the principal rooms is through low and mean passages, unworthy [of] the style and dignity of such a mansion’ (Humphry Repton, acquired from Aldsworth 2015, 164).

He therefore proposed to remedy this by turning the north side into the principal facade. In order to create a formal entrance from a façade not designed for polite use, Repton suggested a redesign connecting it to the flanking service buildings via colonnades (discussed above in ‘Circulation’). Fetherstonhaugh chose another of Repton’s designs, without colonnades, which Rowell (2000, 89) attributes to financial constraints. This is certainly possible given his unchecked spending, lavish entertaining and friendship with the Prince of Wales. However, the compromise still showcased Fetherstonhaugh’s status. The north façade was enhanced with an elaborate portico of gleaming Portland stone, behind which lay an entrance courtyard. Repton’s plans reflect more efficient work yard arrangements, for example relocating the linen yard closer to the laundry building, and away from the new entrance. Simplifying the outbuildings’ surroundings emphasised the redesigned north facade, creating a well-defined focal point for arriving guests. The flanking buildings simultaneously visually screened the impressive north façade prior to arrival, which created a dramatic zenith to Repton’s carefully designed carriage drive. This was designed with an approach from the east, which provided a view of the impressive south façade on the way to the new main entrance on the north. Bradney (2005, 33) underscores the unrecognised social purpose such approaches served. Repton’s drive accomplished this deftly as it then swung to the north, and entered the new entrance court, neatly showcasing Fetherstonhaugh’s entire property. Skilfully incorporating the existing service buildings into the landscape design was deliberately used to further enhance the appearance of status.

### *Outbuildings: Stables*

Since horses and carriages were the dominant form of transportation, stables were ubiquitous to country house estates. They often followed wider architectural trends. James Gibbs (*Book of Architecture* 1728) and Isaac Ware and Inigo Jones (*Complete Body of Architecture* 1756) all favoured country house plans with wings, and advocated locating the stables there. If detached, stables sometimes served as the entrance point of an estate, and were therefore designed by architects even if other estate outbuildings were not. Except for specialists they are largely not considered in country house studies unless their architecture is deemed significant (Worsley 2004, 2). However, they were spaces extensively used by servants. Furthermore, since horses were the dominant form of transport until the twentieth century, they remained a consistent fixture of the estate. Throughout the eighteenth century they became larger complexes, including spaces for multiple purposes (Worsley 2004, 124). Suspension and steering developments made travel by coach more comfortable. Consequently, coach houses were included to accommodate a variety of vehicles. Improving road conditions as a result of turnpikes increased country entertaining. This directly impacted stable architecture, as extended stabling to lodge guests' horses was desirable. Estate smithies were even built for equestrian owners, like at Calke. As with household servants, the stables saw a steadily developing servant hierarchy, usually headed by a coachman who supervised grooms, postilions, and tigers.<sup>3</sup>

Calke's extensive stables were constructed in 1712-1716, only a decade after the house was built (Colvin 1985, 105). The quadrangular brick building is located on a prominent rise to the north (fig 2.23). Local master builder William Gilks mirrored Calke's architecture with orderly placed doors, windows and openings trimmed in stone (Colvin 1985, 104). The entrance is demarcated with a large pediment above the main arched opening, and further ornamented with a central octagonal cupola (fig 2.45). The interior configuration indicates an extensive interest in transportation, with distinct areas for carriages, stable horses, and riding horses. The Harpurs were enthusiastic racehorse breeders, evidenced by Sir Harry's construction of a riding school in the 1760s (Colvin 1985, 106). Although made fashionable by the king, only people extremely devoted to horsemanship invested in them (Worsley 2004, 164).

---

<sup>3</sup> A tiger was a small, lightweight groom who stood, or sat on a small seat at the back of a carriage.

Calke's was the first private riding house not built for dressage, a specific form of horse training focused on performance (Worsley 2004, 202). The location of Calke's riding school, at the back of the stable complex reflects its utilitarian purpose. Nonetheless, Sir Harry was personally involved, supervising in comfort from a built-in gallery with fireplace (Barber 2016, 31). In a particularly well-known incident, Sir Harry ordered his groom to put down Squirt, a horse plagued with an illness affecting his legs (Clee 2012, 48). The servant refused, and Squirt became the sire of a modern multi-million-pound bloodline (Clee 2012, 267). The Harpur-Crewes' interest in horses and carriages continued into the nineteenth century, when a smithy, horse hospital and cart sheds were built.

The reclusive nature of later generations of the family preserved the extent of their passion, as automobiles and bicycles were banned from the estate until well into the twentieth century (Colvin 1985, 74). The remaining carriage collection therefore spans the eighteenth to early-twentieth centuries, including a hand-pumped fire engine from 1740, essential for a self-sufficient, secluded estate (Barber 2016, 33). The prominent location of the stables, their design complimenting the house's architecture and constant additions to the complex clearly reflect the Harpur-Crewes' continued passion for equestrian pursuits. In stark contrast, Brodsworth's owners chose to reuse the eighteenth-century stables they inherited with the estate. They were located well away from the main house, near the repurposed brewhouse/laundry examined above. Rather than investing in facilities to support the stables, the Thellussons paid a local smithy for blacksmithing as needed (YAS DD168 1/36). Casual labour and reuse of existing buildings reflects dependence on the nearby Pickburn and Brodsworth railway station rather than carriages for transportation (Goode 1975). This contrast in approaches towards a common, functional, and often overlooked building type reveals the individual values of each family, directly reflected in the wider estate architecture.

#### *Outbuildings: Garden buildings*

The Age of Enlightenment prompted a rise in science that affected the country house landscape. Many owners interested in agriculture and botany built glasshouses, vineries, and other specialty buildings, which were tended by an army of groundsmen. When addressed in country house narratives, they are positioned as advertisements of wealth. The buildings themselves required expensive new technologies, glass, and

maintenance. Their contents were the literal fruit of colonial power and required many skilled labourers. Although they were examples of innovative technologies and symbols of Georgian conspicuous consumption, these buildings easily fell into disrepair if not constantly and properly maintained. Subsequently, little research exists on their practical contribution to country house life, and what they reveal about the individuals who invested so heavily in them.

The centrepiece of Calke's garden buildings is an impressive south-facing brick orangery, with five full-height sash windows with arched transoms and attached glasshouses for growing exotic fruit (fig 2.46). The building was part of an extensive late-eighteenth century campaign by Sir Harry Harpur to reshape Calke's landscape. In contrast to his reclusive descendants, his lifestyle was quintessentially aristocratic: marrying the daughter of an earl, racing horses and serving as a Member of Parliament. It was therefore essential that his country seat include polite outdoor experiences that mirrored the house itself. The gardens and buildings initially started by Sir Harry continued to occupy his son, Sir Henry. He invested in a complex system of tunnels for servants to access various garden buildings and equipment. An additional benefit was privacy to enjoy the gardens, which was of particular interest to him. However other changes indicate interest in the gardens' practical output. The tunnel system included space for boilers to heat new cucumber houses and vineries (Barber 2016, 57). His personal library included copies of *The Gardener's Dictionary* (Miller 1733) and *Eden: or a compleat body of gardening* (Hill 1757), both containing advice for managing vegetable, herb, and kitchen gardens (Purcell and Thwaite 2013). Additionally, *A curious Herbal* by Elizabeth Blackwell (1737-1739) was useful for managing the physic garden laid out by his father for growing medicinal herbs. Although not completely self-sufficient, the reclusive Sir Henry's garden department at Calke produced apples, pears and citrus fruits, along with bread, beer and dairy (Colvin 1985, 66; 125). Estate-grown food lessened dependency on (and thus interaction associated with) outside tradesmen.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the family built upon Sir Henry's improvements, continuing to accommodate a mix of practical and personal interest in the estate's garden area. Alterations that enhanced leisure use by family included the orangery's decorative glass dome and a new flower garden for avid gardener Lady Georgiana

Crewe. Due to more readily available medicines, the physic garden became a produce nursery (Barber 2016, 57). A mushroom house was clearly a considered decision as evidenced by a copy of *Illustrations of British mycology* by Mrs TJ Hussey (1847-55) in Calke's library (Purcell and Thwaite 2013). By the late-nineteenth century, the large garden labour force was split between day labourers, married gardeners who lived in estate housing with their families and even a gardener who slept onsite to stoke furnaces throughout the night (Barber 2016, 58; 'Calke Abbey' 1881). The ever-changing dynamic between leisure use and produce garden mirrors the various households at the house itself. Its initial creator, Sir Harry was often away in London, and the facilities supported his country retreats, providing pleasant promenades and exotic fruit for guests. In contrast, altering and adding to the facilities enabled more food production, which supported Sir Henry's solitary lifestyle. The structures then provided a solid foundation on which subsequent generations could build, aligning with their own needs and interests. Although all too often left to ruin, or ignored in country house studies, changes in an estate's garden department both reflect and impact the household itself.

This section has sought to argue that outbuildings are a particular form of service spaces that speaks, like other areas, to the changing priorities and interests of owners and individual household management and structures of service. Tracking the appearance and disappearance of estate buildings gives an understanding of how people within the house (family and servants) lived.

## 2.6 Conclusions

This chapter has shown that domestic service spaces are more interesting than previously thought. It has revealed that the story of service architecture in the British country house is more complicated than has been suggested. Period design guides like Gibbs (1728), Kerr (1865), Stevenson (1880) and Ware (1756) were idealised views of what should happen in service spaces. They are useful, but are only a starting point. Country house owners consulted and absorbed them and then adapted them to their particular circumstances, both architecturally and socially. There were physical, architectural and financial constraints which meant that prevailing ideals had to be accommodated within existing structures. I have shown that where there is a pre-

existing building there is often an attempt to accommodate and adapt the architecture to meet ideals. But quite often there is also a compromise.

The chapter has also shown that service spaces were adapted to the particular household structures, family lifecycles, eccentricities of country house owners, and the agency and personality of servants. Although these stories do not always get well documented, configurations in response to owners and senior servants begins to emerge in this chapter. These analyses have highlighted threads in the British servant story that will be explored in the next chapter: themes of change over time, servant hierarchy, gender divisions and changing technologies flow throughout the stories of the households examined here.

The chapter illustrates that analysing service spaces through the lens of space and microhistories is effective, demonstrating that the British service story is not static. Asking questions about the four spatial categories of facilities, accommodation, circulation and outbuildings is a useful lens through which to examine the story of service spaces over time. Having applied this methodology at this level on the reasonably well-known houses of Uppark, Calke and Brodsworth, the thesis now moves on to investigate Kiplin Hall, a less well known house, in Chapter 3. Applying the same approach seen here, but on a deeper level will expose a more nuanced picture of service at a house that is perhaps more typical of the middling rank of country house across Britain, but which is also of a type that is poorly represented throughout art historical studies.

## Chapter 3: Kiplin Hall

### 3.1 Introduction

Kiplin Hall, a historic house museum in North Yorkshire has an undeniable atmosphere of idyllic seclusion. Approached from the main road via a winding lane, its centrepiece is a three-storey brick Hall, accentuated by ogee topped towers (fig 3.1). The prominent structure is set within a designed landscape restored to include historic topiaries, hedges and a rose garden and a walled garden which generates additional income for the museum (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 41). The house is owned by and managed by Kiplin Hall Trust. It is part of the Historic Houses Association and the Yorkshire Country House Partnership, which provide valuable contacts and networks for houses like it. Historic structures like the stables complex, which is used as a study centre by the University of Maryland, and service buildings lived in by current staff, are not accessible to visitors but nevertheless contribute to its setting. This rich combination of conventional country house museum, designed landscape, and estate buildings make it a typical example of many country houses which sit outside conventional heritage organisations.

Kiplin was originally constructed in 1622 and remained a single-family house until the dawn of the twentieth century. In the 1920s, social, economic and political changes combined with disinterest in the estate prompted its owner to sell part of the estate properties (Schulz 1994, 27). By 1930 the site consisted of little more than 100 acres, including the Hall, outbuildings and gardens (Haslam 1983b, 281). Ownership was turned over to Bridget Talbot in 1938. Talbot, who was aware of the unique nature and national significance of country houses, was prescient enough to see beyond single-family occupancy. She developed several initiatives designed to secure the house financially and architecturally. In 1953, it was listed Grade I, but the building continued to decay. In 1968 Kiplin Hall Trust was founded and the house opened as a historic house museum. A significant portion of the service wing was demolished in the 1970s, but this building was separately listed as Grade II in 1986. Aiming to ‘preserve the air of a vibrant and happy Victorian home,’ Kiplin’s exhibits highlight centuries-old *objects d’art*, scrapbooks, letters and clothing, which created snapshots of historic owners from the seventeenth-century Calvert family to the nineteenth-



century Carpenters (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 46). Interpretive schemes use the architecture to contextualise family-focused stories and displays.

In this chapter, Kiplin's complex service space stratigraphy is explored through the spatial themes examined in Chapter 2. The evolution of service facilities, accommodation, circulation and outbuildings are reanalysed from a service perspective. Explorations of the revised phasing of the house are then further investigated through archival sources relating to the biographies of owners and servants, and the structure of the household over time to create a continuous service narrative. Considering the architectural development of these areas alongside the lives of servants and family members reveals the potential of this deeper level of investigation to shed new light on the service architecture of a typical English provincial country house.

#### *New research and analysis*

When the decision was made to turn Kiplin into a historic house museum, priority was given to the main building's historically-significant architecture, in which previous owners' collections could be displayed. The building's survival depended on a conservation plan involving an aggressive demolition campaign, which separated the service wing from the main house in 1976. The extant service spaces were renovated into flats and workshops for museum staff, which remain inaccessible to visitors. These changes literally fractured the relationship between the house and the service wing. This, coupled with the absence of servant stories from the museum experience means that Kiplin's service history, and its vital role in the Hall's survival, was effectively erased. Fortunately, former caretaker Tom Prime carried out a photographic survey during demolition. My study has used this unique source alongside other historical and physical evidence to recreate lost servant spaces and give voice to their stories once more.

The service wing demolition campaign reflects well-established perceptions that Kiplin's primary architectural value lays in its seventeenth-century core (Pevsner 1981, 208). The towers and long gallery have been of considerable interest to architectural historians (Coope 1986; Cooper 1999; Mennim 2005). The house is frequently presented as a representation of the seventeenth-century Calvert family's

rising power. George Calvert was one of the founding families of Maryland, and as such, the house has also been an important source of inspiration and pilgrimage for American historians and visitors. It has also fostered a longstanding and fruitful relationship with the University of Maryland, whose annual summer school is accommodated within the former stables complex and which makes the house the focus of their study. The recent Heritage Lottery Funded ‘Charting Chipeling’ project carried out archaeological investigations to better understand the wider estate (Brightman 2017). However, most studies completely ignore Kiplin’s later phases of development, with only a few acknowledging its complex evolution (Gomme and Maguire 2008; Mennim 2005). Kiplin’s eighteenth-century interiors provided a powerful backdrop for the Crowe family’s aspirational collections of art and furnishings. Similarly significant nineteenth century additions include the neo-Gothic library and gardens built by several generations of the Carpenter family. However, a clear understanding of the development and phasing of Kiplin, and the impact of individual owners on its public – and private – spaces, is still lacking. This chapter provides a detailed analysis of Kiplin’s architectural phasing and spatial configuration to explore how it was experienced by all classes of historic occupants. Kiplin presents a picture of master-servant relations that challenges the stereotypical narrative of British service architecture.

#### *The current house: a brief description*

Kiplin Hall is currently accessed from the north, via a drive that passes the nineteenth-century Kiplin Mews – and a series of estate workers’ cottages – on their way to the car park (fig 3.2). In the house, they encounter a seventeenth-century architectural envelope containing an eighteenth-century interior, with an early-nineteenth century addition. This is not the experience of an eighteenth-century visitor, but this sense of time-travel and complexity perfectly suits its function as a historic house museum today.

Until the late-nineteenth century, the main approach to Kiplin presented visitors with impressive views of the Hall, a 65 x 53-foot three-storey rectangular building (Haslam 1983a, 202). Each three-bay elevation is punctuated by a tall central tower with an ogee dome. The double M-style slate roof contains four chimneys, with unusual decorative open spaces set between multiple flues. The predominately Jacobean-style

house is overlaid with decorative Georgian elements. It is built of hand-made brick, articulated by Yorkshire stone quoins, window and door surrounds, stringcourses, corbels and raised-plinth foundation (Brightman 2017, 34).

High status brick diapering marks the principal, east façade (fig 3.3). Panelled arched double doors at the base of the central tower demarcate the main entrance. The doorway is surrounded by a stone entablature, flanked by Tuscan columns on raised plinths. The side bays each have three windows attached to stone stringcourses on the lower two floors, the taller ground floor windows having been lengthened in the eighteenth-century. Single upper storey windows with carved hood moulds are centred under each gable, whilst small windows are tucked under each eave near the tower corner.

The south façade is dominated by the two-storey neo-Gothic wing (fig 3.4). Its eastern face consists of five bays with blind pointed arches, divided by false buttresses. A thick octagonal chimney caps the southeast corner, and a prominent full-height bay window is centred in the south elevation. The wing's west side also has a double-storey bay window, but its pointed arches were removed in the late-nineteenth century.

The Hall's west elevation faces a modern lake, which replaced an early serpentine fishpond (fig 3.5) (Webster 2010, 40). In contrast with the formal east elevation, fenestration on this side is asymmetrical. The tower has a single window on the ground floor, with a secondary door in the north side. The cellar is marked by a single ground window on this side.

The current north facade was heavily-impacted by the 1970s demolition (fig 3.6). Shortened, asymmetrically-placed upper windows in the tower reflect a newly-inserted staircase. Scars of former buildings and structures pockmark the north side. The ground floor has no windows, whilst the first-floor windows are blocked from the inside and only a single window illuminates one upper gable.

The remainder of the service complex is a detached, L-shaped, multi-storeyed structure. Like the main Hall, with which it is aligned, the east façade is brick with windows and doors that are dressed with Yorkshire stone (fig 3.7). This two-storey

portion has four bays, with dormers set in a gable roof. The central ground floor window has a half window flanking each side. The simple architectural regularity aligns with standards of eighteenth-century service architecture, as discussed in Chapter 2. However, the south and west elevations of this area were largely reconstructed in the 1970s, as evidenced by noticeable differences in the brickwork (fig 3.8).

A single-storey, L-shaped wing abuts the north end of this taller structure. Irregularly-placed segmental brick-arched windows and doorways are set in brick walls, topped by alternating height rooflines, giving the building a vernacular feel. The longer section of this structure runs north-south, rising to two storeys at its southern end. The centre area of the ground floor has an open carriageway and is topped with an octagonal cupola with ogee roof containing a large clock (fig 3.9). The outline of the demolished portion of the service wing is demarcated by a low, curved stone wall between the two sections of the L-shaped complex.

#### *Geographical context*

Kiplin sits on the banks of the River Swale within the Vale of Mowbray. The estate is isolated yet located centrally between major local towns and settlements. Nearby Catterick was developed during the Roman period as a crucial node between the provincial capital of *Eboracum* (York) and military outposts along the Scottish border (Page 1914). To the north lies the market town of Richmond, an ancient borough market and a site of eighteenth-century sociability, including its early theatre (Page 1914). Between 1846-1969, Kiplin was easily accessible via the Eryholme–Richmond railway line, which also connected Richmond to Northallerton (Suggitt 2005, 49; Tomlinson 1967, 473). Originally a coaching town, Northallerton was a stopping point along the Great North Road, the main London-Edinburgh route during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Page 1914). Like many contemporaries, Kiplin's eighteenth-century owners sought to remove it from the path of new developments in travel, by negotiating carefully to divert the new road – now the B6271 – around the boundaries of the estate (QSB Easter 1793).

### *Historical background*

Artefacts uncovered during recent archaeological work suggest the area around Kiplin Hall was occupied as early as the Mesolithic period (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 44). Since the Norman Conquest, it was largely an annex of aristocratic and ecclesiastical estates. A mill at ‘Chipeling’ held by Enisan of Count Alan appears in the Domesday Book of 1086 (Farrer and Clay 2013, 82; Powell-Smith 2016). In the twelfth century, Kiplin lands were given to the premonstratensian abbey of St Agatha in Easby, which was founded by Roald, Constable of Richmond (Farrer and Clay 2013, 83). Some five miles distant from the abbey proper, the non-cloistered canons of St Agatha took advantage of an existing mill on Kiplin Beck, building a farmstead with facilities for working the land (Schulz 1994, 3). The small abbey fell victim to the first wave of the Dissolution, passing to John, Baron Scrope of Bolton in 1537 (Page 1914). The powerful and well-connected Scrope family retained the ruined abbey as a sign of Queen Mary I’s favour (Jaques 1977, 59). However, they disposed of extraneous monastic lands including Kiplin, which was purchased in 1559 by Thomas, 1st Baron Wharton who used the estate to add to his family’s rising prestige (Grummit 2008). However, in 1619, nearly bankrupt from entertaining King James, Philip 3rd Baron Wharton was forced to sell the Kiplin estate (Melville 1913, 5; Page 1914).

The estate was purchased by Sir George Calvert, whose father had been Wharton’s principal tenant (Foster 1960, 263). Leonard Calvert had only been a yeoman, and therefore part of,

‘The rank and file of gentle folk, lacking great lands and royal, political or ecclesiastical preferment... When, however, a member of such a family has emerged into the glare of London and the life of the court, especially when he has attained high office and played a part on a wider stage, his footprints are readily traced’ (Foster 1960, 270-1).

George’s impressive new building at Kiplin, built between 1622-1625, provides a good starting point to begin to unravel the complex story of this house and its inhabitants through time.

### Early architecture: 1622-1722

Sir George Calvert’s architectural statement was centred around the tall, rectangular brick house. Stylistically, the house appears to honour fashions set by James I, under

whom Calvert served as principal Secretary of State and was named Lord Baltimore (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 26). The house was accentuated by towers and expensive, glazed windows. A small square opening at the top of each tower marks the original location of battlements. The building's most notable decorative element is its brick diapering. Similar ornamental elements are found in nearby contemporary buildings like Old Yafforth Hall, which pre-dates Kiplin by nearly a decade (Page 1914). Kiplin's diapering terminates above the upper stringcourse, suggesting the building may have originally only been two storeys tall. Kiplin's architect remains unknown. Hussey's (1931, 228) suggestion that it was Inigo Jones remains in dispute (Jaques 1977, 59). A more plausible connection is John Thorpe. Cooper (1999, 162) considers dual stair towers such as at Kiplin a unique characteristic of Thorpe's design. A social connection between Thorpe and Calvert further strengthens this theory. Thorpe was a vestryman at St Martin-in-the-Fields, the church in which Calvert both married and buried his wife, Anne Mynne (Colvin 1995, 979).

The Hall was originally entered via a double-courtyard complex, similar to Uppark on its east side. Cartographic evidence suggests the outer courtyard was entered through a substantial arched gate (fig 3.10) (ZBL M/1). The depiction of its curving roofline could represent either a full gatehouse like Westwood Park, or simply a decorative gateway like Chastleton. The forecourt appears in the same position as the existing courtyard, but once included a small building with a centrally-positioned door and two chimneys. Its large scale, prominent location and alignment with the original road suggest lodgings befitting a person of standing. It seems likely that this was the steward's house. Stewards fell between increasingly distinct social classes at this time, as they had more authority than other servants, but remained inferior to their employer (Cliffe 1999, 110). However, they filled an important and trusted role in managing the estate. This was crucial for absentee landlords like the Calverts. Future archaeological survey and excavation could reveal evidence of this building and a better understanding of Kiplin's early household dynamics.

Kiplin's earliest interior configuration is unknown. Mennim (2005, 64) suggests it was a Jacobean hall house, but neglects to acknowledge the rarity of this form at such a late date. Gomme and Maguire (2008, 46) more convincingly connect it to contemporaneous houses like Gainford Hall (Co. Durham, 1600-1603) and Treowen

(Gwent, 1627), asserting that the central spine was key to how the house functioned (fig 3.11). However, other parts of their reading of the building are problematic. My analysis of the building fabric found no physical or documentary evidence corroborating the claim that the kitchen was in the building's northwest quadrant (Gomme and Maguire 2008, 48). It is more likely the lower-status rooms in this location were a buttery or servery, whilst the kitchen, bakehouse, brewhouse, laundries and stables were in separate buildings. A 1723 survey depicts a cluster of buildings joined by a wall delineating a work yard to the north of the house, which likely denoted these service buildings (fig 3.10) (ZBL M/1).<sup>4</sup> Archaeological investigations in this area uncovered packed mortar and demolition rubble layers dated between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Brightman 2017, 60). The segregation of service and family areas enforced by this arrangement conveniently limited servant access to the house during the Calverts' frequent absences. The later attached servant wing, discussed in Phase One, was also constructed in this location, which further supports the idea that the area was originally used for service purposes.

The Calverts' pattern of sporadic occupancy continued through subsequent generations. George's heir, Cecil who inherited the house in 1632, was more of a venture colonist than a landed gentleman. Although he never visited America, his sense of identity is reflected in his portrait, which depicts him in his role as Proprietor of Maryland, with a map of the colony and an enslaved boy (fig 3.12). Kiplin provided Cecil with rental income used to support his colonial ventures, while he lived in a small Wiltshire estate. Likewise, the third and fourth Lords Baltimore spent time at other estates or overseas, using Kiplin for income and to maintain their landed gentry status. Charles Calvert, 5<sup>th</sup> Lord Baltimore, used the income to improve his impressive estate at Woodcote Park, Surrey, but nonetheless fell deep into debt (Yentsch 1994, 100). When he sold Kiplin in 1722, it provided him with much needed funds. It also set the stage for the new owners, the Crowe family, to give Kiplin renewed life as a historical nexus within the locality.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cartographer Thomas Simpson was commissioned by Christopher Crowe the Elder to carry out the survey shortly after he purchased the estate in 1722 (ZBL M/1). Simpson included buildings, their relative location and details like courtyard walls and chimneys, suggesting the importance of such elements.

### 3.2 Phase One: 1722-1818

Charles Calvert's stepfather, Christopher Crowe was in the inverse situation as his stepson: he was in possession of all the accoutrements of an elite gentleman through a position as British Consul in Livorno, but in need of a substantial estate. Purchasing Kiplin therefore helped closed the gap between Crowe and the titled aristocracy with whom he mingled. Examination of this phase of Kiplin reveals continued assertions of the Crowe family's dynastic ambitions, leading to a series of improvements over the course of nearly a century of ownership.

Updated service facilities added during this phase included a new kitchen wing to supported full-time family occupation of the house (figs 3.13, 3.14, 3.15). This made a powerful visual statement. However, attempting to impose ideal standards of eighteenth-century architecture on an existing seventeenth-century house led to innovative solutions in internal planning and access arrangements, creating distinctive family-servant relations. Circulation routes were altered, appearing to meet the new expectations for family privacy but creating pressure points that most architects would have deemed undesirable. Architectural changes also reflect an emerging and more complex servant hierarchy, as accommodation for lower servants moved farther away from family spaces. The estate also expanded to 4500 acres under Crowe family ownership (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 31). The family's changing relationship with the wider community was also reflected in Kiplin's architecture. This section considers house and outbuilding architecture together for the first time, exploring how, collectively, they made a statement about the family's status.

#### *The Crowes*

Christopher Crowe the Elder (owned Kiplin 1722-1749) worked in Livorno between 1705-1716, where he acted as British Consul and as a buying agent for British gentlemen, including the Duke of Marlborough, who was busy acquiring foreign goods to decorate his new house at Blenheim (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 29). When he retired, Crowe purchased Woodford Hall (Essex), a neat, Palladian manor with symmetrical wings and a piano noble formerly owned by Sir Richard Child, Viscount Castlemain (Anon. n.d., 15). Child's neighbouring estate Wanstead, designed by Colen Campbell, became a destination for London's elite, including Crowe. He continued to value his Essex connections even after purchasing Kiplin, and did not sell Woodford



until 1726 (Parliament 1728). However, Woodford was only a small estate, surrounded by larger properties, with no room for expansion (Anon. n.d., 15). Purchasing Kiplin enabled Crowe to build a larger architectural and landed legacy for his family. Family was a powerful motivator for Crowe. His position in Livorno was secured by his brother (Schulz 1994, 9). His wife, Lady Charlotte Lee, was a well-connected wealthy widow with grown children. They likely married for love and had four children of their own, despite Charlotte being 37 years old. Her death in 1721 may have contributed to Crowe's decision to purchase Kiplin from her son, Charles Calvert in 1722 for £7000 (Schulz 1994, 11). By then the house was quite outdated and unsuited for full-time family use. He took the decision not to update the original service facilities located in detached buildings, but added an additional wing to support his modern lifestyle. His choice of design, interior renovations and exterior alterations to the existing Hall exhibit a conscious effort to highlight modern architectural trends, establishing his place within Yorkshire's elite as he had already done in Essex.

Since his father had substantially modernised the Hall a decade earlier, Christopher Crowe the Younger (owned Kiplin 1749-1776) focused on estate improvement when he inherited in 1749. In 1754 he purchased surrounding properties, increasing rental income by over 50% per annum (Jaques 1977, 63). In the vanguard of gentlemen farmers, he took an active role in husbandry and updated the estate buildings and farmhouses. He was renowned for innovative growing methods, high-quality produce and inventions like a foot-powered blacksmith's hammer (Young 1770, 256). His relationship with Kiplin's long-time steward Robert Hutton was significantly different to that of his father's. As Hutton aged, Christopher took on many of Hutton's duties himself and built him a new steward's house (discussed in 'Outbuildings' below). His improving philosophy gained the approval of contemporary writer Young (1770, 256-257) who noted that he 'lays a foundation in his discoveries for the absolute support of thousands'.

When George Crowe (owned Kiplin 1776-1782) inherited his brother's estate in 1776, he was 57 years old and had an established life including a manor in Northallerton, estate in Langton and rented London townhouse. Servant tax records during his ownership list minimal staff, suggesting he did not spend much time at Kiplin once he inherited the property (Cartwright 1898, 65). Instead, he took a view common to

younger gentry sons, seeing the estate primarily as a source of income (Jaques 1977, 70). By this time, the estate provided sufficient income to cover substantial debts George had accrued from failed business ventures in the 1760s (Jaques 1977, 67). As a result, he made no substantial changes to the Hall.

Unlike his father George, Robert Crowe (owned Kiplin 1782-1818) expected to inherit Kiplin and followed in the footsteps of his uncle and grandfather, adding to and improving the estate. His efforts focused on alterations to the grounds, deliberately considering the relationship between house and land. In 1793 he re-routed the main road around the property, erecting a wall along its edge in 1793 (QSB Easter 1793). The decision not to use the newly cordoned off land to grow crops appears to align with Overton's (1996, 7) assertion that enclosure acts of the time were not as focused on increasing agricultural output as simply consolidating the wealth of landowners like Crowe. Family and guests enjoyed views of the landscape and possibly a new eye-catching folly from the second-floor long gallery, which runs through the centre of the house (fig 3.15) (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 30). Although scholars like Gomme and Maguire (2008, 121) assert the gallery is likely an unusual example of the seventeenth century, recent analysis of the roof indicates it was reconfigured during Robert's tenure, as late as 1793 (Brightman 2017, 48). This interest in the ways in which the landscape was viewed from the house continued to be developed in subsequent building phases.

### *Facilities*

Christopher Crowe used Kiplin to construct his status as well as reflect his wealth and was keen to demonstrate his awareness of contemporary conventions at the highest echelons of society. As discussed in Chapter 2, newly-built eighteenth-century country houses had class separation integrated into their design. However, by 1722 Kiplin's service facilities were a century old. The reconfiguration of these spaces provided a powerful statement about Crowe's familiarity with fashionable houses such as Woodford and Wanstead, at the same time as it responded to new technologies and the needs of a family in permanent residence.

The older outbuildings to the immediate north of the Hall were demolished by Christopher Crowe c1739 to make room for a new, attached service wing (fig 3.13,

3.14). George Cuit's 1780 painting, which is the earliest known reliable pictorial evidence of the Hall, depicts a two-storey rectangular wing abutting the Hall's north side (fig 3.16).<sup>5</sup> The five-bay east façade aligns with the Hall. Regularly placed, vertically aligned windows with stone surrounds on both storeys create a rhythmic design common in eighteenth-century architecture. However, the new wing's lower height and the absence of stone quoins clearly indicates its utilitarian purpose, as advocated by period design guides. It is interesting that Crowe only added this wing, leaving the exterior of the main Hall largely intact. At other houses, like Kimbolton Castle, Cambridgeshire, the entire principal façade was remodelled to give the appearance of a new Georgian house. Was this a deliberate attempt by Crowe to embrace the antiquity of the house and legitimise his connection with it? Or does this simply indicate that a well-functioning household initially took precedence over style?

The key space within the new wing was an improved kitchen, located at its northern end. A substantial chimney within the wing indicates its primary function as the working heart of the house. Throughout the eighteenth century, dining became an art form, requiring more staff with specialised skills. Closer proximity between the new attached kitchen area and dining areas enabled better communication and provided the family with warmer meals. However, it remained at the far reaches of the complex, keeping smells and noise at a distance. Although not a primary focus in design, servants did benefit from these arrangements. The construction of a service wing attached to the main house meant they no longer faced the elements when moving between service and family spaces; an important consideration in North Yorkshire!

Kiplin's new service wing also included a spacious servants' hall. It had been the custom for servants to dine communally in the main house's hall well into the seventeenth century (Cliffe 1999, 24). Northern households held on particularly long to antiquated ideas of hospitality centred around a communal hall (Cliffe 1969, 115). However, removing servants from reception rooms and limiting access to the main house was crucial to the principles of eighteenth-century architectural and social

---

<sup>5</sup> Cuit (1743-1818), an artist and the son of a builder was known for his detailed paintings (Cust 2004). The level of verifiable architectural detail on the main house, including the east façade's diapering, makes his representation of the service wing a relatively reliable source for general form and fenestration, although focus on polite architecture limits its usefulness.

segregation. A multi-purpose servants' hall, where they could both work and dine addressed this concern. How was this perceived and experienced? If Kiplin's servants were, like most of their contemporaries, recruited locally, did they perceive this as being ejected from sharing space with the family? Or did they welcome their own communal space and the social distance it also afforded them?

The low end of Kiplin's original hall layout continued to be used for service even after communal hall customs died out. The northeast corner of the house became the housekeeper's room through to the early-nineteenth century (fig 3.13). Mary Williams was the Crowe's long-time housekeeper. Her room was strategically located, close enough to oversee servant activity in the new wing, whilst remaining within calling distance of the family. Mary was especially important during widower Christopher Crowe the Elder's tenure because she was the senior female overseeing the entire household. Her role, like her space, both reflected and enforced a growing servant hierarchy evident both at Kiplin and in wider British society.

Whilst the new wing provided some updated service spaces, other services remained on the periphery and out of sight. The laundries, bakehouse and brewhouse appear to be housed in single-storey buildings behind the new wing. A low building set at an angle behind a short brick wall that abuts the north end of the kitchen wing is visible in the Cuit painting (fig 3.16). Continued use of such vernacular buildings, which may have dated to the seventeenth century, suggest that the Crowes focused on updating the service areas most likely to present visitors with the appearance of an efficiently run, modern household.

### *Accommodation*

In the mid-eighteenth century, members of the gentry like the Crowes strengthened ties with the more established aristocracy by distancing themselves from the lower classes (Girouard 1978, 184). Country house design that incorporated distinct social zones, separating masters from their servants aided this effort. Intimate spaces like bedrooms gained more importance, becoming private sanctuaries for the elite. They were often positioned deep within the house, separated by dressing rooms, which fulfilled a variety of uses including daily toilette, letter writing, and visiting with close friends. Kiplin's large first-floor rooms were therefore partitioned, forming a series of

suites to meet this need. Servants were pushed to the periphery of the house, no longer sleeping on truckle beds in their masters' bedrooms and on pallets throughout the house.

The new eighteenth-century service wing addition provided ample room for servants' quarters on the first floor (fig 3.14). Like the kitchen, this area was close enough for servants to be on call, whilst remaining removed from the main house. Each end of the wing had its own chimney, suggesting the first floor was divided into two distinct spaces, but the exact interior configuration is unknown. Depending on household arrangements, the rooms may have been unequal in size and accessibility might have varied. Servants who did not sleep in the house still required supervision, and lodging arrangements aided the maintenance of social order and segregation of the sexes. Typical servants' quarters of the time were larger, dormitory-like rooms shared by multiple servants (Cliffe 1999, 103). If Kiplin's quarters adhered to this layout, separate staircases might have facilitated such gender segregation. The 1777 manservant tax may, as elsewhere, have affected the Crowes' hiring patterns, decreasing the number of 'luxury' menservants like footmen (Schwarz 1999, 239). George Crowe was certainly only employing a small number of menservants in 1780 (Cartwright 1898, 65). Restricting male servants to the most visible roles and increasing the number of female servants enabled large households to continue functioning without increasing spending. Kiplin's menservants had other options for lodging on the estate, including the late-eighteenth century stable complex, and as discussed above, some men like estate steward Robert Hutton lived in a purpose-built house. It is therefore possible that the entire first floor of the service wing was women's lodgings. Housekeeper Mary Williams would likely have had a separate bedroom conveniently located to supervise lower servants. Unfortunately, nineteenth-century renovations and twentieth-century demolition removed critical evidence that could have otherwise answered these fascinating questions about gendered divisions of eighteenth-century service space.

The first-floor northwest bedroom was cut off from other family rooms yet became more accessible to servant areas when a service corridor was installed, as discussed below. Despite lower servants moving out of the main house, body servants often continued to have rooms in or near family areas. Kiplin's northwest bedroom was an

ideal location for an upper servant like a valet. It was entered through the service corridor but remained within summoning distance of family rooms. The bond between Christopher Crowe the Elder and his Italian valet, Girolamo Francesconi, was forged during their time together in Livorno. Francesconi's position as an upper servant and a foreigner set him apart from his colleagues. It is unknown how well he integrated into British culture, how proficient his English was, or how other servants viewed him. Record of a child born to Girolamo and Mary Francesconi and the burial record for 'Mary Francesconi, housekeeper to Mr Crowe' suggests he married housekeeper Mary Williams, whose status within the servant hierarchy was similar to his own (PR/BOL 1/2). They were clearly valued servants, as Christopher Crowe the elder left each of them substantial bequests, and they worked for the family until their own deaths (ZBL II/5). Francesconi and Williams' marriage raises interesting issues about the impact of inter-personal servant relationships on household dynamics.

Kiplin's second floor was used for childcare and included nurseries, children's bedrooms, a schoolroom, and other servants' rooms (fig 3.15). The two 'high' nurseries and a 'low' nursery listed in a nineteenth-century inventory appear to reflect the Crowe's occupancy (ZBL IV/10/3/3). Childcare facilities were especially important for Christopher Crowe the Elder. Since he was a widower, his four children were largely raised by servants. Proximity to their charges was of paramount importance to nurses. They slept in younger children's rooms, and as children grew, continued to sleep nearby. The northwest bedroom was likely used by the senior childcare servant, such as a head nurse. The position of her room was similar to the valet's room below, tucked away in a corner between service and family spaces, reflecting the liminal social position of such servants. This set a precedent for servant use of the northwest room on the second floor, which lasted well into the nineteenth-century when it was occupied by the governess (Denison 1887). Through a combinations of partitioning space within the house, the Crowes provided new accommodation arrangements that both reflected and structured the household's increasingly complex social and service hierarchy.

### *Circulation*

Kiplin's rooms were originally directly connected, creating a circular path around the house. Family and servants alike passed through one room to gain access to another.

North and south tower staircases initially provided basic access to different floors. Sometime after 1722, Christopher Crowe the Elder constructed a cantilevered staircase in the middle of the house, creating a processional route that supported an increasingly nuanced social structure (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 12). Visitors entered a formal lobby, newly partitioned from the old hall. If they were of sufficient status, they were then escorted deeper into the house, up the ornate new staircase. Arriving on the first floor, they proceeded along the stair hall, and finally into the upper drawing room. As the culmination of a formal processional route, this large, open room with three different access points seems to have been a privileged reception space rather than a private family space (after West 1999, 120). The new staircase was essential to creating this formal visitor route but was otherwise functionally superfluous since both the north and south towers still contained staircases. The family likely continued using the enclosed south stair to access private upper-floor rooms. The north staircase was located between main house and new service wing, and therefore provided servants with access to all levels. In this instance, Kiplin's original configuration was well-suited to support new ideals of social segregation between family and servants.

The new staircase's central location also impacted the use of other spaces. The Crowes redesigned the ground floor southwestern room for formal dining, symbolised by its new fireplace carved with cornucopias. The concept of a single-purpose room for dining continued to gain popularity throughout the eighteenth century (Cliffe 1999, 29-30). *Service à la française* called attention to the layout of dishes, which became highly decorative, adding a theatrical quality to dining (Gray 2010, 256). Consequently, the path from kitchen to dining room was a critical service route. However, Kiplin did not have a direct corridor linking the kitchen and dining room, and the new central staircase further complicated passage between these areas. Servants entered the house at the north tower and proceeded through a short corridor, remaining unseen before emerging onto a landing on the new staircase (fig 3.13). However, passing through the remaining polite spaces of stair and entry halls to reach the dining room door rendered them visible to guests and family. As incongruous as the concept of servants moving from the hidden depths of a house into public spaces now seems, circulation pattern analysis helps to explain how this worked. Although perceived today as a single pathway, we must remember that emerging awareness of status within the servant community created a tacit understanding of which spaces a

servant could – and could not – traverse. A kitchen maid moved behind the scenes, carrying food from kitchen to the stair landing. A footman then transported dishes through public spaces to the dining room. This arrangement further supports the theory that social appearance, not convenience, was the primary motivation for the central staircase's construction.

Despite these ground-floor arrangements, preserving privacy in the first-floor family bedrooms required servant-only circulation. The central spine that Gomme and Maguire (2008, 46) highlight as a significant original feature once again figures prominently. Unusually, an open space runs between the core of the chimneystacks, down the entire length of Kiplin's spine (fig 3.14). It is a small space, 35.5" wide and 86" tall with vaulted ceilings (fig 3.17). These dimensions were dictated by the configuration of the pre-existing chimney stacks, creating a cramped tunnel between the two which opens into small, flat-ceilinged vestibules. These were spatial 'pressure points'; junctions unavoidably traversed by both servants and family. The corridor remained the main path by which servants reached all rooms. The upper drawing room's primary access route is through the central vestibule; the south bedroom via the south vestibule. Houses with similar arrangements like Coleshill and Wrotham Park ease such circulatory pressure points with strategically open walls or columns. However, at Kiplin there is merely a small change in ceiling height. Traces of door furniture in Kiplin's vestibules suggest there may have been an attempt to segregate these areas from the corridor. These small interventions and fragmentary traces in skirting boards and architraves there preserve archaeological evidence of innovative solutions to accommodate new ideas about social and spatial hierarchies and segregation within old, established house layouts. It seems highly likely that similarly creative solutions existed elsewhere.

### *Outbuildings*

Whilst Kiplin's household service spaces drew closer to the main house in the new service wing, other buildings expanded further into the estate. When Christopher Crowe the Younger's inherited, 'he found all the farm houses and offices in miserable repair,' which he subsequently mended and rebuilt (Young 1770, 255). These included new stables and estate offices designed to support his life as a gentleman farmer.



Crowe the Younger also constructed a new ‘elegant as well as useful’ steward’s house with ‘all sorts of conveniences in plenty; and a neat room for drinking tea in’ (Young 1770, 255). Though its exact location remains unknown, it appears to have been constructed at some distance from the Hall (Young 1770, 255). As discussed in Chapter 2, distinctions between household and estate workers began developing in the eighteenth century. However, the steward remained an important part of the overall household structure. Kiplin’s steward Robert Hutton was given expenses for candles, wine and meat (ZBL IV/3/1/48; ZBL IV/3/1/37). He spent more than a quarter of a century with the family, collecting rents, tracking estate works, and paying wages (ZBL IV/3/1/14; ZBL IV/3/1/4). His duties lessened significantly under Crowe the Younger. This seems more likely to reflect Crowe’s personal interest in estate management than a lack of trust between the two, as suggested by Jaques (1977).

Labour relations between the Crowes and the surrounding community became more closely entwined and was reflected in other buildings, too. Payments for chimney sweeping and washing reveal a pattern of hiring casual labour from nearby villages (ZBL IV/3/1/25). Burial records in which individuals were identified as a ‘servant of Mr Crowe’ attest to a tight sense of community identity (PR/BOL 1/2). Crowe the Younger also contributed to local industry, inventing a foot-powered blacksmith’s hammer which was ‘of excellent service to all country smiths’ (Young 1770, 256). Overall, this was a period of considerable change, in which it is possible to explore the innovative ways in which old houses were adapted to accommodate new ideas about increasingly-complex service structures, but also shaped the experience of service, for servants and family alike. Further change was to come, as the house became a very different kind of home in the nineteenth century.

### 3.3 Phase Two: 1818-1868

When Robert Crowe died in 1818, he bequeathed the Kiplin estate to his daughter Sarah and her husband John Delaval Carpenter, Earl of Tyrconnel (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 32). The Tyrconnels’ relationship to the estate was different than their predecessors, and aligned with a general shift in the way country houses were used. Reaping the benefits of lucrative eighteenth-century improvements, some nineteenth-century landholders changed to a leasehold model which based rent on holdings rather than output (Overton 1996, 151). This would likely have been appealing to the

previously landless couple, who had no farming experience. Consequently, it is perhaps more useful here to consider their relationship to the estate from a cultural lens as advocated by Finch (2008, 513-514). In this context, women like the Countess took an active role in shaping country house grounds to support new social fashions (McDonagh 2018, 101). House parties gained in popularity, partially due to advances in transportation that allowed for easier access from urban centres (Girouard 1978, 218). Kiplin was connected to York and London via railway stations in Richmond and Northallerton (Tomlinson 1967, 473). Changes in entertaining necessarily impacted how such houses functioned, which in turn required differing service needs. Thus, the Tyrconnels began renovating Kiplin and its grounds into a modernised country estate befitting their status.

The Tyrconnels reflected their awareness of contemporary architectural trends by adding a Gothic Revival style wing to the main Hall. But they also added a new service wing to Kiplin in brilliant white stucco, reflecting their understanding of contemporary ideas about household management (figs 3.18, 3.19, 3.20). It provided additional service accommodation, removing servants from the main house and freeing up space within for guests. This wing reinforced the established servant hierarchy and created gendered and work-specific spaces. Kiplin's grounds also expanded in this period. Extensive gardens and new building types like glasshouses required a substantial team of grounds staff, all signifying the Tyrconnels' wealth and status.

This phase is defined by the seemingly successful transformation of a self-sufficient gentleman-farmer's estate into a country retreat supporting a lifestyle of leisure. However, once again close analysis reveals that a more complicated picture of ideal versus reality; a greater concern with the Tyrconnels' carefully-cultivated image, rather than the reality of the household.

#### *The Earl and Countess of Tyrconnel*

When the eighteen-year-old Sarah Crowe married the Earl of Tyrconnel in 1817, it is likely she still lived at Kiplin, her childhood home (Schulz 1994, 19). In 1818 they inherited jointly, with the Earl being granted a life tenancy (Schulz 1994, 19). Census records show that the Tyrconnels were in residence only periodically, even though the house remained permanently staffed ('Kiplin Hall' 1841; 'Kiplin Hall' 1851;

‘Mansion’ 1861). They often travelled to fulfil social obligations and the Earl’s passion for yachting. In April 1841, they were in the Isle of Wight for the Cowes Regatta (‘Watchhouse Lane’ 1841).

The creation of Kiplin as a centre of sociability and status was crucial to the Tyrconnells, since the Earl was an Irish peer without an estate of his own. In 1846-48, he constructed a local railway station, partly to enable guests to travel to weekend shooting parties at the Hall (Schulz 1994, 20). The architect P. F. Robinson was commissioned to add a large south wing in ‘Wyatville’s Gothic’ style to the house (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 32). It included false buttresses and pointed-arch windows with tracery, which complemented the newly enclosed battlements of the towers (Schulz 1994, 20). Tyrconnell’s coat of arms was inserted above the main door of the east tower and heraldic stained-glass windows emphasising the Earl’s lineage from King John further appropriated Kiplin as his dynastic seat (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 7). The interior of the wing had coffered ceilings and large, four-centred arched openings designed to accommodate multiple seating areas in which small groupings could gather and converse. It was a thoroughly modern configuration designed for a style of informal visiting that contrasted markedly with the formal spaces of sociability of the previous century.

Despite surviving sources, the Tyrconnells’ personalities remain elusive and their individual temperaments enigmatic. Architectural changes to the main house were clearly influenced by ideas gained through travel, access to metropolitan centres, rapidly developing technologies and a large social circle. However, examination of the intricacies of the service spaces and the service experience reveals a more nuanced view of the lived experience in the Tyrconnell household.

### *Facilities*

The Tyrconnells did not focus their attentions on updating existing service facilities, preferring instead to construct an addition to the service complex. Doing so shielded a vernacular jumble of chimneys and lean-to roofs between the Hall and service wing from public sight. The east façade of the out-dated kitchen wing was allowed to become overgrown with foliage, creating a pleasing vignette of ivy-clad buildings and chimneys and an impression that the service areas had developed organically.

Between 1818-1820 the Tyrconnells constructed the 'White Wing', so called because it was rendered with gleaming stucco. This two-storey curved structure infilled the space between the northwest corner of the Hall and the earlier L-shaped service complex, effectively creating an enclosed service yard (fig 3.21). The yard looked inwards, with multiple openings on the inner (east) elevation but few outward-facing windows on the west façade. There is little precedent for the wing's unusual curved shape. However, the arched footprint, stucco rendering and low-sloped roof could be considered a reflection of a 'rural Italian' Palladian influence (Girouard 1978, 272). The overall impression was similar to the rounded, stucco towers of John Nash's Cronkhill (1802, Salop) and Sandridge Park (1805, Dev). Although not curved, the service wing on Nash's Luscombe Castle (1800, Dev) has a similarly angled relationship to its main house.

The White Wing's interior spatial arrangements reflected contemporary ideals in service planning, principally the expansion of hierarchical divisions to include work-based and gendered zones, which were overseen by senior servants. During the Tyrconnells' occupancy, the White Wing's ground floor included specific provisions for a butler's pantry, shoe house and steward's office (ZBL IV/10/3/3). These male-dominated spaces were supervised by the butler, part of Kiplin's established servant hierarchy. The kitchens, scullery and larder remained in the eighteenth-century wing, under the eye of the housekeeper, whose office was still tucked in the northeast corner of the Hall (fig 3.19). There were no significant alterations within the kitchens, despite frequent entertaining. This could have been a financially-motivated decision since the female servants working in these spaces were less expensive than costly technological innovations. Records do not suggest the Tyrconnells employed a full-time cook, but it was not unusual in such households for the housekeeper to fulfil this role as seen at Brodsworth in Chapter 2. Locally-sourced casual servants provided additional service labour when it was needed. Overall, this suggests a concern to balance the needs of the household with contemporary architectural fashions.

The location of the laundry at this time is somewhat obscure, but historical evidence supplemented by trends of the time suggest the strong possibility that it was in the farthest wing of Kiplin's service block. Laundries were self-contained departments

with specialised equipment and spatial needs that did not align with the social and gender segregation so desired by employers of this time (Girouard 1978, 283). As discussed in Chapter 2, they were often located on the outskirts of the service wing, and were sometimes outside the house complex altogether, as at Brodsworth. Examination of the 1857 OS map of Kiplin Hall shows the kitchens and White Wing were connected by a perpendicular wing to the north (fig 3.21). This structure also appears in the far right of Cuit's painting (fig 3.16) and is still visible in an 1860s photograph taken during the Tyrconnels' ownership (3.22). It delineates the northernmost side of the service complex with space behind for a drying yard, which fits the pattern of outlying laundries. Furthermore, the later structure that replaced it (discussed in Phase Three below) included a new laundry in the same location, also supporting the theory that this wing contained the laundry during this period.

Like the facilities themselves, laundry labour arrangements varied, but generally followed a range of common practices. Sambrook (1999, 206) describes a hierarchical ideal involving numerous ranked laundrymaids working under a laundress; an orderly system familiar from other domestic departments. However, laundry routines, and therefore labour needs were tied to individual households and living patterns (Gerard 1984, 181). The department had duties related directly to the house (linens), whilst also laundering the clothing of an ever-changing number of family, guests and servants. Kiplin's laundry department likely grew and shrank to accommodate the Tyrconnels' seasonal schedule. When the family was elsewhere, they only employed a single live-in laundrymaid ('Kiplin Hall 1851). When families were in residence, staff at many houses was often supplemented with casually-hired laundrymaids and washerwomen who took in piecework from multiple households. Steedman (2004, 12-13) points out that these women remained relatively low in the household labour structure. However, considered from the perspective of the nearby communities from which they came, Gerard (1984, 179-80) highlights that the indoor nature and flexible hours of the work was appealing and provided an important contribution to household income. It is therefore possible that when the Tyrconnels were in residence or entertaining, laundry labour arrangements expanded the Hall's connection to the surrounding community.

### *Accommodation*

The first floor of the White Wing addition provided lodging for the Tyrconnels' large live-in staff, who were permanently based in the house. Gendered segregation appears to have been especially important in accommodation, which was used during non-work hours. The first floor of the White Wing was dedicated to menservants' quarters (fig 3.19). These men would normally have been supervised by the senior male servant, usually the butler. However, in 1841 butler John Alton lived with his family in an estate house ('Butler's House' 1841). Alton was therefore only able to directly supervise menservants during the day, leaving night supervision to the next highest live-in manservant, which in 1851 was under butler John Skinner ('Kiplin Hall' 1851). After the Earl's death in 1853, the role of the butler became especially important. The 1861 census lists the Countess' butler Henry Toplis as 'Head of House' ('Mansion' 1861). He lodged in the White Wing with other menservants including the coachman, stable boy and groom who were more commonly housed on the estate in the stables (ZBL IV/10/3/3). Gender segregation was of paramount importance in this phase of Kiplin's accommodation arrangements.

The eighteenth-century kitchen wing's first floor remained women servants' quarters, subdivided into smaller heated spaces by a series of chimneys visible in historic photographs (fig 3.22). Inventories note these rooms had multiple bedsteads, indicating that they were shared, even though Victorian servants might have expected private bedrooms (ZBL IV/10/3/3). These women were also supervised by a senior (female) servant, usually the housekeeper and were in close proximity to her room and to other female workspaces, such as the kitchen. In 1861, housekeeper Annie Hinchcliffe supervised a staff of seven ('Mansion' 1861). However, living in the outdated eighteenth-century wing, Kiplin's women servants were not as comfortably accommodated as their male counterparts. Some servants, however, had a greater degree of independence. The laundrymaid's bedroom was outside the female kitchen wing, located near the laundry, dairy and cheese room (ZBL IV/10/3/3). This may also, however, have made them targets for impropriety by male staff (Girouard 1978, 272).

Some servants were provided cottages on the estate. Records mention a Steward's House and Butler's House, but never at the same time ('Butler's House' 1841; 'Kiplin Hall, Steward's House' 1851; 'Gilbert Cargey' 1861). They may have been the same

building, allocated to married, high-ranking male staff. As noted above, John Alton was in residence in 1841 ('Butler's House' 1841), while the Earl's unmarried steward Thomas Flintoff resided in the Hall ('Sleeping Rooms' 1841). In 1851, however, Flintoff's successor Gilbert Cargey and his wife lived in the steward's house ('Kiplin Hall, Steward's House' 1851). Estate housing seems to have been reserved for married men. Ann Alderson, charwoman was Kiplin's only recorded married female servant ('Kiplin Hall' 1851) and like most women undertaking these duties probably lived out and worked at multiple households (Horn 1990, 228).

Examining Kiplin's accommodation arrangements reveals that gender segregation was an important aspect of the Tyrconnels' commitment to social ideals of the period. This is evident in the willingness to co-locate different household groups by gender. Despite the White Wing being farther away from their places of work, the stable boy, head gardener and estate steward lodged there at times.

### *Circulation*

The White Wing included an enclosed staircase at the east end, which is labelled 'men's stairs' on a later nineteenth century plan (figs 3.18, 3.19) (ZBL M/21). It provided the only access point to the new first-floor menservants' bedrooms. Similarly, an enclosed staircase adjacent to the kitchens, labelled 'women's stairs', led to female staff bedrooms above (ZBL M/21). These circulatory routes were tightly controlled access points; further evidence of the way in which architectural elements were used to enforce social expectations of gender segregation between servants.

At some point in this period, the wooden service staircase in the north tower was replaced with stone. This may have been designed to accommodate the increased use and loading of family and visitor luggage and traffic during the Tyrconnels' residence. These steps had several landings, creating more access points into the service wing. Was this purely functional, or was it a further reflection of the complex negotiation of shared access points and circulation routes around the house? Although these routes do not appear to have changed dramatically during this period, servant presence could be summoned more rapidly thanks to innovations such as the bell system located in the service wing corridor. Highly visible servants within the household were distinguished by their livery. The Countess's footman William Parnel wore livery with

gold lace ('Mansion' 1861; ZBL IV/1/679). Uses of other technology, such as the liveried butler's dinner gong ensured that both family and servants understood where they should be and at what time, on either side of the proverbial green baize doors.

Upstairs, the service corridor remained the main, shared circulatory route, but the addition of the Gothic wing removed the south tower staircase (fig 3.19). The quality of the furnishing of the northwest bedroom during this period suggests it had been appropriated as a family space, possibly contributing to further corridor congestion (ZBL IV/10/3/3). Careful scheduling of dressing, eating and cleaning routines by the housekeeper and butler may have alleviated this pressure. Additionally, suites were created by allocating some bedrooms with a small dressing room, which had separate entrances onto the central corridor (ZBL IV/10/3/3). This provided family with multiple private and semi-private spaces on the first floor. As the principal heir, the Countess seems to have been actively involved in the management of the estate (Schulz 1994, 19). This is likely to have extended to household management, including the regulation servant routines. Increased desire by owners to control servant behaviour became more problematic throughout the nineteenth century, as servants increasingly resented the resulting lack of personal freedom. Kiplin reflects the challenges presented by old houses in accommodating these trends, and the compromises that had to be made by both the family and the household in reality.

### *Outbuildings*

Like her father Robert, Sarah Tyrconnel (née Crowe) heavily invested in Kiplin's grounds. Cartographic evidence reveals significant landscape and outbuilding development between 1839-1857. Early maps show a few outbuildings nestled next to the property's northern border (fig 3.23). By 1854, these buildings had been expanded to include a long vinery to grow grapes, built against the estate's north wall (fig 3.21) (Webster 2010, 41). Fruit, vegetables and hundreds of varieties of flowers were grown in new glasshouses; a marvel of modern innovation, requiring large amounts of glass and slender framing. Before the invention of chambered hot water boilers later in the century, they were often heated with stoves (Palmer and West 2016, 41-2). Kiplin's were heated with coal-fuelled fires, requiring additional staff to care for the facilities as well as the produce (ZBL IV/1/377). Their presence in the landscape, as well as the flowers and produce enjoyed by family and guests, added to the Tyrconnels' prestige.



Expansion of these areas reflected contemporary trends in the relationship between landscape and architecture. Throughout the early-nineteenth century, Britain's elite found a new appreciation of nature, which Girouard (1978, 214) considers a reaction to earlier philosophies that valued imposing order on nature. Socially, this is evident in the decline of formal group entertaining, and a rise in informal socialising. Country house inhabitants and guests were no longer content simply appreciating carefully composed landscape vignettes from within houses (Girouard 1978, 214). Vistas like that between Robert Crowe's long gallery and folly were not engaging enough. Consequently, architecture began blurring the boundaries between house and gardens, which increased permeability between these two domains. With new architectural trends unencumbered by classical principles like symmetry, styles such as the Gothic Revival were free to incorporate creatively massed buildings that mirrored the surrounding forms of nature (Girouard 1978, 219). In newly-built homes and renovations of this period principal living rooms were constructed at ground floor level, as was Kiplin's Gothic wing (Girouard 1978, 220). This was a significant departure from earlier buildings like Calke Abbey, where principal rooms were located above a rusticated level usually comprised of service spaces. Instead, new arrangements allowed for elements like full-length windows and conservatories, which invited nature into polite interior spaces. Reciprocally, outdoor architectural features like benches and covered trellises extended indoor conveniences into nature.

The Tyrconnells embraced this lifestyle, as evidenced by a portrait of the Countess by Siegfried Bendixen. She is comfortably seated in the Gothic wing, showcasing her appreciation of the new space. Nature is abundantly represented within the room by a vase of hothouse-grown cut flowers. The connection between house and surrounding garden is further highlighted by a view of Kiplin's serpentine pond and Gothic folly through the tall windows behind her. Plans for a conservatory would have integrated the house and gardens even further, but were ultimately rejected (ZBL M/17). However, cartographic and archaeological evidence reveals that throughout the landscape features like benches, sculptures and a summer house, which were all accessible via neatly delineated pathways, provided family and guests with opportunities to leisurely enjoy the grounds (fig 3.21) (Brightman 2017, 26).

Kiplin's grounds staff increased in response to this investment in the estate. In 1841, only a single journeyman gardener lived on the estate ('Garden House' 1841). By 1851 there were two under gardeners supervised by head gardener David Davies ('Kiplin Hall' 1851; 'Garden House to Kiplin Hall' 1851). He continued to supervise the garden department for at least a decade and was eventually granted a cottage when he married ('Gardener's House' 1861; 'Kiplin Hall' 1851). In 1865, head gardener William Fuller was granted a salary that included a cottage and vegetables for his family, along with funds to pay his apprentices (ZBL IV/1/295). The evidence of a hierarchy including full-time and casual labour, along with the location and arrangements of garden outbuildings indicates an autonomous department which nevertheless mirrored the hierarchies within the Hall itself.

During this period, the house and estate can be argued to have been organised into 'work zones', from the clustered spaces of kitchens and laundries, to the garden buildings and glasshouses beyond the Hall. Vertical hierarchies also operated in the White Wing's gender-segregated floors with separate access routes. Such spatial arrangements encoded gender divisions and social hierarchies into circulation routes in ways that did not require constant surveillance or monitoring by senior servants or heads of household, such as the Tyrconnels. This served as a foundation for Kiplin's final phase of expansion at the end of the nineteenth century.

### 3.4 Phase Three: 1868-1904

The Tyrconnels had transformed Kiplin into a comfortable early-nineteenth century home. In 1868, the Countess bequeathed the house to her late husband's distant cousin, Walter Cecil Talbot (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 33). Talbot was the Earl of Shrewsbury's second son and a relative of the Marquess of Waterford (Schulz 1994, 21). He was well-connected but without property of his own. To meet the conditions of his inheritance, he changed his surname to Carpenter and married a Protestant, (Webster and McLuckie 2016, 34).<sup>6</sup> It has long been assumed that Carpenter's occupancy of Kiplin was characterised by continuity with the Tyrconnels (Schulz 1994; Webster and McLuckie 2016). However, Carpenter's newly inherited country

---

<sup>6</sup> Upon inheriting in 1868 Captain Walter Talbot legally changed his name to Carpenter. During his naval career he was steadily promoted, becoming Admiral Walter Carpenter in 1894 (Schulz 1994, 22). For consistency, he is referred to as Carpenter in this thesis.

estate still required updating. By 1868, Kiplin's service facilities comprised the outdated eighteenth-century kitchen wing and the early-nineteenth century White Wing, connected by a vernacular wing that also accommodated the laundry, larders and stables. This sprawling, disjointed jumble of spaces did not meet with the approval of a naval man with a predisposition for order and became the focus of Carpenter's renovation campaign.

Construction began in earnest between 1873-76, when Carpenter supervised a building campaign that reused materials, reorganised room use and altered service spaces that, 'so offended my eye... that I pulled it down with my own men' (Carpenter n.d.). Shortly after the completion of these works in 1876 having given birth to their only child, Carpenter's wife Marie died (Schulz 1994, 22). In 1887 he married Beatrice de Grey, the daughter of Lord Walsingham, with whom he shared many acquaintances (Schulz 1994, 23). Carpenter continued with further renovations designed to offer greater convenience for the family and give the house a more unified aesthetic appearance.

#### *Admiral Walter Carpenter*

Captain Walter Carpenter's naval career began at the age of thirteen (Schulz 1994, 22). He was on active duty in Bermuda when he learned of Lady Tyrconnel's death (ZBL IV/1/346). He had likely already begun his courtship with Maria Mundy, daughter of Grenada's governor, but the conditions of his inheritance might have hastened their marriage. Carpenter was embedded in Caribbean life and his solicitor John Topham suggested he let Kiplin Hall for three to five years, generating valuable income for improving the house on his return to England (ZBL IV/1/347). Kiplin was marketed as an easily-accessible house in an ideal location from which to enjoy leisure activities like shooting and fishing; a comfortable house being 'completely furnished, having up to a very recent period been in the occupation of the late Countess of Tyrconnel' with a housekeeper's room, servants' hall, kitchen, pantries, twelve servants' bedrooms, and outbuildings (ZBL IV/6/3). Many of the tenants of Kiplin between 1868-1887 came for only a few weeks or months during the shooting season. Even after his daughter Sarah's birth in 1876, Carpenter continued to focus on his naval career rather than enjoying Kiplin, gaining a promotion to Rear Admiral in 1882 (Schulz 1994, 22). His early role was therefore that of Kiplin's landlord, visiting to 'be on the Estate &

see after things' and giving instructions to his solicitor, Topham (ZBL IV/1/855). The scale of Kiplin's service accommodation was crucial to its attraction as a rentable property, since elite tenants expected generous, well-appointed service spaces in both short-term properties and new-build houses (Franklin 1981, 87).

Carpenter finally settled at Kiplin following his remarriage in 1887. Alterations to family spaces, service areas, and the wider estate reveal a strong desire to create a unified aesthetic at Kiplin. Within the house he accentuated the Hall's Jacobean characteristics, fitting out the library with dark wood panelling, an elaborately carved fireplace surround and low-relief, coffered plaster ceiling from which hung small pendants, reminiscent of a similarly-proportioned room at his family seat of Ingestre (Staffs). The hall panelling also bears a striking resemblance to the fully-panelled drawing room at Wolseley Hall (Staffs), from which he wrote frequently. Carpenter initially hired Thomas Wyatt to renovate the service wing; an architect whose neo-Gothic style complimented the design of the early-nineteenth-century south wing (ZBL IV/1/1027). Carpenter was familiar with the Wyatts' style from visits to Ashridge (Herts) and Wilton House (Wilts), the home of his sister, the Countess of Pembroke. Wyatt was eventually replaced by William Eden Nesfield who ultimately created a unified country house and service wing that met Carpenter's expectations and befitted his status (Schulz 1994, 25).

### *Facilities*

Early in Carpenter's ownership, several prospective tenants requested repairs as part of the rental agreement or declined the let altogether, citing the unreasonable level of costs required to make it comfortable (ZBL IV/1/585; ZBL IV/1/517). Carpenter's solicitor Topham advised rebuilding some areas altogether. However, it was not until a lease expired in 1873 that he turned his attention to the renovation of the service wing (ZBL IV/1/855). Although the basic functions of servants had not changed dramatically, there was a greater interest in emphasising specialisation of spaces to signal status (Franklin 1981, 88). Architects like Wyatt were skilled at creating service spaces for specialized tasks. At Lathom House (Lancs), Wyatt more than doubled the number of its service rooms (Franklin 1981, 88). He developed similar proposals at Kiplin through building new spaces and subdividing others (ZBL IV/1/1027). These were 'grand ideas' but Wyatt's refusal to agree a contract price and his unwillingness

to retain the existing kitchen ultimately led to his dismissal. Instead, Carpenter hired William Eden Nesfield, appointed a project foreman, employed a local builder and reused materials to save money on a more modest building project (ZBL IV/1/1027).

In 1874, the outdated eighteenth-century kitchen wing had been gutted (ZBL IV/1/1027). Shortly after, construction began on a two-storey brick addition to the west, with sash windows and a simple gable roof with dormer windows jutting into the service courtyard (figs 3.24, 3.25, 3.26). This new kitchen block expanded Kiplin's female work zone. The existing east façade was also renovated, adding dormer windows like those on the new addition, which gave the two areas the appearance of a single building. Indoor plumbing was introduced in the hall and services in 1874 (ZBL IV/1/1032). The kitchen and scullery boilers ensured a reliable source of hot water (ZBL IV/1/1205). These technological innovations introduced efficiency and greater comfort for tenants and the servant community itself.

In 1874, the housekeeper's office, previously located in the northeast corner of the Hall, was relocated to the kitchen wing (fig 3.24). Probate inventories suggest it was expanded to include a storage area accessible only by the housekeeper (Denison 1887). At this time, housekeeper Elizabeth Jocelyn cooked for family and tenants. Concerned that his 'useful and faithful servant' would leave if overworked, Carpenter eased her responsibilities, requiring her only to supervise the cook and other servants, which were to be provided by tenants themselves (ZBL IV/1/993). The location of the new housekeeper's room facilitated superintendence over servants and communication with her employer during periods when the house was let. The updated facilities and expanded kitchen wing evidently enabled servants to work more efficiently, making Jocelyn's task easier and ensuring she stayed.

The greatest building alterations however, were made to the wing and associated structures, which had connected the kitchens to the White Wing. These buildings had developed organically to include laundries, larders and stables. In 1875 they were demolished and replaced by a unified building to Nesfield's design (fig 3.24). The structure comprised two parts. The first was a one-storey, L-shaped wing abutting the kitchen and continuing westwards. A two-storey addition connected it to the White Wing, enclosing the service yard. This section was capped by a tall cupola with

double-faced Nesfield-designed clock that was highly visible even at a distance. The clock however, was a constant reminder to servants of the regulation of time, work and order.

Historic documents hint that a need for updated facilities might not have been the primary motivation for the construction of this new laundry wing. Its interior layout was sufficiently similar to the old laundries that a new description was considered unnecessary for insurance purposes (ZBL IV/3/16). No full-time laundrymaid was employed at Kiplin, although a sparsely-furnished laundrymaid's bedroom provided accommodation for part-time or casual staff (Denison 1887). At this time, it was common to send laundry out to washerwomen who worked from their own cottages called 'bothy laundries' (Sambrook 1999, 188). However, at a time when period guides emphasised the desirability of designing houses to accommodate the maximum number of servants a patron could afford, a full complement of laundries might have been considered attractive by prospective tenants (Franklin 1981, 87). New drying arrangements were also designed to meet expectations of privacy. New houses included enclosed drying grounds, replacing older traditions of drying clothing on lawns or yew hedges (Sambrook 1999, 188). Carpenter made ingenious use of Kiplin's existing structures to meet this expectation, adapting a disused, roofless stable building adjacent to the laundries as an enclosed drying ground. All of these changes indicate the important role played by service spaces in contemporary perceptions of the status of a country house, and its owners.

#### *Accommodation*

The 1870s kitchen addition included additional first-floor accommodation space (fig 3.25). Combined with rooms above the old kitchen, this nearly doubled female-servant lodging space. This was necessary as by 1891 Kiplin's female to male house servant ratio was three to one, mirroring national trends (Franklin 1981, 89; 'Kiplin' 1891). The close relationship of their work to lodging areas effectively shrunk a servant's physical world. Differences in amount and quality of furnishings recorded in probate inventories suggest the head housemaid had a single bedroom, whilst under-maids shared if necessary (Denison 1887). During rental periods, the adjacency of new rooms to existing was especially useful, aiding housekeeper Elizabeth Joelyn in supervising tenants' servants. Even lower servants like kitchenmaids and scullerymaids were

accommodated by the new arrangements. The spaces in the expanded kitchen block provided ample space for ground floor lodging for servants whose jobs were relegated to the kitchen. This expansion supported changing gender balances by providing more female accommodation. Critically, it also firmly removed almost all servants from the house, as recommended by period design guides (Murphy 1883, 70). By 1887, when Carpenter, his wife and 10-year-old Sarah settled at Kiplin these spatial arrangements had facilitated a nearly self-governing servant community.

Two exceptions can be seen at Kiplin. One is the rise in temporary staff, which mirrored national trends of using more casual servants throughout the 1880s (Gerard 1984, 187). Gerard's (1984) study highlights that this is unexplored territory for scholars but played a significant part in the labour structure. Accommodation for the laundrymaid was limited to a single room with only a camp bedstead and other contents that suggest it was also being used for storage (Denison 1887). This supports the idea of casual laundry labour at Kiplin. Day workers like laundrymaids and washerwomen, who were employed on the outer edges of the service complex, were sometimes considered outdoor staff, a rare area where the gender divide was less enforced (Sambrook 1999, 188). Some casual roles, like that of the 'odd man employed to carry wood and coal' did not require accommodation (ZBL IV/3/12). Casual servants were more commonly used in households that were constantly changing and had different seasonal or entertainment needs (Gerard 1984, 180). Would renters taking Kiplin for a season augment their time at Kiplin with local community help, perhaps even asking Mrs Joclyn to hire servants for them? If so, this could indicate a close relationship between permanent and temporary servants that might have created a closer bond between them, rather than the insular country house community often suggested by scholars.

The second exception to this close-knit country house servant community is the governess. The inventory taken on the death of the Countess in 1868 records two second-floor nurseries, most likely used by guests (ZBL IV/10/3/3). An 1887 inventory listing a governess' bedroom along with these nurseries suggesting that the Carpenters had resumed use of these spaces for their original function (Denison 1887). The governess' bedroom, furnished with a brass French bedstead, chintz curtains and mahogany furniture is recorded immediately before the north-tower landing,

suggesting it was located in the northwest corner; a theory strengthened by existing wire bell remnants in the room (fig 3.26) (Denison 1887). As has been suggested in the analysis of Brodsworth and Calke, this layout reflected the ambiguous status of the governess as someone who could move between classes, a trait praised in contemporary advice manuals like *Mothers and Governesses* (Maurice, 1847). The Carpenters' governess, German-born Otilie Zahyborka was certainly considered a servant and she participated in events such as a servants' dance in 1890 (B01-F17-D01). However, she was also thought of fondly by her pupil Sarah Carpenter, whose diary describes 'Fraulein', who taught her music, history and literature (B14-F05-D01). Zahyborka frequently dined with the family and her well-appointed, if liminally-located rooms suggest that, like many other governesses, she successfully straddled and navigated both the social and spatial complexities of Kiplin's service architecture.

### *Circulation*

Photographic evidence reveals that the area surrounding the north tower was a jumble of lean-to structures which Carpenter found 'excessively inconvenient' (fig 3.27) (Carpenter n.d.). This area was also reconfigured by Carpenter. The first two bays of the early service wing were demolished, separating it from the main Hall. They were replaced by a single storey structure, topped with a parapet and recessed from the east façade (fig 3.28). This building physically connected family and service areas whilst establishing a new, clear visual hierarchy between them, in line with late-nineteenth-century design ideals. The work was commemorated by a carved stone dated 1874, which was inserted in the south elevation of the kitchen, and the area became known as the 'housekeeper's link'. Inside, a solitary north to south ground-floor corridor limited access from the service wing to the house. The 1976 demolition photographic record shows that this ground floor space provided a meeting point for several landings and sets of three or four steps (fig 3.29). This suggests these short landings were added to reorient the stairs' termination firmly within the housekeeper's link. An east-facing exterior door in the link connected the nearby housekeeper's room to the east yard and the Hall's main entrance. This enabled the Carpenter's housekeeper to completely close off family spaces whilst remaining at Kiplin when it was unoccupied ('Kiplin Hall' 1871; 1881).



Within the Hall, the northwest ground-floor room played a crucial role in late-nineteenth century circulation. Carpenter had inherited Crowe's layout of this space: a small, secluded corner room, cut off from other living spaces by a north to south service corridor that was inserted between the room's east side and the centre chimney stack. The room's previous use remains unknown, but proximity to the dining room and service corridor raise the possibility that it was an early butler's pantry (ZBL IV/10/3/3). However, Carpenter disliked the circuitous early dining room route, which as noted above, required servants to pass through the central stair landing and now his newly-panelled formal entrance hall. He proposed to eliminate the northwest service corridor altogether and insert a service door directly into the north wall of the dining room. Thomas Wyatt disagreed, suggesting it would feel 'very cramped & unsatisfactory & likely to diminish the best China dinner service!' (ZBL IV/1/1027a). However, under Nesfield's direction, the changes were made, with a heavy velvet curtain being placed at the stair hall's west end to mask the only space through which servants still had to pass (fig 3.24).

This alteration changed the room's primary use, sacrificing nearly a quarter of the original Hall's footprint to service in order to create a more direct route from the kitchens to the dining room. Nevertheless, this change seems to have expanded its use. Servants accessed the space through a door in the east wall, which also opened onto the north tower and housekeeper's link. The south door not only led to the dining room, but also the west lobby, which would have been used by estate workers and tradesmen. They used the northwest room as a waiting area, since it was furnished with hall chairs, tables, an umbrella stand, clock and hat rails (Denison 1887). Carpenter met with them in his business room in a small annex located to the north, accessed via a third door (fig 3.24). Scott (1858, 161) advised that such a room, with waiting room should be located conveniently near the service spaces, as seen at Kiplin. The northwest room evolved from secluded room to active circulatory space, perfectly positioned for flexible use by the multiple social classes that interacted there.

Carpenter's rebuilt passageways, staircases, and entries facilitated more efficient service routes, controlled servant movement, and minimised their presence in family spaces. Existing scholarship suggests that efficiency in distance between service spaces was not a concern (Franklin 1981, 92). However, these changes illustrate that

Kiplin's circulatory routes were carefully designed to make maximum use of available space. Kiplin shows that Carpenter was concerned with circulation. To what extent was this a direct response to the building? To what extent did this reflect his experiences in other settings, for example naval ships?

### *Outbuildings*

Repairing Kiplin's outbuildings was an immediate concern in letting Carpenter's newly inherited estate (ZBL IV/1/347). There is no indication of any previous renovations to Christopher Crowe's eighteenth-century stables, but Carpenter was aware that this area was of primary importance to the seasonal tenants he hoped to attract (ZBL IV/1/667). Indeed, one potential tenant described the outbuildings as 'not such as any gentleman having regard for the wellbeing of his horses &c could think of making use of' (ZBL IV/1/585). As a member of the Bedale hunt, this was probably also of personal interest to Carpenter as well (ZBL IV/1/1029). He urged Topham to make basic repairs to the stables and offices as soon as he inherited (ZBL IV/1/600). But it was not until he had completed the major renovations of the house, and service wing alterations in 1878, that he and Nesfield turned their attention to rebuilding Kiplin's stables.

The new stable complex was square: two sides were bounded by an L-shaped building and the others with walls enclosing the stable yard (fig 3.30). It is a long, low, two-storeyed brick building with gable roof intermittently punctuated with dormers and vents (fig 3.31). Materials were reused from other buildings, saving money and ensuring visual continuity with Kiplin's earlier buildings (ZBL IV/1/1027). Frugality did not indicate indifference, however. Carpenter and his architect quarrelled over shoddy craftsmanship that required several corners to be rebuilt, until sturdy stone quoins were finally installed (ZBL IV/1/1140).

The new stables were built at a distance from the service wing and also provided accommodation for staff. The first-floor quarters included a kitchen, scullery, three bedrooms and a washing house (Denison 1887). In 1891, it was occupied by coachman William Elborough, his wife, four children and a groom ('Kiplin' 1891). It was a relatively comfortable home, with a fireplace adapted for a boiler and a cistern in the loft for water (ZBL IV/3/16). This is a noticeable difference from previous stables

accommodation in the old link near the White Wing and the kitchens (ZBL IV/10/3/3). The further physical separation of the stables from the service wing of the house reflected the ongoing social segregation of house and grounds staff.

Carpenter also sought to create a more formal and orderly approach to the house for visitors. Cartographic and photographic evidence suggests that the approach to the house had previously been rather informal, with the lane from the main road dividing directly in front of the Gothic wing bay window to give visitors a view of the Tyrconnells' building works and garden features, including the serpentine pond, Gothic folly and the White Wing (figs 3.21, 3.22). Carpenter disliked this approach, seeking to create a more formal, controlled form of access to the house (Carpenter n.d.). A new access lane crossing the meadow from the east towards the principal façade was created, flanked by an avenue of lime trees (fig 3.30). The lane culminated in a courtyard with an impressive pair of stone-pillared gateposts and cast iron gates (fig 3.1). Access to the service wing to the north was also well-defined by high brick walls which obscured the service buildings behind. Nesfield's initial designs were for 13-foot walls, but Carpenter deemed these 'hideously high', a waste money and unnecessarily oppressive (ZBL IV/1/1141). Although he had deliberately given Nesfield free rein with the stables design, Carpenter insisted that the walls be reduced to nine feet (ZBL IV/1/1141). The route bisected the service wing and the new stables, widening slightly in front of the complex, to accommodate several riders or perhaps the Hunt, and drawing attention to these modern, professionally designed buildings and to Carpenter's status (fig 3.30).

Carpenter's hallmark on Kiplin's architectural history is defined by alterations that visually unified disparate older elements. The appearance of a well-designed, self-contained service wing was essential to the vibrant modern lifestyle enjoyed and expected by Kiplin's late-nineteenth century family and their guests and tenants.

### 3.5 Conclusions

Admiral Carpenter's death in 1904 marked the beginning of Kiplin's decline. Rather than living at her childhood home, his daughter, Sarah Carpenter Turnor lived with her husband at Stoke Rochford (Lincs) (Schulz 1994, 27). Steadily increasing tax rates during the twentieth century prompted her to dissolve the estate and sell property

piecemeal to fund other, more favoured properties (Schulz 1994, 27). During World War II, the RAF requisitioned Kiplin as they did so many country houses, turning the first floor into flats (Robinson 2014). On its departure, the house had no family to inhabit it. It was a building designed and altered over time to support dynasty, prestige and leisure. But its entire evolution was predicated on the availability of servants to maintain it. It was only in the later part of the twentieth century, by redefining its purpose and maintenance strategy, that it was reincarnated as a historic house museum by the Kiplin Hall Trust.

The chapter highlighted that more subtle relationships existed between ideal service-space configuration and reality. The building's development included creative use of space in response to the building's existing architectural legacy: in the eighteenth-century, Christopher Crowe required a level of family privacy that previous generations did not need. The ingenious renovation of the space between chimney stacks to provide a fashionable yet functional service corridor is a rarity in British country houses. The variety of ways Kiplin has been used over time is also integral to understanding the story of its evolution. The Earl and Countess of Tyrconnel possessed titles but no lands upon inheriting. They added legitimacy to their social standing by constructing the White and Gothic Wings. Visible and extensive service spaces showed their awareness of architectural trends and implied agreement with the social attitudes driving them. Thus, the concepts of gender segregation and service zones were heightened during their ownership. Attitudes and interactions were also greatly impacted by patrons' individual personalities, and Kiplin's role in forming personal identity. Admiral Carpenter created a modern country house through frugally renovating existing spaces and reusing materials on new additions. His changes also drew out the hierarchy of servants. The great amount of trust he placed in his housekeeper also clearly shows that service was still seen as a desirable position at this point in Britain. At the same time, his need for prestige is evident in the visual cohesiveness and ordered layout of the spaces.

Kiplin's history is not remarkable but it is typical. It is not a perfect example of a newly-built British country house at any one particular period in time. Nor is its story one of salacious or bizarre master-servant relationships. In truth, it likely mirrors many houses with a rich history of evolution, too often ignored by scholars in favour of

prototypical new-builds. Exploring the full history of such a complex house, occupied by diverse characters effectively exposes a more nuanced view of the British country house servant experience. This was accomplished through comprehensive investigation that focused on the biography of a single house throughout time. The building's service spaces were reconstructed, then examined in conjunction with documentary sources. Looking at architectural configuration alongside household records, and circulation patterns together with household structure revealed how occupants interacted with the architecture and each other. This highlighted the circumstances that impacted prevailing attitudes towards servants and subsequently the factors that determined how they moved about the house. It demonstrates that British service architecture both manipulated and was manipulated by its inhabitants, revealing a complex and fascinating interplay between servants, owners and spaces.

## **PART ONE: THE BRITISH COUNTRY HOUSE**

### *Conclusions*

Part I has shown that contrary to the dominant British servant narrative, the visibility of service architecture played a significant role in conveying wealth and status. This is evident in nineteenth-century visitor routes to Kiplin Hall, Uppark House and Brodsworth Hall, which all deliberately passed obvious service areas. Interior appearances were equally important, as seen in the early path servants traversed to access Kiplin's dining room, which maximised the visibility of footmen, thereby highlighting their expense. Such arrangements and subsequent changes were highly individual however, impacted by existing architecture, personal motivation and financial circumstances. Owners used such service space alterations to consciously manipulate social dynamics to align with personal motivations. Circulatory pattern analysis revealed that Kiplin's first-floor 'servant' tunnel was actually shared space, implying a degree of familiarity between family and servants. In contrast, Calke Abbey's relocated kitchen preserved the privacy of the 'Isolated Baronet' whilst creating a centralized servant community in the house's northwest corner.

Chapters 2 and 3 also demonstrated the intimate relationship between service space configuration and servant hierarchy, both of which were predicated on an established British class system. At Kiplin, the household's evolving eighteenth and nineteenth-century servant hierarchy is directly traceable through service space analysis. For example, the addition of the White Wing supported the Earl and Countess of Tyrconnel's social expectations by providing a set of spaces reserved for menservants, supervised by a butler. At its most evolved, Britain's service system was nearly self-operating, not requiring a master's direct involvement. This implies a level of trust between master and servant that contradicts the many works of scholarship that instead highlight class tensions. Efficient service architecture arrangements were essential to the system's success. This is particularly apparent in Kiplin's late-nineteenth-century arrangements. Architectural changes that moved the housekeeper Elizabeth Joelyn out of the main Hall gave her more direct supervision over lower servants. She subsequently became a valued member of the household, trusted to maintain the building in the family's absence, including during rental periods. Similarly, Uppark's

hierarchical spatial arrangements supported a servant hierarchy established early in the household's evolution. This was successful, ensuring smooth operation even under two generations of inexperienced mistresses.

The case studies also made strong connections between servants and their proximity and access to family members and spaces. Kiplin's development progressively distanced servants from family spaces as the service wing became more complex and evolved. At the same time, the physical connection between house and servant wing became ever more controlled, reflecting changing master-servant relationships. Gender was also an important cultural consideration, applied to varying degrees of success. Every case study exhibited gender segregation; spaces that impacted servants' personal experiences whilst manipulating behaviour by reflecting attitudes and expectations. From overt gendered additions like Kiplin's White Wing, to integrally designed spaces like the maidservants' rooms on the first-floor of Brodsworth's service wing, servant experience was constrained by the social expectations of gendered spaces. Even unsuccessful attempts are revealing. Sir George Crewe's new nineteenth-century circulatory routes at Calke Abbey were not enough to enforce segregation, resulting in several pregnant maids (Colvin 1985, 66).

This examination of houses highlights that the British domestic service experience is not as static as it is often presented, and current methods of investigation remain inadequate. As shown in Chapter 2, even the service architecture of a predominantly single-phase house like Brodsworth contains intriguing stories like governess Elizabeth St Clair McDougal's marriage to the house's owner. Furthermore, the fallacies of conventional methodologies become especially apparent when exploring houses with complex phasing and deep histories, like Kiplin. Reconstructing lost servant spaces exposed a reciprocal relationship between British service spaces and the servants that used them. Every time the building changed, the household adapted accordingly. Likewise, changes in household structure prompted architectural alterations. Considering these changes and servant spaces within the context of their use by servants helped make sense of their experiences. Kiplin's eighteenth-century upper servants were given privileged access to the main Hall, as befitted their status. Exploring opportunities for interactions within these spaces exposed the previously unknown marriage of the valet and housekeeper. In contrast, the segregation enforced

by later architectural changes made for a more isolated servant experience in the same house. Examining such shifting spatial relationships and how servants negotiated these spaces provides thought-provoking insight into the variety of servant experiences in a single house over time.

Part I has successfully demonstrated that the level of deep analysis employed in Chapter 3 on Kiplin provides the means to untangle the service history of incredibly complex British country houses. It illustrates that the methodology is effective for finding social meaning even in architectural change that obscures servant stories. This level of investigation is therefore the way forward and will be employed in Part II, American Country Houses. Two American case studies will be comprehensively analysed to evaluate the methodology's usefulness in houses constructed with different materials and techniques, and varying levels of preservation and resources. The houses span a period of close Anglo-American relations, which has been used in prevailing histories to perpetuate ideas about the adoption and adaptation of British ideals in American country houses. Mount Vernon was constructed prior to the American Revolutionary War, when Virginia was still a British colony. Kingscote's development reached its zenith after the American Civil War when the nation saw a great influx of immigrants and ideas, including from Britain. In Part II I will investigate the American houses within the unique context of United States history. The section also seeks to explore service architecture development in order to identify culturally distinctive phenomena that informed perceptions of domestic service, thereby impacting servants' lived experiences.



## **PART TWO: AMERICAN COUNTRY HOUSES**

### *Introduction*

Having revealed a much more nuanced and complex story of British service history in Part I, this section now turns to American country house service architecture. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American houses are frequently compared to their British counterparts, especially with regards to polite spaces and stylistic commonalities. Early plantation landscapes share similarities with British estates, leading to the assumption that they also functioned the same way and that their service architecture development followed a comparable trajectory. This section establishes the origins of American houses and their service spaces and labour practices within their colonial context. This provides the foundation on which the detailed case studies in Chapters 4 and 5 are then analysed.

### *Architectural and social origins of American country houses*

The earliest members of America's upper class were aristocratic Royalists settling in Southern colonies like Virginia (Fischer 1989, 218). They were appointed to positions in colonial government and built grand residences in growing power centres. Houses in such places, like the Governor's Palace (1706, Williamsburg, VA) show evidence of British influences in their formal architecture, brick construction and interior configuration. The disproportionately high survival rate of such structures compared to their more ephemeral timber counterparts may help account for modern assumptions about British influences in colonial architecture. Additionally, members of the early elite class of men who constructed such buildings were more connected to Britain than the colonies. They either temporarily relocated from Britain to complete prestigious colonial appointments or spent a considerable amount of time gaining a formal education and training in Britain. However, even though the architectural styles and polite spaces of their grand houses resembled British country houses, their service arrangements differed significantly. The most obvious difference, apparent even in seventeenth-century in houses like Bacon's Castle (1665, Surrey, VA) is locating service facilities in separate buildings disconnected from the main house. There is still some scholarly debate about the cultural origins of such buildings. Linebaugh (1994)

suggests it was in response to extreme climactic conditions. Olmert (2009) and Upton (1979) both assert that attitudes towards servitude were a contributing factor.

Their *architectural* origins are directly connected to colonial vernacular traditions. Service outbuildings were common in rural plantation houses, which far outnumbered elite ‘palaces’. Their architecture was heavily influenced by tobacco culture, which was a labour-intensive crop requiring many workers. Mindful of the need to keep labourers in the profitable tobacco fields, planters initially minimised the labour required for house construction by using locally-available timber and designing the houses on site (Carson 2013, 1). Consequently, the majority of early houses were small, impermanent structures constructed on earthfast or post-in-hole foundations, sitting directly on the ground surface. This building method was so common that such structures were referred to as ‘Virginia houses’ (Wells 2018, 38). Separate kitchens or outbuildings were constructed in the same way as required. In the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries even wealthy planters built with wood, preferring to invest early profits in acquiring more land and keep labourers in the fields (Wells 2018, 17). Service outbuildings were therefore an early characteristic of the colonial landscape, in both rural and urban contexts, and were seen in upper- and lower-class houses. This makes a compelling case that they were not simply emulating upper-class British country houses but were an adaptation to unique cultural circumstances.

In the seventeenth century, both field labourers and domestic servants were primarily white indentured servants. Some were serving indentures as a result of crimes and escaped when they reached the colonies. Consequently, the term ‘servant’ and idea of servitude was imbued very early with a negative connotation not paralleled in Britain (Sutherland 1981, 4). The problem of finding good servants was compounded in the late-seventeenth century when lower birth rates and a rise in real wages in Britain caused a decrease in people immigrating to the colonies (Menard 1977, 389). Consequently, towards the end of the seventeenth century enslaved black labourers and domestic servants outnumbered white servants. With such an abundant labour force, the new ‘native elite’ class of planters, who had little or no direct connection to British culture grew increasingly wealthy and powerful throughout the eighteenth century. Their plantation houses became larger, and more permanent structures with obvious evidence of conscious design. Such houses required more domestic servants,

positions that were also filled by enslaved people (Menard 1988, 130). The desire to enforce segregation between free whites and enslaved blacks further embedded the outbuilding culture into the American country house landscape. The resulting, recognisable configuration where ‘a landowner’s house stood surrounded by buildings of subordinate function inevitably hinted that the planter represented a kind of mayor’ (Wells 2018, 13). Thus, the ‘big house’ and the small vernacular outbuildings that serviced it, staffed by enslaved black servants were America’s first recognisable country houses and came to represent America’s elite class throughout the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries.

A primary objective of Part II of this thesis is to test the efficacy of my methodology on these country houses. The section examines two American case studies with the same detailed level of analysis employed at Kiplin Hall (Chapter 3). American houses present a different set of challenges from the British houses investigated in Part I. Impermanent materials, more extreme climatic conditions and different methods of construction have resulted in differing levels of preservation from British houses and even within America. America has strong history of applying fieldwork and archaeological approaches to vernacular buildings, which this thesis builds upon (see for example Carter and Cromley 2005; Chappell 2013). These methods have shown to be useful for understanding plantation slave buildings, which were part of the early American country house landscape (Vlach 1993). However, the challenges here are in connecting such buildings to the country house itself and applying archaeological and spatial techniques to spaces within the house. The methodology will be employed with the goal of understanding how the outbuildings functioned as service spaces for a house with an established and well-known story. The techniques are then applied to a nineteenth-century house that demonstrates the evolution of service arrangements into more integrated service spaces.

Another key objective is to examine the reality and extent of British influences in American houses. In Chapter 4, Mount Vernon’s social and architectural origins were investigated to establish a baseline for eighteenth-century American country houses. It questions previous assumptions about British influences that seem solely based the house’s final, most stylistically-developed plan. Motivations for change throughout time are also considered to ascertain the extent that alterations responded to perceived

British expectations or cultural and social concerns closer to home. In Chapter 5, aspects of nineteenth-century American service spaces that appear to overtly resemble contemporaneous British models are explored in Kingscote. Breaking away from these assumptions the building is considered within the context of earlier American houses. It moves beyond appearances to ask whether spaces also functioned the same. Treatment of, attitudes towards and experiences of servants in these houses is critical to determining the extent to which British service norms infiltrated American country house life.

The final aim of Part II is to identify culturally distinctive traits and developments in American service architecture. The impact of early differences in spatial types and configuration on servants and household structure is explored. Eighteenth-century Anglo-American relations are considered, as this was a time when British influences were not always desirable. Were there conscious efforts to incorporate elements that encompassed burgeoning American ideals? Equally important is America's contentious history of slavery, which played a significant role in domestic service. This labour system had different spatial needs than British models and must be considered. The shifting uses of the country house throughout nineteenth-century America are also explored, including how service space changes contributed to new lifestyles. The impact of a shifting power base resulting from the Civil War is investigated as service architecture is analysed for evidence of changing social structures tied to regional traditions. New labour patterns, including an influx of immigrant servants is also critically investigated. Since this was a period when America's burgeoning economy prompted new relationships with other European countries, this too is an important component to understanding the limits of British contributions to American service architecture at this time. These two case studies expose distinctive cultural themes in American service architecture, the implications and lasting legacies of which are then discussed in the thesis' final, discursive section.

## Chapter 4: Mount Vernon

### 4.1 Introduction

George Washington's Mount Vernon in Virginia hosts an average of one million visitors annually (Brandt 2016, 199). The historic core of the estate encompasses a mansion and supporting outbuildings, as well as six acres of formal grounds and gardens. The life of America's first president is further interpreted on a four-acre working farm and wharf on the Potomac River. Nearby, George Washington's Distillery and Gristmill carries on the tradition of what was once America's largest whiskey producer (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 161). Washington family tombs, enslaved peoples' burial ground, and orientation and education centres encourage guests to reflect on Mount Vernon's wider cultural significance. Such an immersive and comprehensive experience of America's premier founding father has made the site the most iconic historic house museum in the country.

Owned and operated by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (MVLA), the estate's buildings are presented as they were in 1799, the year of Washington's death. A clear conservation directive guides maintenance, restoration, reconstruction, and interpretive schemes (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2020a). Even though the date remains fixed, on-going work by the Historic Preservation, Architectural History and Archaeology departments continually reveal new information. Advanced approaches combined with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (Grimmer 2017) ensure consistently high-quality conservation practice. MVLA also ensures projects and information are publicly accessible, further ensuring the estate's position as a preeminent example of the American preservation movement.

Building the present Mansion complex had begun by 1743, but did not reach its final iteration until 1797, after the American Revolutionary War.<sup>7</sup> Construction spanned a critical period in the new nation's development and accompanying struggle to define American culture. During this time, it evolved from a modest tobacco plantation to a

---

<sup>7</sup> Mount Vernon's main house is referred to as the Mansion or Mansion house, historically and by MVLA.

prosperous 8000-acre, five-farm estate (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 113). As a reflection of antebellum life, the Mansion complex remains closely tied to early American traditions and emerging national identity. The development of the buildings and landscape highlights issues surrounding the history of American domestic service that also challenge assumptions about Anglo-American service relations throughout the eighteenth- and early-nineteenth centuries.

*New research and analysis*

After George Washington's death in 1799, his descendants retained ownership of the estate for more than 50 years. The house remained little changed due to declining fortunes. Seeing the poor state of the Mansion during a river cruise in 1853, native Virginian Louisa Cunningham reflected, 'I was painfully distressed at the ruin and desolation of the home of Washington, and the thought passed through my mind: Why was it the women of his country did not try to keep it in repair, if the men could not do it' (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 200). By 1860 her daughter Pamela Ann Cunningham had founded MVLA, which subsequently secured the property, began restoration and officially opened America's first historic house museum. MVLA seeks 'to preserve, restore, and manage the estate of George Washington to the highest standards and to educate visitors and people throughout the world about the life and legacies of George Washington' (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2020b). Most Mount Vernon scholarship, whether produced under the auspices of MVLA or by independent scholars, is likewise infused with this focus on Washington himself. This chapter pulls away from the biographical approach that dominates studies of Mount Vernon. Instead, Washington's tenure is set against an objective assessment and reinterpretation of his initial inheritance from both his father and brother. It challenges assumptions that phases of the house can be neatly mapped onto successive generations of the family. This raises new questions about Washington's architectural legacy and impact on the site. It encourages exploration of interactions between enslaved peoples, hired servants and the estate, placing emphasis on the lived experiences of the household and estate inhabitants. Consequently, the chapter proposes that Mount Vernon's history can move beyond one man to encompass the wider household and estate community, and critically examines assumptions about the impact of British service models in eighteenth-century America. A brief description of the current house will set the scene. This is then followed by geographical and

historical background before moving on to the analysis of two principal building phases.

MVLA's early preservation efforts played to Washington's popularity, as Mount Vernon was an important pilgrimage site for visitors. Repairing his tomb and building a new access road were therefore priorities (John Milner Associates 2004, 2-122). Outbuildings were recognised as an important part of the estate landscape and were retained, although their impermanence and America's contentious history of slavery contributed to a bias in restoration that favoured functionality to support the house as a museum. In 1859, the worst outbuildings were repaired, but five had to be entirely rebuilt (John Milner Associates 2004, 2-121). In the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries others were altered for administrative use. Wood floors overlaid tiles, turning the servants' hall into the Superintendent's office, whilst the kitchen was outfitted with a modern stove and additional window to create a comfortable visitor reception space. Although the preservation directive always included recording and efforts 'not in any way to alter or change' the buildings, these vernacular structures remained the most flexible spaces and therefore vulnerable to alteration over time (John Milner Associates 2004, 2-121).

Modern documentation perpetuates the distinction between Mansion and outbuildings. The *Mount Vernon Historic Structures Report* (Mesick-Cohen-Waite Architects 1993) gives detailed information about the Mansion drawn from documentary and physical evidence. However, the kitchen and servants' hall are noticeably absent, despite being physically connected to the Mansion by colonnades. Mount Vernon's Architectural History and Historic Preservation departments are engaged in on-going studies to create separate reports for each outbuilding, but these include only cursory information about their relationship to other buildings on the estate. The *Mount Vernon Estate and Gardens Cultural Landscape Study* (John Milner Associates 2004) includes an abbreviated history of the outbuildings only insofar as they relate to the landscape. The separation of Mansion and outbuildings is even evident in the museum's interpretive scheme. A standard Mansion tour is timed, with a set route and does not include access to the few spaces servants regularly used, like the butler's pantry. Unfortunately, the Enslaved Peoples tour does not enter the house at all, despite the fact that, as this chapter will show, servants moved in and out of the Mansion during the course of their

day. As a result, the social and architectural connection between the outbuildings and the Mansion remains unexplored, and thus the nuanced relationships between family, white servants and enslaved peoples are unrecognised.

This study considers the homestead landscape as a whole, as well as the symbiotic relationship of Mansion and outbuildings. Examining the development of vernacular outbuildings as an integral part of the evolution of the polite architecture of the Mansion reveals a more nuanced view of life at Mount Vernon. It uncovers the critical role of a diverse enslaved and hired labour force in the development of America's domestic service history. The chapter uses phasing dates aligned more with archaeological findings than periods assigned by architectural historians focused on the Mansion. This allows relationships between buildings to be considered as if they were individual rooms in a single building. This perspective exposes Mount Vernon's place in America's vernacular traditions, from which later domestic service spaces evolved.

#### *The current house: a brief description*

Located on the estate's highest point, the Mansion is Mount Vernon's focal point. Visitors first see the dominating structure upon entering the historic area's main gate (fig 4.1). Serpentine paths border a long bowling green, arriving at a circular drive in front of the house. Curved flanking colonnades attach to two-storey dependency buildings, further directing the eye towards the Mansion. This multi-building plan with fluctuating roof heights is a variation of the compound five-part plan common in the Tidewater region (Olmert 2009, 34). Lanes to the north and south break off from the central Circle Drive. Each lane culminates in a large brick building, which forms the outer boundaries of two symmetrical walled gardens. Garden corners are punctuated with small octagonal buildings historically used as toilets and seed sheds.

#### Mansion

The Mansion's wood frame sits upon a foundation of locally produced brick, some of which may have been made in Mount Vernon's own kiln (Fitzpatrick 1940a, 72). The simple nine-bay by two-bay rectangle contains 21 rooms over two storeys and an attic. It is clad in bevelled wood tiles which have been 'rusticated' to look like stone, an uncommon finish seen more often in the northern colonies. This process involved



throwing sand, which Washington sourced from local sandstone, onto the freshly painted exterior, and scoring it to resemble stone blocks (Fitzpatrick 1940a, 256). The house is topped by a double-hipped roof with gabled dormers on all sides and paired interior chimneys, typical of high-status Georgian houses in the middle colonies (McAlester and McAlester 1984, 143). The central octagonal cupola however, was an unusual feature that provided ventilation for the house in Virginia's warm climate.

Architectural elements such as dentil moulding on the eaves and multi-paned double hung sash windows proclaim the building's high status. The central of three doors on the west façade is topped with a triangular pediment popular in America in the latter half of the eighteenth-century. Though clearly a focal point, this door sits slightly off centre, evidence of compromise from a previously existing version of the building. A rare, large pediment with an oxe-eye window mirrors this element at roof level (McAlester and McAlester 1984, 139). The north façade is dominated by a two-storey Palladian window similar to one found in Batty Langley's *The City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs* (1740) (fig 4.2). Despite this connection with an English pattern book, Washington's choice of broken-pediment design relates more closely to trends in American Georgian architecture (McAlester and McAlester 1984, 141). Likewise, the full-length two-storey veranda (known as the piazza) on the east side was an unusual addition (fig 4.3). However, the eight square columns harmonise with the pilasters surrounding the front door and the north Palladian window, illustrating the use of high-status details to create architectural cohesion.

### Circle Drive

Multiple buildings surround the Circle Drive, a round path in front of the Mansion. Arranged perpendicularly to the Mansion, two sets of symmetrically placed buildings face each other across the drive (fig 4.4). Their configuration, as well as decreasing size and ornamentation highlights the grandeur of the Mansion whilst transitioning from the estate's polite spaces to service areas. Closest to the house's north side, a servants' hall attaches to the Mansion via a curved colonnade (fig 4.5). It is mirrored by a kitchen on the south (fig 4.6). Like the Mansion they are wood-framed on brick foundations. They are simpler, two-storey gabled structures with paired-end chimneys but still with dentil moulding at the eaves. Only the elevations facing the Circle Drive

have a rusticated finish, while the sides and back are clad with more common clapboard. The front door and two windows of the servants' hall contrasts strongly with the lavish fenestration of the Mansion. Doors opening onto the back of the buildings and the colonnades are practical additions providing access to work yards and the Mansion. Square columns reminiscent of the piazza support the colonnades' open arched sides (fig 4.7). While the north colonnade is original, the south was restored in 1875 after being completely destroyed in a storm in 1861.

Moving further away from the Mansion, a gardener's house sits next to the servants' hall, opposite the storehouse. These buildings are simpler than the Mansion and its attached dependencies. They are shorter, with only one and a half storeys and clapboard siding. Yet they are more ornate than the estate's more utilitarian buildings, which do not have the ornamentation seen here, like rusticated quoins. In form, ornamentation, and location their status as transitional buildings is evident. The elevations facing the Circle Drive have hipped roofs with dormers, similar to the Mansion. However, the back elevations have simple gable ends with single chimneys (fig 4.8). Rusticated quoins are only on corners visible to approaching guests, while the remainder is the same clapboard as the estate's other service buildings. Hinting at their dual status, these buildings have doors opening onto the Circle Drive, as well as side doors that open onto the lanes leading to the estate's work areas.

#### North and South Lanes

The buildings lining the North and South Lanes also contrast markedly with those flanking the Circle Drive. Behind the gardener's house is a salt house (north lane), while a smokehouse (south lane) sits behind the storehouse (figs 4.9, 4.10). Both buildings are square, wood-framed structures with hipped roofs. Lacking any embellishment, they are entirely clapboard-sided, with minimal overhanging eaves and no windows. Single doors, which have virtually no moulding, open toward the Circle Drive. The smokehouse likely informed the corresponding salt house's design. The smokehouse's square form, open interior and pyramidal roof were designed to retain smoke for meat preservation (Olmert 2009, 76). It sits on a raised brick plinth above the ground-level floor. Smoking meat requires salt, usually stored in a trough within the smokehouse itself (Olmert 2009, 80). However, Mount Vernon also had a

fishery, demanding even greater quantities of salt, which was also stored in the salt house.

In both form and style, the spinning house (north lane) and washhouse (south lane) continue to follow the functional aesthetics of Mount Vernon's outbuildings (figs 4.11, 4.12). They are single-chimney, gable-end buildings clad in clapboard, denoting their common status. This simple linear building form grew out of the New England folk tradition, accounting for around 40% of surviving American Georgian buildings (McAlester and McAlester 1984, 79, 139). Their double-hung sash windows are considerably smaller than the Mansion and Circle Drive buildings. The one-and-a-half-storey spinning house is larger than the washhouse, and marks a notable exception to the estate's symmetry. Its gable ends have doors with small batten doors above for loft access. In contrast, the smaller washhouse is only a single storey. Its opposing doors open onto the south lane in the front and laundry yard at the back, providing ventilation. A substantial end chimney signifies a large hearth within.

The stable complex at the end of the south lane contrasts with the simpler buildings on the lanes. A gate closes off the barn and coach house from the south lane. A large stable yard is formed by the space between. The seven bay, two-storey stable is one of the largest brick buildings on the estate (fig 4.13). It is parallel to the Circle Drive buildings nearer the house and is visually connected to the architecture of the Mansion by a large decorative centre gable above an arched carriage door. Though a utilitarian structure, the solidity of materials and architectural elements denote a social connection with the Mansion's polite architecture and the household, as Washington's personal interest in horses prompted frequent visits from himself, family and guests.

The architectural statement of the stables is mirrored by the greenhouse quarters at the end of the north lane. After fire destroyed the original building in 1835, MVLVA used historic drawings to reconstruct this important part of Mount Vernon's landscape in 1951. The hipped-roof central portion is set over the two-storeyed seven-bay structure (fig 4.14). Aesthetic similarities with the Mansion are evident in the decorative pilasters supporting a central gable which has an oxeye window, giving the appearance of an elongated pediment. A full-height central-arched window, flanked by six full height windows, dominates the façade. Prominent paired-end chimneys provided heat

for the greenhouse. However, the long building conceals a dual purpose. Two low, solid flanking wings, referred to as the Quarter, accommodated enslaved peoples. Their garden side walls supported fruit vines, whilst doors and diminutive arched windows punctuate the north side, which was used by enslaved peoples as lodging. The unadorned, repetitive architecture of this façade contrasts sharply with the decorative polite architecture of the garden elevation.

Encompassing over 16 buildings, the estate's architectural cohesion is accomplished through symmetry and the hierarchical use of materials, forms, and styles. The result is the culmination of 40 years of the Washington family's developing relationship with the enslaved labour force that enabled the estate to thrive. Analysis of archaeological and archival records have uncovered buildings that no longer exist, due to rapid cultural development and impermanent building materials. Several non-extant buildings whose construction and destruction are relevant to the estate's evolution are included in this chapter. Like the British houses examined in Part One, the organisation of space into four categories of facilities, accommodation, circulation and outbuildings provides a systematic analytical framework encompassing all of Mount Vernon's servant spaces, both within the house and in separate buildings. Having briefly described the architecture of Mount Vernon, this chapter now turns to give contextual geographical and historical information before delving into the analysis.

### *Geographical context*

Mount Vernon is located within Virginia's Chesapeake Bay tidewater. The area's abundant rivers and estuaries supported early colonial settlement and successful trade (Middleton 1953, 30). Nearby cities like Williamsburg and Annapolis were carefully built to a designed plan, thereby becoming administrative and cultural capitals (Walsh 2013, 57). Tobacco exportation was colonial Virginia's economic lifeblood. Between 1622 and 1775 Chesapeake region tobacco exports rose from 60,000 to 100,000,000 pounds (Middleton 1953, 95). This contributed to the region's early power structure, described by Kulikoff (1986, 263) as a 'self-perpetuating oligarchy'. A disproportionately small number of planters owned vast properties, which they continued to add to and improve (Walsh 2013, 56). Their subsequent fortunes enabled them to dominate society and wield significant political influence (Carson 2013, 2).

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the tidewater region remained predominantly rural, peppered with few urban centres (Carson 2013, 4). This was shaped by tobacco plantations that required thousands of acres to turn a profit because the crop quickly depleted the soil (Walsh 2013, 57). Until the latter half of the eighteenth century, so much land was given to tobacco that colonists imported almost all goods other than a few food crops for self-sufficiency (Walsh 2013, 56). Planters eager to maximise revenue adapted agricultural practices, rotating fields instead of crops (Kulikoff 1986, 47). Tobacco exports relied on river transport since rough, undeveloped overland routes damaged the delicate crop (Middleton 1953, 34). Riverways also socially and economically connected plantations spread throughout the area (Kelly 1979, 204-5). Mount Vernon's position on the banks of the Potomac River, which is the Chesapeake Bay's largest waterway, ensured it was well-connected.

#### *Historical background*

Dominant narratives attempt to place George Washington within Virginia's elite class from the beginning. As a national hero, he is often the nexus of Mount Vernon's story. Washington family biographies and architectural histories are presented as only evolutionary steps leading to Washington's position as America's preeminent founding father. However, using the property's building history to lead investigations suggests an alternate narrative. The estate Washington inherited had much humbler beginnings. In the seventeenth-century, the property that became Mount Vernon was known as Little Hunting Creek. A 1690 survey depicts a small building on a larger property (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 22). It was likely a 'dwelling house', which Wells' (2018, 71) statistical analysis of eighteenth-century *Virginia Gazette* advertisements suggest were remarkably consistent, conforming to standard dimensions usually between 320 to 990 square feet.

However, the 2500-acre property's principal value was the land itself. In 1726 Augustine Washington bought it and an adjacent 200-acre plot to add to what eventually became a 10,000-acre tobacco plantation (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 28). Although this was not their primary residence, the Washington family did live there

between 1734-1738 (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 25). Despite scant evidence,<sup>8</sup> Dalzell and Dalzell (1998, 26) assert that Augustine Washington completed a substantial amount of work to the property's existing building or constructed a new house to accommodate his wife and three children. If true, it was still probably a rather roughly-built structure. Consequently, the family moved from Mount Vernon to a large house near Fredericksburg in 1738. This could be an example of short-term comforts being sacrificed for the long-term dynastic ambitions.

In 1743, George Washington's half-brother Lawrence inherited the property, and renamed it Mount Vernon. He immediately began constructing a house, widely believed to be encased within the current core of the Mansion. Shortly thereafter he married Anne Fairfax, a member of the local gentry (Fairfax 2017, 37). Some of the architectural details of this house do not appear to fit scholars' assumptions about Lawrence's gentry status and are explained away as a product of the speed with which he built. An assemblage of four outbuildings ('dependencies') on Lawrence's probate inventory is frequently used as evidence of a high-status complex (*An Inventory of the Estate of Lawrence Washington* 1753). However, they appear to suggest a middle-class household. Furthermore, Lawrence's labour force does not support the idea of an elite household. With only an estimated one in fifty slaves being employed as domestics, the majority of Lawrence's 37 slaves would have been occupied with labour-intensive tobacco crops (Pogue 2002, 5; Vlach 1993, 18). A small household staff aligns with America's emerging middle class more than the gentry label often assigned to Lawrence and by extension Mount Vernon, in order to support George Washington's status as a national hero.

This reappraisal of Mount Vernon's early period raises interesting questions about the assumptions often made by scholars that the house's phases neatly align with the story of the Washington family. Scholars have a strong desire to locate the Washingtons dynastically and architecturally within the Mount Vernon site, providing a literal and metaphorical foundation for the subsequent biography and hero narrative of George Washington. However, the fact that Augustine Washington might have left very little

---

<sup>8</sup> Dalzell and Dalzell (1998, 25) base these assumptions on the current house's earliest foundations, despite a lack of dating evidence. A current basement survey being conducted by MVLA could provide more conclusive proof.

architectural legacy on the site opens up new possibilities for understanding Mount Vernon as an architectural response to a pre-existing assemblage of essentially *vernacular* buildings. This highlights the significance of the building choices made as the Washingtons negotiated and constructed new forms of gentry identity, in their social lives and in their building campaigns.

#### 4.2 Phase One: 1754-1774

George Washington did not directly inherit Mount Vernon following his half-brother Lawrence's death in 1752. Instead, Lawrence's wife Anne was named tenant for life until their daughter Sarah came of age. However, Sarah died early 1754, leaving George in line to inherit the estate after his sister-in-law's death. By this time, she was remarried and lived with her new husband, so she leased Mount Vernon to George (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 171). At this time it was a working tobacco plantation and the lease included 18 enslaved labourers with a variety of farm buildings, in addition to a modest house and four outbuildings. Art historical studies frequently focus on alterations to the polite spaces of the Mansion during this time (see Manca 2012 for example). This is partly because these elements survive and speak to the idea of the Washington's emerging status. However, the majority of these changes were completed by 1759, five years after the Washingtons became tenants. What happened at Mount Vernon between 1759 and 1774, when art histories tend to pick up the story once more? The next section of this chapter argues that this was a period of service space construction, whose story is largely absent from existing accounts of the site.

Changes were being made to service buildings and the wider landscape as early as 1760. These changes were pivotal contributions to transforming Mount Vernon from a vernacular complex to a formally designed late-eighteenth century estate landscape. This period also witnessed changes in the household structure and dynamics, including the arrival of Martha Washington and her servant community. This section explores how the architectural and landscape alterations of this period reflected the Washingtons' personal values and their status as owners of a large enslaved community. It explores how architecture framed the lived experience of enslaved servants, but also how they actively negotiated service spaces. Examining this formative period in American country house development reveals new information

about the origins and distinctive trajectory of domestic service and service architecture in the United States through the lens of one of its most iconic houses.

### *George and Martha Washington*

When George began leasing Mount Vernon in 1754, he did not immediately settle there. The purchase of Kit, enslaved carpenter in 1755 (adding to the 10 enslaved individuals he already owned) demonstrates that he was already planning work to the house and estate. Before any substantial construction began he was called away for military service. His distinctions on the battlefield were the catalyst for his subsequent political and societal rise (Fields 1994, 446). But his extensive travel and experience of British colonial architecture during this period has also been argued to have informed his subsequent architectural inspirations (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 79). However, plans seem to have been underway prior to his travels. He had appointed his brother Jack and neighbour George William Fairfax to oversee master builder, John Patterson and his workers. Between 1757-1759 construction focused on expanding and updating the main house, perhaps in anticipation of Washington's future inheritance and acknowledging his rising status. He added a full storey to create a two-storeyed house plus an attic (figs 4.15, 4.16, 4.17). The central hall was also lavishly redecorated. Panelling was installed on the walls and a large, black walnut staircase replaced the old cramped stairs (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 50). New floors were installed throughout. These improvements, focused on the exterior appearance and public spaces of the house, were clearly designed to impress visitors with the architectural refinement of Mount Vernon.

At some point during his travels, Washington captured the attention Martha Dandridge Custis, who lived 120 miles away at White House Plantation in New Kent County (Fields 1994, 105). Martha was born of modest means, raised on her father's 500-acre plantation, where she was taught housekeeping, household management and cooking by her mother (Fields 1994, 430). Her first marriage to Daniel Parke Custis raised her status significantly. His death in 1757 left her in charge of properties totalling over 17,000 acres (Fields 1994, 434). When she married George in 1759, she was one of the wealthiest widows in Virginia, and had two children and an established household including enslaved house servants. When George fully inherited Mount Vernon in 1761, they were well underway to moulding the estate as a reflection of their personal



ideals and household needs. Given the transformation of Mount Vernon's household dynamics that this entailed, it is surprising that so little consideration has been given to its impact on service architecture and spatial organisation. This forms the focus of the next section of this chapter, which returns to the categories of facilities, accommodation, circulation and supporting outbuildings, which proved particularly useful in analysing British service architecture.

### *Facilities*

After enlarging and redecorating the Mansion, the Washingtons shifted their focus, altering the service buildings and grounds. Lawrence's complex included a kitchen, washhouse, dairy and storehouse, which required updating to meet the needs of George and Martha's larger family and enslaved population (fig 4.18). This also presented an opportunity to manipulate the architecture to influence household operation, addressing George's predisposition for order. Although none of these buildings remain, archaeological and documentary evidence reveals their crucial role in redefining household and servant relations during this transitional stage of Mount Vernon's development.

### Kitchen

In 1931, eminent American archaeologist Morley Williams partially excavated an area around the current kitchen and uncovered a brick foundation, situated at a 45-degree angle to the Mansion (Pecoraro and Breen 2014, 5). Modern excavations have located and verified the earlier trench, exposing further foundations and confirming that the building was 20' by 30' (Pecoraro and Breen 2014, 18). This was likely the kitchen building that George inherited from Lawrence's estate. Extensive food-related artefacts such as mid-eighteenth century blue and white Chinese export porcelain further support the building's early kitchen use (Pecoraro and Breen 2014, 33). However, since much of building lies under the present kitchen, its full extents remain somewhat enigmatic.

Restoration work in 1950 exposed a substantial fireplace foundation attached to this older building (Pecoraro and Breen 2014, 12). This is likely remnants of the 1762 oven and hearth constructed by Guy, an enslaved labourer whom Washington rented for £30 per year (Washington 1976a, 297-8). Ovens were uncommon at this time, as most

settlers used Dutch ovens and griddles, producing distinctly American bread products like cornbread and hoecakes (Olmert 2009, 4). Only 15% of households had a kitchen 560 square feet or larger (Wells 2018, 79). Adding a bake oven to Mount Vernon's 600-square-foot kitchen enabled the Washingtons' full-time residency.

While contemporary British kitchens were tucked away in basements, the Tidewater's characteristically separate kitchens pragmatically protected the main house from undesirable smells and especially heat in Virginia's warm climate. However, Olmert (2009, 35) asserts this model of 'new kitchen architecture had little to do with cooking and everything to do with race, gender, and social space.' When Martha moved to Mount Vernon in 1759 she brought six enslaved household servants, including a cook named Doll (Fields 1994, 105). Doll worked from 4am stoking the kitchen fires, to 8pm after preparing the next day's bread dough (MacLeod 2016, 9). She was aided by Beck the scullion and Breechy the waiter who moved between kitchen and Mansion (Freeman 1951, 22). Trust levels in established master-servant relationships like Martha's were vital in households operated by enslaved servants (MacLeod 2016, 8). In this way, Martha sought to ensure continuity in the household management practices she brought from her household to her new home.

Martha was directly involved with household management, 'going through every department before or immediately after breakfast' with servants like Doll (Torrence 1949, 162). Frequent kitchen visits allowed her to supervise enslaved servants, minimising resistance techniques like procrastination and slow work (Thompson 2016, 70). As will be discussed in Chapter 6, this marks a significant departure from the distance between elite British housewives and their servants. It is also a clear indication that while separate kitchens afforded the opportunity for segregation, they could also be socially-permeable spaces.

### Washhouse

Opposite the kitchen, another 20' by 30' brick foundation was uncovered. Its use as a washhouse can be deduced from historic documents and archaeological evidence. During a later building phase Washington's foreman consistently wrote regarding the 'new washhouse'. Washington finally corrected him that the building was to be used for a servants' hall, the current building which sits atop the excavated foundations.

Whilst a 1760 order for materials to fix the washhouse loft shows that Washington maintained the building, the fact that laundry technology did not significantly change throughout the eighteenth century suggests that the older building continued to meet the needs of the family, requiring only minor repairs over time.

Nevertheless, the laundry was a hive of activity, and its location further away from the house was important. An enslaved woman named Jenny washed the family's clothing, whilst more delicate items were finished by personal servants like Martha's seamstress and maid. Household linen was also washed and mended. Initially this was imported and therefore expensive and carefully inventoried to minimise theft. Whilst washerwomen were not responsible for cleaning field labourers' clothing, they did wash house servants' livery, which was light coloured and lined with twill fabric called shalloon, dyed an expensive red colour (Fitzpatrick 1938, 304-5). Washing was also included in the employment contracts of single, hired white servants. Soap was made in the adjacent yard, usually on a seasonal schedule (Thompson 2012, 3). These activities were not neatly confined to the washhouse itself, but spread into the surrounding landscape, making the washhouse a nexus of servant activity.

### Dairy

Two 16' by 16' sandstone foundations situated at opposing angles on the Mansion's landward side were uncovered in the early-twentieth century. The southern foundation is situated between the kitchen and Mansion. Its use as a dairy is supported by recent excavations in the nearby South Midden, where household refuse was disposed. Milk pan fragments were uncovered that correspond with goods Washington ordered from England between 1761-1765 (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2012b). Such equipment was often imported by gentry families who made a profit on excess dairy produce, which could be quite lucrative. Riversdale House, Maryland produced enough excess butter to finance a new, marble-shelved dairy (Olmert 2009, 99). Although Mount Vernon's early dairy's interior fittings remain unknown, its proximity to the Mansion's polite architecture suggests it included fashionable, but functional architectural elements like overhanging eaves and open latticework in the top of the walls, which encouraged cool cross breezes.

Dairies were important not only for produce, but as a status symbol, which prompted the Washingtons to repair the one they inherited in 1763. It was a distinctly female space, overseen by the mistress. But the actual labour, performed by servant women, was quite skilled. Advertisements for enslaved women frequently mention dairying as a premium skill set (Olmert 2009, 102). Mount Vernon's dairymaid Kitty was one such enslaved woman. However, Washington expressed concern that she not be left alone in the cool, windowless building since she had previously stolen dairy products whilst working (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 257). Potentially to mitigate this situation, Washington expected the wives of his hired white gardeners to be able to manage a dairy (Fitzpatrick 1940c, 182, 433; Washington 1976b, 422). This illustrates that the dairy's position between the heavy working kitchen and polite Mansion spaces mirrored the complex racial and social dynamics of the work that went on there.

### Storehouse

Another 16' x16' sandstone foundation was located on the Mansion's northwest side. Since compelling physical evidence exists for the other three buildings' uses, this is widely believed to be the storehouse that George inherited from Lawrence (John Milner Associates 2004, 2-5). This building type was unique to American plantations and was essential for a self-sufficient estate operated by a population of dependent, enslaved workers. In addition to seeds, gunpowder and tools for the estate, Washington locked blankets, shoes and rum for servants in the building. When visiting Mount Vernon, Scotsman Robert Hunter exclaimed at the novelty of 'a well-assorted store for the use of [Washington's] family and servants' (Wright and Tining 1943, 196). Although the space was strictly controlled, hired white overseers were often entrusted with access. Washington's body-servant-turned-overseer John Alton was responsible for procuring fabric for servants' clothing from the storehouse among other tasks (Fitzpatrick 1931, 137). Proximity between the early storehouse and the Mansion provided an additional layer of security and supervision over valuable commodities, and against the perceived threat of theft by enslaved servants.

Although the Washingtons made only minor changes and additions to these surviving service buildings, these alterations reflected the changing needs and household dynamics of a family rapidly rising up the social scale. Intensively-used buildings like the kitchen and laundry were updated but remained at a distance from the house to

keep noise and unpleasantness at bay. Buildings with high-value contents like the storehouse and dairy were set close to the Mansion and easily secured. The relationship of these buildings to each other and to the Mansion itself was critical during a time when the estate was still growing and a full plantation structure with complex hierarchy of white and enslaved servants was not yet as self-regulating as it was to become. With minimal changes the Washingtons established a new sense of class and order, and these early buildings remained in use until the estate's next construction phase began in 1774.

### *Accommodation*

Mount Vernon had no servant quarters within the house, unlike British houses and later American houses. Some sleeping arrangements can be reconstructed through examination of household dynamics and hiring practices. The family spaces reflect George's well-documented private nature, which must also be considered when examining servants' sleeping arrangements. Even so, some enslaved servants may have slept in locations within the house that had other primary functions, which was a common practice (Chappell 2013, 156-178). Accommodation at Mount Vernon was varied, according to position and type of servant, which also reflected differing attitudes towards enslaved and hired servants.

### Enslaved servants

An estate plan drawn by Samuel Vaughan in 1787 depicts a large building on the north lane, labelled 'House for Families' (fig 4.19). Savage's 1792 painting confirms a gable building, two-and-a-half storeys high, five bays wide and three deep (fig 4.20). Archaeological evidence suggests the building was in existence during George and Martha's early occupation. Twentieth-century excavations uncovered a brick-lined cellar pit containing over 60,000 surviving artefacts. The occupation layer with the highest concentration of ceramic artefacts was dated c1760 (Pogue 2003). During this phase a partition with a door was constructed, creating more distinct spaces in the building. A loft was added in 1769, thereby increasing the building's useable floorspace. Pogue (2002, 10) estimates the 55' by 35' building could have accommodated 102 people. However, as the smallest of Washington's five plantations, Mount Vernon only supported 25-58 enslaved and hired servants, labourers and

tradesmen between 1760-1774 (Abbot and Twohig 1994). This suggests Mount Vernon's enslaved population enjoyed larger than average accommodation.

The pit included second-hand ceramics previously used by the Washingtons. This, in addition to evidence of food waste illustrative of an unusually diverse diet appears to suggest that the enslaved servants in the House for Families were treated well, which some scholars credit to close proximity to the household (Pogue 2003). However, putting the subfloor pit in its wider context is more revealing. These subfloor pits were common amongst Virginia's enslaved populations throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Samford 2007, 108). They frequently used them to store personal belongings, which protected private property in barrack-style quarters (Samford 2007, 141). Securing or hiding personal possessions was one strategy through which slave agency and individual identity could be constructed within the constraints of such communal dwellings.

#### Hired servants

The Washingtons hired few white house servants because their labour needs were largely met by the enslaved people inherited from Martha's first marriage. Within the house, the new attic contained only one room with a fireplace (figs 4.17). The attic was separated from family spaces by an enclosed staircase, suggesting at least some servant use. The impact of this decision is explored in more detail below in 'Circulation'. The senior hired servant most closely associated with the house would have been a housekeeper who would have been afforded premium accommodation within the house. However, Martha's direct involvement in household management left little room for a housekeeper. Employment records indicate they were only hired during times of personal strife. For example, Martha employed three housekeepers for short amounts of time between 1765-69, corresponding with periods of illness and the eventual death of her daughter Patsy (Thompson 2019, 104). Lodging these short-term employees in the attic's heated room would meet the need of a hired white servant, yet could also be closed off when a housekeeper was not employed.

Many white servants at Mount Vernon, like gardeners possessed specific skillsets tying them to the estate rather than the house. Consequently, they were often lodged near their duties. The estate's early weavers were skilled men, trained overseas. The

spinning house was divided into two spaces: the main room was used for spinning, while the other half provided accommodation for the head weaver. Housing such trusted servants near their work spaces provided an additional layer of security over valuable goods, like the wool stored in the loft above. Crucially, Washington believed that segregation was an essential component of maintaining the social boundaries required for hired white servants to supervise and oversee enslaved servants, which formed a significant part of their duties (Thompson 2019, 97). This is evident in Mount Vernon's accommodation arrangements, which insured white servants' arrangements were superior to those of enslaved servants. In addition to private lodging, employment contracts indicate that the Washingtons' white servants themselves negotiated for benefits like washing, high-quality food and separate dining spaces. All of these elements combined to establish and maintain a hierarchical servant community based on race and personal freedom. Accommodation for hired, white servants was therefore heavily influenced by both proximity to work spaces and segregation from enslaved servants.

### *Circulation*

There is little evidence for servant circulation spaces within the Mansion during this phase of development. The simple layout (four up, four down, central hall) inherited from Lawrence contained no servant specific spaces (fig 4.21). Nearby Gunston Hall (c1755-59) has a similar floor plan to Mount Vernon's early configuration. However, whereas newly-built Gunston had servant circulation, constructing a service corridor at Mount Vernon was impossible due to large existing chimney blocks in the gable ends. Mount Vernon also only contained a single staircase, which was prominently located in the central hall, linking the ground and first floors. Washington's decision to increase its size, using luxurious black walnut and ornately carved balusters emphasised the polite status and public use of this staircase (fig 4.15). Visitors may well have assumed that another, less-conspicuous servants' staircase also existed behind the scenes, even though this was not the case. So how did servants traverse through the house? At the bottom of the staircase, a door opened to the dining room, a liminal space which to servants was a work space. Serving meals necessitated easy access to the kitchen, which was provided by an ante-room (closet) attached to the dining room, discussed below. This route – from work yard, through the ante-chamber and dining room to the staircase – allowed housemaids and body servants to access the

house, moving upstairs without passing through other polite spaces, and thereby minimising their presence. Although the prominent west door was also located near the staircase, it was only accessible from the interior; exterior access required a key. Keys at Mount Vernon were kept in a locked key chest, accessible only by family members and estate overseers (Thompson 2019, 100). Restricting access points implies a high level of control over servant presence within the house.

Subtle elements in architectural and documentary evidence suggest additional means of controlling servant movement within the house. Contemporary household management guides highlight the significance of temporality (Glasse 1762). Servants were expected to clean and prepare the ground floor before the family rose and move throughout the house ‘opening and closing blinds throughout the day, as the sun moved from room to room’ (Glasse 1762, 12-13). However, such guides were aimed at audiences in Britain and may not have been adhered to by American householders who perceived the visibility of enslaved servants as an indicator of wealth. Byrd (2016, 39) points to punkah fans operated by enslaved children, common in Southern dining rooms as an example of material culture that speaks directly to the ostentatious use of human labour in plantation homes. This aspect of American domestic service could be taxing on enslaved people as they endured strict bodily and behavioural control such as being required to stand whilst in the presence of white people (Genovese 1976, 334). Although the architecture of American houses at this time does not exhibit social segregation as obviously as British houses, further evidence of distinct cultural practices impacting servant movement and relating to social divisions begins to emerge from closer analysis of servant circulation within the Mount Vernon Mansion.

The Mansion only had a single staircase leading to the new attic level (figs 4.16, 4.17). Uncertainty over the attic’s use caused overseer George William Fairfax and carpenter John Patterson to question the location and configuration of the new staircase. For Fairfax, the issue was easily clarified by knowing who the intended occupants would be. He wrote to Washington ‘with regard to the Garrett Stairs I am at a loss unless I know whether you intend that for Lodging Apartments for Servants’ (Hamilton 1901, 69-70). If it was used for storage and did not require frequent access, he suggested building the staircase in a corner of the first-floor northwest room. However, if the attic was for servant lodgings, Fairfax suggested building an enclosed staircase with



door in the large first floor landing area. Fairfax himself was a British aristocrat, which may explain why he suggested attic servant accommodation, which was less common in American plantation houses than in British houses. In the end the enclosed option was chosen and constructed. This suggests at least some consideration by Washington for future servant use, potentially by hired white servants, as discussed above in ‘Accommodation’.

### Closets

A 1758 letter from builder John Patterson informed Washington that he had yet to begin construction of two ‘closets’, one on each end of the Mansion (Hamilton 1901, 28-29). Significant late-eighteenth century alterations obscure the extent of these structures, but clues raise interesting questions about their use and impact on household dynamics. Contemporary houses typically referred to both interior cupboards and small ante-rooms as closets (Wenger 2013, 123). Correspondence between Washington and Fairfax references another small room in the house as a closet, so this is likely the definition used at Mount Vernon (Hamilton 1901, 69-70). Mount Vernon’s 2017 Blue Room Restoration Project uncovered evidence of an exterior doorway in the first-floor northwest bedroom (Spurry 2017, 34). The door led onto a balcony with balustrades on the closet roof, providing views of the Potomac. The two closet additions were therefore only single storey structures.

The new closet attached to the Mansion’s south side abutted the dining room (fig 4.16). Directly outside were the dairy and kitchen. If the closet had an exterior door, it could have functioned as a transitional ante-chamber between the exterior service buildings and polite dining room space. This may have set a precedent for the later addition of a side entrance and ante-room linked to the Mansion, discussed below in ‘Facilities’. The space may have also been integral to Martha’s interaction with servants. It was a socially-liminal space where she could meet with servants to plan the day. Proximity to the kitchen made it easily accessible and facilitated supervision over enslaved servants working there. The Peyton Randolph house (1715) in Williamsburg, VA has a similar arrangement. ‘Mrs Randolph’s closet’ connected the kitchen to the rest of the house, was well-positioned to oversee service yard activities and served as the main servant thoroughfare to the house (Olmert 2009, 17). Mount Vernon’s arrangements suggest a more nuanced mistress-servant relationship than might normally be

expected. These relationships and ways of living and working would be tested when visitor numbers increased dramatically as a result of Washington's rise to political prominence, which is explored in Phase Two.

A closet on the north side of Mount Vernon's Mansion created a private ante-chamber attached to the parlour, the primary ground floor reception room. Wenger (2013, 123) asserts that during this period American architectural design was still developing and these early closets were frequently used as secluded studies. The north closet overlooked the storehouse, affording security and oversight of its valuable contents from within the house. An exterior door matching the south closet would have provided Washington with access to supervise provisioning and interact with overseers. The location of the additional closets therefore makes it unlikely that they were solely private spaces, but rather transitional spaces meant to facilitate supervision over servants working nearby, or enforce security around spaces with limited service access.

### Work yards

During Lawrence's tenure, an open work yard lay between the storehouse, dairy, washhouse, and kitchen on the west side of the house. The dependency buildings were arranged in a V-shaped configuration, creating a central yard in which enslaved servants were surveilled by family from within the house. But in 1760, George Washington hired William Triplett to construct low brick walls topped with wooden fence posts linking the dependencies to the Mansion (Washington 1976a, 258). The evidence discussed below suggests these walls demarcated two new work yards to the south and north, whilst clearing the original central work yard of servant activity. Along with spaces to work, yards were socially important to enslaved people, a fact that Fesler (2010, 31) attributes to the prominence of outdoor space in their African societies. This is significant because separating Mount Vernon's early work yard also separated the servant community.

The north wall linked the washhouse and storehouse to the Mansion's northwest corner. A refuse pit containing mid-eighteenth century ceramics was uncovered on the north side of the early washhouse (Breen 2015). An ash layer in this stratified feature suggests the area on the north side of the new wall was a work yard for laundry related

activities like washing and soap making. Similarly, the south wall linked the kitchen and dairy to the southwest corner of the Mansion (fig 4.18). Archaeological evidence on the south lawn, in the area behind the new wall gives evidence of its use as a work yard (Breen 2006). A demolition layer found on an 18' by 18' earthfast foundation, positioned in alignment with the early kitchen and dairy shows that the area was cleared of superfluous structures no later than 1759. A substantial midden in this area yielded large quantities of household refuse dating from this time, representing 'a crucial period in the history of foodways – when dining was transformed from an ordinary activity into a ceremonial one' (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2012a).

The formation and position of new yards have implications for understanding the lives of enslaved servants. Although still visible from the closets at the north and south, they were no longer in the Mansion's direct viewshed. Upton (1984, 69) states that 'if the master's landscape was a network that implied connection and movement, the landscapes of the slave was a static one of discrete places,' which I interpret as meaning that moments and individual spaces were more important to enslaved peoples than how they were connected. If this reading is correct, did the new kitchen and laundry yards' positions alter how servants experienced and negotiated these workspaces? In shifting farther away from the Mansion's polite spaces, did they move deeper into the enslaved servants' world? If so, this would create an opportunity for servants to attach more meaning to the new yards, turning physical *workspaces* into what Heath (2010, 159) describes as *places*.

The new walls physically and visually cordoned off labour activities, creating an open, polite space between the dependencies, thus clearing the Mansion's west side of servants. This was likely part of a larger campaign to transform the west side into the principal entrance. Although there has been some debate amongst scholars (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998; Pogue 1994) about which was the Mansion's original entrance façade, recent archaeological evidence has emerged favouring Pogue's (1994, 104-106) assertion that it was the symmetrical east side, which faces the river. Recent excavations have uncovered the foundations of small buildings on the east lawn that appear to be the 'two houses in the *Front* [emphasis mine] of my House,' built in 1762 (Washington 1976a, 258; Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2019, 5). Improvements to the estate landscape on the Mansion's west side at this time also support the theory

that it was altered to become the principle approach at this time. Enslaved labourers built brick walls around the south garden (1762), constructed the formal north garden (1763) and created an avenue directly connecting the main road to the house (1769) (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 60; Washington 1976a, 298, 303; John Milner Associates 2004, 2-14). These changes, combined with the relocation of the work yards, indicates that Washington sought to transform the polite approach and first impressions of the house. Upton (1984, 66) asserts that such processional routes played an important role in conveying the relative social rank of plantation owners and their visitors. However, these alterations to redefine Mount Vernon's formal approach for the benefit of white family and visitors also impacted key exterior service workspaces, which in turn manipulated the presence and visibility of servants on the estate.

### *Outbuildings*

The tobacco plantation that George inherited from Lawrence included a variety of farming-related barns, stables and storage buildings in addition to quarters and cabins for the estate's enslaved labour force. However, increasingly poor yields and overworked soil negatively impacted estate finances throughout the 1760s. The issue was aggravated further in 1765 with the enactment of the Stamp Act, which taxed colonists on British commodities during a time when the majority of goods were imported. Washington believed colonists should endeavour to become economically independent and signed an agreement to boycott British cargo (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 64).

He diversified the estate, adding buildings to support alternative industries in an attempt make Mount Vernon more self-sufficient. The estate's enslaved labour force, previously engaged in tobacco farming, was reassigned to new activities around Mount Vernon. Washington began growing wheat and constructed a mill to produce and sell flour (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 62). He operated fisheries, taking great quantities of fish from the Potomac. In addition to a 'fish house' located near the water, large amounts of salt for preserving were stored in a salt house (Washington 1976a, 367). Blacksmith's and cooper's workshops produced barrels and boats (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 62). A kiln and carpenter's workshop supplied building materials for the growing estate.

Some buildings were more focused on providing for the expanding enslaved community. Washington began growing flax and raising sheep. Enslaved servants processed this raw material, creating yarn in the spinning house (Washington 1976a, 118n). Skilled, mainly white, weavers produced linen and wool fabric from which enslaved seamstresses made clothes for the entire enslaved populations of Mount Vernon and Washington's other four plantations (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 62). Finer fabrics used for family clothing and linens were imported from other areas of America.

Other buildings were adapted for servant care. A building on the south lane was appropriated for use as a hospital in 1760, during an outbreak of measles (Washington 1976a, 118n). Early records of repairs to a schoolhouse also raise questions about the treatment of servants at Mount Vernon. Anti-literacy laws actively limited the education of enslaved peoples, which was widely believed to encourage rebellion (Genovese 1976, 561). Vaughn's 1787 drawing of Mount Vernon clearly depicts a 'School Room' in the small octagonal building at the north garden's far end. Gunston Hall also had a schoolhouse, in the plantation's 'Log-Town', so called because the slave buildings were built of logs (Bisbee 1994, 17). Who was being taught in Mount Vernon's schoolhouse and what education did they receive?

New buildings emerging on the estate during this phase reflect not only diverse occupations for many servants, but the changing needs of a growing servant community. Many of the jobs individual estate labourers did were for the support of all enslaved labourers. This very likely impacted the social dynamics of the servant community, separating it from the family as bonds within the community tightened. Changes also demonstrate the beginning of an attempt by Washington to shape the landscape into distinct work zones, which he pushed further in the next phase of Mount Vernon's development.

Building history and social relations during this time are challenging to trace. They are frequently overshadowed by George's later heroic status and the estate's final architectural design. Yet this early period is critical to the estate's development, as George and Martha deliberately moulded the buildings and landscapes to reflect their evolving personal identities. This was very much a period of growth for the estate – the family, enslaved community and architecture expanded, which impacted and was

impacted by relationships between all three of these elements. As George's position within American society and politics became more defined, further architectural changes were made to reflect this, marking the next phase of development.

#### 4.3 Phase Two: 1774-1799

This phase begins with a series of alterations to the Mansion and immediate surroundings that have come to define Mount Vernon. Between 1774-1775 the footprint of the house nearly doubled. A new set of symmetrical outbuildings were connected to the Mansion with elegantly-curved colonnades, which created an impressive central complex (fig 4.22). Washington biographies tend to highlight these changes and then track Washington's activity in the Revolutionary War of 1775-1783, where he emerged as a national celebrity. The estate's story is usually picked up only on the hero's return to Mount Vernon for sporadic visits between 1783-1797, when his presidency required him to live elsewhere. Nevertheless, the changes which were made to the site during this period are conventionally interpreted as the embodiment of orderly Republican ideals embraced by the nation's first president.

This study diverges from narratives that centre on the cult of personality of Washington. It remains focused on materiality and spatial organisation as the estate becomes more developed. The stratigraphy of the estate as a whole is examined by investigating how each building's appearance on and placement within the landscape impacted Mount Vernon's inhabitants. From this perspective, building works on the estate in the 1780s-1790s can be understood not as an isolated campaign, but rather the completion of earlier plans disrupted by material shortages and Washington's wartime absence. An interest in the function and meaning of buildings, rather than their architectural style also allows us to see how buildings, landscape and household structures were used to maintain the balance between public expectations and the desire to retain and preserve private family life. Critically, this section draws out connections between the architectural changes and their impact on servant lives. It also considers Washington's evolving views on slavery, asking if his increasingly critical views of the very institution that supported his lifestyle is reflected in the evolution of Mount Vernon's service architecture, and how servants experienced these changes.

### *President Washington and the First Lady*

Washington's life during this period was fast-paced, challenging and complex. His role in the American Revolutionary War (1776-1783) and his double-term presidency (1789-1797) is well documented. However, these large-scale events are only part of the Washington family's multi-faceted life, which impacted on the architecture of Mount Vernon and its household relations. Throughout the 1760s-1770s the social status of the Washington family had continued to rise. George was instrumental in colonial government, having been twice elected to the Virginia House of Burgesses. The electorate was composed of leading landowners such as Peyton Randolph, Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson. Serving alongside these notable figures, Washington became part of a burgeoning Virginian colonial gentry. It is perhaps unsurprising that he embarked on a major renovation campaign to expand the Mansion and add facilities for entertaining in 1774. The 1760s closets were demolished and replaced with full-height wings with hipped roofs, which were fully integrated into the structure (figs 4.23, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26). A two-storey banqueting room filled the north wing. The south wing included a butler's pantry and china closet, private study and master bedroom suite. Washington felt the construction process was much smoother when he was directly involved (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 100). However his war-time position as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army, which began in 1775 took him away from Mount Vernon for eight years.

In his stead, Martha (who remained at Mount Vernon) and project overseer Lund Washington struggled to execute George's vision (something that is explored further later in this section). Nevertheless, after the completion of the north wing, construction began on a matching set of dependencies on the west side of the Mansion, on the site of the four original outbuildings. These faced one another across the Circle Drive and were connected to the house with curved, open colonnades that bounded the Mansion's principal front. The main entrance was further improved throughout 1777-1778. A large central pediment with oxeye window was added to the roof along with an octagonal cupola. Dalzell and Dalzell (1998, 109) suggest that overseeing these changes, even if from afar, provided Washington with a welcome source of respite during a time of political uncertainty. However, the construction process seems less than restful. Both labour and material shortages disrupted building works (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 103; 107). Martha was also struck by a private tragedy in 1781 when her

son, Jackie died (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 21). It is hard to overstate the heavy burden she faced at this time: losing a loved one, caring for her two young grandchildren and running a household in the middle of construction works and war. Consequently, Mount Vernon's staff dynamics shifted during these times as Martha stepped away from directing domestic matters herself, instead relying more on hired servants, who in turn directed enslaved servants. Examining the spatial configurations of the house and estate at this time helps shed new light on the nuances of how servants themselves navigated such changes.

By 1783 the war was over and Washington resigned his military position, vowing not to serve in public office again. He returned to Mount Vernon, where he could continue to supervise the ongoing building works. Between 1783-1787 he reshaped the landscape on a scale and in a manner that appears to be influenced by the work of British landscape designers such as Capability Brown. A vast area in front of the Mansion was cleared and edged with serpentine drives hugging the brick walls of the garden (fig 4.22). This created a pleasant vista from the house and afforded approaching visitors a full view of the Mansion. In 1787 a tall, south-facing brick greenhouse with full height windows was completed in the north garden. Details such as a large pediment and Palladian windows linked this structure aesthetically to the house, as part of its polite 'pleasure grounds' (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 117). Modern scholars viewing these changes from an Anglo-centric perspective assert that the presence of recognisable British influences indicates that estate beautification was Washington's primary motivation (Manca 2012, 133). Whilst these changes did make a strong visual statement, they also impacted how the household functioned. There existed, as Upton (1984, 59) posits multiple landscapes within the estate that were defined by differing experiences, as we shall explore below.

By 1787, the Mount Vernon estate was nearing its completed form. However, Washington's election to the office of America's first president between 1789-1797 halted further planned work. George and Martha moved first to New York, then Philadelphia. Their niece Fanny Bassett Washington remained at Mount Vernon, entertaining guests on her uncle's behalf and running the household according to Martha's instructions, which were communicated through copious correspondence (Fields 1994). Communicating via courier also served a more insidious purpose. In



order to circumvent a Pennsylvania law that offered freedom to enslaved people who resided in the state for six months or more, the Washingtons sent servants back and forth to Mount Vernon on a regular basis (Thompson 2019, 59). Perhaps in part due to Washington's absence, estate changes during this time were minimal. His diaries reflect an idyllic view of Mount Vernon as a much-anticipated retreat for which he longed (Washington 1976a; 1976b; 1978). Relying heavily on Washington's own descriptions, Manca's (2012) work also focuses on this idealised version of Mount Vernon in the late-eighteenth century. However, by only narrowly considering Washington's goals and focusing on aesthetic changes, the impact on the estate's wider population goes unacknowledged.

The last changes George made to the estate, between 1791-1793 focused on enslaved servants' lodgings. The House for Families was demolished and replaced with a 'New Quarter' (discussed below in Accommodation) (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 182). This consideration of enslaved servants' living situations was undoubtedly informed by George's changing attitudes towards slavery. His growing hostility to the system sits at odds with his reliance on it to support his lifestyle and the estate. Manca (2012, 95) asserts that the form of the New Quarter and related changes was motivated by shame and therefore aimed to shield views of older servant accommodation. However, stepping away from the elite perspective and giving weight to the experiences of the enslaved community reveals complexities that scholars are just beginning to untangle, and which are explored in this section (Schowler et al. 2016; Thompson 2019).

### *Facilities*

When the south wing was added in 1774, it created servant spaces within the Mansion for the first time. A butler's pantry was constructed across from the dining room, near an exterior door for access to the kitchen (fig 4.24). The small room is outfitted with countertops and shelves for table service. A smaller room for china and silver plate is tucked into the corner of the south wing, adjacent to the butler's pantry. Household records and correspondence almost exclusively refer to the space in relation to butler Frank Lee, as 'the closet under Frank's direction'. Frank initially began working at Mount Vernon as an enslaved waiter in 1768 (MacLeod 2016, 6). He was eventually promoted to butler, a position that entailed responsibilities for china, silver, waiting on the family and guests, supervising cleaning and overseeing stores. However, he would

have continued to deeply feel his enslaved status as he was also directed to do menial tasks like pounding stone and painting the house (Thompson 2019, 116). Although he performed service in the Mansion house, his sphere of work was not comfortably confined to the house. This is a marked difference to the level of respect commanded by British butlers.

A small staircase led from the butler's pantry to a large room beneath Washington's study in the south wing, referred to as the 'cellar kitchen' (fig 4.23). Although it does contain a large fireplace, there is no evidence it was ever used for cooking. This frequently overlooked space is incredibly revealing about household dynamics at Mount Vernon during this phase. Documentary evidence shows that it functioned as a white servants' hall, where enslaved servants served meals to hired white workers like the gardener and his wife (Fitzpatrick 1940a, 200-201). Although part of the main house, a sound-deadening ceiling insulated Washington's study above from any noise. The main entrance is an exterior door in the south wall. This is significant because it meant that they were not allowed to enter family spaces above, but neither were they expected to enter via the west door used by enslaved servants. Frank Lee, descending from the butler's pantry above would have been expected to perform dinner service rituals very similar to those of the family. Whilst these arrangements ensured that white servants received the social and physical segregation they demanded, it is perhaps more notable that such practices also further oppressed enslaved servants even within the estate's servant population.

### Kitchen

After the south wing was added to the Mansion, the four earlier dependencies on the west lawn were demolished. In 1775 a new kitchen building was constructed, positioned at a right angle to the Mansion, on the site of the old kitchen and dairy (fig 4.22). This wooden building was covered in clapboard but had rusticated quoins which linked it aesthetically to the house. The new kitchen was 20' by 30', with three ground-floor rooms and two first-floor rooms (figs 4.24, 4.25). A large kitchen room covered half the ground floor. It included updated technologies such as a smoke jack and bread oven, required for entertaining the estate's ever-growing number of guests. The southwest-corner room had a recessed, tiled floor creating a cool space used as a larder. The kitchen's south elevation did not have windows, which kept it insulated in

Virginia's intense heat. The new kitchen did have a back door, which led to a yard with a pump. Shielded from the front of the Mansion, yet vital to their duties, this area might have held significance for enslaved servants beyond simply a workspace. Such yards acted as social hubs for servants, for example as kitchen servants and laundrymaids met whilst gathering water (Heath 2010, 169).

The new kitchen's east wall also contained a door, which led to an open colonnade. This marks the first time a service dependency was physically connected to the Mansion. This new kitchen building, plus the Mansion's south addition, containing the Washingtons' private rooms were completed before the Mansion's north addition and corresponding dependency. This suggests that the Washingtons' personal living spaces and kitchen were the priority in the early stage of this building campaign. The sequence of construction allowed Martha to occupy her new living spaces whilst building continued on the north side. Once complete, the configuration of new wings and dependencies meant that public rooms for guests, including a banqueting room and lodging for guests' servants were on the north and therefore completely separate from new family spaces like the kitchen, master bedroom and Washington's study which were located on the south side. The arrangement enabled the family to close the north (public) side of the Mansion when they were not entertaining, keeping a smaller number of house servants. During social events, additional enslaved people and hired servants like the gardener's wife were called into service as required (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 437).

### Storehouse

A storehouse remained an essential part of the estate. During this phase it was housed in a new structure, near the newly-constructed kitchen (fig 4.22). It was a single-storey building with a hipped roof facing the Circle Drive and a simpler gable on the other end. The corners visible from the Circle Drive had rusticated quoins like the kitchen, linking it again aesthetically to the assemblage of new dependencies surrounding the expanded Mansion. The interior had two rooms: a storeroom for supplies at the front and a back room used for lodging a single hired male servant. The rooms were not internally connected, but instead each had a separate exterior, which had implications relating to servant circulation discussed below. A great variety of commodities were stored there: from goods for servants like shoes, blankets, clothes and hats, to building

supplies like caulk, lead, nails and tools, and even gunpowder and rum. This building was further away from the Mansion than the old storehouse, but its contents remained valuable. The previous arrangement allowed Washington to directly oversee the space, but the new configuration required an intermediary to ensure security. As the estate grew, overseers gained responsibility and were given access to the key (Thompson 2019, 100). Despite tight control however, Washington more often suspected enslaved people of theft (Thompson 2019, 100). A white male servant (not the overseer who would have had his own house) lodging in the storehouse's other half was yet another theft deterrent. This aligns with Upton's (1984, 66) theory that planters perceived the people they enslaved as incapable of respecting many aspects of white society. Instead they relied on force to ensure compliance, and the presence of a white male within the storehouse building implied such a threat of physical retribution.

### Smokehouse

A smokehouse was located behind the storehouse on the South Lane at least as early as 1776, when Washington refers to it as a marker for tree planting (fig 4.22) (Fitzpatrick 1940c, 460). It may have replaced an older structure somewhere else on the estate. The new location along the South Lane formalise its position on the estate landscape. The clapboard-clad, wooden-frame building sat on a brick foundation, and matched the other South Lane service buildings. Smokehouses were an important part of colonial life, providing cured meats throughout the year. Constructing a new smokehouse that stylistically aligned with other service buildings illustrates an attempt at cohesive design, along with a continued reliance on early American building traditions (Manca 2012, 109). Like many Virginian housewives, Martha personally oversaw the curing process. Excess meats were sent as gifts to visitors, like William Hambly who received six 'hams of her [Martha Washington's] own curing' (Fitzpatrick 1941, 369). From an elite perspective Mount Vernon's new smokehouse was a prestigious building heralding the estate's bounty. Enslaved peoples experienced such spaces much differently. They could be a place of temptation. Typical rations only included a small amount of salt pork and not the luxury of cured meats (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 66). Removing the clapboard siding on the back of a smokehouse exposed wide gaps that enslaved servants could slip into and remove meat. To avoid this some smokehouses were constructed with closely-spaced 'double-studded' structural framing (Wells 2018, 52). The strategic location of Mount Vernon's

smokehouse helped minimise theft yet remained convenient: its position across from the kitchen was accessible to servants preparing family and guest meals, whilst close proximity to the white servant accommodation in the nearby storehouse building provided an additional measure of servant-on-servant surveillance. Smokehouses could also be places of trauma for enslaved people. Not only did the blood, meat and bone create a bad smelling space, but these dark, close buildings were frequently used for physical punishment, either as jails or for whipping (Vlach 1993, 65; 67). Smokehouse use and perception by these two completely different populations reveals vastly experiences of the same physical space.

### Washhouse

During this phase, the original storehouse and washhouse in the Mansion's west yard were demolished. Washington was away on military service at this time and overseer Lund Washington assumed that the new building (which matched the recently-completed kitchen) on the site of the old washhouse would be a larger, improved structure serving the same function (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 107). Martha agreed, and directed him to include a large fireplace at one end, which was built (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 107). However, George had other plans for the building to be used as servant accommodation, discussed below. Consequently, the washhouse was moved next to the smokehouse along the South Lane (fig 4.22). Building stratigraphy reveals that early partitions were removed to make room for washing tasks, suggesting the South Lane washhouse was not a newly-constructed building, but an older structure adapted for laundry use (Didden 2002, 2-3). This new location was closer to the well in the kitchen yard for easy access to the large amounts of water required for the laundering process. Additionally, the garden wall behind the washhouse formed a drying yard.

During this time the estate's population – family and servants – was expanding. Guests were also cared for, as reflected by a visitor account of being treated 'not [as] a stranger but a member of the family in his estimable house. They took care of me, of my linen, of my clothes' (Budka 1965). This generated so much laundry that there was no particular washday, but rather laundry was done every day. The new washhouse removed this dirty, noisy work even farther from the house. The laundry area was also clearly delineated by physical boundaries like the garden wall, South Lane fence and

smokehouse. This configuration reflects an attempt to limit servant agency, confining them to a particular area during work hours. However, as Fesler (2010, 29) notes, it may also have created different kinds of working conditions, in which enslaved servants had a slightly greater sense of autonomy within a specified zone, away from direct surveillance and supervision.

### Dairy

When the new kitchen was built on the site of the old dairy, a new dairy had to be constructed. Vaughan's plan shows it was a considerable distance from the Mansion, closer to the river, to the east (fig 4.19). It went from being one of the dependencies closest to the house during the earlier phase to one of the spaces farthest removed from the Mansion. Why was this? Dairying involved milk gathered from the estate's cows, which were housed in a new barn southwest of the dairy. The need for refrigeration was met by close proximity to cool river water. Finished dairy products were brought up the hill to the new kitchen on a gravel path built by enslaved workers in 1799 (Vail 1947). The new dairy was therefore located in the centre of related resources, maximising its efficiency. Unfortunately this left it vulnerable to theft. To mitigate against this, Washington forbade some servants from working in the dairy (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 276). Writing from Philadelphia he suggested some of them work together because if left alone, 'besides idling away half the day under pretence, never failed, I am well convinced, to take a pretty ample toll of both Milk and butter' (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 257). Martha specifically requested the wife of the white gardener be skilled in dairying, which may have been intended as supervision against theft. Whilst the dairy's new location may have maximised the efficiency of the process, labour arrangements had to be adjusted accordingly.

### *Accommodation*

Despite nearly doubling the Mansion's square footage, the new wings were not designed for servant accommodation. Most servants lodging within the house did not have their own spaces, so they remain invisible in the architectural record. Two exceptions exist. The first is butler Frank Lee, who had a small room under the butler's pantry, tucked behind the basement stairs (fig 4.23). He likely slept there when on duty in the Mansion. It was a convenient distance from family spaces, and if connected to the bell system installed in 1784, would have ensured he was always on call, especially

during times when the Washingtons hosted overnight guests. In some ways this space was a luxury. It was a private space, within the house and whitewashed, contrasting sharply with the poorly constructed, dark cabins common in enslaved people's quarters (Heath 2010, 164). Additionally, there is a possibility that Frank attempted to create a meaningful 'place' out of this space through subtle additions like shelves and spiritual tokens that do not survive in the archaeological record (Heath 2010, 173). However the space compared to others on the plantation however, it is important to note that the space was underground, without windows and barely big enough for a sleeping pallet. Depending on Frank's personal experiences, the cramped, isolated basement room may not have been the luxury it appeared.

The only definitive documentary evidence for servants sleeping within the house involves an unheated attic room. In June 1794 Washington requested that his estate steward prepare the southern-most attic room for a white servant accompanying the president from his Philadelphia household as his personal attendant. The room he was allotted was directly above the Washingtons' bedroom in the new south addition (figs 4.25, 4.26). It was only accessible by a back staircase constructed for George and Martha's personal use, as discussed below in 'Circulation'. Close proximity to a servant was unusual for Washington and highlights the distinctive relationships between the Washingtons and their white hired servants during this later phase of the site. Unlike enslaved servants who lodged together, the accommodation of white servants reflected their position and personal circumstances.

### Enslaved servants

The first floor of the new kitchen had been used for accommodation since its construction in 1775. Frank the butler married Lucy the cook and the couple had three children (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 60). Lucy and the children lived above the kitchen for a time. Frank may also have slept there when not needed in the house overnight. Close proximity to the Mansion gave Lucy and Frank's enslaved children special privileges: they were allowed to play near the Mansion, whereas the presence of other enslaved children was restricted. In this context it is interesting to note that Frank was a 'mulatto', a mixed race enslaved person often selected for household service because of light skin (Thompson 2019, 113). Were Frank and Lucy's children also light-complexioned and therefore considered more visually-

acceptable presences in the carefully-controlled, designed landscapes of Mount Vernon?

Most enslaved servants slept in separate buildings located at the end of the North Lane. In 1775, designs were developed for a 'New Quarter' in this area. However, due to the outbreak of war and Washington's first presidential term, construction did not begin until 1791 (Fitzpatrick 1939a, 279). This time lag has led to the building being considered part of a different building campaign. Shortly after its construction the House for Families was demolished. Manca (2012, 95) suggests that a primary goal for these changes was to remove servants' living spaces from polite view. The new accommodation consisted of long, single-storey, brick additions on either side of the two-storey south-facing greenhouse (discussed below in 'Outbuildings') (fig 4.22). The wings were only accessible by doors on the north side. The sides were segregated by gender and each contained two rooms that could only be entered from outside. Washington specified they be outfitted with 'berths' – interpreted as bunk-bed style sleeping platforms – an uncommon feature that would have maximised occupation. Although the New Quarter was smaller than the House for Families that it replaced, the design was more spatially efficient. Was this an attempt to control a population which was now located even further away from the Mansion? It is difficult to determine whether the relative comfort of a new building would have outweighed the social restrictions incorporated in the design.

During this period, visitors recalled seeing small single-family cabins across from the new quarter, describing them as 'huts...habitations [that] cannot be called houses' (Budka 1965, 100; Vail 1947, 77). They were likely built by the enslaved peoples themselves, a common practice on plantations including Washington's other estates (Fitzpatrick 1940b, 434). Typical single-storey wood cabins were constructed on earthfast foundations, with exterior chimneys (Vlach 1993, 22). The cabins' position across from the new quarter created the impression of a plantation 'village', a configuration used by planters to frame their as governmental centres, thereby underscoring their own power and prestige (Upton 1984, 63). Washington supported marriage within the enslaved population, believing familial bonds fostered goodwill and happiness. A more mercenary viewpoint could argue that he economically benefitted from any resulting children, so housing families in individual cabins had



financial motivations as well. Smaller individual buildings remained popular with plantation owners, but the late-eighteenth century saw a trend towards more sturdy brick or log buildings (Heath 2010, 164; Pogue 2002, 11). Monticello's Mulberry Row (c1770s, Charlottesville, VA) and Gunston Hall's Log Town (c1780s, Masons Neck, VA) were constructed of these materials and more deliberately placed on the landscape than Mount Vernon's cabins seem to have been (Scholnick et al. 2001; Shonyo 2012). Although such cabins enabled families to live together, conditions were not pleasant. Occupants of these buildings continued to sleep on the dirt floors, which proved a dangerous practice when ten people were once badly injured during a lightning storm at Mount Vernon (Washington 1976a, 281). Pogue (2002, 11) suggests that Washington's decision to leave the cabins unimproved and instead construct a new barrack-style quarter, which by this time had fallen out of fashion 'might be interpreted primarily as an attempt to control the activities of the Mansion House slaves by placing them in an environment that was more readily supervised'. It is interesting to consider whether enslaved servants were happier with the relative freedom of poorly-built individual family cabins, or the better-constructed but closely controlled new quarter.

The location of these buildings, out of sight from the Mansion meant they were the least-important aesthetic component of the Mount Vernon landscape. Indeed, the new quarter completely blocked them from the polite gaze (Manca 2012, 95). Nevertheless, this was likely the centre of the plantation landscape from an enslaved person's perspective (Upton 1984, 63). The co-location of the cabins and the new quarter's north side may have fostered a closer servant community between. The gardens and yards between the two rows of accommodation buildings was reminiscent of a small village. The space between the new quarter and cabins was filled with small vegetable gardens to supplement rations of fish, salt pork and cornmeal. Enslaved peoples were also allowed to raise chickens, which they sold in nearby Alexandria for funds to purchase furniture. Such quarter yards were one of the more successful areas of 'place-making' by enslaved servants, partially because labour performed here benefitted themselves and not the plantation's white population (Heath 2010, 171). The sense of community was furthered when the north room of the greenhouse became a shoemaker's and tailor's shop for the enslaved population. This appears to have been a conscious and deliberate attempt by the enslaved community to create a sense of

community and home, albeit within the conditions and constraints of estate enslavement (Dalzell and Dalzell 1998, 136).

### Hired servants

The rooms above the new kitchen were used by hired white servants later in this phase. In 1796 Washington instructed his steward to install a lock on the first-floor rooms, since the family was returning to Mount Vernon with a white cook. This may have been a request by the servant seeking privacy in a building also used by enslaved servants. This period of increased social responsibilities prompted Martha to advertise for a household steward who could take over some of the supervision of enslaved house servants. This freed up Martha's time to entertain yet still oversee daily household management. No steward was hired, but in 1798 she employed housekeeper Mrs Forbes, who had come highly recommended by her previous employer, Virginia governor Robert Brooke (Thompson 2019, 88). The rooms above the kitchen not only kept Mrs Forbes within close proximity to the people and spaces she supervised but also afforded her the well-segregated comfort expected by a servant in her position.

Across the Circle Drive, on the site previously occupied by the old washhouse and storehouse a new building known as the servants' hall was constructed. It has two storeys with two rooms on each floor (figs 4.24, 4.25). Like the kitchen, it was connected to the Mansion by an open colonnade. The term 'servants' hall' appears to connect Mount Vernon to British service architectural templates, but the history of the building deviates substantially from British traditions. Historically it was variously referred to as 'lodgings for white servants', 'white servants' apartments', and 'house for strangers', clarifying its use. During construction there was confusion over its intended purpose. Overseer Lund Washington assumed the building was to be a new washhouse and he constructed a sizable chimney in its east wall for laundry purposes. However, by December 1775 Washington had written to correct him, and Lund agreed to alter the 'servants' hall'. Tiles were installed on the ground floor, the walls were plastered, skirting board and chair rails were installed throughout and each room had a fireplace (Pogue 2005, 4). These changes make it clear that Washington always intended it as accommodation for higher ranking servants. However, between 1793-1796, Washington allowed estate steward William Pearce to live in the servants' hall with his family (Fitzpatrick 1940a,110-11). Proximity to the Mansion's kitchen also

gave Pearce access to the 'kitchen, the cook belonging thereto, Frank the House Servant, a boy also in the house' (Fitzpatrick 1940a, 110-11).

In 1796 the servants' hall reverted to its intended use. The hall was thoroughly cleaned, and a lock installed on its west door (Fitzpatrick 1940c, 80). The building was declared off limits designated solely for the use of 'gentlemen's servants' (Fitzpatrick 1940b, 40). Pogue (2005, 4) suggests that keeping such a large space exclusively for guests' servants was an overt attempt to signal the family's status. However, since Washington was not generally given to ostentation, its practical purpose must also be considered. Mount Vernon had an enormous number of visitors, with guests staying overnight nearly 60% of the year (Mount Vernon Ladies' Association 2016, 60). Seen in this context, the building appears to be a unique adaptation to the unusual circumstances of Washington's fame. It also provides a glimpse into an even more complex layer of servant segregation that did not exist in many American households.

Along with building new structures and enlarging the Mansion, Washington executed an overhaul of the landscape that included carefully designed changes, as discussed below. Specimen trees, flowers, fruit gardens and serpentine pathways were installed by a skilled head gardener who supervised many enslaved laborers. Consequently, Mount Vernon's gardeners grew more important during Phase 2. Washington had a propensity for white, foreign-born gardeners. Their high level of responsibility was rewarded with good pay, accommodation, washing and sometimes meals. In 1799, the building next to the servants' hall was renovated for the head gardener's house. The building's exterior mirrors the appearance of the storehouse, which sits directly opposite, across the Circle Drive (fig 4.22). It is one and a half storeys high with a half-hipped, half-gable roof. The corners that are visible from the Circle Drive have rusticated quoins that visually tie it to the Mansion and underscored the status of its occupant. This prominent location also signalled to visitors that Washington employed such a skilled servant. During the planning phase of renovation the interior configuration was discussed in detail (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 437). The main consideration was to create a homely space out of what had previously been a shoemaker's and tailor's shop. This care highlights the preferential treatment skilled servants like gardeners enjoyed.

### *Circulation*

The new south wing addition included a narrow staircase connecting the ground floor to the first floor, where George and Martha's new bedroom suite was located (figs 4.24, 4.25). An even narrower, winding staircase connected the first floor to the attic (4.26). A cursory examination might suggest these back staircases were for servant use because of their secluded position and small size. However, when the south wing was built, the first and attic floors were only accessible from these staircases. Although servants who were required to carry out duties in George and Martha's bedroom would have needed to use them, the new stairs' primary use was for private access by George and Martha.

The lobby area at the bottom of this staircase on the ground floor played a critical role in preserving family privacy and minimising servant presence. Servants cleaning or lighting fires in the ground-floor southeast bedchamber and the Washingtons' first-floor bedroom entered into the ground-floor lobby from the exterior east door. They then accessed the bedchambers without travelling through private and polite spaces like Washington's study and the central hall passage. Similarly, servants accessing the dining room entered the Mansion through a new door in the south wing's west side. They stepped into a lobby that mirrored the one on the east side. The west lobby was an important circulatory node, connecting the dining room, kitchen via a colonnade, and the butler's pantry, which was the only servant space inside the Mansion. Unlike the east lobby, this side would not have also been used by family. This marks it as entirely a service space. Washington's study was between the east and west lobbies and could have functioned as a throughway from one side of the house to the other. However, he was extremely protective of this private space and forbid anyone from entering. This new configuration installed distinct circulatory service nodes (the east and west lobbies), which only took up a small amount of area but provided servants with efficient access to interior work spaces.

The newly-built colonnades that connected the kitchen and servants' hall dependencies to the Mansion also show careful consideration for circulation. The open-sided, roofed structures are raised slightly above ground level and follow the curve of the Circle Drive, thus creating a formal entrance on the Mansion's west side (fig 4.24). Art historical readings of these features highlight the unusual open sides, which provided

a view of the river beyond (Manca 2012, 53). However, this ignores the fact that their primary use was delineating a path from the new dependencies to the Mansion house. Whilst the south colonnade provided shelter for Martha on her daily visits to the kitchen, it also formed a processional route for servants to carry food from the kitchen to butler's pantry before being served to family and guests in the dining room. This is interesting because as Upton (1984, 66) explores, most processional plantation landscapes were designed to confirm the estate's white social hierarchy. Enslaved servants who were not subject to the same social expectations took at times even deliberately ignored such routes (Upton 1984, 66). Thus Mount Vernon's colonnades are significant because they created a prescribed *servant* route, legitimising their presence near the Mansion's polite spaces, but also discouraging them from deviating from the path and travelling across the polite space of the west lawn.

During this phase, routes throughout the homestead landscape became similarly formalised. Vaughan's plan shows fences, represented as solid lines, running along the North and South Lanes (fig 4.19). The South Lane functioned as a corridor, linking the work 'rooms' of washhouse, smokehouse and near the kitchen (fig 4.22). Across the estate on the North Lane, similar fences connected buildings directed related to the lives of the estate's enslaved population. Here the exterior corridor provided access to the spinning house, overseer's house and blacksmith's shop, before opening up to the enslaved servants' living area in the New Quarter. This neat, formalised arrangement was intended to convey a sense of orderly productivity (Manca 2012, 109).

However, the enslaved servants who traversed these areas were unlikely to have perceived their part in Washington's grand unified vision. Instead, they would have felt the impact of changes on a very individual level. The concentrated zones, which were not only delineated but also closed off by fences and gates, served to strongly police servant movement. The areas where servants worked (south) and lived (north) were on opposite ends of the homestead landscape. During daylight hours, most servants should be labouring on the southern side of the Mansion. In contrast, the enslaved community's north quarter would have been full of life in the evenings. These two hubs of servant life were firmly separated by the Mansion. To travel from one to another, servants passed through the polite space of the Circle Drive. Since we know that Washington increasingly eschewed visible enslaved people, it is easy to imagine

that a servant making the journey from one side to another outside of the accepted daily schedule would have felt the heavy gaze of the Mansion's elite inhabitants. This illustrates that the newly-created order evident in Mount Vernon's landscape at this time was not simply for aesthetic purposes but also created routes which controlled servant movement, minimised agency and imposed further oppression.

### *Outbuildings*

After the Mansion and dependency alterations, Washington turned his attention to the wider landscape, including buildings even farther away from the Mansion. Previously, utilitarian buildings had been scattered haphazardly on the outskirts of the Mansion's viewshed. During this phase they were redesigned and relocated in such a way as to relate more deliberately to the house, thus playing an important part in Washington's vision of a productive landscape (fig 4.22) (Manca 2012, 109). In 1782 a new stable barn and coach house were built at the end of the South Lane. The coach house is the last wood-frame building lining the South Lane. A large two-storey stable situated perpendicular to the Mansion sits in sharp contrast to the simplicity of the other South Lane buildings. It is constructed of brick and has a central roof pediment that echoes the Mansion's. The coach house and the barn replaced earlier structures destroyed by fire in 1781. Even though Washington's duties prevented him from personally overseeing construction, he remained involved in the planning process. He asked his foreman for the dimensions of the old, ruined buildings and used the information to design a larger barn that abutted the garden wall. The space between the barn and coach house functioned as a stable yard, which was further delineated by a gate at the end of the South Lane and 'repository for dung' to the east. Like the South Lane itself the stable yard was work space with boundaries that were clearly legible to enslaved servants. Drivers, stable boys, 'waggoners', and postillions would have spent long hours there (Abbot 1999, 527-542). Although this ostensibly formed another hub in the landscape of Mount Vernon's enslaved servants, here the social boundaries blur. Washington was particularly proud of his horses and mules, and frequently showed them to visitors. During these times, this yard became an extension of the polite landscape, illustrating the fluidity of the white landscape even as Washington worked to confine the movements of his enslaved workers.

Changes to this period's service architecture were heavily impacted by Washington's attempt to formalise the estate's buildings and landscape. The phase's reorganisation, construction and alterations were motivated by his desire for an ever more productive and efficient plantation (Pogue 2002, 6). These changes, along with ones in the house, in the form of additions and new dependencies focused on supporting his social status as the nation's first president. However, as this section has shown, these spaces were experienced and negotiated differently by, and therefore had other meanings in the lives of enslaved servants. Spaces within the house largely remained closed to enslaved people unless they were actively serving during an event. Even within the new family spaces in the south wing the presence of enslaved servants was carefully controlled to ensure privacy, through lobbies that provided access to the east and west sides of the house. Despite the Mansion's large size, the new west lobby, adjacent butler's pantry and butler's bedroom below were the only spaces specifically for service within the house. Therefore even though the house fully functioned for entertaining which depended on the presence of servants, there was literally no space for them, which like made being there even more uncomfortable.

Expanding this phase to encompass servant buildings such as the New Quarter shows that rather than two separate phases, construction at this time reflects a cohesive design vision. But my analysis has also suggested that enslaved servants would not have perceived the landscape this way. However, they would have felt the effects of Washington's careful spatial planning, which separated the homestead landscape into distinct working and living zones. Restricting where servants were allowed to be at particular times of day and clearly demarcating circulatory routes throughout the landscape limited servant agency and controlled their movement. Exploring these changes from the servant perspective has shown that the architectural orderliness usually defining Mount Vernon's later years had a far greater human impact than previously recognised.

#### 4.4 Conclusions

The methods applied earlier in the thesis to British houses have undoubtedly proven effective at Mount Vernon. Architectural and historical analyses have provided the means to question and shed new light on one of America's oldest and most well-studied country houses. Focusing on household dynamics and relationships between

the separate service buildings so common on early-American plantation landscapes has exposed a much closer connection than previously acknowledged: these buildings and the spaces between were essentially a country house service wing turned inside out. Expanding conventional phasing to encompass the wider homestead landscape has revealed that American service architecture developed from unique societal, political, and labour conditions. This is apparent when studying the service spaces as they developed from minimal vernacular buildings to more deliberately designed and placed permanent structures. These investigations have demonstrated that contrary to prior assumptions, Mount Vernon's domestic service model was only loosely connected to British traditions. The addition of a butler's pantry and moving the laundry facilities further away from polite spaces as seen in Phase 2 are recognisable characteristics of British service models like Kiplin Hall (Chapter 3). However, deeper analysis of individual household dynamics at Mount Vernon revealed the presence of an enslaved butler who was not given the same level of respect and trust as his British counterparts. Likewise, putting the washhouse relocation in the wider context of Mount Vernon's evolution suggests the change arose from vernacular traditions more than the sense of propriety prevalent in contemporary British society.

This chapter establishes a stronger contribution by enslaved servants to America's domestic service history than previously recognised. Spatial analysis has firmly connected service architecture design to owners' desire to control enslaved servants. This is particularly evident in the increasingly formalised spatial order of estate buildings throughout Mount Vernon's development. Servant movement was also delineated by circulatory routes that were previously interpreted by architectural historians as polite landscape design. Other service spaces conveyed a more overt message, such as those altered to ensure security (whether through sturdier construction like smokehouses, locks on the storehouse or direct supervision), which constantly reminded enslaved servants they were not trusted. However, the household's history also exposed how enslaved servants pushed the boundaries of their confinement, making room for personal effects in a subfloor pit in the House for Families, for example. Since they made up the majority of house servants at this time, the experiences of and attitudes towards enslaved peoples is incredibly important.



This detailed investigation has also exposed a more nuanced view of household relations in eighteenth-century American country houses. The master-servant relationship was only one dynamic within a complex system of social values based on personal freedom. The household also included hired white servants. Their presence and specialised skills conveyed the wealth and prestige of their employers – a symbol made more apparent by accommodating them in prominent locations, such as Mount Vernon’s gardener’s house. They were subservient to their masters, but as free men and women considered themselves superior to enslaved servants. Service architecture and household structures supported this difference. They were provided with better and more private accommodation, closer to their duties. Their work also included supervision of enslaved peoples which reflected a more trusting relationship with their employers, and gave them power over those who were not free. The importance attached to this distinction is a vital consideration in the history of American domestic service.

As potentially the most culturally-significant early-American house, Mount Vernon has a clear role in the development of American domestic service. Due to Washington’s contribution to the nation’s formation, his house, family and their lifestyle was emulated throughout the country. However, his meteoric rise was unanticipated and complicated. His struggles and in a way, America’s emerging cultural identity are apparent in Mount Vernon’s service architecture development. The house was not built by a person born into the gentry and it is not quite the cohesive reflection of the hero Washington became. Instead its vernacular roots are still apparent in the multiple small buildings surrounding the Mansion, in the lack of servant circulation within the building, and in uniquely American spaces like the smokehouse. Yet it also shows attempts to assert order, both architecturally and socially – building styles move from the humble washhouse on the South Lane to the two-storey kitchen with open colonnades near the Mansion, serving to outline carefully designed work and habitation zones. The next chapter explores how these early beginnings evolved throughout the nineteenth century. The lifespan of Kingscote in Newport, Rhode Island encompasses the American Civil War, a critical period in the nation’s development. It questions how attitudes towards servants evolved after emancipation and explores how service architecture developed in response. The case

study investigates the impact that the resulting shift in power base, from South to North had on domestic service systems, service spaces and servants' lived experiences.

## Chapter 5: Kingscote

### 5.1 Introduction

Newport, Rhode Island is famed for its opulent Gilded Age ‘cottages’; ostentatious mansions reflecting the flamboyant lifestyle of America’s late-nineteenth century elite. The most elaborate houses like the Breakers (1895) and Marble House (1888-1892) tend to outshine earlier examples. However, situated behind a simple, painted-wood fence at the upper end of fashionable Bellevue Avenue sits Kingscote, one of the city’s earliest and most significant country houses (fig 5.1). Construction started in 1839, at a time when the Southern states were still an economic and social powerhouse. Slavery had become a national institution and an engrained commercial practice. Large tobacco and cotton plantations had created an elite class who could escape from working plantations to the more temperate climates of resorts like Charleston (South Carolina), White Sulphur Springs (West Virginia) and Newport. The early- to mid-nineteenth century, marked an important moment in the history and function of the American country house, from the centre of plantation estates to personal and familial sanctuaries, like Kingscote.

Kingscote not only spans a period of shifting American ideals but has intriguing British similarities that present an opportunity to examine if and how British traditions were adapted in country house service architecture of this period. It was designed by Richard Upjohn, who migrated to America in 1829 (Gill 1991, 32). Although born and raised in England, he went on to make major contributions to the field of American architecture. Kingscote reflects compromises between design ideals based on an established class system and the needs of an owner accustomed to a household of enslaved servants. Unpacking this issue becomes even more important as ownership of the house changed after the American Civil War. A new class of American elite made wealthy by industry and trade rose to power. Country houses continued to be an important status symbol for these groups. The foreign-born domestic servants they employed therefore not only had to deal with the stigma attached to roles previously filled by enslaved servants, but social tensions with employers struggling to assert their newly-found social superiority. Accordingly, this chapter explores how Kingscote’s second owners negotiated changing social relations through service space alterations

and new hiring practices. Also encompassing the late-nineteenth century, the chapter finally explores the lasting architectural and social impact of America's contentious history of domestic service.

*New research and analysis*

Kingscote was inhabited remarkably by just two families prior to being bequeathed to the Preservation Society of Newport County in 1972 (Ferguson 1977, v). George Noble Jones built the house and occupied it with his family until the Civil War, when he sold it to a member of Newport's prominent King family.<sup>9</sup> The sprawling, grey wood-framed house is set within a small parcel of carefully landscaped property, entirely enclosed by a painted picket fence. Picturesque Gothic details create its quaint, *cottage orné* appearance. The interior of the house is interpreted to showcase the King family's years of occupation, from porcelain collected during William Henry King's lucrative years in the China trade to stuffed chintz armchairs added during the twentieth-century occupancy of Gwendolen (King) Armstrong and her daughter. With such a detailed focus on the collections of the King family, it is not surprising that Kingscote's early years have largely remained unstudied.

This chapter applies an archaeological approach to Kingscote's construction and phasing, building on preliminary research carried out during a research fellowship at the site in 2015 (Keithan 2015). It considers the social implications of the building's early configuration, exploring adaptations to accommodate a household that included both enslaved and hired servants. The experiences of both groups are examined through analysis of the spaces they occupied. Additionally, Kingscote's complex household dynamics are considered within the wider context of changing American social ideals as the nation moved closer to the Civil War.

Kingscote's primary value to architectural historians is considered to be its American Gothic Revival ornamentation and the innovative interior design details of the dining room, designed by preeminent American architects McKim, Mead and White (for

---

<sup>9</sup> The house was not called Kingscote (an abbreviation of 'King's Cottage') until 1880, when Mary Smith was paid \$15 for 'washing curtains at "Kingscote", name by which Bowery St. house is hereafter to be designated' (NRP Vol. 33). For clarity this thesis refers to the house by this name throughout.

example see Gill 1991). These aesthetic elements reflect the status of Kingscote's owners as members of Newport's social elite. However, despite accounting for over a third of the building's footprint, Kingscote's service spaces remain unstudied and off limits, used only for storage and caretaker accommodation. Unlike nearby houses such as The Elms (1901) or The Breakers (1895) that appear, superficially at least, to follow British exemplars with clearly-defined service wings, the nature of Kingscote's early service architecture is unclear. Consequently, servants remain invisible in Kingscote's current story and interpretation.

This study seeks to address this issue by exploring the changing nature of Kingscote's service spaces and the lived experience of its servants. It explores how the evolving social status of Kingscote's owners within Newport was structured and reflected in the architectural and spatial configuration of master-servant relations, and how this changed over time, as the families became increasingly prominent members of local society. Kingscote also affords an opportunity to explore the experience of immigrant servants. How did they interact, both with their fellow countrymen/women and with servants of other nationalities? What cultural attitudes did they bring with them from home or previous service experience? As with Mount Vernon, Kingscote is argued to provide a valuable insight into the evolution of distinctly American service traditions, reflected in country house service architecture. This chapter follows a similar structure to previous case studies, beginning with a description of the house which is then set within its geographical and historical context in order to reveal the circumstances impacting its construction. Three building campaigns are then explored through the thematic framework of service facilities, accommodation, circulation and outbuildings as deployed within previous case studies.

#### *The current house: a brief description*

Today, modern development means that the Kingscote estate is bounded by streets on all its four sides. Although Bellevue Avenue, to the east is the major thoroughfare, Kingscote is accessed from the south, off Bowery Street (fig 5.2). Visitors entering the main gate are presented with a view of the building's southwest aspect (fig 5.1). From this perspective, all of the wood-framed building's impressive, asymmetrically-massed wings are visible. Proceeding from this point, visitors are drawn closer into

the carriage circle, where the south, entrance façade becomes increasingly dominant (fig 5.3).

Kingscote is an early example of the American Gothic Revival style, and the movement's innovations, contributions to architecture, and architect Richard Upjohn's interpretations of it are well-trodden territory (Downing and Scully 1970; Gill 1991; Yarnall 2005). Kingscote is a particularly important example of Upjohn's work, in which its asymmetrical massing, scale and ornamentation flow successfully into the surrounding landscape. The building's architectural detailing and paint scheme visually unify the disparate sections of the house and somehow make this relatively modest building seem larger. Although the flush-clapboard siding is currently grey, historic paint analysis has revealed earlier schemes of sand-coloured and later green schemes of paint. Like Mount Vernon and the nearby Redwood Library and Athenaeum, Kingscote's original siding was rusticated, wood with sand-flecked paint that was scored to resemble a more expensive stone building. Red shingles are used across the building's undulating roofline, interrupted by small dormer windows and battlements. Gables are ornamented with serpentine bargeboards and carved finials. The ground floor windows throughout and upper-storey windows on the east wing are topped with heavy drip mouldings. Other upper-storey windows contain diamond-paned casements.

The south and east wings are the most elaborate in the building and contained the original family rooms. The main entrance is through a covered porch, under a gabled dormer in the middle of the south elevation. The four-centred arched front door is flanked by stained glass windows and sheltered between a small battlemented projection to the west, and a full-height three-sided bay at the end of the east wing. A covered porch protrudes from the entire length of the east façade facing Bellevue Avenue (fig 5.4). It is accessible through full-length windows that slide into the walls of the double parlours. This unusual feature is more commonly seen in Southern houses, as it creates cool cross breezes throughout the house. The tall east wing is balanced by an equally high two-and-a-half-storey, three-sided structure in the middle of the complex, added by the architects, McKim, Mead and White (fig 5.5). It features elements like an unusually and unnecessarily large gable-end chimney stack and vast expanses of wall tiled with Tiffany glass.

The two north wings become both architecturally simpler and shorter as they move away from the highly elaborate family areas (fig 5.6). With no projections, only a few dormers and two storeys, their plainness clearly denotes their inferior status and servant use. They recede from view and have fewer and smaller openings. Unlike Mount Vernon, Kiplin Hall and other houses discussed in this thesis, there is no indication of the existence of an exterior work yard. The remains of a well and pump suggest the north lawn was used for outdoor service activities. The service areas are only partially visible as they are shielded from the main drive by large, established bushes. Despite this, the service areas are not, and do not seem to have been intended to be, invisible. Instead, they are visually minimised, receding into the background yet still contributing to the overall impression of the house's expansiveness.

Continuing this pattern, the carriage house further recedes, sitting in the northwest corner of the property (fig 5.7). Although built in the late-nineteenth century, it is similar in style to the main house, with a sympathetic decorative scheme. The simple wood-frame building is painted grey with decorative bargeboard on the dormer gables. An octagonal cupola recalls the tallest areas of the main house. Like the service wings, this utilitarian building is located out of direct sight from the house, but still harmonises with its architecture and the surrounding landscape.

### *Geographical context*

Newport is one of three towns on the island commonly known as Aquidneck.<sup>10</sup> Its advantageous position on the southern tip of the island, nestled in Narragansett Bay enabled Newport to become one of the nation's leading seaports by the third quarter of the eighteenth century (Gill 1991, 30). The early development of the city was closely linked to these maritime connections, including slavery. Over sixty percent of the nation's slave passages originated from Rhode Island during the eighteenth century (Coughtry 1981; Fitts 1998; Lemons 2002). Despite state legislature outlawing slavery as early as 1652, Newport's merchants were deeply enmeshed in the triangle trade of Caribbean sugar, rum and enslaved Africans (Brown University Steering

---

<sup>10</sup> The island's official name is Rhode Island, but to avoid confusion with the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, which is commonly abbreviated to Rhode Island, the island alone is called by its alternate name, Aquidneck.

Committee on Slavery and Justice 2006, 9). By 1764, Newport had 22 distilleries producing rum to exchange for slaves (Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice 2006, 10). Therefore, although Newport was geographically located in the North, the city's large enslaved population and presence of surrounding plantations aligned it more closely to Southern cultural traditions, and throughout the eighteenth century, most of its businesses were connected to slavery in some way (Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice 2006, 9). The British recognised Newport's strategic and economic value, occupying it during the American Revolution from 1776-1779. The 1807 Congressional Act abolishing the Transatlantic slave trade severely impacted the economy (Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice 2006, 22). The loss of half the island's population in the subsequent economic downturn preserved much of the eighteenth-century waterfront (Onorato 2007, 14).

Whilst many American cities experiencing similar setbacks revived as industrial centres, Newport's lack of rivers and railway connections mitigated against subsequent industrial development (Gill 1991, 32). In the nineteenth century, the city reinvented itself as a coastal resort. It was well-positioned between major metropolitan areas like Boston and New York, accessible by ferry or private yacht. The island's sheltered position and rolling landscape created a pleasant climate of mild winters and warm summers with cooling cross breezes. Seasonal visitors prompted a building boom of resort hotels, rental cottages and grand private estates. The island's small size and limited population fostered a sense of exclusivity that at its height actively affected America's social order. This sense of exclusivity is still evident today. Known as the 'Sailing Capital of the World', the 'City by the Sea' and the 'Queen of Summer Resorts', the population swells in the summer months. Newport's distinctive, rich history is argued to have created the 'densest collection of notable architecture – representing the widest historical span – of any American city' (Onorato 2007, 13).

### *Historical background*

Kingscote's early position within the city of Newport is important to consider, especially in light of significant changes to the urban area over time. The house lies well outside the historic eighteenth-century village, on what was an isolated ridge in the centre of the island. It was originally accessed by dirt tracks that later became



Bellevue Avenue and Bowery Street. The house was originally surrounded by farms and open land, with expansive ocean views (Ferguson 1977, 2). Like other wealthy Southerners, George Noble Jones was attracted to Newport because its climate provided welcome relief from plantations plagued in the summer months by yellow fever and malaria (Ferguson 1977, 3). Its elevated aspect and large windows took advantage of the island's cross breezes, whilst a nearby marsh provided ideal waterfowl-hunting conditions, with few mosquitos (Ferguson 1977, 2). Kingscote's original context was therefore rural, connecting the house and its occupants with nature and affording them a retreat from the plantation and the bustle of town life.

In the mid-nineteenth century the city grew, welcoming slave plantation owners as well as the elite of New York and Boston seeking to escape the noise and grime of growing cities (Onorato 2007, 14). Newport quickly became a fashionable coastal resort, resulting in a wave of hotel building. By 1844 Ocean House, an imposing four-storey Greek Revival hotel had been built opposite Kingscote, disrupting its sense of rural isolation (Yarnall 2005, 34). Bellevue Avenue subsequently became the locus for Newport's new resort community. Although the American Civil War affected building between 1861-1865, it did not halt construction. As the source of America's wealth shifted from agriculture to industry, plantation owners were replaced by the nation's new industrial elite. However, unlike their predecessors, whose plantation houses were the focus of investment and who were content to lodge seasonally in hotels, these newly-wealthy industrialists were determined to make grand architectural statements that were impossible in the context of crowded city lots. These were the 'cottages'<sup>11</sup> of Newport's Gilded Age; huge mansions on small estates hidden from view behind high stone walls. They functioned in similar ways to British country houses of the same period, offering their owners periodic respite from city living. Kingscote is often overlooked because of its position amongst such grandeur. However, closer examination of its phasing exposes a story which once again reveals how distinctive and different the expectations and lived experience of American service architecture could be.

---

<sup>11</sup> The term 'cottage' is frequently used to describe Newport's nineteenth-century mansions. This does not refer to the building's size, but rather seasonal use, contrasting with 'villas', which were used year-round (Yarnall 2005, 39).

## 5.2 Phase One: 1839-1864

This phase encompasses Kingscote's earliest years including changes made during the design process. Studies of this phase are dominated by art historical approaches highlighting architect Richard Upjohn's fame, the American Gothic Revival style and Newport's first 'cottage' (Downing and Scully 1970; Onorato 2007; Yarnall 2005). In contrast, the buildings-led approach used here aids in positive identification of original components and a previously unknown building campaign (Keithan 2015). The section asks what motivated these changes and how the household adapted to them. This phase includes the entire occupancy of its builder, George Noble Jones and his family, from planning to sale. Jones is customarily presented as a typical seasonal Newporter, escaping plantation drudgery (Ferguson 1977). This biographical approach only acknowledges his Southern connections as a framework for Newport's attraction, and tangentially his source of wealth. This section explores the extent to which his Southern lifestyle influenced Kingscote's architecture and household dynamics. It re-evaluates Jones' relationship with Upjohn, stripping away the prominence of the architect's stylistic contributions and revealing compromises made to meet the family's functional needs. This provides a platform from which to investigate the household's labour structure.

Additionally, historians only anecdotally note the presence of Jones' enslaved servants, instead preferring to focus on later phases more closely aligning with British service traditions (Ferguson 1977, 14). Mapping documentary sources like plantation records, correspondence and personal recollections, onto the spaces therefore makes critical contributions to understanding the interaction of enslaved and hired immigrant servants in the first half of the nineteenth century. It helps break down the sharp North-South cultural divide to which scholars continue to cling. Exploration of the tensions between Jones' Southern roots and his Northern proclivities, and how Kingscote's architecture and staff evolved to meet the changing cultural norms he was subject to enhances understanding of the complex regional interplay during a crucial time in American history.

### *George Noble Jones*

George Noble Jones was from a prominent Georgia family. In 1733 his ancestor Noble Jones emigrated from England to aid James Oglethorpe in surveying and planning the

city of Savannah (Phillips and Glunt 2006, xii). He was awarded property in 1736, where he established the family's fortune by constructing Wormsloe plantation (Phillips and Glunt 2006, xiii). In the nineteenth century, George Noble Jones continued the family tradition, owning multiple plantations in Georgia and Florida. Since they were a significant source of income, he invested in skilled overseers to effectively operate the plantations during his absences (Phillips and Glunt 2006, xiii). Whilst correspondence suggests Jones was concerned about the treatment of labourers, there is no indication the native Georgian questioned the system that enslaved them (Phillips and Glunt 2006, xiii). Additionally, his personal lifestyle demonstrates a preference for more socially connected locations like his Savannah townhouse, Europe and Newport. This paints the picture of a man who benefitted from deeply embedded Southern attitudes, using his privilege to physically distance himself from the disagreeable aspects of daily plantation management.

Jones likely met his first wife Delia Tudor Gardiner in Newport, where her family also vacationed. Even though the Gardiners' New England roots were as deep as Jones' were in Georgia, cultural differences do not seem to have been an issue (Ferguson 1977, 5). He remained close to his in-laws even after his wife's death, attesting to their good relationship (Ferguson 1977, 7). His parents-in-law had a Gothic Revival style house called Oaklands built by architect Richard Upjohn, who Jones subsequently hired to design his own Newport summer cottage in 1839. Oaklands, located in Maine is often overlooked by architectural historians but shares an architectural vocabulary with Kingscote that should not be discounted. Like Kingscote, Oaklands has four-point-arched openings, heavy drip moulding and battlements indicative of Upjohn's interpretation of the Gothic Revival style in his native Britain (Gill 1991, 34; Keithan 2015). However, differences in design and architectural detail of the two houses reflect their distinctive purposes. Whereas Oakland's squat, minimally decorated, hip-roofed solidity suited year-round habitation, Kingscote's delicate scale and gables dripping with finials and bargeboards aligned with Newport's informal resort atmosphere. Nevertheless, its architecture was sufficiently innovative that it is still widely considered one of Newport's first mansions (Yarnall 2005, 39).

Jones initially hired Upjohn to design a seasonal retreat that would accommodate himself, his mother and two unmarried sisters. He requested luxuries like a large

parlour and unusually early indoor plumbing (Ferguson 1977, 2). The building included a servant wing, for Jones' hired Irish servants ('Family number 667' 1850). However, Upjohn's design also had to meet the expectations of a Southern household travelling with enslaved servants, as explored below. Additionally, by completion in 1841, the household had changed. In 1840 Jones married Mary Wallace Savage Nuttall, a wealthy widow who owned a plantation and 80 slaves (Ferguson 1977, 9). Mary was a typical Southern belle, who was known for opulent entertaining, which Jones also enjoyed (Bragg 1999, 79-80). Upon marriage he further added to the family's assets by purchasing the Florida plantation of Mary's late husband, which included enslaved labourers (Ferguson 1977, 9). The new household also included Mary's daughter by her first marriage and the couple's first son (Bragg 1999, 87). Period descriptions depict a vibrant household, enjoyed by the couple's five children, extended family and guests throughout their ownership (Ferguson 1977, 10). The house accommodated amateur theatricals and tea parties, whilst the surroundings facilitated outdoor activities like riding and fowling (Ferguson 1977, 2, 11). During the years before the Civil War, Kingscote supported the complex cultural dynamics embodied by the household: a Southern family, served by both enslaved and hired servants, part of a society more connected by wealth and elite status than regional attitudes.

### *Facilities*

In September 1839, Jones rejected preliminary drawings as too small (Ferguson 1977, 1). The final design therefore incorporated a separate service wing, attached to the northwest corner of the main house (figs 5.8, 5.9, 5.10). A long corridor separated the spaces from the main house and provided access to the dining room and main stair hall. The relationship between house and servant spaces aligned with contemporary trends advising service areas 'of less height than the main building, divided into two stories, with sleeping-rooms on the [upper] floor' (Downing 1852, 272). The design clearly illustrates the importance of spatial representations of the master-servant hierarchy in houses without separate service buildings. Although previous scholarship mentions the final design's larger size, more significance is attributed to Gothic ornamentation, bolstering its claim as one of America's first Gothic Revival homes (Ferguson 1977, 8). However, a surviving working sketch reveals the service wing was an area of considerable design effort (fig 5.11). The addition of three rooms and a

service corridor substantially enlarged the footprint. Consequently, it was this expansion, not decorative ornamentation that enabled Kingscote to function as a fully-staffed home, thus turning a simple cottage into Newport's first country house.

A detailed 1850 map shows a small extension on the northwest side of the service wing, added sometime after the house's completion (fig 5.12). It likely connected to the kitchen through a door that replaced a window in the west wall of the original plan. Wear patterns on the door's threshold give evidence for early insertion (Keithan 2015). Although it no longer survives, this change is notable as a direct response to the family's actual lifestyle. The house was designed for a family of four adults and their servants, but by 1850 was housing three adults and four children ('Family number 667' 1850). These additional family members literally pushed servants to the outskirts of the house, prompting an expansion of the wing. In addition to uncounted enslaved servants travelling with family, eight servants were employed to maintain the house ('Family number 667' 1850). This seems like an excessive show of wealth for a family with an abundant source of free labour but is more indicative of a *laissez-faire* perspective of servants as a labour commodity. In a time when tensions were mounting between abolitionist Northerners and slave-owning Southerners like Jones, it was more convenient to fit in by hiring servants from Newport's Irish immigrant community. Such servants could also remain with the house during periods when it was let out. In contrast, Jones staffed his Savannah household exclusively with enslaved peoples ('Family number 1823' 1860). However, regardless of the political climate, the family were more comfortable having their personal needs met by enslaved servants, who travelled with them (Bragg 1999, 83). Due to their training and enslaved status, these servants were potentially more trusted with the bodies of the elite in ways that hired help were not due to their ability to leave employment.

The kitchen was located in the northwest corner of the servant wing, farthest from family spaces (fig 5.8). All food-related tasks were entirely contained within the 224-square-foot kitchen and adjoining 42-square-foot pantry space. This is a marked difference from Mount Vernon's 800-square-foot kitchen building, one of multiple food-related buildings discussed in Chapter 4. Kingscote's role as a seasonal retreat, instead of a working estate, did not require as many service space types. Newport's strong trade connections ensured ready access to many goods and services not

available to isolated plantations. Technological innovations included kitchen stoves, which replaced massive open fireplaces ubiquitous in eighteenth-century kitchens. As the prevalence of large houses in the North increased, they followed the regional trend for interior kitchens. Upjohn, who worked exclusively in the North, regularly included interior kitchens in his residential designs like Oaklands and the Edward King House (1845-1847), also in Newport. However, the location of Kingscote's kitchen is notable. It was in a separate service wing, rather than being part of an integrated service area like other Northern homes. Kingscote's kitchen capped the end of the service wing instead of being centrally placed like British models. With three exterior walls (including the pantry), it was therefore a compromise between increasingly popular interior kitchens and the exterior plantation kitchens to which Jones was accustomed. Furthermore, the absence of a cook's room or bedroom offers the possibility that the Joneses travelled with an enslaved cook familiar with their tastes. Therefore, this added separation might have functioned as an important social divide.

Laundry was washed in the basement, located under the original dining room (currently the library), which marks a significant departure from plantation washhouses. An in-built circular alcove contains the remains of a firebox and mount for a large caldron, indicating construction contemporaneous with the house's foundation. A basement pump provided water. This well-engineered element, along with Jones' uncommon request for indoor bathrooms prevented frozen and burst pipes in the colder northern climate (Ferguson 1977, 7). Additionally, locating the laundry in the basement instead of a separate building saved valuable outdoor space since the property was originally less than two acres (Ferguson 1977, 1). With rapid construction of nearby hotels and buildings, a basement laundry also offered the Joneses another advantage: they were able to literally avoid airing their dirty laundry. Although differing significantly from earlier American country house laundries, it offered a practical solution to Kingscote's location and compact estate.

As architectural historians rightly point out, Kingscote's status as a private country house sets it apart during time when Newport enjoyed a resort hotel culture (Gill 1991, 30). However, its value goes far beyond elaborate serpentine bargeboard and dormer finials. Although the house's original design has many elements that appear to be taken from British or northern architectural trends, careful analysis suggests a more complex

relationship between the building and its inhabitants. The original service layout and early changes are significant because they are a record of compromise between the stylistic repertoire of a Northern architect and the endemic attitudes and practical needs of a Southern plantation owner.

### *Accommodation*

Jones asked Upjohn to include ‘two or three sleeping apartments for servants’ in his revised plans (MssCol 3115/b11992504/13/3). The east attic is commonly believed to be Upjohn’s solution, and Ferguson (1977, 14) cites room divisions, ventilation and built-in cupboards as evidence. However, physical analysis reveals the attic’s ventilating dormers and rooms divisions were later additions, as examined later in this chapter. In contrast, the service wing’s first floor included four rooms separated from the family spaces by a corridor with a staircase connecting to the mirroring ground-floor service corridor. Analysis of the woodwork suggests these rooms were originally intended for servants (Keithan 2015). Whilst the trefoil motif on the doors resembles other first-floor rooms, they are constructed of painted, flat panels rather than carved, stained wood like family bedrooms (figs 5.13, 5.14). Likewise, their moulding is simpler, painted, and does not include the distinctive drip mould that caps doors and windows in all family spaces. These architectural characteristics were designed to convey an unambiguous social message understandable by all occupants, clearly marking the first-floor service wing rooms for servant use.

Even though this arrangement radically differed from the detached servant lodgings common in early country houses like Jones’ own plantations, he approved the design. This suggests he may have planned to staff the house with hired servants, who would have expected a certain type and level of accommodation as part of their labour contract. The rooms adequately fit the majority of the eight servants the family subsequently hired, many of whom worked in the house (‘Family number 667’ 1850). However, despite the original intent servants did not use these rooms during the family’s occupancy. By the time Jones arrived in 1840, his mother and sister were already ensconced (Ferguson 1977, 9). Rooms required shuffling to accommodate his new wife and stepdaughter. It is therefore likely the original servant bedrooms were appropriated by family at this time, and as more children were born. The service wing addition discussed above could have answered the call for servant lodging. Attached

to the service wing without interfering with family rooms, it maintained a configuration recognisable to Irish servants. Furthermore, servant accommodation located at a distance from family spaces was an arrangement Jones was comfortable with due to his familiarity with plantation architecture.

In addition to the hired servants immediately displaced by this change, enslaved servants also required lodging. The Jones women travelled with enslaved personal servants, and Mary once took three such servants simply to visit a friend (Hoffman and Hoffman 2009, 39). Enslaved servants also travelled back and forth from Jones' plantations with careful records of their journeys noted (see for example Phillips and Glunt 2006, 215). These servants were not afforded the quality lodging hired servants insisted on. Only 40 years prior house servants commonly slept wherever they could, including the basement as illustrated by Mount Vernon's butler. It is therefore possible that the attic, conveniently located above family bedrooms, was considered sufficient for enslaved servants even though it was not light and airy enough for paid help. These changes significantly altered the neat social order of Upjohn's original design. Through a combination of both architectural alterations and compromise in use, the house continued to function for the family, resulting in an informal, busy and almost chaotic atmosphere noted by visitors (Ferguson 1977, 13).

### *Circulation*

Corridors on the servant wing's ground and first floors were intended to provide efficient circulation (figs 5.8, 5.9). They were positioned so as to connect service spaces whilst separating them from family spaces. As discussed in Chapter 2, servant corridors were common in British country houses from the mid-eighteenth century. It is therefore easy to overlook the significance of a servant corridor in this early-nineteenth century American country house. The economic power centres were still shifting from South to North, and Southern models dominated. Bespoke servant corridors were rare in country houses since most service spaces were in separate buildings. As at Mount Vernon, servants entered directly into family spaces and shared circulatory routes within the house to carry out their duties. However, the presence and location of Kingscote's interior corridor, which was sandwiched between service and family areas also consolidated servant movement, minimising the need for direct supervision. This architectural arrangement would also have been familiar to Jones'



hired Irish servants, who required less training, behaving in accordance with the established British class model they were familiar with.

Servant rooms were accessed via doors in the corridors' north wall, whilst doors in the south wall of the ground floor corridor led to family spaces. There, a door at the east end opened onto the central stair hall, providing access to family rooms without moving through them and causing disruption. A door across from the kitchen gave access to the dining room, ensuring the shortest possible route into a service-intensive room. Curiously, the west end's exterior door does not open into a service yard, but rather the edge of the south lawn. Considering the Joneses' lifestyle offers an explanation. During their occupation, informal entertaining frequently included outdoor activities (Ferguson 1977, 11). Outdoor connections were also an important part of their southern lifestyle and are evident in Kingscote's architecture. The tall parlour windows recess into the walls, opening onto the full-length east porch. Likewise, the front porch's large doors were frequently opened, giving access onto the south lawn. In this context, exterior areas functioned like rooms, with the south and east lawn for family use, whilst the west and north yards were adjacent to the service wing and stables. The service corridor's exterior door can therefore be interpreted as an easily accessible door to serve a family space.

A service staircase rising from the basement laundry to the original first-floor servant bedrooms provided vertical circulation. However, whereas the ground-floor service corridor provided direct access to the family space of the dining room, the first-floor corridor arrangement was designed to preserve family privacy. Servants had to first travel the length of the service corridor, then up a short flight of steps, then into the main stair hall from which the family bedrooms were accessible (fig 5.9). Through a height discrepancy caused by differing ceiling heights in each wing, the service wing was literally lower than the family rooms, sending an unequivocal message about the status of each area's occupants. The Joneses may have perceived this differentiation as particularly important since the practice of lodging enslaved servants in separate buildings was so engrained that even townhouse properties in cities like Savannah included outbuildings.

The neat social divisions created by these circulatory patterns were interrupted when the family appropriated the service bedrooms to accommodate their growing numbers, as discussed above. Although the first floor was no longer service space, the service corridor remained the best option for access to family bedrooms, forcing hired and enslaved servants to share circulatory space with the family. Although the attic's exact use is not clear, it was certainly a servant space (fig 5.10). Access necessitated travelling the length of the service corridor, passing by the new family bedrooms. The family's need for comfort prompted a change in room use at the expense of clear social order within the architecture. Whilst the original design provided separate circulation that was easily understood by immigrant and enslaved servants alike, later arrangements were much messier, which consequently impacted dynamics within the diverse household.

### *Outbuildings*

Kingscote's original stable was located in the north-western corner of the estate, but no longer survives. Cartographic evidence shows that it was efficiently connected to the house and major thoroughfares despite its isolated location (fig 5.12). A drive connected the stables to the turning circle at the house's main entrance, allowing visitors to be dropped off first. King Street and the track that became Bellevue Avenue were conveniently accessible without passing the house. Built 'in the form of a whimsical wooden Gothic chapel,' the architecture harmonised with the main house (Ferguson 1977, 9). The estate's design is lauded as one of the first American examples of the picturesque (Downing and Scully 1970, 134). The harmonious relationship between buildings and landscapes heralded a new age of American architecture in the nineteenth century. The stables' design contributed to this, visually anchoring the property's boundaries to the house, and acting as a focal point in the landscape.

The Joneses owned a barouche, typically drawn by two horses (Ferguson 1977, 10). Travelling in this stylish, open vehicle clearly asserted the family's social status. As they grew, Jones' children enjoyed riding across the island to picnic (Ferguson 1977, 10). Such equestrian activities were an essential part of Newport society life, creating opportunities for the elite to see and be seen. Even today, the Newport Coaching Weekend draws thousands of spectators annually, attesting to its lasting intangible heritage and strong association with Newport society. The majority of the three hired

menservants in the Jones household in 1850 likely worked in the stables ('Family number 667' 1850). By this time, many abolitionist Bostonians summered in Newport, creating an increasingly volatile environment for Southerners like Jones (Ferguson 1977, 15). Due to the outdoor nature of their duties, coachmen and grooms were much more visible than their indoor counterparts. Employing white immigrants for these higher profile roles, instead of using enslaved Black servants helped eased tensions and served a critical political purpose. Horses, carriages, menservants and the stables were therefore an essential part of establishing and maintaining the Joneses' position within Newport's evolving society.

The original stable was removed shortly after the northern portion of the property was sold in 1856 (Historic American Buildings Survey 1969, 4). A new road, called Jones Avenue was constructed to delineate the property's latest north boundary. By this time the surrounding area had substantially changed from the isolated rural retreat Jones had originally enjoyed. Neighbour Edward King engaged Upjohn to build his house in 1845, disrupting Kingscote's westerly views, and the vast Ocean House Hotel blocked the east. Bellevue Avenue was completed in 1853 and country houses like William Wetmore's Chateau-sur-Mer (1852) were being built by a new type of owner like Wetmore and King: wealthy merchants who made their fortunes in the China trade (Yarnall 2005, 53). Consequently, Jones let Kingscote for most of 1857-1858, returning in 1858-1859, but was in Savannah again by 1860 ('Family number 1823' 1860; Hoffman and Hoffman 2009, 220). Since there is no indication that he ever rebuilt the stables, it is possible that even at this early stage he considered selling. Jones' could have hired transportation during this time in Newport. This was such common practice that a contemporary remarked, 'It was no unusual thing to meet there a company of twenty or thirty carriages from Newport, including Sam Place's hack, which was in constant requisition in summer' (Peterson 1853, 259).

Kingscote's stables and their connection to the landscape, household and wider trends in American country house building have largely gone unexplored due to their early demolition. However, the decreased size of the grounds and subsequent removal of the stables corresponds to a shift in the role of the estate in American country house life. Whilst Gowans' (1964, 327) view of an antebellum world that was 'rural, individualistic, and naively romantic' is problematic, as illustrated by Mount Vernon's

complex history in Chapter 4, the assertion that the Civil War ushered in a ‘harder, brittler... world of high finance and heavy industry’ which impacted living is evident in the rise of a new elite class whose business ventures were based in large urban centres instead of being tied to the land like their agrarian predecessors. Whilst resort towns like Newport remained popular places to retreat from noisy, dirty city life, large hotels like Ocean House, built across the street from Kingscote c1844 as mentioned above, had fallen out of favour (Yarnall 2005, 34). However, Aslet (1990, 242) connects the rise in post-Civil War country houses on smaller properties to a continued American penchant for resort towns, suggesting that private mansions on modest estates perfectly met the needs of the country’s rising elite by providing the convenience and social opportunities of resort culture with the privacy and luxury of country estates. Consequently, even though land was no longer the primary source of income and properties were reduced and had fewer outbuildings, the houses themselves continued to convey the wealth and power of the America’s elite.

In conclusion, this phase clearly shows evidence of influences from earlier American traditions like those seen at Mount Vernon – in both the presence of enslaved servants and spatial organisation. Kingscote’s service wing was only minimally attached to the main house, instead jutting out towards the back. Additionally, the entire wing was separated from family spaces with a very clearly defined service corridor that effectively insulated family spaces from the house’s working spaces. Later, when the family expanded and co-opted servant spaces for their own use, the presence of enslaved servants is more difficult to track. The same social hierarchy evident at plantations, which put hired servants above enslaved servants, makes it likely that the enslaved servants that travelled with the Joneses were pushed to the outskirts of the house – either in the new northwest addition to the service wing, or in the dim, airless attic.

Kingscote’s early years also show the beginning of new trends like hiring immigrant domestics and spatial configurations that met their expectations. The freedom that hired Irish servants enjoyed afforded them the ability to only take up employment in houses with service space arrangements they were comfortable with. These likely would have been informed by established British models like an attached service wing (as opposed to separate buildings seen in the South) and servant bedrooms (not

barrack-style accommodation). The inclusion of these types of spaces in Kingscote's original design reflects both the architect's comfort with British design whilst also suggesting that Jones had always planned to staff the house with at least some hired servants, potentially in an attempt to fit in with Newport society, which was becoming a nationally-renown resort city attracting people from a variety of locales and differing views towards slavery. The service spaces are therefore a mix of American traditions and adaptations made for newly-emerging trends.

### 5.3 Phase Two: 1864-1880

Early in the Joneses' occupation Kingscote was infrequently let, usually to people whose own cottages were under construction (Ferguson 1977, 15). However, rising tensions between North and South<sup>12</sup> throughout the late-1850s increasingly kept the family in Georgia and they let the house more often. In 1861, the outbreak of the American Civil War severed Jones' property interests. Newport aligned with the Union (North) and was therefore physically and ideologically cut off from the southern plantations from which Jones gained his wealth. Remaining in Newport would have necessitated forfeiting his southern properties to the Confederacy (South). Jones initiated a complex set of legal transactions to safeguard Kingscote by transferring it to his first wife's family, who remained in the North (Historic American Buildings Survey 1969, 2). However, the war caused Jones significant financial difficulty and he sold his Newport property to William Henry King in 1864. The property abutted the Edward King property, which belonged to William's brother and included an Upjohn-designed mansion built between 1845-1847. Whilst the Kings were a prominent Newport family, William Henry was minimally involved in Newport society, and only at Kingscote for a short time. The house was rented to his nephew David King who made alterations to the house in an attempt to insert his own new family into Newport's elite social set. During the early years of his occupation, David made minor alterations that were so well integrated that they remained unidentified until recently (Keithan 2015). The examination of these changes focuses on how such subtle alterations to

---

<sup>12</sup> The American Civil War (1861-1865) highlighted the North-South cultural divide in the country at that time. The South (Confederacy) attempted to protect slavery and the elite lifestyles it enabled by breaking away from the country, whilst the North (Union), which did not have as much political or economic power aimed to maintain the unified states and abolish slavery in order to equalise power.

service spaces consciously helped shape the family's social status and how household dynamics and relationships contributed to and were impacted by that process.

### *Estate of William Henry King*

William Henry King lived in New York City after making a fortune in the lucrative China trade, with which he bought Kingscote. It is possible that the purchase of Kingscote was influenced by William Henry's brother Edward, who was the owner of vast tracts of land in Newport (Yarnall 2005, 74). With the former Jones property in William Henry's ownership, all of the land between Spring Street and Bellevue Avenue belonged to members of the King family. During his occupancy William Henry employed the fashionable interior designer Leon Marcotte to carry out minor redecorations (Historic American Buildings Survey 1969, 4). The 1865 Rhode Island census records only two servants in his household – an Irish maid and a black male servant ('Household number 2440' 1865). Focus on cosmetic improvements plus a small staff suggests he did not use the house for entertaining. Regardless, he was not able to spend much time at Kingscote due to a mental breakdown and subsequent institutionalisation in 1866 (Ferguson 1977, 17). He spent the rest of his life in McLean Asylum in Massachusetts. Consequently, his estate was put into probate with court-appointed guardians who were required to keep meticulous records that contain many useful entries concerning the subsequent changes to Kingscote.

In 1875 William Henry's nephew David King Jr and his new bride Ella began renting the house. Like the Kings, Ella's family the Rives, were a prominent Newport family. Although David had previously expressed distinct disinterest in settling in Newport, Ella found Kingscote charming (Collins 2003, 5; Ferguson 1977, 19). Like his uncle William Henry, David became wealthy in the China trade. Fortunes from commerce were increasingly more common, and a marked difference from the wealth that America's (and Britain's) earlier elite class had gained from land. Consequently, late-nineteenth century American country houses like Kingscote were able to showcase upper-class status without the encumbrance of large estates. Renting Kingscote during the summer months allowed David and Ella the opportunity to begin building their own identity as a socially elite couple within the community that their families' established positions paved the way into. They were to become the single most influential occupants in Kingscote's history.

David and Ella began to make changes to the house to suit their own lifestyle as early as 1876. They had two children between 1876-1878. Additionally, social activities at this time were significantly different from the earlier antebellum era. Relaxed outdoor events gave way to increasingly formal evening dinners and balls. Consequently, the Kings' alterations were centred on entertaining: a small addition to the dining room and updated service areas (figs 5.15, 5.16, 5.17). Their choice of popular Newport architectural firm George C Mason and Son shows an attempt to follow local trends. Conversely, not choosing a nationally-recognised architect indicates restrictions and restraint. The fact that the house did not belong to them and they were required to get funds and approval from William Henry's estate guardians to carry out any changes no doubt influenced construction at this time. There may also have been a conscious desire to integrate alterations into the existing architecture to maintain stylistic integrity as well – especially given Ella's well-known love of the house. George Mason Jr's passion for and skill in working with older buildings could have facilitated this goal.

### *Facilities*

David and Ella supported their increasingly prominent role in Newport society by updating Kingscote's service spaces. In 1879 David sought estate funding to outfit the northeast service room as a butler's pantry with shelves, drawers, work surfaces and a sink (fig 5.15) (NRP Vol. 32). Whereas William Henry only employed an Irish maid-of-all-work and one manservant, David and Ella hired at least 10 full-time servants, including butler John Lew ('Household number 2440' 1865; 'Dwelling House 235' 1880). Newport's social scene had become more formal, aided by households full of skilled servants with specialised jobs. As senior servant, a butler's presence implied the family employed a full complement of servants. At Kingscote however, Lew only supervised a housemaid, cook and occasional day servants ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). Attitudes towards the Irish were steadily declining, even though they continued to comprise the largest proportion of hired help (Urban 2009, 264). Therefore, Lew's nationality, as one of the household's two American-born servants added further legitimacy to the Kings' social standing.

A bay window extension not evident on Upjohn's early plans enlarged the dining room during this phase. Physical examination reveals its foundation abuts the main house, whilst the floorboard arrangement correspondingly differs on the ground floor (Keithan 2015). At this time, local architectural firm George Champlain Mason and Son carried out dining room renovations previously believed to be confined to the interior (Onorato 2007, 187). However, the bay window can conclusively be dated to this period through an 1878 payment to 'Friedrick (*sic*) Bros. for stained glass windows', which portray fruit and flower themes still evident (fig 5.18) (NRP Vol. 32). Furthermore, the space was only used as a dining room until a new dining room was inserted in the early-1880s, discussed in Phase 3. Through minimal enlargement and costly dining-related ornamentation, the Kings created a formal, luxurious entertainment space. This reflected changing dining practices in America as well as Newport's social scene. In contrast to the Joneses' outdoor mid-day clambakes and picnics, the Kings hosted elaborate evening dinners that foreshadowed the Gilded Age opulence that came to define Newport (Ferguson 1977, 11, 19). Their lifestyle also required service adaptation like more servants to cater social events. However, there is no indication that the Kings permanently employed a wait staff. A combination of casual day labour as necessary, and an efficient service wing with kitchen and butler's pantry within steps of the dining room met their needs at this time.

Inventories indicate servants continued to do laundry in the basement prior to the estate being placed in probate (NRP Vol. 25). However, in 1877 A T Stewart was paid for 'making a laundry' (NRP Vol. 32). Ferguson (1977, 19) states that Mason's 1876-1878 renovations included a two-storey addition containing a laundry and servant bedrooms that 'blended so completely with the style of the original house that for many years' it went unrecognised. Unfortunately, he neglects to describe its location or include evidence for this theory, and it has therefore remained unexplored. Photographic evidence contradicts Ferguson, showing a single-storey addition to the service wing's northwest corner, replacing Jones' earlier extension (fig 5.19) (Keithan 2015). Mason's involvement is evidence in the crenelated roof resembling the new dining bay and architecturally harmonising with the main house.

Although not as removed as typical British country house laundries (for example Calke Abbey and Brodsworth in Chapter 2), its relocation to the outskirts of the main service



area reflects a growing distaste by America's elite for such labour-intensive tasks. Laundry had become a more complex, time-consuming task requiring many chemicals and processes completed by more servants including specialist finishing often done by lady's maids. The new arrangement therefore provided the Kings' live-in laundress Hannah Conelly and lady's maid Bertha Grunwald with a lighter, better ventilated work room, convenient to other service spaces ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). Consequently, the Kings' need to distance themselves from dirty tasks actually resulted in better working conditions for some servants.

### *Accommodation*

Since he was a reclusive bachelor, William Henry King did not need the service wing bedrooms for family use like the Joneses. Instead he outfitted them with minimal, painted furniture and single bedsteads befitting servant use (NRP Vol. 25). The stables also contained a bedstead, wardrobe and close stool box for servants (NRP Vol. 25). David and Ella maintained this practice, updating the spaces with new, matching bedroom furniture and toilette crockery (Ferguson 1977, 19). The house was staffed with a butler, valet, lady's maid, housemaid, laundress, cook, and two nurses, many of whom lodged in these spaces ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). However, without recognisable spatial divisions common in British houses, it is difficult to accurately place specific servants within the wing. There are no obvious male and female zones like at Brodsworth. Nor is there evidence the laundress slept away from other servants near her work as Kiplin's did. The family bedrooms do not include smaller adjacent rooms for personal servants and no size or location hierarchy marking upper servant rooms is evident. Prior to 1878, the Kings' staff modestly fulfilled the needs of a typical elite nineteenth-century American household, but Kingscote's architecture did not yet support the nuanced social order to which their immigrant servants were accustomed.

Accommodation was expanded between 1878-1880 when the east attic was renovated (fig 5.17) (Keithan 2015). Three dormers in the east roof were installed to provide critical light and ventilation. These dormers are first visible in a painting by noted architectural artist J P Newell, who was active in Newport between 1870-1880 (fig 5.20). However, they are absent in an earlier 1878 photo, limiting their construction to this brief period (fig 5.19). The attic contains three rooms, two of which were

appropriate for servant accommodation. The smaller, centre room, labelled 'storage' on a later inventory, has many locks consistent with use as a trunk room (NRP Vol. 47). These bedrooms were essential for adequately housing the Kings' growing staff. Since the bedrooms are located directly above the largest family bedrooms, their logical inhabitants were the lady's maid and valet. They were intimately involved in their employers' personal lives and proximity within the main house was an extension of the trust placed in them. Additionally, in 1880 lady's maid Bertha Grunewald was the household's only German servant, whilst valet Thomas Farrell was born in New York ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). Their familiarity to the family and their nationalities placed them outside the household's mainly Irish servant community. Attic accommodation therefore provided increased convenience for the family whilst maintaining social order within Kingscote's servant community.

The northwest family bedroom was enlarged during Mason's dining room campaign (fig 5.16). The current configuration was previously believed to be original (Ferguson 1977, 39). However physical examination and historic image analysis revealed two distinct building phases (Keithan 2015). An early painting by Upjohn shows the west wing's gable roofline continues straight to the service wing, interrupted by a small dormer window (fig 5.21). The window opens onto a crenelated rooftop balcony capping an original single-storey portion of the dining room. Photographic evidence from 1878 shows the crenelated dining room protrusion was built up, topped by a hipped roof and dormer that still exist (fig 5.19). Mason's bay window extension is also visible, illustrating the relationship of these two alterations and challenging Ferguson's (1977, 20) assertion that Mason's dining room renovations were demolished in a later campaign. A flooring change in the bedroom above, at the point where the original room ended adds further proof that it was enlarged. Visitor accounts in the 1850s state that the Jones children used bedrooms on west side of the house (Ferguson 1977, 13). By 1878 the Kings had two young children and employed nurses for each. Frenchwoman Françoise Dumis had likely been young Philip's nurse since his birth in Paris in 1878 ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). The longevity of her employment and willingness to travel abroad with the family indicates a close child-servant relationship. Like most nurses, she likely slept in his room and Mason's first-floor extension therefore ensured the children's bedrooms were sufficiently large.

### *Circulation*

The first-floor corridor was returned to its intended use when servants once again lodged in the north wing bedrooms (fig 5.16). The Kings' staff remained entirely in the service wing except when carrying out duties in family spaces. Furthermore, this restoration of Upjohn's original spatial configuration provided a direct route to the new attic servant accommodations, up a hidden staircase at the end of the corridor. Although their respective families were prominent in Newport society, David and Ella were just beginning to establish their own position, and servants played an important role. Prior to moving to Newport, David's lifestyle in China was supported by a small contingent of servants to meet his needs (Collins 2003,4). Upon marrying Ella, they spent time residing with her parents who employed 13 servants and a gardener ('Household number 83' 1875). Consequently, separate circulatory routes established important social divisions that asserted David and Ella's growing social status.

Adding a new laundry to the service wing further consolidated servant circulation. The increasing formality of late-nineteenth century entertaining required more linens and clothing and thus more frequent washing. Sambrook (1999, 23) asserts that textile goods were used as an indicator of social status. A variety of well-laundered and -finished textiles publicly showed that a family could afford to employ the skilled servants necessary to care for them. As a result, the percentage of all American domestic servants who were employed as laundresses rose from approximately 6% in 1870 to over 15% only two decades later (Katzman 1978, 47). The original basement location required servants to repeatedly traverse the stairs for various processes: soiled linens were brought to the basement, wet clothes were carried to the outside drying yard, dry items were returned to the basement for ironing and finishing before finally being returned to their place within the house. The new laundry had easy access to the outdoor linen yard and was convenient to other service spaces. Additionally, it saved dining room users above from invasive noises and distasteful smells emanating from the earlier laundry below. Therefore, relocating the laundry to the service wing not only created a more efficient workflow, but also strengthened the architecture's social order.

### *Outbuildings*

William Henry's purchase of the property included a stable, located in the northwest corner of the property. Its form is unknown, but contents including only a buggy, dogcart and sleeping equipment suggest it was quite simple (NRP Vol. 25). In the wake of the Civil War, visible racial bias was still common. Therefore, the single bed, wardrobe and close stool included in the stable were likely sufficient to enforce racial segregation between Warren, William Henry's African-American servant, and Julia Johnston, his maid-of-all-work. Additionally, William Henry's reclusive and sporadic occupancy did not necessitate an elaborate stable, and he may have availed himself of the neighbouring stables at his brother Edward King's Italianate mansion. However, the presence of such a building indicates the importance of transportation facilities and outdoor staff was essential to attracting periodic renters between 1863-1875.

Although the stable was neither architecturally significant nor overly large, David and Ella withdrew funds from the estate to paint the house and stables during their second rental season in 1877 (NRP Vol. 32). A shared enjoyment of equine activities was an important tenet of their relationship, and David's journals often record pleasant rides together (Collins 2003, 22). Horses were transported by boat from their winter lodgings in New York and later Washington DC (Collins 2003, 11). In contrast to William Henry's single manservant, David and Ella employed both a coachman and a groom ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). These changes reflect the growing importance of horses to the Kings' lifestyle and in Newport society, which consequently drove the next phase of outbuilding construction.

Examination of Phase Two has shown that the Kings did not drastically change the house. As tenants they were still cautious in their occupation. As a new family, they were slowly asserting their presence among Newport's elite, building from their families' positions. The changes they made were therefore calculated for maximum convenience with minimum financial outlay and architectural disruption. Alterations to the service wing increased household efficiency. In America, a rising domestic reform movement in the 1870s attempted to treat domestic service as a profession by standardising conditions and labour expectations (Sutherland 1981, 164). Repositioning Kingscote's laundry provided an opportunity to incorporate better sanitation, light and ventilation that would have made work there more appealing.

However, it is the smallest change that foreshadowed the house's greatest development: the dining room alterations during this phase paved the way for a dramatic addition that redefined the way the household functioned, as explored in the final phase.

#### 5.4 Phase Three: 1880-1894

Social practices of elite American society became more established and ritualised – with specific times and expectations for different activities – throughout the late-nineteenth century. New houses in Newport like Marble House and the Breakers were palatial and opulent, the result of tremendous wealth gained by industrial barons like the Vanderbilt family. Consequently, changes at Kingscote during this period were more dramatic, but still focused firmly on entertainment spaces, service architecture and buildings to support elite activities. This phase examines how the Kings negotiated around the restrictions of an existing building that was not theirs to entirely recreate. It looks at how targeted, efficient changes were executed in order to maintain their position in the upper echelons of Newport society. It pulls away from studies focusing on the aesthetic value of this period's alterations (Roberts 2010; Tschirch 2013; Yarnall 2005). Instead, it investigates how the architectural changes impacted servant lives, how they reflected changing master-servant relationships, and how servants negotiated the new configuration.

#### *David and Ella King*

Throughout the nineteenth century David and Ella did become prominent members of elite Newport society, just as they had set out to do when they moved to Kingscote. They also gained recognition within wider American society. David was appointed to number of diplomatic posts and was well-known in Washington DC, where they had another house (Collins 2003, 15). The family was well-travelled, going abroad frequently for business and pleasure. In keeping with Newport society and their position within it, the Kings' entertained more often at Kingscote throughout the 1880s. They hosted up to 10 dinner parties during Newport's six- to eight-week summer season, each of which could last three hours or more (Collins 2003, 23; Ferguson 1977, 22). This was in addition to dinners at other houses that they attended.

In 1880 the estate granted David \$10,000 to construct a ‘larger dining room, more bedrooms, bathroom, linen closet & modern conveniences [that] are much wanted in this house’ (NRP Vol. 33). A three-storey addition constructed between 1880-1882 was designed by the nationally-renown architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White (figs 5.22, 5.23, 5.24). Its position – within the centre of the existing house’s two wings – made it a literal and figurative centrepiece for the house. The entire ground-floor was taken up with an elaborate dining room (fig 5.25, 5.26). This room is still lauded by architectural historians today for innovative elements including Tiffany glass, cork surfaces and a unique blend of stylistic influences that make up the American architectural movement known as the Shingle Style (Broderick 2010, 160; Emery 2009; Tschirch 2013). Its purpose was to cement the Kings’ social status by enabling increased and more formalised entertaining. It also prompted changes in household management and was complimented by updates to existing service areas and the construction of new outbuildings, explored below.

### *Facilities*

The architectural and social value of McKim, Mead and White’s dining room addition is well-established: The space uses eclectic, hand-crafted elements and a combination of Japanese and colonial stylistic influences reflecting the melting pot of America’s unique cultural history (Yarnall 2005, 104). However, its novel architecture has overshadowed its functional relationship with the rest of the house. As a result, it is seldom considered from a service perspective. The work radically impacted Kingscote’s servant wing even though facilities were not the building campaign’s focus. In 1881, instead of enlarging the existing footprint to add a dining room, McKim, Mead and White physically separated Upjohn’s original service wing from the house and relocated it to the northwest (NRP Vol. 34). The distinctive three-storey wing was then constructed between the main house and service block (fig 5.22). At first this decision may seem extreme, but the cost of labour to move the wing was only \$200, which was less than half the price of the new dining room’s Tiffany glasswork (NRP Vol. 34; NRP Vol. 35). Within the service wing, only minor changes were made during this time. New plumbing, a range and a furnace were installed, and the spaces were freshly painted (NRP Vol. 35; NRP Vol. 36). In 1882, small additions to the kitchen and laundry were constructed, but their position and extent remain obscured by twentieth-century changes (NRP Vol. 36). Only carrying out minor interior updates

to the facilities whilst creating a wholly new spatial configuration by physically shifting the entire service wing suggests that a primary factor in Kingscote's service space changes at this time was family-servant relationships.

The new addition literally divided the house in two, further supporting a theory of changing household dynamics. The large ground-floor dining room covered more square footage than the entire original service wing. It is comprised of a single space, which spans between the main house and service wing. The east and west ends are capped by two exterior walls with art glass features. A double pocket door in the south wall opens into the family's original, much smaller dining room, which subsequently became a library. The house's main entrance hall and other formal spaces are entered from the new space via a smaller doorway, also in the south wall. The north wall, which is covered with thick wood panelling, separates the service corridor on the other side. Cork tiles top the panelling and line the ceiling to buffer sound. Whilst the Kings used the dining room as an entertaining space, their servants used it as a workspace. The new dining room would have been within the butler's domain, which also included the butler's pantry described above. This building campaign further expanded the butler's realm, and supported increased entertaining through the inclusion of a china and glass closet inserted between the butler's pantry and the dining room's east entrance (fig 5.22).

At Kingscote records indicate that prior to the addition's completion, the butler held a tenuous position, even though he was the highest-ranking household servant. In 1876 butler Henry Kirtland took his employer David King to court for assault, and was subsequently awarded \$100 for damages (Collins 2003, 43). Between 1881-1883 the family employed four different butlers, attesting to the upheaval of a house under construction (Collins 2003, 44-46). However, the butler gained new importance once the addition was complete. Unlike Kingscote's earlier configuration, the new formal entertaining space could not effectively function without both the gravitas and management of such a senior servant. Consequently, the family followed prevailing trends, hiring an English butler, which would no doubt have positively influenced perceptions of their status ('George Valentine' 1885). King's personal servant records not only note his nationality, but also that he preceded the family to their Washington DC home, attesting to his importance (Collins 2003, 46). During a time when social

differentiation was increasingly important, a British butler gave the appearance of an established hierarchy in the same way the new dining room he oversaw firmly delineated the spaces servants and family occupied.

Between 1880-1885, statistical data appears to show that despite Kingscote's increased size, service arrangements remained stable. In 1880 a butler, housemaid, laundress and cook serviced the house ('Dwelling House 235' 1880). An occasional footman, second maid or scullery slightly raised this number between 1881-1885 (Collins 2003, 44-46). Casual workers provided additional labour when supplemental cleaning was required (NRP Vol. 36). However, as with the butler, the appearance of stability is contradicted by the Kings' personal servant records. They indicate a widening social breach between family and servants that corresponds to the physical distance enforced by the new addition. Unpacking this information significantly enhances understanding of individual household relations. The Kings experienced a remarkably high employee turnover. Only one household servant, housemaid Margaret McIntosh was employed consistently from 1880-1885 (Collins 2003, 44-46). In contrast, during the same period more than eight cooks worked at Kingscote (Collins 2003, 44-46). One later record simply states, 'new cook left in Nov' – the lack of detail implying a decided indifference towards some servants (Collins 2003, 46). In 1885 the family employed cook Elizabeth Flutesene and housemaid Clara Lingren, who were both Swedish ('Elizabeth Flutesene' 1885; 'Clara Lingren' 1885). Whilst the majority of servants begrudgingly entered into service until they could find a less stigmatised profession, Lintelman (1989, 10) suggests most Swedish women immigrated specifically to seek domestic work and stayed longer, feeling more fulfilled in their positions. As neither Elizabeth nor Clara are mentioned beyond 1885, it is unclear if they shared their countrywomen's experiences. Kingscote was clearly a difficult workplace, and viewed from a servant's perspective, the family-servant distance that the relocated service wing provided may have been a welcome arrangement.

### *Accommodation*

Historically, house servants lodged in the service wing's first floor. As discussed above, the David and Ella King expanded accommodation by renovating the east attic during the previous building campaign. These areas were both originally accessible



via the centrally located service corridor. However, just as on the ground floor, McKim, Mead and White's addition split the first floor (fig 5.23). The new first-floor layout provided two additional family bedrooms, separated by a corridor. Its function as family space was clearly defined by a door and level change between the addition and the old service wing. On the other side of the addition, the original house's second-floor east attic continued to be used as servant bedrooms (fig 5.24). However, the new configuration meant that the attic staircase was between the addition's bedrooms and the original first-floor bedrooms, which were all family spaces. However, the attic's purpose was denoted through simply routed, flat panel doors instead of the carved family room doors that surrounded it. Payment for carpeting confirms six servant bedrooms in 1882 (NRP Vol. 35). However, the new addition completely disconnected the attic from other servant bedrooms, creating two distinct accommodation zones for house servants.

Both areas remained essential to accommodate the 6-8 servants working in the house during this time (Collins 2003, 46). Exploring which servants occupied each area gives valuable insight into household dynamics. By piecing together servant records it is possible to recreate servant arrangements at Kingscote's zenith. Aligning American service with British models would suggest gender as the prevailing segregation factor, but this is problematic here. The household appears to have supported three male servants: a butler, footman and valet; and five female servants: a cook, kitchen maid, housemaid, laundress and lady's maid (Collins 2003, 45-46). However, with three bedrooms in each accommodation zone, the arrangement was not conducive to Kingscote's three-to-five gender ratio. Another potential solution based on British models considers the archetypal servant hierarchy. However, as neither area could accommodate all four upper servants in individual rooms as was common in Britain, this arrangement can also be discounted. Furthermore, the butler's, cook's, valet's and lady's maid's elevated status might suggest they occupied the east attic since these rooms were closer to family spaces. However, despite the addition of dormers, these spaces remained dark and cramped, with low ceilings. This arrangement would have left the lighter, larger rooms directly above the service facilities to lower servants.

An alternative solution, motivated by family needs places the butler, valet and lady's maid in the attic, despite the rooms' sub-par conditions (fig 5.24). These servants

regularly interacted with family as part of their positions. Their presence near family bedrooms was not only tolerable, but proximity could also have provided increased convenience for the family. The first-floor service wing bedrooms would then have been occupied by lower servants (fig 5.23). In this arrangement, the cook likely had her own room and was responsible for supervising the area. As the only male, the footman would have had a separate room. Consequently, the housemaid, kitchen maid and laundress shared, making the most of the wing's larger rooms. Heedless of servant comfort, this arrangement places those who cared for the house in the service wing, and servants responsible for the family closer to them. It breaks away from the dominant narrative, suggesting that American accommodation zones may have responded more to household needs rather than established British traditions.

The second floor of McKim, Mead and White's work provided additional servant accommodation that has largely gone unacknowledged (fig 5.24). The space was divided into two ample nurseries for the Kings' two children Maude Gwendolen and Philip, who were largely raised by nurses. Each room was outfitted with a tile fireplace and fender, providing comfort and safety for occupants (NRP Vol. 35). The southwest corner of the larger, west room expands into a sizable bay entirely comprised of windows. Elegant, yet practical wood-panelling covered two-thirds of the wall height. The rooms are accessed via a staircase located where the original service wing abuts the addition. The rooms' positioning, between the service wing and family areas appears to align with British societal norms placing children, nurses and governesses in an ambiguous social position, discussed in Chapter 2. A full nursery suite designed by eminent architects and prominently located at the top of the new addition gives the impression that the Kings children were raised in accordance with such trends.

However, considering individual household circumstances in conjunction with these architectural changes complicates the story. David and Ella hired Irishwoman Margaret Fitzgerald to care for their first child, Maude Gwendolen, who was born in Newport in 1876 ('Margaret Fitzgerald' 1880; 'Maude King' 1885). Frenchwoman Françoise Dumas cared for Philip upon his birth in France in 1879 ('Françoise Dumas' 1880). By this time, the family's social milieu was expanding to include diplomatic circles (Collins 2003, 15). Ella frequently corresponded in French and augmented her wardrobe with costly gowns from Worth's of Paris (Collins 2003, 15, 23). David's

French connections included appointment as assistant commissioner to the 1889 Paris Exposition (Collins 2003, 17). The Kings' penchant for French culture is reflected in nursery staff hiring patterns. After Fitzgerald left her charges in 1882, 'new French nurse' Léonie was hired at a higher salary (Collins 2003, 44-45). In 1885, the Kings employed Frenchwoman Elvia Clevents ('Elvia Clevents' 1885). This was probably the 'Elvine' whom King recorded paying the higher rate of \$20 during the same year (Collins 2003, 46). The isolation of Kingscote's nurseries indicate these women had a great deal of autonomy over the King children. Further research into historic French child-rearing trends could shed more light on their lives. Regardless, Kingscote's late-nineteenth century nursery arrangements combined with the Kings' hiring patterns reveals a nuanced dynamic reaching beyond stereotypical British ideals, incorporating international influences.

This building campaign created three distinct servant accommodation zones: the original servant wing, the old east attic, and the new nurseries. The resulting segregation appears to provide opportunities to segregate servants according to accepted groups based on gender or hierarchy. However, mapping the Kings' household onto the available spaces proposes less conventional arrangements, thereby raising questions about the accepted narrative of nineteenth-century American domestic service and its architecture.

### *Circulation*

Interrupting Kingscote's original configuration understandably impacted how occupants moved through spaces. The new layout was more complex, thereby prompting different circulatory patterns. The most obvious change was that servants were required to travel through the new addition to access any ground-floor family spaces (fig 5.22). Their route started at one of two access points leading from the service corridor into the dining room. One door, located in the centre of the service corridor, is integrated into the wood panelling of the dining room's north wall. Another door is located at the east end of the service corridor and opens into an alcove in the addition's northeast corner. Why were two separate access points needed for the large open space of the new addition? Considering how the space was actually used helps answer this question.

The Kings were prolific hosts, holding up to 10 dinner parties per summer season (Collins 2003, 23). However the space also needed to be large enough to accommodate guests during larger events such as balls. Kingscote's addition was constructed shortly after the formation of McKim, Mead and White's firm and shows evidence of an unorthodox, creative use of space and boundaries that became a hallmark of the American Shingle Style (Scully 1971, 136; Yarnall 2005, 101-2). The opening of trade with Japan in 1853, and a profusion of Japanese architecture displayed at the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia infused American architecture with new ideas (Downing and Scully 1970, 162).<sup>13</sup> McKim, Mead and White used the concepts of moveable and carved screens to push the limits of what created a room. At the Newport Casino (1879-1881) lacy wood balcony screens form spaces that are both indoor and outdoor. The Isaac Bell House (Newport 1881-1883) exhibits a similar concept inside. When closed, large pocket doors in the central hall delineate two distinct rooms: a dark cosy hall with inglenook, and a bright reception room. However, when the doors are open, the hall becomes part of a single, well-lit entertaining space. Kingscote's addition was constructed between these projects and reflects an interesting transition between the two. The ground floor of the new addition is a single large space. However, a delicate carved wood screen like those seen at the Casino spans the entire width of the east end (fig 5.26, 5.27, 5.28). Like the doors at the Isaac Bell House, and reminiscent of Japanese shoji screens, Kingscote's panels can be rolled away, opening or closing off the addition's east quarter.

Architectural historians often present this as an elite convenience, providing a full ballroom or intimate dining space as required (Gill 1991, 34; Yarnall 2005, 104). However, this dynamic element also substantially impacted servant movement patterns. When the panels were closed, a formal dining room was created. Servants accessed this room from the panelled door in the north wall, which was conveniently located across the service corridor from the kitchen. Once again, McKim, Mead and White's early contributions to the Shingle Style are evident: more efficient servant routes were a move towards houses that could function with fewer servants (Roth 1999, 36). When configured thus, the addition's partitioned east end became the

---

<sup>13</sup> British trade with Japan was not established until the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Alliance, on 30 January 1902.

primary route that servants used to access ground-floor family spaces. In this arrangement, the east end essentially functioned as a corridor (fig 5.27, 5.28). Servants could move between service and family wings without interrupting diners on the other side of the screens. This flexible solution sharply contrasts with the rigid and sometimes convoluted circulatory routes seen in British houses like Kiplin Hall, discussed in Chapter 3. By incorporating innovative architectural ideas influenced by America's unique relationship with Japan, Kingscote's new addition responded to specific functional needs and was indicative of Americans' mounting quest for household efficiency.

Whilst the addition's ground floor became a model of effective passage, similar analysis of its first floor illustrates the same approach was not practical for private spaces (fig 5.23). Along with more dining space, additional family bedrooms were a main motivation for the building campaign (NRP Vol. 33). However, instead of simple, large rooms and circulatory spaces reminiscent of the ground floor, the first-floor layout includes a labyrinthine L-shaped corridor shoe-horned between two new bedrooms. Investigating household dynamics offers possible justification for this inelegant design. Need for ample natural light was likely one factor in the new bedrooms' placement against as many exterior walls as possible. They also required easy access to the main stair hall, which accounts for the east-west portion of the corridor. The north-south portion is more problematic, dramatically dividing the addition in two. Its primary purpose was to provide access from the service wing to first-floor family rooms, bridging the household's two distinct populations. Although it awkwardly disrupts this level's otherwise beautiful family spaces, when viewed from a service perspective, this was the addition's most vital first-floor element.

The landing at this corridor's north end contains a surprising number of doors: three of the four walls have openings. The area is separated from the addition's corridor by partial-glass double doors. The landing is divided from the service wing via a door and level change to the west. The north door leads to a bathroom. Finally, the area also houses the stairs to the second-floor nurseries. Such a quantity of restricted access points in a small area indicates a highly controlled zone. Charting occupants into this space illustrates frequent use by people of multiple social levels, adding further complexity. At the highest social stratum, the Kings' children travelled down the

nursery stairs, which notably do not contain a door. They entered the main house via the double doors, which servants also necessarily used. Unlike other service doors, these are wide with transparent glass, representing their socially flexible nature. In contrast, the single door separating the landing from the service wing is solid and compact. It forms a firm boundary denoting the service wing's utilitarian status. The bathroom accessed from the landing was likely used by the children and servants, including nurses. This landing is therefore a critical, highly utilised social buffer zone vital in navigating Kingscote's increasingly complex social dynamics.

In summary, the circulatory arrangements resulting from McKim, Mead and White's addition provided adequate paths through a newly divided house. The combination of innovative, flexible solutions and well-considered access points asserted an awareness of the increasing importance of social segregation. However, closer analysis has demonstrated that some elements also hold a previously unidentified spatial complexity, potentially echoing the tensions between servants and a family like the Kings, who were attempting to establish societal legitimacy.

### *Outbuildings*

Kingscote's estate buildings were considerably changed during this period. However, due to demolition and modern reuse, the buildings and their significance have gone largely unexplored. The existing carriage house<sup>14</sup> was built in 1893 by prominent architect Dudley Newton (Onorato 2007, 189). Newton designed several notable Newport mansions and had studied under George Champlain Mason, who had completed Kingscote's earlier alterations (Yarnall 2005, 67). The one-and-a-half-storey, gable-end building is located northwest of the house, aligned with the property's northern boundary at Jones Avenue (fig 5.29). Newton was noted for his stylistic flexibility, incorporating Gothic Revival elements into the carriage house's functional design, to create a simple building that aesthetically harmonised with Kingscote's architecture. Dormer windows are accentuated with decorative bargeboards matching the main house. An asymmetrically placed cupola usually denotes a stable, whilst also echoing the McKim, Mead and White addition's octagonal

---

<sup>14</sup> The building is rarely referred to as a stables, even though the two terms are often interchangeable. This highlights the shifting importance from horse riding to carriage driving occurring in Newport at this time.

shape. Although the historic drive is nonextant, cartographic evidence shows a web-like network of lanes emanating from a front yard. The new building therefore functioned as the hub of the estate's outdoor activity, connecting to Bowery Street, Jones Avenue, and other outbuildings at a discreet distance from the house.

By the 1880s driving was an activity that distinguished Newport's social classes, since its rituals provided multiple opportunities to showcase wealth and status. Newport's elite drove out according to a set weekly schedule (Collins 2003, 24-25). A man's choice of passenger demonstrated his status, whilst only elite women were afforded the privilege of being chosen as passengers (Collins 2003, 25). Whereas many took advantage of Newport's public transportation options, including omnibuses and cabs, only the wealthiest could afford to own horses, purchase the requisite equipment, and employ staff (*Newport Villa Owners'* 1883, 43). Despite the Kings' generally high staff turnover, coachman Edward Moran was their longest-employed, best-paid servant (Collins 2003, 42). He consistently had grooms under his service, all of whom were Irish, a nationality openly discriminated against by this time (Collins 2003, 44-46; Sutherland 1981, 40). Therefore Moran, who was Irish himself was not only trusted with tasks like transporting horses between the family's homes, but also managing other high-turnover employees (Collins 2003, 42). Kingscote's new carriage house considerably improved Moran's working conditions, and potentially his own status within Newport's wider servant community. Pragmatically, the new carriage house updated facilities for horses, equipment and staff to meet daily transport needs. However, the stylistically harmonious, architect-designed building went beyond necessity, making an architectural statement reflecting the family's awareness of and compliance with societal expectations.

No physical evidence remains of Kingscote's other outbuildings, as they are buried under a modern car park in the estate's northwest corner. However, detailed maps show their appearance and disappearance on the landscape over time. In 1876 the property only contained a house and stables (fig 5.30). By 1883, two additional buildings appear to the west (fig 5.31). One contained the coachman's toilet and two gardener's workshops that D. Patt was paid \$100 to construct in 1882 (NRP Vol. 36). The second building was a considerably larger investment: King expended \$1003 on a 'greenhouse & grounds' the following year (Collins 2003, 14). Maps from 1883-

1921 depict it as a long, glass-roofed building, with a solid, enclosed north end (figs 5.31, 5.32). Including the carriage house, these outbuildings covered nearly a quarter of the 3.3-acre estate, considerably expanding the property's architectural footprint.

As discussed in Chapter 2, British estates frequently had complete gardening departments, operating almost autonomously from the main house. Newport, however, was a thriving resort town, and seasonal residents expected the same conveniences of the urban centres they escaped. Grocers, florists, fancy goods purveyors and landscape gardeners all advertised in the annual *Newport Villa Owners' Summer Visitors' and Residents' Guide* (1883), illustrating that greenhouses like the Kings' were not necessary in the way that British estate garden buildings were. Instead they were a status symbol, allowing owners of any size estate to 'convey the illusion of self-sufficient landed life – providing their own produce for the table and every form of outdoor amusement for family and guests' (Aslet 1990, 21).

Most servant studies overlook gardeners as they infrequently lodged in servant wings, making them difficult to trace. Full-time British gardeners often lived in estate housing. Some of Newport's larger estates, like the Breakers, did include a full garden department including housing. However, despite the Kings' expansion and investment in garden buildings, they did not employ a live-in outdoor staff. Instead they took advantage of Newport's close community, paying an independent gardener to oversee the grounds throughout the year (NRP Vol. 33; NRP Vol. 35; NRP Vol. 36). Although homeowners still considered these skilled labourers as staff, they worked at multiple houses and therefore had more freedom over their working conditions. This arrangement enabled smaller estates such as Kingscote to operate like larger estates at a much lower cost.

During this phase, the Kings sacrificed a significant amount of their small estate to new outbuildings. Their hiring practices were economical, paying stables staff well to support the very visible hobby of driving, yet saving costs by employing part-time labourers to maintain the gardens. These shrewd decisions illustrate that constructing the buildings and employing the staff necessary to support popular leisure activities was a primary consideration. It indicates that such houses and grounds built by the upper echelons of American society at this time were responding to specific social and



cultural needs. In contrast, leisure activities like shooting, which relied on large estates remained popular with the British elite. Their country estates, including the houses and their service architecture responded to distinctly rural lifestyles, which required large staffs that consequently continued to be an indicator of status.

This phase shows that the changes of this period, like new outbuildings and the McKim, Mead and White addition were motivated by shifting social patterns. However, changes impacted far more than the family and friends that enjoyed them. The stunning, innovative architectural details that the dining room is known for did create a subtle opulence envied by the Kings' peers. The corresponding calculated and efficient service changes greatly influenced servants' lives. New divisions between service and family spaces echoed the Kings' desire for more formal master-servant relationships, which was also encouraged by rapid servant turn-over. Unexpectedly, this contributed to a diverse international servant community at Kingscote that reflected wider patterns of immigration. When examined in this light, the physical and social distance prompted by Kingscote's final phase could have provided servants a greater sense of freedom, creating a tighter servant community.

## 5.5 Conclusions

This chapter has revealed the previously unexplored story of Kingscote's servants and service architecture. Examination of the design and early alterations to the building shows clear connections with early American country house models like Mount Vernon, subtly seen in service architecture. Tracing the presence of enslaved servants in the house strengthens this connection. Attitudes and spatial configurations initiated by slavery continued to impact subsequent experiences of domestic service and attitudes towards service. Kingscote's early years also show evidence of movement towards post-Civil War hiring practices and servant space arrangements. Initially foreign-born domestics worked alongside enslaved servants exposing a previously underexplored moment in American service history. The social stigma of service associated with slavery continued and was encouraged by households like Kingscote, where these groups worked in the same house at the same time.

Late-nineteenth-century events like the Civil War and America's entrance into global finance through trade with China and Japan aided in the development of a distinct

cultural identity independent of British colonial history. The absence of a well-established class system made the distinction between employer and employee even more important after the abolition of slavery. To entice and retain servants, employers abandoned outdated paternalistic attitudes in favour of professionalism and improved work environments (Romero 1988, 322; Sutherland 1981, 164). This appealed to immigrants whose home countries instilled particular expectations of working conditions within the service profession. However, despite their willingness to take on domestic roles, Romero (1988, 319) notes the importance of ongoing power struggles between mistresses and their servants as a mirror of wider class issues impacting America at the time. Correspondingly, this chapter shows, through analysis of Kingscote's architecture and service arrangements, that household management and spatial use responded to distinctly American service needs even though it has recognisably British elements like a separate service wing and butler's pantry. Service within the American country house prioritised social, cultural, and spatial distinctions between employers and their servants. This chapter has highlighted the poor treatment and micromanagement that immigrant servants faced as their employers attempted to assert their superiority. Despite difficult working conditions, continuous employer-employee tension, and a high rate of servant turnover, immigrants shaped nineteenth-century domestic service in America.

The chapter also highlighted a practicality evident in American service planning. British houses tended to attempt to follow the expectations of contemporary commentators and design guides. This is evident for example, in Kiplin's shared 'service' corridor and strict gender segregation in the White Wing. In contrast, Americans only built or kept the spaces that they needed. Unbound by tradition, this meant that a housekeeper's room was not necessary, but a butler's pantry was. This is also evident in estate landscapes. As the purpose of American country houses shifted from plantations to personal retreats, land was an unnecessary encumbrance. Estates became smaller and priority was given to spaces and buildings that supported specific leisure activities. Likewise, hiring practices show no evidence of superfluous servants. Instead, servants likely fulfilled multiple roles as needed, whilst some servants, like gardeners were independent contractors and worked for multiple homeowners.

These findings have highlighted three themes surrounding the lasting legacy of unique American cultural experiences in race, gender and class. These have been traced in the service architecture and household dynamics of country houses throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The thesis now moves on to briefly summarize the major findings of Part II before engaging in a deeper exploration and discussion of the implications of these key differences between British and American houses in Chapter 6.

## **PART TWO: AMERICAN COUNTRY HOUSES**

### *Conclusions*

The analyses of the case studies in Part II have exposed a rich picture of American country house service architecture and servant history. I set out to examine American country houses with the same methodology as Part I, *The British Country House*. I asked if it would be equally effective on houses made of different materials, with construction techniques and levels of preservation. The detailed investigations in Chapters 4 and 5 have demonstrated that a buildings-led approach offers helpful ways to unpack American service history. Archaeological and spatial analysis strategies called into question prevailing assumptions about the extent of British influence in American country house architecture. Examination of service spaces has revealed that although some areas appear to resemble British service architecture, the similarity is minimal and superficial. American country house owners only selectively and deliberately chose to include some spaces recognisable from the British model. However, they were happy to leave out those that did not support their own domestic service practices and household structures. Instead, the overarching dominant influences on American service architecture development were substantial distinctive cultural events and attitudes. These were deeply rooted in early American traditions, and continued to impact domestic service.

Chapter 4 (Mount Vernon) has demonstrated that an archaeological approach is especially effective for exploring separate service buildings, which were the dominant service spaces on eighteenth-century American country house estates. I have shown that the form, configuration and construction of such buildings responded directly to the functional needs of colonial plantations, and developed from vernacular American building traditions. As American country houses developed throughout the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, specialised service buildings types like smokehouses, which were not seen on British estates, remained part of American country house service arrangements. Service buildings were designed and constructed on-site and were less permanent, which makes them challenging to trace. Examining the material culture of Mount Vernon's service buildings through analysis of both

standing structures and archaeological excavation revealed their presence and absence on the landscape over time.

Connecting these shifts in service spaces with labour trends, which were dominated by the use of enslaved blacks, but also included hired white servants, exposed a more nuanced story of social structures in the American service story. Spatial analysis of exterior circulatory routes and access points revealed that such buildings became more intentionally placed over time as work spaces of similar types were located near one another. Living spaces for enslaved servants were also grouped, forming zones throughout the wider homestead landscape. This minimised the agency of enslaved servants. Segregation between enslaved blacks and free white servants, both architecturally and socially also supported the oppression of enslaved peoples. This section has considered the complex interplay between social groups in early American country houses through spatial and historical analysis. This has firmly established the vital role America's enslaved peoples played in its service history, which has not previously been recognised.

My methodology has also proven effective on interior service spaces, and in nineteenth-century American country houses. Analysis of Kingscote's (Chapter 5) antebellum period highlighted definitive connections to Southern domestic service traditions. These early, formative years are often overshadowed – both at Kingscote specifically but also in the wider story of American service – by later developments, when country houses appear to incorporate more recognisable British architectural elements. Chapter 5 has shown that the nineteenth-century was actually a period when the dominant function of American country houses changed. The nation's social and economic centre shifted from Southern planters whose wealth was tied to the land, to Northern industrialists whose fortunes were not dependent on vast estates. They were more interested in creating social centres, such as at Newport, where they built country houses for seasonal entertainment. Their lifestyles included larger and more formal events like dinners and balls, which required supporting service spaces. Some of these resembled their British counterparts, which may have contributed to the assumption that country houses in the two nations also functioned the same.

What I have actually shown is that household practices differed significantly from Britain. America's main domestic service labour force at this time was female immigrants. They entered the country with their own assumptions and expectations about service. Many came from countries where service was an established, respected occupation and they expected a certain level of professional courtesy from their American employers. However, American country house owners' attitudes towards and expectations of their servants were still heavily influenced by the country's history of slave labour. The resulting distrust American employers felt towards their servants was manifest socially in their attempts to assert dominance and superiority. Servants were often poorly treated, resulting in higher turnover, which in turn further solidified tensions between masters and their servants. I have traced this significant social difference between Britain and America in service architecture as well. American masters preferred to directly supervise household management and domestic service. With this service model there was very little need for upper servants, and the servant hierarchy that was essential to efficiently operating British country houses does not appear in America. This is reflected architecturally by the absence of a housekeeper's room and no discernible gender segregation. As a house that developed throughout the nineteenth century, Kingscote adapted to and compromised in an attempt to meet changing American social and architectural ideals. Like Kiplin in Britain, Kingscote's history is the story of American service development. Its building fabric and the voices of the servants I have revealed here reflect changes over time that encapsulate the rich story of American service.

The examination of American country houses in Part II has revealed significant cultural differences between British and American service arrangements. Three themes of race, gender and class, which arose from unique cultural events and subsequently informed American country house domestic service, comprise the basis of discussion in Chapter 6: Cultural Distinctions – an American Service Model. The extent of the influence of these distinct American characteristics is comprehensively explored through a comparative analysis of the British and American case studies previously examined in this thesis.

## **Chapter 6: Cultural Distinctions – an American Service Model**

### 6.1 Introduction

This thesis has argued that the detailed architectural, archaeological and historical analysis of country house service architecture sheds new light on the structural and spatial strategies that created the conditions and lived experiences of servants in Britain and America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The starting point for these investigations was the architecture itself, as stratigraphic analysis formed pictures of building development over time. A wide variety of historical documentary sources shed light on domestic relations by providing information about both individuals and household management. Biographies of place were then built for each house by overlaying this knowledge of people onto the histories of the spaces they occupied. By applying this blend of methodologies to multiple houses of different time periods on both sides of the Atlantic, this thesis has nuanced existing narratives of British country house service spaces, whilst also challenging existing assumptions that American country houses simply emulated and adopted British cultural models. Such assumptions ignore the unique cultural experiences and conditions of the American service experience revealed by greater familiarity with American history and houses. My case studies have shown the value of analysing the spatial configurations of service architecture. Focusing on function and spatial relationships reveals a deep wealth of information about household dynamics throughout history. Vernacular studies advocate a hands-on approach, examining building materials, construction techniques, and spaces to understand everyday buildings previously considered architecturally insignificant. The form of America's early service buildings developed in direct response to functional needs that were originally met by vernacular structures, as illustrated by Mount Vernon in Chapter 4. The subsequent development of American country house service architecture reflects important differences in social attitudes towards servitude, but also, and crucially the impact of the system of enslaved labour.

Three themes emerged from this research. American and British country house service architecture developed differently in response to unique cultural experiences in race, gender and class. Examining the development of the previous case studies exposed

architectural differences beyond those attributable to individual owners, finances or existing architecture. While these themes have been minimally acknowledged as elements of service, their nuances remain overshadowed by a sense of nostalgia that pervades studies of domestic service and interpretations of service architecture. Mapping servant lives and cultural experiences onto the architecture reveals rich relationships and a strong, independent cultural evolution of American domestic service, which forms the focus of discussion in this final substantive chapter of the thesis, and which I argue is one of the most important contributions of my thesis to wider scholarship. The chapter commences with a review of the architectural development of American service architecture as evidenced by the case studies in Part II, American Country Houses. It sets architectural characteristics within a wider cultural context, drawing together the findings in Chapters 4 and 5 into a cohesive vision of the development of American service architecture. The chapter then moves on to a detailed discussion of each of the three themes of race, gender and class, which are supported by specific examples pulled from the thesis' case studies.

*The development of American service architecture: A review*

American country houses and their service architecture had a complex relationship to Britain's architectural traditions and social structures. One way of nuancing our understanding of the cultural relationships between the two countries is to explore the patterns of British colonisation in America, from the seventeenth century onwards. Fischer (1989) suggests it is possible to identify four distinctive British 'folkways' which emerged from the ways in which particular groups of British subjects settled in specific regions of America. Those settling in the South were mainly aristocratic Royalists. This impacted many aspects of social and political life, and regional development. As the centre of wealth and power throughout the eighteenth century, plantations were colonial landed estates. Plantation houses resembled country houses of the landed gentry in Britain, not so much in form but in their function, which was to establish and grow status. A fundamental difference however was that land – and therefore wealth and power – was affordable. It was thus acquired through business acumen, which was more important than an inherited title. This enabled people like the Washingtons, who had only tenuous British connections, to acquire estates and build plantation houses as symbols of their newly-acquired status.



American country houses also developed as a response to slave-operated plantations, which were radically different from the tenant-occupied agricultural estates that supported British country houses. Practical and functional differences underpin key architectural divergences between the two. The earliest American domestic service spaces were also linked to the needs of plantation architecture. There were few dedicated servant spaces within the main house, and the majority of services were located in separate structures, built in a vernacular tradition befitting their utilitarian purpose. Late-eighteenth century outbuildings became more consciously designed and integrated with the landscape, rather than moving into or being attached to the house. During this period British country house owners were consolidating service wings and manipulating estate landscapes for pleasure. Their American counterparts were also more consciously designing estate landscapes, but the overarching purpose was to direct and enforce servant movement and activity.

The victory of the Union in the American Civil War shifted the centre of power from the South to the North. It decimated the slave-operated plantations and industrialists favouring the North began rapidly accumulating wealth. Land played no part in their fortunes, and the idea of the 'estate' ceased to define the American country house. This contrasts with Britain during the nineteenth century, where the aspirations of newly wealthy northern industrialists remained the acquisition of a landed estate and title. The new nineteenth-century American country house model was intended for sporadic use and entertain according to a set social schedule. They were grouped closer together in resort communities like Newport, where owners could enjoy a community of their social peers. The houses were configured to meet the specific needs of seasonal entertainment, but not necessarily year-round living. Kingscote is an example of this type of house, initially constructed to provide a retreat from hot Southern summers. Its compact size may have partially been in response to the need close the house in the off-season. Originally the Joneses hosted clambakes and card games, which were mostly held in the parlour and outdoors. As Newport expanded, entertaining increased and formal dining became more popular. This required more kitchen and serving facilities and larger dining rooms that newer houses incorporated into their designs. Although service spaces at this time appear superficially to resemble their British counterparts, the absence of certain spaces considered essential to the British house is revealing. This absence should not be interpreted as evidence that American houses

were simply less-developed versions of the British country house. Rather, it was a response to new ways of living – and serving – within the American cultural context. Having reviewed the general trajectory of American service architecture development in conjunction with wider cultural events, the chapter now moves on to discuss the three main themes of race, gender and class. Each thread represents a specific area of distinct cultural difference, which emerged from the case studies in Chapters 2 through 5. Concepts connected to these key topics are connected with American service architecture and contrasted with British examples. This comparative analysis highlights how service architecture both supported and was responding to American cultural norms, and crucially, how this impacted servants' lives.

## 6.2 Legacy of enslaved labour

Although the landed estate concept was inspired by familiar British models, it was the practical considerations of colonial tobacco plantations that influenced the development of American estate labour systems, architecture and domestic service. America's domestic service system began with extensive importation of enslaved peoples. Early American service needs were met by these enslaved black servants and plantation owners therefore had little reason to hire white domestics, of which there were few available. Consequently, the story of America's eighteenth-century domestic service history is also the story of enslaved Africans.

The role of paternalism within the institution of slavery is complex, but critical to understanding master-servant relations. An altruistic façade provided slave owners with the justification for slave ownership and the creation of forms of discipline and punishment essential to the maintenance of the system. Paternalism was especially crucial to American slavery due to the close physical proximity of masters and enslaved peoples on large, isolated plantations (Genovese 1976, 5). Plantation architecture structured and reinforced these relationships. Service buildings were positioned to allow maximum surveillance and supervision, whilst clearly-delineated circulatory routes controlled servant movement. Chapter 4 has shown how, when George Washington married Martha Dandridge Custis, she brought with her additional enslaved house servants. At this time, the four service dependencies (kitchen, washhouse, storehouse and dairy) fanned out from the original back of the house at the west. This created a central work yard visible from the Mansion's west rooms. The

Washingtons were then able to oversee servants directly during a critical period in the estate's history, when they were still establishing themselves as substantial property owners and growing the estate and its labour force. The later c1775-6 building campaign altered this configuration, reflecting the Washington's increasingly secure social status. As the new kitchen and servants' hall were built, the central work yard was replaced by separate yards behind the new buildings. Likewise the new washhouse, located on the South Lane, had a separate back yard. Simultaneously, circulation became more restricted as formal pathways accessed by fences and gates defined routes. These changes resulted in a reduction of direct visual surveillance, but increasingly clear spatial boundaries that controlled servant movement just as effectively.

British households did not require this level of control. Uppark's mid-eighteenth century configuration appears architecturally similar to Mount Vernon's early work yard layout. Two outbuildings flanked the north side of the house with a large work yard in the centre. However, closer inspection reveals its design was not intended as a supervisory tool. Many of the house's north-facing windows were blocked, indicating a desire to remove service from view, rather than expose or overlook it. Likewise, Uppark's tunnel construction, first in 1723 to the old kitchen, and later to access the north outbuildings, appear to mimic the boundaries set by Mount Vernon's service lanes. At Uppark however they were primarily motivated by the desire to render servants invisible, rather than explicitly control their movement.

Likewise, when Christopher Crowe the Elder constructed Kiplin Hall's new service wing in 1739, he chose to place it on the narrow, north side of the house. The servant staircase occupied the north tower, and all north-facing windows were blocked, making direct supervision of servants from the Hall impossible. Such oversight was unnecessary due to the development of servant hierarchies in Britain. The addition of a housekeeper's room positioned at the junction of the Hall and service wing mirrored the developing servant hierarchy. Kiplin's housekeeper Mary Williams supervised servants in place of the Crowes themselves. Although Mount Vernon, Uppark and Kiplin exhibit well-established similarities during the eighteenth century, these subtle distinctions reveal a fundamental difference in service and the way servants were perceived and treated. The upstairs-downstairs divide becoming entrenched in

eighteenth-century British service architecture focuses on hiding servants, whilst the priority in eighteenth-century American social divisions was asserting dominance over enslaved servants.

As the number of enslaved labourers increased throughout the eighteenth-century, hired white servants became scarce and more specialised. George Washington's title records reflect this trend. By 1773 the majority of his white employees were builders, with the exception of the estate's head gardener. The same year 14 enslaved persons worked full-time as house servants (Abbot and Twohig 1994, 238-239). A clear divide between the two populations is evident in plantation architecture, particularly accommodation arrangements. From c1760-1792 Mount Vernon's large, two and a half storey House for Families accommodated the majority of enslaved peoples, including house servants. In 1791-1792 barrack style quarters flanking the new greenhouse segregated single enslaved males and females. Across the lane, families were allowed to construct small cabins. Despite small changes in separation between enslaved populations, all the buildings remained in an area off the North Lane, designated simply as the Quarter. Although the buildings themselves evolved, enslaved peoples were always expected to live communally.

Hired white servant accommodation was much more varied and individual. The few hired single male servants lodged in a room in the storehouse, with a door opening onto the South Lane. Hired white housekeepers were accommodated in the upper storey of the kitchen building. Washington repurposed the building across from the storehouse, originally a hospital, into a house for the gardener and his wife. The building had 'a room to lodge in above (which a decent Woman would require) and another below to Cook in' (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 437).

This difference between concentrated enslaved areas and dispersed areas populated by hired white servants reflects the different levels of freedom each group had within the wider estate. The rigid physical segregation between the two servant populations seems to have been primarily driven by white servants' expectations. As skilled workers, they had more leverage to negotiate working conditions. They required contracts clearly delineating labour and personal terms. In addition to wages, they expected lodging, washing and food. They were provided with better quality food than

enslaved servants and dined in a separate room where they were served by enslaved peoples (Washington 1978, 116). Washington echoed many employers when he lamented that white servants were ‘accustomed to better fare than I believe in the labourers of almost any other Country, [which] adds considerable to the expense of employing them’ (Fitzpatrick 1939b, 66). In contrast, enslaved servants, who were denied any stake in their own employment terms, cooked and ate in the Quarter. They supplemented minimal rations with their own produce and poultry. This self-reliance, and enforced communal living is the product of family and white servants alike ‘othering’ enslaved peoples in a way not present in the British servant hierarchy, which was developing at the same time. Racial divisions were built into the architecture and enforced not only by America’s elite, but also by white servants.

Scholars often assert that house service was more desirable to enslaved peoples than work on estates. However, spatial analysis reveals a less positive lived experience of these positions. Since plantation architecture was firmly rooted in the functional needs of early agricultural estates, the houses themselves had few service spaces. Facilities like kitchens, dairies, laundries and servant halls were located in separate buildings built in the vernacular tradition rather than spaces within attached service wings. Mount Vernon did not have any servant spaces until a butler’s pantry was included with the c1776-8 south wing addition. It had no servant corridors or staircases for housemaids to use. Additionally, the bell system was not installed until 1794.

Conversely, a secondary staircase and adequate service spaces within the house was essential in Britain. As seen with Calke Abbey in Chapter 2, the servant staircase was so important that it was the same size and configuration as the main staircase in the original house. This kept servants invisible, which British country house owners preferred. However, owners of enslaved servants considered their presence a visible reminder of wealth and status. Without servant corridors, staircases and lobbies, enslaved house servants were continuously in the presence of their masters. They were expected to stand in the presence of any white person (Genovese 1976, 334). Their days were often unreasonably long, as they were expected to be available at any time. Consequently, whilst American servants might have been a more visible part of the household, the absence of circulation spaces in plantation houses removed any sense of privacy that British service circulation spaces created.

Such a tedious and oppressive working environment contributed to resistance behaviours. Acts such as feigning illness, theft, and sabotage were acts of self-preservation used to ‘speak volumes about not only their reactions to the institutions of slavery but also the actions of those trying to control them’ (Thompson 2016, 70). House servants were in an optimal position for successful escape, the ultimate resistance act (Thompson 2016, 73). Through their proximity to the elite they were able to gain skills and refinement that bettered their chances of supporting themselves. Oney Judge was the daughter of a Mount Vernon seamstress, with light skin and freckles, which gained her a position as Martha Washington’s personal maid. Benefits of this role included receiving better quality clothing and a small amount of cash wages, as well as travelling with the presidential household to Philadelphia, where many free blacks lived (Schoelwer 2016, 20). Despite such preferential treatment, Oney escaped in 1796, a clear indication that personal freedom was more highly valued than the presumed superior conditions of household service.

In contrast, service in a British household however was a stable career. Paid servants were rewarded with increased pay and advancement and motivated by potential loss of income or bad references for jobs poorly done. An opportunity for upward mobility was evident in the hierarchy of service spaces: upper servant rooms were spatial manifestations of improved quality of living resulting from hard work. Conversely, America’s simple, vernacular service buildings and lack of service spaces within houses reflected the lack of advancement possibilities for enslaved servants. Unfortunately, the conditions and spaces that enslaved house servants were subject to set a precedent for subsequent employer expectations in postbellum America.

Even after the war, many owners expected emancipated black servant to remain in antebellum positions under substandard conditions. Established racial views perpetuated poor working conditions for emancipated blacks who continued as domestic servants after being freed. It did not help that many former enslaved servants were victims of an enslaved mind-set. This led some employers to take advantage, ‘hiring’ emancipated blacks for service positions that provided room and board, but little or no monetary remuneration. After the Mount Vernon Ladies Association opened Mount Vernon as a historic house museum, they hired former enslaved peoples

to clean the house. Their presence was often noted by visitors and seen as part of the ‘authentic’ Mount Vernon experience. In Britain, even retired servants, like Kiplin Hall’s housekeeper were recognised and cared for by their employers.

This analysis has demonstrated that American perceptions of domestic service were and still are inextricably linked to a contentious history of race relations. Perceptions of service were initially formed by (negative) attitudes towards enslaved African labourers. Updating and improving polite architecture whilst leaving service buildings unimproved reveals minimal consideration for servant welfare. Enslaved domestic servants in Britain were much rarer and served as a signifier of wealth and status, as evidenced by their inclusion in portraits and paintings, where they are treated much the same way as exotic pets. Of course, many British country houses relied on slave labour in plantations in the Caribbean, or in industries with which they were connected, such as Kiplin Hall’s seventeenth-century owner Leonard Calvert. However, such stories rarely feature in British country house histories or interpretations and recent attempts to recover such stories, as at Brodsworth, face many challenges (Dresser and Hann 2013). The presence of enslaved servants in America instilled an early, hostile view of servants and service as a profession. Despite the outlaw of slavery, the continuation of a domestic service system served as a carrier for these attitudes and ideas. This contrasts with Britain, where class structures were well-established and where service was seen as a well-established, acceptable form of employment, especially in rural areas where housing and access to other resources was closely linked to the estate.

### 6.3 Impact of gender disparity

Menservants were rarer in America than they were in Britain. Enslaved men were assigned to fieldwork due to their superior physical strength. In fact, their physical strength may have at times been perceived as a threat within the household environment. Consequently enslaved menservants who worked within the house were usually either elderly or had particular qualities that made their presence and visibility within the house more desirable. Additionally, male house servant roles were limited: footmen were rare and perceived as a luxury. Despite being status symbols, owners also expected them to complete other tasks when not serving, including manual labour.

After the abolition of slavery, male house servants were equally rare. The American Civil War decimated the nation's male population. Additionally, negative attitudes towards servitude were engrained in American culture due to the association with slavery. The idea of the subservience required of servants proved unappealing to men. At the same time, America's newly-emerging class of elite industrialists were trying to court British society in an effort to solidify family mergers, resulting in conglomerate families with international wealth and power. At a time when menservants were increasingly luxurious in Britain due to the servant tax, Americans flaunted their wealth by hiring footmen and butlers. Their presence within a household became a symbol of America's understanding of and respect for British traditions. However, these roles were just superficial. Butlers rarely managed household, instead serving as the public face of the servant force, which added social prestige to American households. Because of the rarity, specificity, and limited availability of acceptable menservant positions, combined with diminished power, domestic service was mainly considered a demeaning occupation for American men.

An exception to this was male servants working, not directly in the house, but on the grounds or in stables of country houses. These jobs were abundant and comprised the majority of male servant positions. In tight nineteenth-century social centres like Newport, some male servants in these roles operated more like independent contractors. Skilled gardeners trained their sons and worked seasonally at multiple houses throughout the community. This provided opportunity for social and geographical mobility that neither male or female house servants enjoyed.

Enslaved women were far more likely to be house servants in colonial America. Female domestics continued to dominate the occupation in the nineteenth century, as waves of immigrants entered the employment system. Perceptions of women as socially inferior affected how servants were viewed and treated. The majority of nineteenth-century female servants in America were Irish. Although they were considered hard workers, they were not particularly well respected. Their familiarity and experience in Britain's service industry meant they needed less training than native born American servants, and elite employers could take advantage of their understanding of a servants' place within a large household. This early gender



imbalance established service as a female profession, which impacted in forms of household management, master-servant relations, and thus, service architecture.

Another distinctive factor in American service history was that in general, American mistresses appear to have been more directly involved in household management. During the eighteenth century, British mistresses began to spend less time personally managing their households; a product of complex social expectations requiring elite women to be removed from everyday tasks to pursue fashionable leisure pursuits. As a result, the day to day management of the household was entrusted to housekeepers. Housekeepers remained with the house even when other servants accompanied family travels. As evidenced in the 'Facilities' sections of the British case studies in this dissertation, servant architecture reflected the importance of these senior servants throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, the structure of colonial American society did not support the kinds of established servant hierarchy seen in Britain. Most white servants were indentured, working towards freedom and an independent life. A scarcity of white servants initially drove mistresses to become more directly involved in household management. The widespread use of enslaved servants further necessitated strong management skills and household management became a source of pride for American mistresses in a way not evident in Britain. The absence of housekeeper's rooms in American country houses is a crucial, but often overlooked or misunderstood symbol of this profound gender and cultural difference in the history of service.

Servants could, however, be used by elite women as a means of negotiating power within a largely patriarchal society. Current scholarship suggests that white Southern women had a much greater financial stake in slave ownership than previously realised (Jones-Rogers 2019). The pattern started early, with parents giving their daughters enslaved peoples, and their sons land, insuring the creation of a balanced estate upon marriage. Martha Washington is an important example of this trend, bringing a large number of enslaved peoples into her marriage. Prior to her first marriage she had already managed her father's household, a practice she continued throughout her life. Her aversion to hired servants is well documented, and as discussed above, she only employed white housekeepers during times of family sickness or increased social responsibilities. The role of enslaved people in supporting the power and agency of

elite Southern women, is a complex and problematic chapter in the story of service, that requires further critical attention.

The active and ongoing role of the American mistress of the house as housekeeper also had other consequences for the status and agency of American servants. American servant studies frequently use the terms 'housekeeper' and 'lady of the house' interchangeably (Sutherland 1981, 11-12). Moreover, many American servants felt that the minimal level of respect afforded professional housekeeper's by American mistresses warranted the difficult training involved (Sutherland 1981, 89). The history of Ella King at Kingscote reveals how distinctive American customs endured. Her mother was raised as a typical Virginian housewife. She employed a full complement of servants, but no housekeeper. Ella adopted a similar arrangement when she married David King and they moved to Kingscote. She saw little need to employ a housekeeper when the house was closed up during the off-season. However, even a modest British country house like Kiplin Hall supported a skeleton staff, including a housekeeper and steward, when the family was elsewhere. The housekeeper's room was therefore a crucial element of British service architecture.

The prevalence of female servants in American houses is reflected in the absence of gender division within American service architecture. A greater balance of the genders in British country houses often led to country house romances, scandals and probably forms of harassment and abuse. Strict gender segregation was advocated by contemporary design guides as a means of encouraging and enforcing morality. At Calke Abbey, where there was little gender segregation, there were multiple instances of female servants becoming pregnant by menservants. At Kiplin, prior to the construction of the male White Wing, the valet and housekeeper married. Was it a coincidence that after the wing was built, there were no instances of servant marriage? In contrast, American plantation houses encouraged communal living between enslaved servants. George Washington actively supported and encouraged family values and the marriage of his enslaved peoples. The predominance of female household servants in American houses meant that separating the genders was not such an issue. At Kingscote for example, menservants likely lodged in the carriage house, whilst female servants were accommodated in the house itself. This segregated the two

and obviated the need to create gendered zones within the house itself. Female servants therefore had very different lived experiences in both countries.

#### 6.4 Adapting for a 'classless' society

Since America did not have a formal class structure, masters and employers looked for other ways to convey social distinction. Britain's class structure was essential for country house development, just as building country houses underpinned social status. As seen in Chapter 2, Calke Abbey's and Uppark's early owners built their houses in conjunction with purchased baronetcies in order to establish themselves in the British aristocracy. The efficient staffs that ran their houses were crucial to establishing and maintaining their social position. With a lack of both titles and wealth, these servants belonged to a distinctly different class from their employers. Employment terms included room and board, along with minimal wages paid bi-annually or annually, ensuring servants had few funds with which to move on. Additionally, there was little opportunity for social advancement beyond a position as senior servant in the household itself. This system, which evolved from an earlier feudal model, ensured servants knew and stayed in their place.

Although American social status and power was directly linked to wealth rather than hereditary rank, country houses remained a critical status symbol. Despite the lack of a formal class structure, social divisions organically developed in response to the country's circumstances. The rustic, informal conditions of colonial America did not foster a class-based society. Although early colonists attempted to retain established class distinctions, the rules of society were impractical for colonial life. The American Revolution provided a marked opportunity to formally determine a social structure. Although George Washington was asked to serve as America's king, the new government settled on a republican nation led by the people, establishing an egalitarian ideal instead. Through land and property ownership, including enslaving Africans, plantation owners in the South became America's first ruling class. The country's first concentrated area of native-born landowners were Southerners, which further enhanced their influential status (Smith 1980).

In the nineteenth century, many immigrants left Britain specifically in order to bypass the class system, hoping to better themselves through hard work. Just as plantations

offered early settlers hope, the massive wealth being accumulated by industrialists and entrepreneurs lured immigrants to ‘the land of the free’. Many of America’s domestic servants initially immigrated with a goal of purchasing land or gaining wealth through business, thereby climbing the social ladder. However, the power and wealth of the upper class depended on the oppression of lower classes. Antebellum America accomplished this through taking advantage of enslaved labour, as discussed above. This established an unspoken, but undeniable class distinction between America’s upper and lower classes that continued to be perpetuated through America’s domestic service history.

Service architecture was used to enforce social divisions. Without a conventional class system, the design of service architecture was critical to establishing the social divide between servants and masters. America’s elite used architecture to oppress their social inferiors, thus conveying an unofficial, yet immovable social structure. Class markers evident in service space design actively asserted this social distinction. Previous scholarship attributes this familiar upstairs-downstairs divide to established British traditions and American desire for a sense of continental legitimacy. However, subtle differences in British and American houses, when put in context to cultural events, reveal an additional layer of meaning in American service architecture.

Analysis of British service spaces and systems Chapters 2 and 3 highlight the significance of and reliance on a defined servant hierarchy. Houses include entire departments dependent on the presence of senior servants, like Kiplin’s White Wing, which was under the control of the butler. However, many of these spaces are absent in American houses. This suggests that even senior servants had little power in American country house service structure. However, the need for wealthy Americans to socially separate themselves from their servants actually created a more concrete master-servant divide than Britain’s. This began with enslaved labour and strict segregation between country house populations aided by locating service facilities in separate buildings. This segregation was not confined to enslaved servants. Plantation houses were sometimes designed without spaces for servants at all. Even as George Washington’s opinions against slavery developed and he hired more white servants, service spaces were not included in Mount Vernon’s renovations. When George Noble Jones constructed Kingscote, architect Richard Upjohn’s original plans included an

attached service wing, in alignment with architectural trends in his native Britain. However, when Jones, who was a slave owner, needed to enlarge Kingscote's service spaces he did not choose to extend Upjohn's wing. Instead he constructed an additional wing, connected to a corner of the original service block, which pushed servants even farther away from family spaces. In contrast Kiplin's 1820s men's block addition was added directly to the house and formed an enclosed service courtyard, further unifying the service area. Kingscote's alterations therefore reflected earlier American ideals of maximising segregation between servants and family.

The cultural differences between British and American concepts of service are particularly apparent when one examines the history of sanitation in the country house. While British households were accustomed to servants attending to their personal needs by emptying chamber pots well into the nineteenth century, the tension between American masters and servants was particularly hard to dismiss in this most intimate act of servitude. The development of country house sanitation in America was used as a means to enforce social differences within households. However, the focus was less on ensuring a difference in the status of master and servant facilities, and more on ensuring privacy for the elite. The importance of separate, but modern facilities for both servants and family is illustrated at Mount Vernon. Enslaved servants used separate toilets or 'necessaries' in the Quarter, which again emphasises the importance of segregation. In the American South, such facilities were also a practical consideration. The large number of enslaved peoples living in dirt-floor buildings would have been a breeding ground for disease if they relied on chamber pots. Whilst two necessaries were built at the back of the main house for family use, two others faced the main drive, their octagonal shape harmonising with the estate's architecture. Their prominent location, and doors opening only into pathways traversed by the elite advertised social division to both classes. These early arrangements set a precedent for America's later country houses. Kingscote was designed with modern plumbing, including bathrooms. Other nineteenth-century Newport houses, like the Breakers had more and elaborate bathrooms with gold fixtures and hot and cold, fresh and salt water taps. Along with conveying status, these spaces met employers increasing desire for personal privacy. Adverse attitudes towards servants created a desire for more privacy, and America's elite preferred to attend to their own personal hygiene. This modern sanitation allowed for minimal servant presence in their private spaces.

As explored at Kiplin Hall, Uppark, Calke Abbey and Brodsworth, the British model of service reflected elite ideas about how the morality and social wellbeing of the servant class could be structured and controlled through architecture. In the Victorian period, when American houses were increasingly reliant on an immigrant Irish workforce, there seems to be evidence of a willingness to adopt some of these British ideals and retrofit them to American houses. Kingscote's late-nineteenth century addition included a dining room on the ground floor and nurseries on the top floor. These spaces were positioned between the main house and the service wing, an arrangement that would have been familiar to their Irish servants and which would have reminded them, regardless of their social aspirations in America, that subservience was still expected by employers in America's supposedly 'classless' society. The Kings' decision to physically separate the house in order to insert these spaces where they might have been expected in a British house forced servants to observe the strict social ideals of Britain: they were spaces occupied by both classes, but their lived experiences were very different.

Opposing goals further aggravated the tension between the two classes. American servants saw service as a stepping stone to social mobility, at the same time that employers expected lifetime career servants like they perceived was common in Britain. This clash created a cycle whereby elite Americans tightly controlled servants in order to maintain their ideal master-servant relationship, but in doing so created a hostile environment that motivated servants to seek other, better opportunities. American society's adverse view of servitude, and elite needs for privacy encouraged closeness between servants within households.

It was essential for British upper servants such as housekeepers, stewards, butlers, and governesses to operate separately from lower servants, which often led to these positions being described in literature as socially awkward. They not only functioned as liaison between the family and lower servants, but their social position reflected this middle ground. In contrast, eighteenth-century American estate owners were more personally involved in their households due in part to the kinds of social and cultural conventions relating to mistresses and the absence of housekeepers, but also other labour structures. The titles of upper servants such as butlers were retained, but the

seniority and responsibility over other servants was denied to them. The implications of these differences for concepts of individual and communal identity deserves further study. On the one hand, senior British servants may have had more power and agency than their American counterparts. But on the other, the American service community may have shared a greater sense of commonality and community, due to the absence of these household hierarchies.

The segregation of early plantations encouraged the development of strong connections between enslaved peoples. Estate architecture physically distanced them from both white family and white servants. Instead of roles with specific limits and responsibilities, enslaved house servants were required to do any job demanded. For example, Frank Lee served as Mount Vernon's butler and was clearly a well-respected member of the staff. He had a room within the house and a butler's pantry to oversee. However, when the family was away he was often commanded to complete menial tasks like whitewashing and breaking gravel for the driveway. This is a sharp contrast to Britain, where the established servant hierarchy defined tasks according to positions. Frank's treatment, typical of enslaved house servants, was another tool for removing power and thus freedom from individuals. This universal lack of freedom, regardless of position, united enslaved peoples. Plantation architecture also encouraged closeness. They slept, ate and did laundry together, the self-sufficient Quarter functioning like a small village.

After emancipation, these communities remained strong. Some former enslaved peoples formed free black towns. Others used ties built during enslavement to form organisations to support goals not achievable for individual blacks. Newport was a major slave-trading centre, and thus had an early black presence, as well as the accompanying oppression. In response to this, the African Union Society was founded in 1780 by free blacks and acted as a platform for black voices. Additionally, two black neighbourhoods developed in the nineteenth century. After race riots by working class white people destroyed much of the buildings, the communities became instrumental in establishing a police presence in the city. These endeavours illustrate how early networks based in servitude expanded beyond the country house and estate and into a larger, metropolitan scale.

Some groups within the service community were bound together by their experience of immigration. The nineteenth century saw waves of immigrants into America, many already trained in domestic service or eager to take it up. Irish people fleeing the Famine composed a large percentage of this community. Governmental schemes encouraged other nationalities such as the Swedish to immigrate in significant numbers. This fed into trends among the elite for certain nationalities to fill particular roles based on preconceptions of specific skill sets: an English butler, French nurse, or Irish maid for example. In general however, the life of an immigrant in service was difficult, as they acclimated to a new country and were subject to treatment based on national stereotypes and prejudices. Like the black communities discussed above, immigrants benefited from forming tight communities based on their shared culture. Two of David and Ella King's seven servants in 1885 were Swedish. This was unusual for the Eastern seaboard since most Swedish immigrants relocated to the Midwest. This disproportionately large percentage may be explained by the Kings' close lifelong friendship with the Swedish ambassador and his wife. This suggests that immigrant networks may have traversed class lines. Immigrant servants often relied on one another for job opportunities. American employers preferred to hire individuals based on personal recommendations rather than using hiring agencies. America's lack of professional domestic training services further limited employers' options for sourcing well-trained staff. Servants with established positions within elite households were therefore well placed to refer friends and family members to their employers. In doing so they built cultural networks within the servant spaces of America's country houses, therefore maintaining cultural connections in a new country in an otherwise isolating profession.

## 6.5 Conclusions

These discussions clearly illustrate that enslaved labour influenced early American domestic service development far more than Britain ideals, establishing the roots that pervaded its evolution. Country house scholars commonly overlook the separate buildings in which enslaved domestics worked due to their vernacular nature. However, the resulting limited focus on polite architecture ignores America's substantial black presence. Social historians searching for servants within these country houses therefore interpret the lack of service spaces within main houses as less-developed versions of British models. However, examining how enslaved peoples



functioned within the wider estate reveals a complex master-servant relationship unique to America. Revealing their lived experience in domestic service contributes to diverse disciplines including material culture, social history, gender studies and race studies. This approach is particularly useful today as the value of intersectionality in social justice issues is increasingly recognised.

Examining American service architecture in conjunction with British spaces exposes dissimilarities throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Mapping cultural phenomena onto architectural differences reveals significances that cannot be attributed to simple adaptation of the established British model. Instead they signify service spaces were designed to support different power dynamics embedded within the American service system. Due to a continuous gender imbalance, American domestic service was not dependent on men. Elite women undermined domestics of both genders in order to gain their own power within a male-dominated society. By limiting service spaces they more directly controlled servants themselves. Conversely, ill-treated servants feeling the oppression of such configurations were motivated to move out of service, contributing to a lack of servants lamented by the elite in the late-nineteenth century. This contributed to the downfall of the American system, even while British domestic service continued to function until World War I robbed the great houses of their male servants.

Architecture is also a vital instrument for exposing servant life in the absence of conventional documentary sources. Prevailing narratives presenting service from elite perspectives obscure the unique American experience. In contrast, centring servant perceptions respects the direct correlation between distinctly American challenges and the development of cultural values such as personal independence. The development of communities based on shared experiences of servitude highlights the consistent oppression of certain groups even within a society that did not have formal social boundaries. These networks were subsequently used to advocate for better conditions in professions beyond service. Personal connections within such groups enabled people within an isolated profession to move into better positions, careers and marriage. The link between the rise of these communities and shared experiences in domestic service has largely gone unexplored in many servant narratives, but adds to the richness of America's cultural heritage.

This buildings-led approach has shown that architectural differences reveal a fundamental difference towards servitude between Britain and America, heavily influenced by issues of race, gender and class. Wealthy plantation owners supporting a large labour force built America's earliest country houses. Domestic service was initially entwined with enslaved labour and was therefore seen as demeaning work by all, even indentured servants and poor whites. Later houses were not dependent on landed estates and began adopting select British service spaces, whilst leaving out others that were not necessary to the American system. After slavery's abolishment, these houses were staffed by an influx of female immigrants who filled the domestic service gap. Their status as poor, foreign females continued to contribute to the occupation's negative reputation. Although the houses had recognisable British spaces and configurations, household dynamics that evolved from America's early traditions were markedly different. The potential for social advancement implied in America's classless system encouraged social mobility in servants. In conclusion, using architectural analysis to expose the lived experience from the perspective of underrepresented populations has a powerful impact, including further implications for modern society, discussed next in the Epilogue of the thesis.

## Epilogue

In this thesis I have argued that American service architecture does not simply emulate the British country house model. Instead, this study shows that the story of service in both contexts is more complicated, as is the relationship between them. My ability to construct this more nuanced narrative draws on my own background in working with both British and American houses, but it also reflects the adoption of a methodology that moves beyond conventional ways of looking at country house architecture. Furthermore, because academic critique alone only serves to polarise opinions and perceptions between the academy, the curatorial profession and the general public, my research questions are driven by a need for action. Rather than assuming that the study of the country house is a sub-discipline that can only ever reproduce and reinforce the narratives and interests of the social, political and cultural elite, in the past and the present, I have sought to ask: *how can we make them do the work that we need them to do within historical archaeology, architectural history and heritage studies?* My research has suggested that because of the deep cultural history and wide veneration of elite houses on both sides of the Atlantic, this work can be, and is indeed most effectively done from within the established institution. As someone who seeks to pursue a future career in the field of curating historic houses, I want to understand how we can expand the narrative of the country house to tell different stories, welcome more diverse communities and be more inclusive, so that individuals and communities who might currently feel excluded from the country house experience also find themselves represented there. Although my thesis is not a heritage-driven study, it therefore responds to, and takes up current concerns surrounding inclusivity in heritage (Smith 2009).

Throughout this study, I have sought to demonstrate the potential of applying well-established methods of archaeological and spatial analysis to the investigation of service architecture. In one sense, this is a product of my training within a department of archaeology and very much the ‘York approach’ which has been applied to other kinds of historical architecture by existing PhD students, from Victorian churches to industrial buildings, workhouses and asylums, eighteenth-century town houses, theatres and industrial workers’ housing. But it also draws on a rich tradition within

America where such approaches are regularly applied to the study of vernacular buildings. Buildings archaeologists have long argued that such methods afford the opportunity to look at types of buildings thought to be less significant in the history of architectural style and typology, or difficult in terms of the absence of surviving documentary sources. My study has shown that the vernacular qualities of early service architecture, especially buildings that sit as separate structures within a larger complex, such as those at Mount Vernon, lend themselves well to this approach. Taking a vernacular approach invites and necessitates an understanding and study of local architecture, since local craftsman often built these spaces and they were, at times in charge of design or changes. Such approaches also offer new insights into well-established analyses of more integrated service spaces within polite architecture, such as at Kiplin Hall and Kingscote. By providing the tools to look more pragmatically at the joinery, hardware and technology of houses, it also facilitates the application of access and isovist analysis and the study of spatial configuration through the identification of small but significant traces of former buildings, doorways, use and wear patterns. In this way, my thesis also contributes to wider debates about methodologies of recording, analysis and interpretation within historical archaeology, in Britain and America (Green and Dixon 2016).

One of the most important contributions of my thesis to the field of country house studies has been the argument for greater awareness of the culturally distinct elements of service history. This is obviously driven partly by my own cultural experience and knowledge base, but it also responds to current questions within the humanities about the need to problematise the legacy of colonialism. The themes of race, gender and class that explored here are already acknowledged as tenets of colonial hegemony that are central to post-colonial critiques like Britain's new imperial history (see for example Harper and Constantine 2010, Levine 2007 and Mohanram 2007). This thesis demonstrates that country house servant studies can be a place of intersectionality for these important concepts. This calls attention to questions about how the template of the country house adapted to and became very different in other colonial contexts, such as the Caribbean, India and Australia (see for example Young 2007). It invites critical comparison with the country house and service architecture of other colonial powers, such as France and its colonies like Algiers and Reunion Island (Cohen 2006; Stanziani 2013). Such studies might encourage us to think more about how ideas of cultural

exchange informed and transformed the British country house experience, especially as members of the British aristocracy and gentry returned from diplomatic service in the colonies, or from managing colonial plantations, bringing with them not only ideas and experiences but also servants like enslaved Black body servants and Indian ayahs, back to Britain.

The focus on American culture also relates to the historical construct of the British Atlantic as a field of enquiry. Whilst it is not surprising that American scholars have consistently sought to gain a place at the table of British country house studies through fora such as the Attingham Trust, my thesis suggests there are more and different stories to be told, which open up and diversify the colonial country house narrative. Rather than considering America as Britain's failed protégé, which simply adopted and emulated ways of living, building and working slightly later than their British counterparts and in slightly less-sophisticated ways, it acknowledges the distinctive history of the American country house story. It highlights important regional differences between the North and the South, the relationship between plantation houses and vernacular buildings, local resources, landscape contexts, economic and political priorities, and household dynamics. Cross-cultural influences are shown to be more fluid than usually assumed, with immigrants and enslaved servants using their own cultural experiences to shape the spaces and practices around them. Understanding the how service spaces were lived in is an important way in which the often-undocumented histories of these groups can be given a voice. In this way, I hope that my thesis has suggested how country houses can begin to embrace a more inclusive idea of heritage, to tell the story of more diverse populations in a way that acknowledges the history of multiple classes, genders and ethnicities. Such an approach acknowledges their contribution to history in a way that does not simply reproduce prevailing class, gender and racial stereotypes.

My work has practical as well as intellectual implications for the ways in which service spaces are presented to and experienced by visitors. Because they have customarily been considered less important or interesting than areas occupied by families, service spaces in country house museums have often become service spaces for tourists, accommodating visitor facilities including cafés, shops and toilets. This study highlights the importance of putting servant stories front and centre within the visitor

experience. However, it has argued that it is important not to look at service spaces in isolation or rely too heavily on the ‘upstairs-downstairs’ divide. Country house owners were interested in their servants and their servants in turn influenced them. My analysis of circulation patterns reveals that servants were much more mobile within the household than is often appreciated, present both within the spaces of the house and their own service quarters. We need to ways of representing the presence of servants within all areas of houses, as well as in those spaces explicitly designated for service functions. Moreover, I have also shown that stories can be told about buildings that no longer exist, through the use of photographic and cartographic sources. An everyday country house like Kiplin Hall, with only one remaining interior servant space, still furnishes us with the opportunity to tell a rich story of architectural and social change. Servant biographies and lived experiences in dialogue with the biographies and architectural legacies of the families who owned them also contribute to this picture.

Of course, many historic house museums have sought over the past few years, to offer exhibitions and activities related to servant spaces such as the kitchen, employing new initiatives such as living history using first- or third-person narratives. Anglesey Abbey (Cambs), operated by the National Trust has incorporated written quotes from the home’s servants onto mirrors, scrub brushes and other objects that were a daily part of domestic servants’ lives. The Breakers (Newport, Rhode Island) is currently in the research phase of a project to open further service spaces to the public. However, houses that do not conform to historical ideals either because they do not include a full complement of servant spaces or have been significantly altered over time are especially challenging. It is often the case that a single space or two is designated for this function, as if this represents the entirety of the servant experience. At the Morse-Libby Mansion (Portland, Maine, USA) a first floor space has been identified as the housekeeper’s room. The extent of the museum’s servant story is limited to wall panels and generic furniture. Kedleston Hall’s (Derbs) kitchen, the only service space open to the public is only minimally interpreted through the presence of the great hearth and inclusion of rows of copious copper pots and crockery, but is overwhelmed by the space’s current function as a café. Whilst these solutions perfunctorily recognise the interest in servants’ presence, they also place disproportionate value on their role as labourers. For in addition to being a work space, the kitchen also functioned a social centre, as illustrated at Mount Vernon for example, by the presence of the children of

the enslaved cook in this space. Other spaces can be used to tell the story not only of servant-master dynamics, but also of interpersonal servant relationships. Issues of seniority, trust and personal freedom are all encapsulated in the sleeping spaces allocated to servants. Kiplin Hall's long-time late-nineteenth-century housekeeper was even given a house after her retirement, which speaks to a depth of trust and closeness between master and servant. The ubiquitous 'backstairs' is a universally recognised element of service architecture, but it was only one of many circulatory spaces used by servants. Features such as corridors, outdoor paths and underground tunnels like at Uppark, as well as doors and gates for access are particularly haunting without a physical servant presence. Such liminal spaces are best understood when considered in the context of their relationship to elite spaces and how servants moved through them. Their evolution is critical to understanding servants' lived experience. The strict gender segregation added in Kiplin's early nineteenth-century White Wing through the creation of separate staircases and specific menservant areas, created a completely different lived experience than Kingscote's lone servant corridor with its single staircase. This thesis has highlighted the importance of circulation as an under-explored and little-interpreted, yet highly varied form of space which was critical to the functioning of country house service architecture, especially where new design ideals, cultural norms or household structures were being imposed onto older, earlier buildings, as at Kiplin Hall.

Many of these spaces were inside the house but others were outside and have therefore been downplayed as aspects of the designed landscape. However, this once again ignores the lived reality of service. Servant spaces existed in a wide variety of locations and separate buildings. Outbuildings like stables and greenhouses are also important structures in which it is possible to see servant experiences intersecting with changing expectations and wider cultural shifts, as at Calke Abbey, where the garden buildings were greatly enlarged to satisfy the unique requirements of the reclusive 'Isolated Baronet', whilst simultaneously reflecting an elite fashion for scientific farming prompted by the Enlightenment. The location and visibility of spaces such as kitchens, dairies and laundries like Brodsworth's repurposed eighteenth-century washhouse might reveal expectations about the location of activities considered no longer suitable to be in close proximity to polite spaces of consumption, or alternatively, the desire by some house owners to closely supervise activities and interactions, likely to discourage

theft or inappropriate interactions between the sexes. Rather than setting up an opposition or tension between the servant and family story therefore, my thesis invites a much more holistic approach to presenting the story of the country house community, of family and servants, and of all the spaces that they shared, and which served to structure and reproduce their mutually-dependent lives and changing household dynamics over time.

Through my case studies, and the close consideration of servant as well as family biographies, I have sought to show that although the distinctive identity and family structure of country house owners inevitably drove the architectural agenda of their homes and provided the spatial and material conditions of servant life, servants themselves also actively negotiated and sometimes transformed these spaces themselves, as a means of structuring their own identities and social relations, with the family and each other. The micronarratives that I have produced at sites such as Mount Vernon enable us to delve deep into the history of a single house and its inhabitants, focusing on relationships, moments of change, and motivations for such developments. I have highlighted how previously-undervalued houses like Kingscote, provides an architectural expression of a pivotal point in America's domestic service history. But I have also shown that even in Britain, 'everyday' country houses such as Kiplin offer very different ways of questioning a supposedly well-established architectural phasing and its implications for the material conditions of servant life.

What are the implications then, of these findings for curators? Within the heritage sector there is growing awareness of the importance of exploring alternative histories. House museums have been identified as one of the areas that are particularly suited to this because the concept of home resonates so universally (Hodge 2011; Hodge and Beranek 2011). My work suggests that we must look again at the biographies of people (families and servants) in conjunction with the lifecycle of houses. Every one has a distinctive story to tell. Celebrating their diversity should benefit historic house museums struggling to survive by identifying different ways of drawing new and more diverse audiences to visit them. The Geffrye Museum's 2016 'Swept Under the Carpet? Servants in London Households, 1600-2000' exhibit proved that even with minimal servant spaces it is possible to not only tell their stories but attract visitors. There individual servant stories were told by interpreting vignette moments within



non-service spaces, which also highlighted ubiquitous presence of servants in historic houses. Micronarratives are highly individualistic stories, resulting from examining the relationships between family, servants, and the architecture over a prolonged period of time. They move away from generalities and stereotypes, allowing us to explore how people actually coped with social expectations, national situations and individual circumstances. They may require us to move away from well-established architectural narratives, especially the assumption that the ‘British story’ is the dominant form of cultural history, to which colonial nations are rather patronisingly invited to contribute a chapter or a footnote. Even within America there is opportunity to challenge the dominant narrative. Scholars like Beranek (2011) and Young (2017) make room to expand the story of the country’s foundation by exploring alternative histories like feminism, hidden within the white, male-centric founding narrative.

Through the comparison of British and American houses and a closer interrogation of the particular and distinctive experiences of service history and service culture, I have shown that the stereotypical vision of the lower-class, white, British servant is a model that is not helpful or valid in the history of American domestic service. The legacy of immigration and slavery created profound differences in the composition of and cultural attitudes towards service communities in the American country house. This is especially poignant now in light of the Black Lives Matter movement, which calls for a re-evaluation of whose history is being told, and by whom. In 2007 the bicentenary of the abolition of slavery in Britain prompted studies of connections between the British country house and slavery (Dresser and Hann 2013; Smith 2009). This paved the way for American heritage professionals to address slavery in American house museums – a more controversial topic because slavery actually existed on American estates. It would be very easy for slavery to become in American country house history, what ‘the servant story’ has become in Britain: the ‘other side’ of elite life, stereotyped and presented in a way that still emphasises and centres on the stories and experiences of the upper classes. But works by Pustz (2010) and Gallas and Perry (2014) have begun to explore how these issues can be successfully and directly addressed in American museums.

The point of undertaking a critical cross-cultural comparison deploying similar methods of archaeological analysis and biographical interpretation has been to show

that the story is more complicated in both contexts, and within and between British and American houses. It demonstrates that the lives of servants and families were closely inter-related and that the spaces they inhabited, moved through and experienced speak eloquently of this inter-relationship, if only we have the willingness to listen. My profound belief as a researcher is that it is possible to do this and that this will benefit houses themselves, increasing their appeal to a wider and more diverse range of audiences, increasing visit times and/or encouraging repeat trips to truly explore the whole house. Dispensing with current 'boilerplate' interpretations will also encourage visits to more properties, even those owned by the same organisation, because of the variety of stories they tell.

I started this thesis with a sketch of the experience of the modern country house tourist, and I want to end with a vision for what the same visit might look like if I have the opportunity to apply my ideas and findings to one of the country houses I hope to work with in the future. You approach the house from the main drive, but this time you choose to follow the exterior paths around the house, entering the service wing first. As you move freely throughout service and family spaces, you are presented with stories of servants alongside families, encouraging you to think about their interactions. You hear voices and sounds of work life mingling with and penetrating family spaces, bells ringing in service quarters as social life also unfolds alongside work activities. A half-finished cup of tea sits on a side table next to a half-made bed, awaiting a maid. A note from the mistress to the cook about the day's menu sits on the long, worn oak table in the kitchen. A footman's box of personal possessions sits open on his bed, his comb hastily discarded nearby as he rushed to answer a bell. You move through the long gallery, stopping in front of one of the many family portraits. Your attention has been captured by a placard in front, on which is displayed an enlarged portion of the portrait's background. You read about the story of enslavement and colonisation hinted at by the presence of the small black boy painted there and note the name of an organisation undertaking current research into this area.

You leave feeling much more aware of the society of the country house and its reflection of and connection to social structures and tensions of today. It makes you think about how we live our lives now. You sit outside on the grass with a friend, taking in the whole house. You begin to discuss questions prompted by your visit.

What responsibilities do we have for those who make them our lives possible, but we do not always see, not just in houses but workplaces and landscapes? How are our lives and theirs inter-linked? What attitudes and aspirations do we have towards serving and being served by others? What can cultural differences in the past and present offer us? How do people inhabit and use architecture to structure a sense of self, relations with others, better lived experiences in the future? You leave feeling truly enriched, bringing these reflections into your everyday life.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

Brodsworth Hall Archives. Doncaster: Doncaster Archives.

DD/BROD/12/1 (1884) *Brodsworth Hall Vouchers.*

DD/BROD/13/2 (1885) *An Inventory of the household furniture, ornaments, pictures, statuary, jewellery plate & plated articles, wines, linen, china & glass, horses and carriages, guns and plants and various effects in and about the mansion, stable, kennels, houses, gardens and premises of Brodsworth Hall near Doncaster in the County of York late the property of C.S.A. Thellusson Esqre. and valued for probate.*

Letters of Richard Upjohn. New York: The New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library Manuscripts and Archives Division.

MssCol 3115/b11992504/13/3 (1839) Letter from George Noble Jones to Richard Upjohn.

Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, Historical Manuscript Collection. Mount Vernon, VA: Fred W Smith Library for the Study of George Washington.

(1753) *An Inventory of the Estate of Lawrence Washington.*

Newport Records of Probate (NRP). Newport, RI: Newport City Hall Probate Court.

NRP Vol. 25 (1868) *Inventory Probate Inventory for William Henry King Estate.*

NRP Vol. 32 (1878-1879) *Annual Account May 1878-June 1879 with The Estate of William H King, David King Jr.*

NRP Vol. 33 (1879-1880) *Annual Account July 1879-June 1880 with The Estate of William H King, David King Jr.*

NRP Vol. 34 (1880-1881) *Annual Account 1880-1881 with The Estate of William H King, David King Jr.*

NRP Vol. 35 (1881-1882) *Annual Account 1881-1882 with The Estate of William H King, David King Jr.*

NRP Vol. 36 (1882-1883) *Annual Account 1882-1883 with The Estate of William H King, David King Jr.*

NRP Vol. 47 (1894) *Inventory Probate Inventory for William Henry King Estate.*

Kiplin Hall Archives. Northallerton: North Yorkshire County Record Office.

PR/BOL 1/2 (1656-1811) Bolton on Swale, Baptisms, Marriages & Burials 1656-1811.

QSB Easter 1793 MIC 2278/1306 (1793) A Plan of Proposed alterations of Roads in the Township of Kiplin.

ZBL II/5 (4 September 1740) Will of Christopher Crowe, Essex. esq.

ZBL IV/1/295 (27 November 1865) Letter from W Fuller to Lady Tyrconnel.

ZBL IV/1/346 (24 January 1868) Letter from Captain Walter Talbot to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/347 (31 October 1868) Letter from John Topham to Captain Walter Talbot.

ZBL IV/1/377 (26 March 1868) Letter from H Bentley to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/517 (18 August 1868) Letter from Charles H Firth to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/585 (22 December 1868) Letter from Thomas Waite to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/600 (10 January 1869) Letter from Walter Carpenter to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/667 (01 April 1869) Letter from Walter Carpenter to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/679 (24 May 1869) Letter from Robson, Wood & Co. to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/855 (15 August 1870) Letter from Walter Carpenter to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/993 (01 March 1873) Letter from Walter Carpenter to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/1027 (16 April 1874) Letter from Walter Carpenter to John Topham.

ZBL IV/1/1027a (16 Mar 1874) Letter from Thos H Wyatt to Capt. Carpenter.

ZBL IV/1/1029 (9 June 1874) Letter from John Topham to George Aitken.

ZBL IV/1/1032 (27 July 1874) Letter from S Owens & Co. to Walter Carpenter.

ZBL IV/1/1140 (7 November 1869) Letter from W Eden Nesfield to Walter Carpenter.

ZBL IV/1/1141 (8 November 1879) Letter from Captain Carpenter to W Eden Nesfield.

ZBL IV/1/1205 (15 June 1881) Letter from Edward Jones to Walter Carpenter.

ZBL IV/3/1/4 (31 October 1735-24 October 1737) Accounts and vouchers.

ZBL IV/3/1/14 (22 September 1739-10 October 1741) Accounts (with list of sums paid to Christopher Crowe the Younger).

ZBL IV/3/1/25 (10 November 1744-10 October 1745) Accounts (with Mary Williams's house-keeping accounts).

ZBL IV/3/1/37 (21 November 1747-26 November 1748) Accounts and vouchers (with Mary Williams's accounts and accounts of the administration of Ann Stephenson's goods and chattels).

ZBL IV/3/1/48 (26 November 1748-37 March 1750) Accounts (with account of corn bought).

ZBL IV/3/12 (1872-1902) Hall and garden accounts.

ZBL IV/3/16 Vouchers.

ZBL IV/6/3 (1868) Furnished Mansion-House, Park, Shooting, and Fishing.

ZBL IV/10/3/3 (nd, c1868) Inventory of the Hall.

ZBL M/1 (1723) A map of the Estate of Christopher Crow esq., lying at High Kipling and Low Kipling in the parish of Bolton and in the County of York, surveyed June the fifth 1723 Scale 5 chains to 1 inch.

ZBL M/17 (1818) Elevation for the South Front.

ZBL M/21 (c1880-1895) Plan of Kiplin Hall improvements.

Kiplin Hall Trust Archives. Kiplin: Kiplin Hall.

Anon. (n.d.) 'The Manors of Woodford'.

B14-F05-D01 (1892) 'Diary of Sarah (Sally) Carpenter'.

B01-F17-D01 (1891) 'Admiral Carpenter's 1891 diary'.

Carpenter, W (n.d.) 'Hand-written notes by Admiral Carpenter' transcription by C Schulz.

Denison, T (1887) Inventory of Furniture & Other Effects At Kiplin Hall.

Yorkshire Archaeological and Historical Society. Leeds: University of Leeds Special Collections.

YAS DD168 1/7 (1861) *Estates of Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson Esqre. Supplemental Account.*

YAS DD168 1/10 (1863) *Thellusson Estates: The Sixth new rent account for the year 1863 comprising one year's rents and outgoings of the estates belonging to Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson Esqre.*

YAS DD168 1/11 (1863) *Estates of Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson Esquire Supplemental Account.*

YAS DD168 1/13 (1865) *Thellusson Estates: The eighth new rent account for the year 1865 comprising one year's rents and outgoings of the estates of Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson Esqre.*

YAS DD168 1/29 (1881) *Thellusson Estates: The twenty fourth rent account for the year 1881 comprising one year's rents and outgoings (from 1st January to 31st December 1881) of the estates of Charles Sabine Augustus Thellusson Esquire.*

YAS DD168 1/36 (1887) *Thellusson Estates: The third rent account for the year 1887 (up to 31st January 1888) comprising rents and outgoings (from 1st January 1887 to 31st January 1888) of the estates of Peter Thellusson Esquire.*

YAS DD168 2 (1861) *Brodsworth Hall Specification of Works by Philip Wilkinson, Architect, London.*

YAS DD168 7/1/4 (1863) *Messrs Lapworth, Carpet Manufacturers, London, 1863: Account for supply and fitting of carpets and furniture at Brodsworth Hall.*

YAS DD168 7/1/5 (1863) *Messrs Lapworth, Carpet Manufacturers, London, 1863: Memorandum account of goods supplied to Captain Thellusson, Brodsworth.*

#### United Kingdom Census records

'54 Old Steine' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Brighton, Kemp Town subdistrict, Sussex.* Public Record Office: PRO RG9/591, folio 13, p 20.

Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Brodsworth Hall' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Brodsworth, Doncaster, Yorkshire.* Public Record Office: PRO RG9/3115, folio 19, p 9.

Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Brodsworth' (1871) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Brodsworth, Doncaster, Barmbrough subdistrict, Yorkshire.* Public Record Office: PRO RG10/4716, folio 39, p 7. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Brodsworth' (1891) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Brodsworth, Doncaster, Yorkshire.* Public Record Office: PRO RG12/3860, folio 17, p 3.

Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Butler's House' (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Catterick, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire.* Public Record Office: PRO HO107/1243, folio 10, p 4. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke Abbey' (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/191, folio 3, p 3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke Abbey' (1851) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/2084, folio 356-357, p 1-2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke Abbey' (1881) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG11/3140, folio 5-6, p 2-3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke Hall' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG9/2269, folio 4, p 1-2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke' (1871) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG10/3247, folio 3, p 1-2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Calke' (1891) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Calke, Calke Parish, Derbyshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG12/2510, folio 9, p 12. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Garden House to Kiplin Hall' (1851) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton, Appleton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/2377, folio 496, p 8. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Garden House' (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Catterick, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/1243, book 10, p 4. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Gardener's House' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG9/3663, folio 85, p 3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Gilbert Cargey' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG9/3663, folio 85, p 3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Hall' (1881) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Brodsworth, Doncaster, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG11/4687, folio 17, p 2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].



‘Kiplin Hall, Steward’s House’ (1851) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton, Appleton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/2377, folio 496, p 8. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Kiplin Hall’ (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Catterick, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/1243, book 10, p 4. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Kiplin Hall’ (1851) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton, Appleton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/2377, folio 495, p 7. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Kiplin Hall’ (1871) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG10/4864, folio 167, p 10. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Kiplin Hall’ (1881) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG11/4870, folio 148, p 2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Kiplin’ (1891) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG12/4027, folio 123, p 2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Mansion’ (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO RG9/3663, folio 84, p 2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Sleeping Rooms’ (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Kiplin, Catterick, Northallerton subdistrict, Yorkshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/1243, book 10, p 4. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Uppark House’ (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Harting, Sussex*. Public Record Office: PRO H107/1101, folio 18, p 3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Uppark House’ (1851) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Harting, Sussex*. Public Record Office: PRO H107/1654, folio 440-441, p 1-2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Uppark House' (1861) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Harting, Chichester subdistrict, Sussex*. Public Record Office: PRO RG9/628, folio 35, p 1-2. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Uppark House' (1871) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Harting, Harting Parish, Sussex*. Public Record Office: PRO RG10/1122, folio 29, p 2-3. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Watchouse Lane' (1841) *Census Returns of England and Wales for Northwood, Isle of Wight, Cowes subdistrict, Hampshire*. Public Record Office: PRO HO107/407, folio 51, p 42. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.co.uk> [accessed 01 March 2020].

#### United States Census records

'Clara Lingren' (1885) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 4*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 17, p 468. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Dwelling House 235' (1880) *United States Census for Bowery Street, Newport, Newport, Rhode Island*. Records of the Bureau of the Census: Roll 1210, p 225b. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Elizabeth Flutesene' (1885) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 4*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 17, p 454. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Elvia Clevents' (1885) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 4*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 17, p 447. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Family number 1823' (1860) *United States Census for Savannah District 3, Chatham, Georgia*. Family History Library Film: 803115, roll M653\_115, p 237. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'Family number 667' (1850) *United States Census for Bowery Street, Newport, Newport, Rhode Island*. Records of the Bureau of the Census: Roll M432\_842, p 365a. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

'George Valentine' (1885) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 4*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 17, p 432. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Household number 2440’ (1865) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 5*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 1, p 350. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Household number 83’ (1875) *Census of the state of New York, Fishkill, Dutchess*. New York State Archives, Albany, New York: Sheet 9. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

‘Maude King’ (1885) *Rhode Island State Census, City of Newport, Ward 4*. New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston, Massachusetts: Vol. 17, p 466. Available at: <http://www.ancestry.com> [accessed 01 March 2020].

### **Published primary sources**

Abbot, W (ed.) (1999) *The papers of George Washington: Retirement series*, Vol. 4. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia. Available at: <https://founders.archives.gov/volumes/Washington/06-04> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Abbot, W and Twohig, D (eds) (1994) *The papers of George Washington: Colonial series*, Vol. 9. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia. Available at: <https://founders.archives.gov/volumes/Washington/02-09> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Adams, S and Adams, S (1825) *The Complete Servant*. London: Knight and Lacey.  
Blackwell, E (1737) *A curious herbal*. London: J Nourse.

Budka, M (ed.) (1965) *Under their vine and fig tree: Travels through America in 1797-1799, 1805 with some further account of life in New Jersey*. Elizabeth, NJ: Grassman Publishing.

Crewe, G (1995) *Squire of Calke Abbey: Extracts from the journals of Sir George Crewe of Calke Abbey, South Derbyshire, 1815-1834*, ed C Kitching. Cromford, Derbs: Scarthin Books.

Downing, A (1852) *The architecture of country houses*. New York: D Appleton.

Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1931) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 2. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3499105> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1938) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 27. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015011913475> [accessed 15 April 2020].

- Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1939a) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 31. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015008612296> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1939b) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 32. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015010470410> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1940a) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 33. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015012061332> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1940b) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 34. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015010477399> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Fitzpatrick, J (ed.) (1940c) *The writings of George Washington*, Vol. 35. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015009169627> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Gibbs, J (1728) *A Book of Architecture, Containing the Designs of Buildings and Ornaments*. London: W Innys and R Manby, P Knapton and C Hitch.
- Glasse, H (1762) *The Servants Directory*. Dublin: J Potts.
- Hamilton, S (1901) *Letters to Washington and accompanying papers*, Vol. 3. New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015026646987> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Hill, J (1757) *Eden: or, a compleat body of gardening*. London: T Osborne.
- Horne, E (1923) *What the butler winked at: Being the life and adventures of Eric Horne, Butler*. London: T Werner Laurie.
- Hussey, T (1847) *Illustrations of British mycology*. London: Reeve Bros.
- Jermy, L (1934) *The memories of a working woman*. Norwich: Goose and Son.
- Kerr, R (1865) *The gentleman's house: Or, how to plan English residences*. London: John Murray.
- Lanceley, W (1925) *From hall-boy to house-steward*. London: E Arnold and Co.
- Langley, B (1740) *The city and country builder's and workman's treasury of designs*. London: J Ilive for Thomas Langley.
- MacDonald, J (1927) *Memoirs of an eighteenth-century footman: travels (1745-1779)*. London: Routledge.
- Maurice, M (1847) *Mothers and Governesses*. London: John W Parker.

Miller, P (1733) *The gardener's dictionary*. London: J Rivington.

Murphy, S (ed.) (1883) *Our Homes, and How to Make them Healthy*. London: Cassell & Co.

Muthesius, H (1904-1905) *Das Englische Haus* [The English House], 3 vols. Berlin: Wasmuth.

*Newport Villa Owners' Summer Visitors' and Residents Guide'* (1883) Boston: WG Morrison.

North, R (1981) *Of building: Roger North's writings on architecture*, eds H Colvin and J Newman. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Parliament, House of Lords (1728) Crowe & al. Petition referred to Judges. *Journal of the House of Lords*, 23(9 February), 175-180. Available at: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol23/pp175-180> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Peterson, E (1853) *History of Rhode Island*. New York: JS Taylor.

Scott, G (1858) *Remarks on secular and domestic Architecture, present and future*. London: John Murray.

Stevenson, J (1880) *House architecture*, 2 vols. London: Macmillan.

Ware, I and Jones, I (1756) *Complete body of architecture, adorned with plans elevations from original design*. London: T Osborne and J Shipton.

Washington, G (1976a) *The diaries of George Washington*, Vol. 1, eds D Jackson and D Twohig. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press. Available at: <https://lccn.loc.gov/75041365> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Washington, G (1976b) *The diaries of George Washington*, Vol. 2, eds D Jackson and D Twohig. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press. Available at: <https://lccn.loc.gov/75041365> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Washington, G (1978) *The diaries of George Washington*. Vol. 3, eds D Jackson and D Twohig. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press. Available at: <https://lccn.loc.gov/75041365> [accessed 15 April 2020].

Wells, H (1934) *Experiment in Autobiography - Discoveries and Conclusions of a Very Ordinary Brain (since 1866)*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Wright, L and Tinling, M (eds) (1943) *Quebec to Carolina in 1785-86, being the travel diary and observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., a young merchant of London*. San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library.

Young, A (1770) *A six months tour through the North of England*. Salisbury: Strahan.

## Secondary sources

- Aldsworth, F (2015) Uppark Revealed. *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 153, 113-170.
- Allfrey, M (1999) Brodsworth Hall: The preservation of a country house. In: D Baker and G Chitty (eds), *Managing Historic Site and Buildings: Reconciling Presentation and Conservation*. London: Routledge, pp. 115-127.
- Arnold, D (1998) *The Georgian country house*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Arnold, D (2002) *Reading architectural history*. London: Routledge.
- Arrowsmith, V and Carr-Whitworth, C (2004) Emerging from the shadows: Maids and mistresses at Brodsworth Hall. In: R Larsen (ed.), *Maids and mistresses: Celebrating 300 years of women and the Yorkshire country house*. York: Yorkshire Country House Partnership, pp. 13-23.
- Aslet, C (1990) *The American country house*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Aslet, C (2012) *The Edwardian country house: A social and architectural history*. London: Frances Lincoln.
- Barber, A (2016) *A souvenir guide: Calke Abbey, Derbyshire*. Swindon: National Trust.
- Bisbee, M (1994) *Of land & labor: Gunston Hall plantation life in the 18th century*. Lorton, VA: Board of Regents, Gunston Hall.
- Boase, T (2015) *The housekeeper's tale: The women who really ran the English country house*. London: Aurum Press.
- Bradney, J (2005) The carriage-drive in Humphry Repton's landscapes. *Garden History*, 33(1), 31-46.
- Bragg, W (1999) *DeRenne: Three generations of a Georgia family*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Brandt, L (2016) *First in the homes of his countrymen: George Washington's Mount Vernon in the American imagination*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Breen, E (2006) Home is where the trash is: Excavating the early households of Mount Vernon. *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archeological Society of Virginia*, 61(4), 186-196.

- Breen, E (2015) *Servant's Hall/Wash House*. Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery. Available at: <https://www.daacs.org/sites/servants-hall/> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Brigham, E and Ehrhardt, M (2013) *Financial management: Theory & practice*, 14th edn. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Brightman, J (2017) *Charting Chipeling: The archaeology of the Kiplin estate*. Northallerton: Solstice Heritage.
- Broderick, M (2010) *Triumvirate: McKim, Mead & White: Art, Architecture, Scandal, and Class in America's Gilded Age*. New York: Knopf.
- Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice (2006) *Slavery and Justice*. Available at: [https://www.brown.edu/Research/Slavery\\_Justice/documents/SlaveryAndJustice.pdf](https://www.brown.edu/Research/Slavery_Justice/documents/SlaveryAndJustice.pdf) [accessed 17 January 2020].
- Byrd, D (2016) Motive power: Fans, punkahs, and fly brushes in the Antebellum South. *Buildings & Landscapes: Journal of the Vernacular Architecture Forum*, 23(1), 29-51.
- Cabazos-Bernal, P, Formaglini, P and Giansanti, F (2016) From the suggestion of viewing to the understanding of photography: A case study on rephotography. *International Conference on Cultural Heritage and New Technologies*, 2-4 November 2015. Vienna: CHNT 20. Available at: <https://www.chnt.at/chnt-20-2015-proceedings/> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Cannadine, D and Musson, J (2018) *The country house: Past, present, future*. New York: Rizzoli.
- Carr-Whitworth, C (2009) *Brodsworth Hall*. London: English Heritage.
- Carson, C (2013) Architecture as social history. In: C Carson and C Lounsbury (eds), *The Chesapeake house: Architectural investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 12-28.
- Carson, C and Lounsbury, C (eds) (2013) *The Chesapeake house: Architectural investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Carter, T and Cromley, E (2005) *Invitation to vernacular architecture: A guide to the study of ordinary buildings and landscapes*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

- Cartwright, J (1898) List of persons in Yorkshire who paid the tax on male servants in 1780. *The Yorkshire Archaeological Society Journal*, 14, 65-80.
- Chappell, E (2013) Housing slavery. In: C Carson and C Lounsbury (eds), *The Chesapeake house: Architectural investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 156-178.
- Chitty, G (2018) 'Caring for Brodsworth: An impact study of the "conservation in action" project at Brodsworth Hall 2016-17.' Research report. York: University of York.
- Christie, C (2000) *The British country house in the eighteenth century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Clee, N (2012) *Eclipse: The horse that changed racing history forever*. New York: Overlook Press.
- Cliffe, J (1969) *The Yorkshire gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War*. London: Athlone Press.
- Cliffe, J (1999) *The world of the country house in seventeenth-century England*. London: Yale University Press.
- Cohen, J (2006) Architectural history and the colonial question: Casablanca, Algiers and beyond. *Architectural History*, 49, 349-372.
- Collins, H (2003) 'Kingscote's Coming of Age: A Sentimental Journey.' Unpublished report. Newport, RI: Preservation Society of Newport County.
- Colvin, H (1985) *Calke Abbey, Derbyshire: A Hidden House Revealed*. London: National Trust.
- Colvin, H (1995) *A biographical dictionary of British architects, 1600-1840*, 3rd edn. London: Yale University Press.
- Colvin, H and Harris, J (eds) (1970) *The country seat: Studies in the history of the British country house*. London: Allen Lane.
- Coope, R (1986) The 'long gallery': Its origins, development, use and decoration. *Architectural History*, 29, 43-84.
- Cooper, N (1999) *Houses of the gentry, 1480-1680*. London: Yale University Press.
- Coughtry, J (1981) *The notorious triangle: Rhode Island and the African slave trade 1700-1807*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Craven, W (2009) *Gilded mansions: Grand architecture and high society*. New York: WW Norton.



- Dalzell, R and Dalzell, L (1998) *George Washington's Mount Vernon: At home in Revolutionary America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davidoff, L (1974) Mastered for life: Servant and wife in Victorian and Edwardian England. *Journal of Social History*, 7(4), 406-428.
- Didden, A (2002) 'Wash House at Mount Vernon, the Home of George Washington, Historic Structures Report, Restoration Department.' Unpublished report. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.
- Downing, A and Scully, V (1970) *The architectural heritage of Newport, Rhode Island*. New York: American Legacy Press.
- Dresser, M and Hann, A (2013) *Slavery and the British country house*. Swindon: English Heritage.
- Drury, P and Smith, P (2010) The Audley End stable block in the 17th century. *English Heritage Historical Review*, 5(1), 44-81.
- Dudden, F (1983) *Serving women: Household service in nineteenth-century America*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.
- Emery, C (2009) 'Colonial lineage and cultural fusion: Family identity and progressive design in the Kingscote dining room.' Unpublished MA Thesis. Winterthur, DE: University of Delaware.
- Evans, S (2011) *Life below stairs – In the Victorian and Edwardian country house*. London: National Trust.
- Fairclough, G (1992) Meaningful constructions – spatial and functional analysis of medieval buildings. *Antiquity*, 66(251), 348-366.
- Fairfax, H (2017) *Fairfax of Virginia: The forgotten story of America's only peerage*. London: The Fairfax Family.
- Farrer, W and Clay, C (eds) (2013) *Early Yorkshire Charters: Volume 5, The Honour of Richmond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, J (1977) *Kingscote: Newport Cottage Orné*. Newport, RI: Preservation Society of Newport County.
- Fernie, E (2006) Art history and architectural history. In: D Arnold, E Ergut and B Ozkaya (eds), *Rethinking architectural history*. London: Routledge, pp. 17-23.
- Fesler, G (2010) Excavating the spaces and interpreting the places of enslaved Africans and their descendants. In: C Ellis and R Ginsburg (eds), *Cabin, quarter, plantation: Architecture and landscape of North American slavery*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 27-49.

- Field, J (2013) Domestic service, gender, and wages in rural England, c.1700-1860. *Economic History Review*, 66(1), 249-272.
- Fields, J (1994) *Worthy partner: The papers of Martha Washington*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Finch, J (2008) Three Men in a Boat: Biographies and Narrative in the Historic Landscape. *Landscape Research*, 33(5), 511-530.
- Fischer, D (1989) *Albion's seed: Four British folkways in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitts, R (1998) *Inventing New England's slave paradise: Master/slavery relations in eighteenth-century Narragansett, Rhode Island*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Foster, J (1960) George Calvert: His Yorkshire boyhood. *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 55(4), 261-274.
- Franklin, J (1975) Troops of servants: Labour and planning in the country house 1840-1914. *Victorian Studies*, 19(2), 211-239.
- Franklin, J (1981) *The gentleman's country house and its plan 1835-1914*. London: Routledge.
- Franz, G, von der Heyde, M and Bülthoff, H (2005) Predicting experiential qualities of architecture by its spatial properties. In: A Martens and B Keul (eds), *Designing social innovation: Planning, building, evaluating*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe, pp. 157-166.
- Freeman, D (1951) *George Washington: A biography*, Vol. 3. New York: Charles Scribner.
- Gallas, K and Perry, J (eds) (2014) *Interpreting slavery at museums and historic sites*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Garnett, O (2000) *Calke Abbey, Derbyshire*. Swindon: National Trust.
- Genovese, E (1976) *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world the slaves made*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gerard, J (1984) Invisible servants: The country house and the local community. *Historical Research*, 57(136), 178-188.
- Gerard, J (1994) *Country house life: Family and servants, 1815-1915*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gill, B (1991) Kingscote: Architectural heritage of an original new cottage. *Architectural Digest*, October, 30-34.

- Girouard, M (1979) *The Victorian Country House*, revised edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Girouard, M (1978) *Life in the English country house*. London: Yale University Press.
- Gomme, A and Maguire, A (2008) *Design and plan in the country house*. London: Yale University Press.
- Goodall, J (2011) *The English castle: 1066-1650*. London: Yale University Press.
- Goode, C (1975) *Railways in South Yorkshire*. Clapham: Dalesman.
- Gowans, A (1964) *Images of American living: Four centuries of architecture and furniture as cultural expression*. Philadelphia: J B Lippincott.
- Gray, A (2010) 'The greatest ordeal': Using biography to explore the Victorian dinner. *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 44(2), 255–272.
- Green, A and Dixon, J (2016) Standing buildings and built heritage. *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 50(1), 121-133.
- Grimmer, A (2017) *The Secretary of The Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service. Available at: <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Grummit, D (2008) *Wharton, Thomas, first Baron Wharton*. Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. <https://doi-org.libproxy.york.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/29172>
- Hamlett, J (2013) White-painted fortresses? *Home Cultures*, 10(3), 245-266.
- Hanson, J (1998) *Decoding homes and houses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardyment, C (1997) *Behind the scenes: Domestic arrangements in historic houses*. Swindon: National Trust.
- Harper, M and Constantine, S (2010) *Migration and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, J (1998) *No voice from the hall: Early memories of a country house snooper*. London: John Murray.
- Haslam, R (1983a) Kiplin Hall, North Yorkshire–I. *Country Life*, 28 July, 202-205.
- Haslam, R (1983b) Kiplin Hall, North Yorkshire–II. *Country Life*, 4 August, 278-281.

- Heath, B (2010) Space and Place within Plantation Quarters in Virginia, 1700-1825. In: C Ellis and R Ginsburg (eds), *Cabin, Quarter, Plantation: Architecture and Landscapes of North American Slavery*. London: Yale University Press, pp. 156-176.
- Hecht, J (1956) *The domestic servant class in eighteenth-century England*. London: Routledge.
- Hicks, D and Horning, A (2006) Historical archaeology and buildings. In: D Hicks and M Beaudry (eds), *The Cambridge companion to historical archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 272-292.
- Higgs, E (1983) Domestic servants and households in Victorian England. *Social History*, 8(2), 201-210.
- Hill, B (1996) *Servants: English domestics in the eighteenth century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hill, J (2020) *Saving Slave Houses homepage*. Saving Slave Houses Project. Available at: <http://www.savingslavehouses.org> [accessed on 23 April 2020].
- Hill, N (1999) Nevill Holt: The development of an English country house. *The Archaeological Journal*, 156(1), 246-293.
- Hillier, B and Hanson, J (1984) *The social logic of space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Historic American Buildings Survey (1969) *Kingscote, HABS No. RI-307*. Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Available at: <https://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ri0060/> [accessed 24 April 2020].
- Hodge, C (2011) A new model for memory work: Nostalgic discourse at a historic home. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 17(2), 116-135.
- Hodge, C and Beranek, C (2011) Dwelling: transforming narratives at historic house museums. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 17(2), 97-101,
- Hoffman, C and Hoffman, T (2009) *North by south: The two lives of Richard James Arnold*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Horn, P (1975) *The rise and fall of the Victorian servant*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan.
- Horn, P (1990) *The rise and fall of the Victorian servant*, new edn. Stroud: Sutton.
- Horn, P (2004) *Flunkeys and scullions: Life below stairs in Georgian England*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Horn, P (2012) *Life below stairs: the real lives of servants, the Edwardian era to 1939*. Stroud: Amberley.

- Hussey, C (1931) Kiplin Hall, Yorkshire. *Country Life*, 29 August, 228-232.
- Hussey, C (1945) The future of great country houses–IV: Housemaids mean tourists. *Country Life*, 30 November, 950-952.
- Hussey, C (1955) *English country houses: Early Georgian, 1715-1760*. London: Country Life.
- Hussey, C (1956) *English country houses: Mid Georgian, 1760-1800*. London: Country Life.
- Hussey, C (1958) *English country houses: Late Georgian, 1800-1840*. London: Country Life.
- Jaques, H (1977) The Kiplin Hall Archive. *North Yorkshire County Record Office Annual Journal*, 5, 60-77.
- John Milner Associates (2004) ‘Mount Vernon Estate and Gardens: Cultural Landscape Study.’ Unpublished report. Charlottesville, VA: John Milner Associates.
- Jones-Rogers, S (2019) *They were her property: White women as slave owners in the American South*. London: Yale University Press.
- Katzman, D (1978) *Seven days a week: Women and domestic service in industrializing America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keithan, A (2015) ‘Building History: New Insights into Kingscote’s Architectural Development’. The Eaddo and Peter Kiernan Lecture for Fellows, 28 May 2015. Newport, RI: Preservation Society of Newport County.
- Kelly, K (1979) ‘In dispers’d country plantations’: Settlement patterns in seventeenth-century Surry County, Virginia. In: T Tate and D Ammerman (eds), *The Chesapeake in the seventeenth century*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 183-205.
- Kent, D (1989) Ubiquitous but invisible: Female domestic servants in mid-eighteenth century London. *History Workshop Journal*, 28(1), 111-128.
- Kulikoff, A (1986) *Tobacco and slaves: The development of Southern cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lane, R (2016) *Understanding historic buildings: A guide to good recording practice*. Available at: <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-historic-buildings/heag099-understanding-historic-buildings/> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Leach, A (2010) *What is architectural history?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Lemons, J (2002) Rhode Island and the slave trade. *Rhode Island History*, 60(4), 95-104.
- Lethbridge, L (2013) *Servants: A downstairs view of twentieth-century Britain*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Levine, P (ed.) (2007) *Gender and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lewi, H, Smith, W, Vom Lehn, D and Cooke, S (eds) (2019) *The Routledge international handbook of new digital practices in galleries, libraries, archives, museums and heritage sites*. London: Routledge.
- Linebaugh, D (1994) 'All the annoyances and inconveniences of the country': Environmental factors in the development of outbuildings in the colonial Chesapeake. *Winterthur Portfolio*, 29(1), 1-18.
- Lintelman, J (1989) 'America is the woman's promised land': Swedish immigrant women and American domestic service. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 8(2), 9-23.
- Lintelman, J (1991) 'Our serving sisters': Swedish-American domestic servants and their ethnic community. *Social Science History*, 15(3), 381-395.
- Lithgow, K and Thackery, D (2009) The National Trust's approach to conservation. *Conservation Bulletin*, 60, 16-19.
- Lynch-Brennan, M (2014) *The Irish Bridget: Irish immigrant women in domestic service in America, 1840-1930*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- MacLeod, J (2016) Enslaved people of Mount Vernon: Biographies. In: S Schoelwer (ed.), *Lives bound together*. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, pp. 3-62.
- MacLeod, S, Dodd, J and Plumb, S (2018) 'Isolation and loneliness – opening up new stories and interpretive experiences at Calke Abbey.' Research report. Leicester: University of Leicester Research Centre for Museums and Galleries.
- Manca, J (2012) *George Washington's eye: Landscape, architecture, and design at Mount Vernon*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.
- Mandler, P (1997) *The fall and rise of the stately home*. London: Yale University Press.
- McAlester, V and McAlester, L (1984) *Field guide to American houses*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- McDermid, J (2008) The making of a 'domestic' life: Memories of a working woman. *Labour History Review*, 73(3), 253-268.

- McDonagh, B (2018) *Elite Women and the Agricultural Landscape, 1700-1830*. London: Routledge.
- Meade-Fetherstonhaugh, M and Warner, O (1995) *Uppark and its People*. Swindon: National Trust.
- Melville, L (1913) *The life and writings of Philip, Duke of Wharton*. London: John Lane.
- Menard, R (1977) From servants to slaves: The transformation of the Chesapeake labor system. *Southern Studies*, 16(4), 355-390.
- Menard, R (1988) British migration to the Chesapeake colonies in the seventeenth century. *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, 99-132.
- Mennim, A (2005) *Hall Houses*. York: William Sessions.
- Mesick-Cohen-Waite Architects (1993) 'Mount Vernon: Historic structure report,' 3 Vols. Unpublished report. New York: Mesick-Cohen-Waite Architects.
- Middleton, A (1953) *Tobacco Coast: A maritime history of Chesapeake Bay in the Colonial era*. Newport News, VA: The Mariners' Museum.
- Mohanram, R (2007) *Imperial white: Race, diaspora, and the British empire*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mooney, B (2008) *Prodigy houses of Virginia: Architecture and the native elite*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Moran, M (2013) *Aprons and silver spoons: The heartwarming memoirs of a 1930s scullery maid*. London: Penguin.
- Morriss, R (2000) *The Archaeology of Buildings*. Stroud: Tempus.
- Moss, R (1990) *The American country house*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2012a) 'From the Great House... to the Kitchen Also: Mount Vernon's Kitchens. Mount Vernon Midden Project. Available at: <http://www.mountvernonmidden.org/data/content.html?pS=Kitchen> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2012b) 'Of 'midlg size & not Deep:' The Archaeology of Milk Pans. Mount Vernon Midden Project. Available at: <http://www.mountvernonmidden.org/data/content.html?pS=Dairy> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2016) *George Washington's Mount Vernon*, 3rd edn. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.

- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2019) Archaeologists Uncover Foundation on East Slope. *Mount Vernon Magazine*, Winter, 5.
- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2020a) *Historic Preservation*. George Washington's Mount Vernon. Available at: <https://www.mountvernon.org/preservation/> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Mount Vernon Ladies' Association (2020b) *The Mission of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association*. George Washington's Mount Vernon. Available at: <https://www.mountvernon.org/about/our-mission> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Musson, J (2009) *Up and down stairs: The history of the country house servant*. London: John Murray.
- Oakley, G (2005) The people's budget in the North and Squire Thellusson of Brodsworth Hall. *Northern History*, 42(2), 329-347.
- Olmert, M (2009) *Kitchens, smokehouses, and privies: Outbuildings and the architecture of daily life in the eighteenth-century mid-Atlantic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Onorato, R (2007) *AIA guide to Newport*. Providence, RI: American Institute of Architects.
- Overton, M (1996) *Agricultural Revolution in England: The Transformation of the Agrarian Economy 1500-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Page, W (ed.) (1914) *A history of the county of York North Riding*, Vol. 1. London: Victoria County History. London: Victoria County History. Available at: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/yorks/north/vol1/pp301-313> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Palmer, M and West, I (2016) *Technology in the country house*. Swindon: Historic England.
- Pecoraro L and Breen E (2014) 'Interim Report on the Summer/Fall 2013 Kitchen Excavation (44FX762/14)'. Unpublished report. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.
- Pennell, S (2016) *The birth of the English kitchen, 1600-1850*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Pevsner, N (1981) *Yorkshire, the North Riding*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Phillips, U and Glunt, J (eds) (2006) *Florida plantation records from the papers of George Noble Jones*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.



- Pogue, D (1994) Mount Vernon: Transformation of an Eighteenth-Century Plantation System. In: P Shackel and B Little (eds), *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian, pp. 101-114.
- Pogue, D (2002) The domestic architecture of slavery at George Washington's Mount Vernon. *Winterthur Portfolio*, 37(1), 3-22.
- Pogue, D (2003) *House for Families*. Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery. Available at: <https://www.daacs.org/sites/house-for-families/> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Pogue, D (2005) Interpreting the dimension of daily life for the slaves living at the president's house and Mount Vernon. *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 129(4), 433-443.
- Polden, P (2002) *Peter Thellusson's will of 1797 and its consequences on Chancery law*. Lewiston, NY: E Mellen Press.
- Powell-Smith, A (2016) *Kiplin*. Open Domesday. Available at: <http://opendomesday.org/place/SE2897/kiplin/> [accessed 5 September 2016].
- Powell, M (1968) *Below stairs*. London: Peter Davies.
- Purcell, M (2017) *The country house library*. London: Yale University Press.
- Purcell, M and Thwaite, N (2013) *The Libraries at Calke Abbey*. Swindon: National Trust. Available at: <https://nt.global.ssl.fastly.net/documents/the-libraries-at-calke-abbey.pdf> [accessed 23 April 2020].
- Pustz, J (2010) *Voices from the back stairs: Interpreting servants' lives at historic house museums*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Roberts, E (2010) 'Japanism and the American aesthetic interior, 1867-1892: Case studies by James McNeill Whistler, Louis Comfort Tiffany, Stanford White, and Frank Lloyd Wright.' Unpublished PhD Thesis. Boston, MA: Boston University.
- Robinson, J (2014) *Requisitioned: The British country house in the second World War*. London: Aurum Press.
- Roffey, S (2007) *The medieval chantry chapel: An archaeology*. Woodbridge, Suff: Boydell Press.
- Romero, M (1988) Sisterhood and Domestic Service: Race, Class and Gender in the Mistress-Maid Relationship. *Humanity and Society*, 12(4), 318-346.
- Roth, L (1999) *Shingle Styles: Innovation and Tradition in American Architecture 1874-1982*. New York: Harry N Abrams.
- Rowell, C (1995) *Uppark, West Sussex*. Swindon: National Trust.

- Rowell, C (2005) Uppark restored: The rescue of an English country house and its collection. *Jahrbuch Stiftung Preußische Schlösser und Gärten Berlin-Brandenburg* [Yearbook of the Prussian Palaces and Gardens Foundation Berlin-Brandenburg], 7, 95-104. Available at: <https://www.perspectivia.net/publikationen/spsg-jb/7-2005> [accessed 15 April 2020].
- Rowell, C and Robinson, J (1996) *Uppark Restored*. Swindon: National Trust.
- Sambrook, P (1999) *The country house servant*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Sambrook, P and Brears, P (eds) (1996) *The country house kitchen, 1650-1900*. Stroud: Sutton.
- Samford, P (2007) *Subfloor pits and the archaeology of slavery in Colonial Virginia*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Sarti, R (2014) Historians, Social Scientists, Servants, and Domestic Workers: Fifty Years of Research on Domestic and Care Work. *International Review of Social History*, 59, 279-314.
- Schoelwer, S (ed.) (2016) *Lives bound together: Slavery at George Washington's Mount Vernon*. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.
- Scholnick, J, Wheeler, D, and Neiman, F (2001) 'Mulberry Row Reassessment: The Building I Site,' Vol. 3. Monticello Department of Archaeology Technical Report Series. Charlottesville, VA: Monticello.
- Schulz, C (1994) *Kiplin Hall and its families, a history*. Richmond, N Yorks: Kiplin Hall Trust.
- Schwarz, L (1999) English servants and their employers during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. *Economic History Review*, 52(2), 236-256.
- Scully, V (1971) *The Shingle Style and the Stick Style; Architectural Theory and Design from Richardson to the Origins of Wright*, revised edn. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shonyo, D (2012) 'Archaeological Investigations at Gunston Hall Plantation 44FX113.' Unpublished report. Gunston Hall Plantation Archaeological Department. Masons Neck, VA: Gunston Hall Plantation.
- Smith, D (1980) *Inside the great house: Planter family life in eighteenth-century Chesapeake society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Smith, L (2006) *Uses of heritage*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, L (2009) 'Class, heritage and the negotiation of place.' Missing Out on Heritage: Socio-Economic Status and Heritage Participation Conference, March

2009. London: English Heritage. Available at:  
[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Laurajane\\_Smith/publication/299410856\\_Class\\_Heritage\\_and\\_the\\_Negotiation\\_of\\_Place/links/56f4e17508ae7c1fda2d7afc/Class-Heritage-and-the-Negotiation-of-Place.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Laurajane_Smith/publication/299410856_Class_Heritage_and_the_Negotiation_of_Place/links/56f4e17508ae7c1fda2d7afc/Class-Heritage-and-the-Negotiation-of-Place.pdf) [accessed 20 January 2017].
- Smith, L (2010) 'Man's inhumanity to man' and other platitudes of avoidance and misrecognition: an analysis of visitor responses to exhibitions marking the 1807 bicentenary. *Museum and Society*, 8(3), 193-214.
- Smith, L (2016) Deference and humility: The social values of the country house. In: L Gibson and J Pendlebury (eds), *Valuing historic environments*. London: Routledge, pp. 47-64.
- Spencer, M (2015) *Calke (Caulk), Taxation*. GENUKI Available at:  
<https://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/DBY/Calke> [accessed 1 March 2020].
- Spurry, C (2017) Biography of a bedroom. *Mount Vernon Magazine*, Winter, 29-35.
- Stanziani, A (2013) Beyond colonialism: Servants, wage earners and indentured migrants in rural France and on Reunion island (c.1750–1900). *Labor History*, 54(1), 64-87.
- Steedman, C (2004) The servant's labour: The business of life, England, 1760-1820. *Social History*, 29(1), 1-29.
- Steedman, C (2009) *Labours lost: domestic service and the making of modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, E (2011) A history of historic house reconstruction: Understanding the past and informing the future. *Internet Archaeology*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.29.3>
- Strong, R, Binney, M and Harris, J (1974) *The Destruction of the country house, 1875-1975*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Suggitt, G (2005) *Lost railways of North and East Yorkshire*. Newbury: Countryside Books.
- Summerson, J (1953) *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*. London: Penguin.
- Summerson, J (1959) The classical country house in 18th-century England. *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 107(5036), 539-587.
- Sutherland, D (1981) *Americans and their servants*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Tatlioglu, T (2010) 'Biographies of people and place: The Harewood Estate, 1698-1813.' Unpublished PhD thesis. York: University of York.

- Thompson, M (2012) 'Activities of the Mount Vernon Domestic Staff.' Unpublished report. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association.
- Thompson, M (2016) Resisting enslavement: 'The roughest people about the house'. In: S Schoelwer (ed.), *Lives bound together*. Mount Vernon, VA: Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, pp. 70-73.
- Thompson, M (2019) *'The only unavoidable subject of regret': George Washington, slavery, and the enslaved community at Mount Vernon*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Tomlinson, W (1967) *North Eastern Railway: Its rise and development*. Newton Abbot: David and Charles.
- Torrence, C (1949) Arlington and Mount Vernon in 1856: As described in a letter of Augusta Blanche Berard. *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 57(2), 140-175.
- Tschirch, J (2013) The new thing at Newport: The Tiffany glass wall at Kingscote, a pathbreaking moment in design and ornament. *Magazine Antiques*, 180(1), 220-226.
- Turner, A, Doxa, M, O'Sullivan, D and Penn, A (2001) From isovists to visibility graphs: A methodology for the analysis of architectural space. *Environ Plann B*, 28(1), 103-121.
- Turner, E (1962) *What the butler saw*. London: Michael Joseph Ltd.
- Upton, D (1979) Toward a performance theory of vernacular architecture: Early Tidewater Virginia as a case study. *Folklore Forum*, 12(2/3), 173-196.
- Upton, D (1984) White and Black Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia. *Places*, 2(2), 59-72.
- Urban, A (2009) Irish domestic servants, 'Biddy' and rebellion in the American home, 1850-1900. *Gender & History*, 21(2), 263-286.
- Vagnone, F and Ryan, D (2016) *Anarchist's guide to historic house museums*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Vail, R (1947) A dinner at Mount Vernon. *The New York Historical Society Quarterly*, 331(2), 77-78.
- Vickery, A (2009) *Behind closed doors: At home in Georgian England*. London: Yale University Press.
- Vlach, J (1993) *Back of the big house: The architecture of plantation slavery*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

- Walsh, L (2013) Migration, society, economy, & settlement: 1607-1830. In: C Carson and C Lounsbury (eds), *The Chesapeake house: Architectural investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 48-61.
- Webster, D (2010) *Kiplin Hall, North Yorkshire*. Richmond, N Yorks: Kiplin Hall Trust.
- Webster, D and McLuckie, M (2016) *Kiplin Hall*. Richmond, N Yorks: Kiplin Hall Trust.
- Wells, C (2018) *Material witnesses: Domestic architecture and plantation landscapes in early Virginia*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Wenger, M (2013) Town house and country house. In: C Carson and C Lounsbury (eds), *The Chesapeake house: Architectural investigation by Colonial Williamsburg*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, pp. 120-155.
- West, S (1999) Social space and the English country house. In: S Tarlow and S West (eds), *The familiar past? Archaeologies of later historical Britain*. London: Routledge, pp. 103-122.
- Wheatley D (1995) Cumulative viewshed analysis: A GIS based method of investigating intervisibility and its archaeological application. In: G Lock and Z Stancic (eds), *Archaeology and GIS: A European perspective*. London: Taylor and Francis, pp. 171-185.
- Wilson, R and Mackley, A (2000) *Creating paradise: the building of English country house 1660-1880*. London: Hambledon and London.
- Wood, J (ed.) (1994) *Buildings archaeology: Applications in practice*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Worsley, G (2004) *The British stable*. London: Yale University Press.
- Wright, P (2009) *On living in an old country: The national past in contemporary Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wrigley, E (ed.) (1972) *Nineteenth-century society: Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yarnall, J (2005) *Newport through its architecture: A history of styles from Postmedieval to Postmodern*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Yentsch, A (1994) *A Chesapeake family and their slaves: A study in historical archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, J (1989) Time-capsule house opens to the public. *The Times*, 25 March, 12.

Young, L (2007) Is there a museum in the house? Historic houses as a species of museum. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 22(1), 59-77.

Young, L (2017) *Historic house museums in the United States and the United Kingdom*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.