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ABSTRACT

When the National Trust for Historic Preservation purchased Drayton Hall in 1974, they made a groundbreaking decision. The Trust took a conservation approach to the house, preserving Drayton Hall as found and presenting it to the public unfurnished. The decision proved to have significant ramifications and as a direct result, interpreting the material culture at the site slid to the side.

Drayton Hall has over a million objects in its collections ranging from archaeological sherds to pieces of furniture, yet the collections play little to no role in site interpretation to the public. The first generation furniture (ca. 1738-1779), at eight surviving pieces, makes up just a small facet of the Drayton Hall Museum Collection. Yet, its significance emphasizes the invaluable role collections play in interpreting Drayton Hall.

The surviving furniture and recorded purchases by John Drayton illustrate the quality and style of furniture used to furnish Drayton Hall in the mid-eighteenth century. New research findings presented in this thesis reveal his use of imported furniture and Charleston-made furniture purchased from Thomas Elfe. An analysis of each group illuminates individuals of similar status to Drayton solidifying his place among the colonial elite in the colonies and transatlantically. As a whole, the furniture is representative of eighteenth-century consumer culture and John Drayton’s taste.

Drayton Hall collections are as important, as significant, and as unique as the architecture of the site. An analysis of the first generation furniture at Drayton Hall reveals the importance of material culture at the site.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Soon after the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) acquired Drayton Hall in 1974, they made a groundbreaking decision: the Trust would operate Drayton Hall as a historic house museum open to the public for tours. But in a decision that proved to have significant ramifications, the organization spearheaded a conservation approach to the house, presenting it unfurnished and preserving it as it was when acquired from the Drayton family. This interpretive and preservation methodology was the extreme opposite of all other historic house museums in America at the time. At Drayton Hall, the initial interpretive plan revolved around the building, its architectural form and details while the material culture of the site slid to the back burner. Forty years after this historic decision, surviving artifacts from archaeological artifacts to eighteenth-century rococo style furniture survive on site locked in storage facilities available only to staff and upon request to independent scholars. The collection is as significant, as unique and as extraordinary as the architecture of the house revealing valuable clues about the eighteenth-century world of Drayton Hall and its seven generations of occupants in ways a building alone cannot do.

Drayton Hall is the oldest surviving and best example of fully developed Anglo-Palladian architecture in North America. Constructed as the homeseat of young John Drayton (ca. 1715-1779), the house, material culture and formally designed landscape provide insight into both his intellect and his status in the eighteenth-century Atlantic
world. While the current interpretation of the site calls for the house to be experienced as an unfurnished architectural masterpiece, analysis of the Drayton family’s possessions enhances the understanding of their lives at Drayton Hall and within the Carolina Lowcountry. While the entire body of material culture from Drayton Hall deserves study, this thesis focuses on the furniture acquired and used by the first generation to occupy the house: its builder John Drayton, his third and fourth wives Margaret Glen Drayton and Rebecca Perry Drayton, their children, and the enslaved Africans who lived under the same roof.\(^1\)

This thesis develops an understanding of the quality and style of furniture John Drayton purchased and used at Drayton Hall. Concurrently, it considers and explores the use of imported and Charleston-made furniture during this period. An analysis of each group supports comparisons between John Drayton and those of similar status in Charleston and Philadelphia solidifying Drayton’s place among the colonial elite both in the colonies and transatlantically. Together, the furnishings used by John Drayton are representative of eighteenth-century consumer culture and their use and placement within the house fall in line with trends of the time.

More specifically, this thesis presents new research findings regarding the first generation furniture of Drayton Hall. First, it develops an understanding of the rarity of the suite of furniture within the broad eighteenth-century context. In conjunction with that, it solidifies that the group was likely imported in preparation for the completion of Drayton Hall, ca. 1748. Second, an analysis and study of the furniture suggests

\(^1\) Ongoing research is being conducted at Drayton Hall to determine where enslaved people lived on the property and looking into the possibility of enslaved people living in house spaces.
London, England, as place of origin for the suite; a task that has proved unsuccessful in past assessments. Third, it fully recognizes that the group of furniture is representative of Drayton’s genteel taste and originally worked in tandem with the architecture of the house. Fourth, it, in an analysis of Thomas Elfe’s Account Book and the Drayton purchases held within, places his purchases in context. This analysis reveals how John Drayton used the pieces in Drayton Hall. Fifth, the collaboration of the study of the surviving furniture and Elfe purchases for the first time presents a cohesive picture of John Dryaton’s taste and how he translated that into furnishing Drayton Hall. Sixth, through an analysis of historic documents from the period, it presents a list of items possibly used in Drayton Hall during the first generation.

John Drayton began construction on Drayton Hall, nestled twelve miles up the Ashley River from Charleston, in 1738 (see Figure 1.1). Dendrochronology confirms that the roof was constructed from trees felled during the winter of 1747/1748, indicating that the house was nearly complete almost a decade after Drayton purchased the land. It is apparent that Drayton, working with a skilled builder, designed the house. Specific de-

---

2 For a complete list of figure credits see Appendix E.
sign qualities in the house indicate that John Drayton, whether in planning or in building, had a heavy hand in the design of Drayton Hall. This is reinforced by the discovery of his library containing seven architectural books. The overall design for the house is based on the work of Italian architect Andrea Palladio and his seventeenth- and eighteenth-century students William Kent and James Gibbs. The rigid application of Palladian standards exhibiting designs traceable to Kent and Gibbs attest to John Drayton’s attention to design and knowledge of architecture. The house survives as a testament of Drayton’s intellectual dexterity and status as one of eighteenth-century America’s most accomplished men.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation, with the assistance of Historic Charleston Foundation and the state of South Carolina, purchased the site from the Drayton family in 1974 ensuring the preservation of the property for future generations. As determined by the National Trust, the site was to be preserved rather than restored to show the layers of history at the site and emphasize the house as an architectural masterpiece. In fulfilling this charge the house is interpreted unfurnished. This standard has remained constant under the administration of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and, currently, the Drayton Hall Preservation Trust (DHPT).

Analysis of early National Trust for Historic Preservation documents regarding the interpretative philosophy for the site reveals a constant focus on the architecture.

6 In January of 2015 the Drayton Hall Preservation Trust took over management of the property in a co-stewardship agreement with the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The NTHP continues to own the property and existing collection but daily operations fall to DHPT.
Throughout memorandums, furnishing plans and correspondence, employees of the National Trust and Drayton Hall continually clarified that the furnishings and material culture of the site were to take second place to the architecture. While their interpretation direction was explicit, their decision-making process and justification for this approach was absent. They consistently specified that material objects should be displayed to enhance the architecture. However, without solid justification for a choice with ample ramifications, the choice today appears ill-advised. Jules Prown argued not long after the National Trust purchased Drayton Hall that decorative arts and other aspects of material culture are pivotal elements of a historic site and should be utilized to their full capacity to strengthen site interpretation. The earlier decision by the Trust stands in sharp contrast to the interpretive schemes all other historic sites then followed.

Despite the architectural focus employed at the site, Drayton Hall holds a significant material culture collection that ranges from archaeological artifacts to surviving pieces of furniture. The collection has grown in size since 1974 and now contains over one million artifacts. It consists of over 1 million archaeological artifacts, nearly 500 objects including twenty-two pieces of furniture, and three archives with over 1,000 records. Many more objects once part of Drayton Hall’s furnishings survive in museum and private collections throughout the country. These cultural artifacts help piece together the lives of those who lived and worked at Drayton Hall yet lack the attention placed on

---

7 Correspondence from 1958-2015, Curatorial Archive at Drayton Hall (Drayton Hall, Charleston, SC).
9 These collections are housed at Drayton Hall and are the: Drayton Hall Archaeological Collection, Drayton Hall Museum Collection and Drayton Hall Archive.
the house. A building does not stand alone. The fusion of building, cultural and material remains – an excellent example of what survives at Drayton Hall – lends to a holistic historic interpretation and provides a lens to help current generations understand past generations. The selective interpretation present at the site both narrows and weakens connections to the past. The furniture of the first generation not only enhances our understanding of the first generation at the homeseat plantation, it also works in tandem with the architecture. Drayton commissioned pieces for Drayton Hall to compliment the spaces he and his family inhabited. Learning more about the furniture used by John Drayton and his wives will not take away from the architecture of the house, but rather work with it to illustrate a more informed and accurate understanding of eighteenth-century culture at Drayton Hall.

The furniture commissioned by John Drayton for Drayton Hall survives as a significant reminder of his stylistic taste and vast wealth, however, these material remains only begin to scratch the surface of him as an individual. Just as he used pattern books for designing the architecture of his house, John also intentionally chose specific styles and pieces to grace his house. His taste demanded that they were of utmost quality and latest fashion. He purchased goods both abroad and in Charleston. His placement of these pieces continues to build upon this point. The use of both imported and Charleston pieces by John Drayton is a interesting juxtaposition in his consumer patterns. He made multiple purchases from Thomas Elfe, a prominent cabinetmaker who worked in Charleston from
1745 until 1779.\textsuperscript{10} Surviving rococo furniture, European in design, make and attribution, can be traced back to use by the first generation at Drayton Hall.\textsuperscript{11} Were these pieces used in juxtaposition of each other, were they placed in side-by-side – of equal quality and similar style – with one another, or were they purchased as complete sets for specific rooms?

A study of the furniture of John Drayton through the lens of consumer culture in the early South significantly augments our limited understanding of John Drayton. This in turn allows for a more accurate understanding of the house for which the furniture was designed. Even though there is limited surviving documentation related to John Drayton, the tangible evidence from the period of his occupation at Drayton Hall greatly enhances our understanding of him and his role in the colonies and the Atlantic world.

The first generation furniture from Drayton Hall has received minimal attention from both the staff at Drayton Hall and independent scholars. The existing research on the group comprises five published sources including “American Chippendale Chairback Settees” by Wendy Cooper from 1977, a brief synopsis in \textit{In Pursuit of Refinement} by Maurie McInnis in 1999, two recent articles in \textit{Antiques and Fine Arts} by Deputy Director of Drayton Hall, historian and archaeologist Carter C. Hudgins, and another in the same publication by Ronald Hurst and Margaret Pritchard published in 2014. While these works set a good foundation for this thesis, they only provide an introduction to John


\textsuperscript{11} Eleven surviving pieces of furniture dating to John Drayton’s occupation of Drayton Hall survive; fifty-two additional items are documented in the Account Book of cabinetmaker Thomas Elfe. Many others pieces exist in private collections and surely even more remain undiscovered. For a full list of furniture from the John Drayton era at Drayton Hall, including surviving pieces, Elfe documentation, and other information gleaned from historical documents, see Appendix D.
Drayton’s furniture. While the preservation approach to the architecture currently plays a large role in the attention given to the material culture at Drayton Hall, themes in scholarly literature and the portrayal of the elite Southern planter by nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians explain the lack of scholarship.\(^\text{12}\)

Many interpretations of the elite Southern planter have existed throughout history, some as old as the South itself, however, two main themes have dominated historians’ understanding from the mid-twentieth-century onward. The first historian-molded subtype will be referred to here as the \textit{benighted elite Southern planter}. Devised by historians of the Old South, this subtype was prominent from the mid-twentieth century until as late as the final decade of that century. It framed the group as an unprogressive class of uncultured, illiterate, and paternalistic slaveholders focused on a conservative plantation life. Proponents of the benighted elite Southern planter including Clement Eaton, Thomas Doerflinger, Douglas Egerton and Bertram Wyatt-Brown consistently treated the planter as out-dated and unwilling to change their lifestyle to a capitalistic viewpoint.\(^\text{13}\)


However, within the last quarter-century, a second subtype has emerged in historical scholarship, referred to here as the entrepreneurial elite Southern planter. This subtype, embraced by modern historians Jeffery Young, William Scarborough, Maurie McInnis, Max Edelson, and Laura Kamoie exposes the elite Southern planter as an avant-garde, eloquent and progressive individual focused on diversifying his plantation empire as well as his intellectual knowledge and solidifying his political position. Proponents of the entrepreneurial elite Southern planter explain the planter’s numerous connections with other members of the gentry class throughout the colonies and transatlantic world.\(^{14}\) John Drayton, as an elite intellectual managing a plantation empire comprised of over 100 properties, fits this entrepreneurial interpretation.

During the mid-ninetieth century when historian interpretation revolved around the benighted elite Southern planter, scholarship on consumerism in the South lagged.

*Southern Furniture, 1680-1830,* by Ronald Hurst and Jonathan Prown illustrate the lack of scholarship on Southern furniture when they cite that between 1920-1997 over two-hundred books on Northern furniture were published; however, less than a dozen

---

were published on Southern furniture.\textsuperscript{15} As the view of the Southern planter evolved into the entrepreneurial elite Southern planter, scholarship on consumerism in the South emerged with more frequency. Works by Southern consumerism scholars such as \textit{In Pursuit of Refinement, The Furniture of Charleston, 1689-1829, Southern Furniture, 1680-1830, The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston, Building Charleston} and \textit{When London was the Capital of America} now recognize the business acumen of the elite Southern planter and the imported and domestic material goods they purchased. These works not only solidify the arguments presented in this thesis, but also underline the significance of the first generation furniture to both Drayton Hall and the study of decorative arts.\textsuperscript{16}

While the first period furniture that once furnished the spaces of Drayton Hall has piqued the intrigue of researchers, no scholar has conducted an in-depth, formal study and analysis. This thesis is the preliminary scholarly study. The method of completing this examination consists of two components. The first explores how John Drayton and his wives acquired their furniture. This research delves into primary source materials and relies heavily on an analysis of transactions between John Drayton and Charleston cabinet-maker Thomas Elfe. It also explores letters written by John Drayton to European factors.


The second research component focuses on the surviving furniture from this period.

Sporadic research has previously been conducted on the Drayton furniture by various researchers for both internal use and limited scholarly dissemination. Joyce Keegan, Collections Manager at Drayton Hall from 2006 to 2013, initiated research on the group during the inaugural Wood Family Fellowship in Summer 2005 with an inventory and furniture study. She continued her analysis as Collections Manager in an effort to update the collections catalogue. While this study and others like it have led to a surface attempt to understand the John Drayton era furniture, the collection has yet to receive the attention the assemblage deserves. Therefore, the first step in beginning the research process is combing through previous research housed in the Curatorial Archive at Drayton Hall to gain a basic understanding of what research has been done and establishing a path for this detailed investigation.\[17\]

The primary source Drayton documents from the era are the pivotal next step in the research process. The Drayton Papers, housed in the College of Charleston Ad- dlestone Library’s Special Collections, as well as the Genealogical Record collection at Drayton Hall, contain primary source documents relating to John Drayton and his furniture.\[18\] Documents such as wills, probate inventories, letters and bills of sale contain descriptive information regarding style, quality and provenance from this era. For example,

---

17 The Curatorial Archive is an archive organized by year from 1958-2015 with documents relating to the collection at Drayton Hall. It includes documents like memorandums, correspondence, deeds of gift and much more and is consistently updated by Drayton Hall Staff.

18 The Genealogical Record, created by Drayton Hall staff in 2013, is a research database organized by individual containing every known document about that person. It includes documents like marriage date, death dates, wills, inventories and other such documents. Many are scans of primary documents held in other collections. It contains the most current information on each Drayton individual.
surviving wills of John Drayton’s parents Thomas and Ann Drayton, as well as Thomas Drayton’s inventory, list furniture inherited by John. The will of Rebecca Perry Drayton and a bill of sale between her and John’s son Charles, likewise provides a documented reference point to identify surviving pieces and unveiling new ones. These documents illustrate potential furnishings used in John Drayton’s home and provide detailed information regarding the price, style, material and the room use of each object. They reveal John Drayton’s taste.

The final component of the research phase is an analysis of the Thomas Elfe Account Book. This analysis is first pertinent to establishing a list of the furniture Drayton commissioned Elfe to construct for use in Drayton Hall and second to providing a basis of comparison for what Elfe’s other customers were purchasing. This comprises of a breakdown by customer to detail what they purchased, how much they purchased and associated costs, and how often they did business with the cabinetmaker to set appropriate comparisons to John Drayton. The comparison between Drayton and equivalent Elfe customers illustrates him as a top customer of Elfe who utilized the cabinetmaker’s services to furnish the less formal family spaces of his house.

A detailed analysis of the surviving Drayton furniture brings to light new information on the pieces and leads to additional attributions. Analyzing the surviving furniture requires the establishment of an organizational system developing updated or additional PastPerfect entries. Drayton Hall’s PastPerfect database contains entries for each piece

---

19 The original Account Book, spanning from 1768-1775, is housed in the Library Society and transcribed in the early 20th century in the “South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine” by Marbel L. Webber, available in installations through the JSTOR database.
of furniture in their collection; these entries include pertinent information about the piece like condition, materials, history, photographs, research information, and provenance. Many of the entries are outdated and as a result, do not contain the most recent research on each piece. To rectify the outdated records for staff and researchers and complete museum standard catalogue descriptions of each piece, each entry is updated. This information is gained through research on the pieces, field analysis and a corroboration of previously conducted research. A compilation of known pieces of furniture from historic documents, photographs and oral accounts is compiled in an excel spreadsheet with all available information. This includes purchases from Elfe, furniture in private collections and historically recorded pieces, such as those in the Elfe Account Book, inventories and wills. This document establishes a basis for future furniture acquisitions by providing style, material and known information about each piece and will be easily assessable. The PastPerfect entries and excel spreadsheet contain the necessary information for formulating the provenance of each piece and writing each description. They will, likewise, aid future researchers and hopefully provide pertinent information for future acquisitions.

Each component of the research section and furniture observation phase is pertinent to developing an analysis of the furniture of the John Drayton era at Drayton Hall. The primary source research lays the foundation for the subsequent Elfe analysis. In combination with detailed descriptions and an analysis of the pieces of furniture used by the

---

20 PastPerfect is a software program used by many museums, archives and historic sites to catalogue various collections. Multiple related collections can be set up in the overall database and can range from photographs, to archaeological artifacts, to pieces of furniture. Each piece of furniture owned by Drayton Hall has its own entry in PastPerfect.
first generation at Drayton Hall from 1738 to 1779, they collaborate to paint a picture of John Drayton within colonial Charleston. With a man surprisingly absent from surviving records, a study of surviving furniture and furniture purchases provides a glimpse into the now vacant Drayton Hall.

The groundbreaking decision to interpret Drayton Hall as an unfurnished architectural masterpiece continues to have ramifications at the site today. The approach remains unique and innovative, intriguing architects to preservationists to the public. To interpret the site in the most accurate way possible, the collections need to be included in public site interpretation. The educational potential for collections to illustrate over three centuries of life and culture at Drayton Hall is untapped. Buildings never stand alone, but rather fuse with the people and material culture who interact with them. The material artifacts at Drayton Hall have the ability to collaborate with the architecture to present an all-encompassing, historically accurate interpretation of life at Drayton Hall. The narrative of the first generation furniture begins to tell a small sliver of that untold story. The surviving first generation furniture illustrates, educates and inspires. Their story argues for their interpretation at the site as invaluable educational objects illustrating the eighteenth-century world of Drayton Hall.
CHAPTER 2
HISTORY

Relatively little historical information, either in private papers or public records, about Drayton Hall survives. Even more surprising, very little information survives about its builder. One of the first public records pertaining to John Drayton is his purchase of the land for Drayton Hall in 1738 at twenty-three years of age. Despite this, enough survives whether in documentation or tangible artifacts illustrating John Drayton as one of colonial America’s most refined entrepreneurial planters. His extensive plantation empire, political career, elite connections, and interest in architecture, science and ornithology exhibit well-rounded accomplishments stretching from his plantation and into the eighteenth-century Atlantic world.

It is believed the Drayton family arrived in South Carolina via Barbados a generation prior to the construction of Drayton Hall when Thomas and Ann Drayton settled just up river from the future site of Drayton Hall in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. The family began their new life in the colony raising cattle on 402-acre Magnolia Plantation. John’s older brother Thomas Jr. inherited Magnolia Plantation and half of Thomas Drayton Sr.’s livestock and enslaved work force. Thomas Drayton, Sr. made provisions for his younger sons John and Stephen Fox by bequeathing the remaining half of his slaves and livestock to the two. Furthermore, the younger sons received equal portions of Drayton’s “Stono” land and all of the “Cowpen” and “Abram’s Savana”.¹ Thomas Sr. pri-

¹ Thomas Drayton, will dated July 7, 1724, book 60, pg. 65, Wills of Charleston County, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.
or to death likely also provided each of his younger sons with cash to finance their move to independent planters. Such a gift would explain Drayton’s ability to build Drayton Hall at the age of twenty-three. John Drayton purchased the land for Drayton Hall in 1738 to create his homeseat, making it the hub for what would eventually become his plantation empire. By the end of his life in 1779 his plantation empire flourished, exporting agricultural products throughout North America, and to Europe and the Caribbean.²

The historical records that do survive reveal that John was not only a planter, but also a significant political figure in colonial South Carolina. His political career began as a St. Andrew’s Parish Church warden, a position which he climbed by 1756 the political ranks to be appointed an “assistant judge for the Justices in the Commission for the Peace.” He served on various county committees further strengthening his connections among Lowcountry elite. The committees ruled on subjects such as the migration of northern settlers into South Carolina, projecting the public debt, operation of the Edisto ferry, electing juries by ballot, and constructing a path from Henry Middleton’s property to Broad Street. He, along with William Cattell, Jr. and William Bull, Jr., both whom he was related to by marriage, were appointed to the fifteenth Royal Assembly from 1746-1747. Drayton’s political career culminated in his appointed by royal governor to the King’s Privy Council from 1761-1775.³

---

By the end of his life John Drayton was one of the Lowcountry’s most accomplished men. His profitable plantation empire comprised of over 100 plantations tallying upwards of 76,000 acres. Enslaved African and Native American’s cultivated rice and indigo for exportation to lucrative European markets in Scotland, England, and Portugal.\(^4\) Drayton’s plantations also raised cattle and pig for consignment to the sugar islands in the Caribbean. As Drayton Hall acted as the hub of John Drayton’s plantation web, it was the homeseat for the wealthy planter. As such, it was not a traditional plantation, but a country estate, copying English models of the period. Drayton Hall was his elite plantation acting as an overall display of Drayton’s material wealth and elite status. For forty years of his life Drayton persistently and resourcefully worked to amass land and manage a large force of enslaved laborers that became the backbone of his political and social standing in the Atlantic world.\(^5\)

Drayton matched his land holdings equally as an intellectual conversant in numerous aspects of eighteenth-century life. Utilizing Palladian standards for the design of Drayton Hall, he constructed his homeseat in the most refined form of architecture of the period. The design of Drayton Hall illustrates his knowledge of architecture. Furthermore, the rococo furniture he purchased boasting rocaille motifs and hairy paws worked in tandem with the architecture. John Drayton molded every aspect of his material world at Drayton Hall with expert care and recognition of popular eighteenth-century principles. Drayton’s intellectual knowledge and international taste coupled with his expertly man-

\(^4\) Drayton Family Papers (Special Collections, College of Charleston Libraries: Charleston, S.C.).
\(^5\) “The History of Drayton Hall.”
aged plantation empire reveal him as a refined elite planter.

His intellectual tastes extended his transatlantic connections. Drayton was a subscriber and a probable supporter of British ornithologist George Edwards (1694-1773). As Carter C. Hudgins notes in *The Material World of John Drayton*, in 1969 a set of watercolors by Edwards were discovered with “a frontispiece marked with the name of John Drayton and the date 1733.” Edwards eventually published his works, but needed the financial support he obtained through subscriptions. The names of subscribers were listed in each published compilation. Hudgins conjectures that this set of drawings was possibly a gift from Edwards, a token of thanks to Drayton for financial support and hoping for continual backing.

A decade after Edwards completed his watercolors for John Drayton, he was the only North American subscriber for *A Natural History of Uncommon Birds* from 1743. In 1760, however, Drayton was joined by two other Americans on the subscription list: William Bartram and Benjamin Franklin. Currently, the Drayton Hall Museum Collection owns twenty-one of the original forty-eight Edwards watercolors given to John Drayton. Hudgins continues by writing how “Such an association extends beyond reflection of Drayton’s wealth to his keen awareness of British scientific efforts to classify and profit from wildlife identified within the expanding British Empire, further placing him within an elite network of eighteenth-century intellectuals.” These watercolors place Drayton not only among colonial American scholars but subsequently English intellectuals as

---

Drayton’s personal, political, and intellectual connections brought him in contact with important British elites like James Glen, royal governor, and George Edwards, ornithologist. Every connection was a well-placed pawn increasing John Drayton’s reputation among British and American gentry. His bonds formed by marriage continue to solidify this point as well as illustrate similar influential South Carolinian connections.

Drayton, in an act that reminds us of the perilous times in the colonial era even for the wealthy, married four times due to untimely deaths of his first three wives; the first two as a result of childbirth. Drayton advanced his status politically and socially with each marriage. Each one of Drayton’s wives provided beneficial connections for Drayton in one way or another. Both Sarah Cattell and Rebecca Perry, his first and last wives respectively, were daughters of prominent plantation owners. Drayton’s second and third wives – Charlotta Bull and Margaret Glen – were, as relations to two of the colony’s royal governors, fortuitous political matches. Charlotta Bull’s father was Governor William Bull, and Margaret Glen was sister of Governor James Glen. These marriages increasingly place Drayton among and within the Carolina planter and political elite classes and did their part to distinguish him in status and affiliation in the New and Old World.

The classical architectural standards employed by Drayton at Drayton Hall show-

---

case his wealth, intellect, and gentry status. Drayton had a heavy hand in the design of the house, drawing on the standards set forth in popular British architectural pattern books. The use of pattern books as design basis became one method of transferring design standards to the British colonies. As explained by Lounsbury in *The Chesapeake House*, “beginning in the late seventeenth century, English publishers produced scores of books – large portfolios of design drawings by noted architects, scholarly treatises on the classical orders, topographical guides to the ruins of ancient Rome, pocketbook manuals for measuring materials.” These volumes increased in number in England and in the colonies; a variety of options existed for use after 1740. However, because of their architectural focus and high cost these volumes were typically among those in the merchant’s and planter’s extensive libraries and not the builder’s or craftsmen’s. Nonetheless, these books guided designers and builders in proper, classical styles fitting of men of Drayton’s social standing.8

In her Master’s thesis, “Volumes that Speak,” Patricia (Lowe) Smith, Curator of Historic Architectural Resources at Drayton Hall, explains the use of architectural pattern

Figure 2.1: Elevation and Ground Plan of a Palace, James Gibbs, early eighteenth century.

---

books in the design of Drayton Hall. A surviving list of volumes in Drayton Hall’s library compiled by Charles Drayton, John’s son and second owner of the plantation, reveals much about John’s design interests. In the list, there appears a group of titles about architecture, clues about potential design inspirations John used for building Drayton Hall. Analysis of the list suggests that John first owned books with early imprints. This list contains several architecture books dating to the era of construction of Drayton Hall; one in particular, *A Book of Architecture* by James Gibbs, contains a plate with an overmantle used as a basis for one within the house. Another book from the same period, *Designs of Inigo Jones* by William Kent, also contains a plate comparable to another overmantle. Interestingly, this volume is not contained in the library list. The form and application of classical elements throughout Drayton Hall reflect designs first circulated in Palladio’s *Four Books of Architecture*. Gibbs explained the use of his designs for “such Gentlemen as might be concerned in Building, especially in the remote parts of the Country, where little or no assistance to Designs can be procured.”

---

10 Quoted in Carson and Lounsbury, *The Chesapeake House*, 82.
Existing fireplace treatments at Drayton Hall demonstrate Drayton’s understanding of architectural pattern books. The chimneypiece and overmantle in the great hall on the first floor bear comparable resemblance to Plate 64 in the Designs of Inigo Jones by William Kent. The carved shell, animal head protruding the broken pediment, and guilloche pattern flanking either side of the overmantle while not an exact copy, obviously used Plate 64 as precedent. The chimneypiece and overmantle in the southeast room flanking the great hall is likewise attributed to a design book.

The collective overmantle matches identically to Plate 91 from A Book of Architecture by James Gibbs published in 1728. There is no record of ownership of Kent’s volume by Drayton or even its presence in America during his lifetime. Drayton may have visited a house exhibiting copied elements from the book or gained access to the book at some point. The Gibbs book, however, is listed in the Drayton library catalogue. Its publishing date, predating the construction of the house, purports it as a strong design source for the overmantle and chimneypiece. These overmantles and chimneypieces illustrate Drayton’s
reliance on architectural pattern books for his design of Drayton Hall.\textsuperscript{11}

Drayton Hall is the oldest surviving fully executed example of Anglo-Palladian design in North America. The house is a two story classical structure atop a raised English basement. Nearly a cube in form, the symmetrical house is seven bays wide on the east and west facades where the two principal entrances are located and six on the north and south. Constructed of brick, the facades are punctuated by projecting string courses at each floor level and terminate in a classical cornice below a double-hipped terne metal roof. The house is proportional and originally intended to be flanked by two outbuildings. The primary entrance by land is dictated by both a receding and projecting two story pedimented portico, the only of its kind, and harkens to Palladio’s Villa Pisani and Villa Cornara.\textsuperscript{12} It holds to the classical orders with Doric columns on the first floor and Ionic above; the elegance of the ornamentation solidify the landside as the primary entrance to

\textsuperscript{11} Lowe, “Volumes That Speak,” 33-36.
\textsuperscript{12} Lowe, “Volumes That Speak,” 39.
the structure. The river entrance is graced with three central aedicule widows with alternating triangular and segmental pediments and a classically ornamented central doorway reached by a double staircase.\textsuperscript{13}

While not strictly symmetrical, the interior plan on the principle floors of Drayton Hall is blocked into six rooms. The central western front of the house is occupied by the great hall (Room 101) on the first floor and upper great hall (Room 201) on the second; they are flanked by four smaller rooms, two on the south and two on the north. They are bordered by the stairhall (Room 109) on the central eastern side. The house boasts bald cypress paneling throughout and a rigid application of the classical orders defines each space. The original paint scheme for much of the house, discovered by Susan Buck between 2001-2004, was a dark cream color with a red wash/primer.\textsuperscript{14} On the first floor the great hall boasts the Doric order in detail, the withdrawing room adheres to the Ionic order and the most important space hierarchically is the upper great hall in the Corinthian order. The architectural hierarchy dictated in these rooms outlines the path genteel guests of the Draytons walked; for a guest of equal stature to the elite family the journey culminated in the Corinthian

\textsuperscript{13} Carter C. Hudgins, Deputy Director of Drayton Hall, explains that recent research proposes that the riverside facade was “meant to” act “as a backdrop for activities in the garden.”

\textsuperscript{14} Susan Buck and Christine Thompson, “Room 101 Paint Chronology,” (paint conservation findings at Drayton Hall, Charleston, South Carolina, 2001-2004).
upper great hall. Studiously designed to impress, these spaces are defined by ornamentation – molded and carved entablatures, overmantels and ceilings – in each respective order signaling the importance of the spaces in reference to the rest of the structure.

As much as the house was meant to impress, the furniture Drayton purchased and displayed in the house complimented the architecture in both quality and style. The furniture reinforced the hierarchical order of room use and social progression through the house.\(^\text{15}\) The majority of surviving furniture from the first generation at Drayton Hall is rococo in style boasting elegant curving lines, flora motifs, shells, volutes, geometric patterns, and hairy paw feet, all complimented by proportional straight lines. The furniture

\(^{15}\) Carson and Lounsbury, *The Chesapeake House*, 77, 120.
ranges from highly decorative, such as the rococo side chairs, slab table frames, and bureau bookcase, to simpler pieces like a pair of pier tables which boast a central shell motif and restrained flower design on the knees of each cabriole leg. A more in depth description and analysis of the furniture will follow in the next chapter, however, it is significant to note that the general style of the surviving furniture equals the house in terms of sophisticated taste.  

As romantically illustrated by Rosemary Troy Krill in Early American Decorative Arts, the rococo style, also called Chippendale by some, “conjures images of genteel colonials, conversing and drinking tea, seated in carved mahogany chairs in rooms with classical pediments inspired by English examples.” In truth, carved details and heavily ornamented objects, the use of mahogany in furniture, and the mixture of both straight and curving lines are the basic form of rococo furniture. As with many styles, the carving and ornamentation in the rococo style can vary from exquisite and covering much of the object to minimal, potentially stemming from a patron’s preference or need for less expensive goods.

---

16 For catalogue descriptions of each piece of surviving furniture see Appendix B.
Krill organizes rococo ornamentation into four defining categories. The first calls upon natural forms taking the shape of shells, flowers and animal figures. “Stylized natural forms,” as Krill terms it, composes the second category which is expressed with “gadrooning, volutes, and scrolls as well as geometric forms such as C-scrolls, and quatrefoils.” Architectural forms such as columns, arches and other various ornamentation make up the third. The final group calls upon textile forms with swags and tassels.\textsuperscript{19} John Drayton in designs gracing the walls and ceilings of Drayton Hall, as well in the rococo furniture, complemented the classical forms of Palladian architecture with each category of rococo ornamentation.

One interesting aspect of rococo style furniture, and quite evident in the Drayton Hall pieces, is the combination of both straight and curving lines. The Drayton side chair is such an example. The serpentine crest rail, pierced back splat and cabriole legs are all composed of curved lines. However, they are juxtaposed by the straight seat rails and stiles. This pleasing use of different lines is present on each separate surviving piece of rococo furniture of the first generation of Drayton Hall.\textsuperscript{20}

Just as important as the style of Drayton’s furniture is that he commissioned it to match each other and complement the spaces it inhabited. He ordered the group of rococo

\textsuperscript{19} Krill, \textit{Early American Decorative Arts, 1620-1860}, 61.

\textsuperscript{20} Krill, \textit{Early American Decorative Arts, 1620-1860}, 61.
style hairy paw side chairs, originally at least a set of twelve, a settee and two marble slab
tables as a suite, intended to be utilized and viewed as a whole.\footnote{Interestingly, John son Charles Drayton’s probate inventory from 1820 lists two settees, but it is unknown if one of the settees listed is the surviving settee. Charles was known to redecorate and continued in his father’s footsteps of keeping Drayton Hall in the height of taste, so they are likely not related. Nevertheless, the potential connection is notable.} Leroy Graves, furniture conservator, and Luke Beckerdite, editor of American Furniture in New Insights on John Cadwalader’s Commode-Seat Side Chairs, explain that “the production of elaborate sets or suites of furniture required a great deal of cooperation between the patron and maker.” The commissioning of Drayton’s suite required collaboration between client – Drayton – European factor for approval of the design and a qualified cabinetmaker. Furthering the need to fulfill the classical standards of symmetry and proportion, a bureau bookcase, two additional slab tables and possibly an easy chair were ordered en suite to the suite of furniture. Meant to compliment without identically matching, the collective group illustrates the importance of not only each piece of furniture individually, but of its presentation as a whole.\footnote{Leroy Graves and Luke Beckerdite, New Insights on John Cadwalader’s Commode-Seat Side Chairs. In Luke Beckerdite, American Furniture (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2000), 153.} The suite of furniture, with at least twenty-four pieces originally and its early date of creation, testifies to its rarity.

The level of sophistication of the rococo furniture John Drayton commissioned to match his house illustrate his genteel taste. The rococo furniture, dating to as early as 1740, is more than likely some of the oldest surviving and quite plausibly earliest examples in the colonies of rococo hairy paw furniture. The use of such decorative furniture was reserved for only the most elite consumer. As Krill notes, during the introduction of rococo furniture in the colonies, the value of gentility increasing among the elite. In-
increased “interest in a genteel lifestyle is manifest through such evidence as the popularity of tea tables and chests of drawers. But the extent of this interest is more difficult to document. Only a few people in the colonies owned furniture similar to designs in Chippendale’s Director or other pattern books.”23 Not only did Drayton own a suite of furniture in the highest of style represented in the Director, but he commissioned the pieces prior to the release of the popular design book. Using references by the foremost scholars on furniture produced in the South, both Southern Furniture and The Furniture of Charleston contain no suitable comparisons considering date and style to the Drayton suite of furniture.24

The only suite of rococo hairy paw furniture comparable to that of John Drayton is that of John Cadwalader, currently housed in Winterthur, the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The suite is well documented as being purchased by Cadwalader to furnish his recently acquired Philadelphia town house in 1769. Cadwalader commissioned well known Philadelphia cabinetmakers to design his furniture for his new house; one of the most well known and well documented being Thomas Affleck (1740-1795), a distinguished cabinetmaker working in Philadelphia from 1763 to 1795.25 While there were by all means other suites of rococo hairy paw furniture commissioned by elites for their high style colonial houses, the use of the style was reserved for only the wealthiest. Krill emphasizes further that “high style Chippendale furniture was avail-

23 Krill, Early American Decorative Arts, 1620-1860, 68.
24 Hurst and Prown, Southern Furniture; Bivens and Rauschenberg, The Furniture of Charleston.
able to only a few wealthy patrons such as Cadwalader.\textsuperscript{26} The level of detail of both the Drayton suite and the Cadwalader suite in combination with their use of hairy paw feet demonstrate each family’s affluence and wealth.

Even more telling of the suite of hairy paw furniture commissioned by John Drayton is the fact that his set was commissioned potentially a whole twenty, potentially thirty, years prior to Cadwalader’s suite. As such, the hairy paw furniture used at Drayton Hall emphasizes John Drayton’s intellect and knowledge of not only architectural design, but also taste in furniture. He not only designed and commissioned both in the newest and most popular style of the period, but was consistently at the forefront of each trend and executed each in the highest of sophisticated style.

Historic documents and tangible artifacts evidence Drayton as a refined intellectual adhering to a genteel way of life. Drayton’s massive and successful plantation empire easily place him among the wealthiest in the colonies. His beneficial connections to prominent individuals politically and socially illuminate his colonial network. His well-rounded interests stretched from architecture to ornithology. Drayton’s refined taste in material goods, notably architecture and furniture, evidence him as a participant in these gentry standards. Collectively, these elements fuse to illustrate John Drayton and his homeseat of Drayton Hall as one of the most significant individuals and properties in the colonies. The furniture he commissioned for use at his house is a direct product of his status and taste. They are as important to the site today as they were when originally brought into the house by John Drayton in the middle of the eighteenth century to furnish

\textsuperscript{26} Krill, \textit{Early American Decorative Arts, 1620-1860}, 68.
his newly completed homeseat.
CHAPTER 3

A Refined Taste: The Drayton’s Imported Furniture

On June 24, 1764, sea weary Captain Mason hand delivered a letter to John Drayton. Mason had recently dropped anchor in the Charleston harbor after a long voyage across the Atlantic. Drayton’s European factor, Samuel Morris, a “very respectfull friend,” requested payment for his services. Morris hoped his “respected friend” John Drayton would send payment with Captain Mason on his return trip. The letter read:

My last was 9th May since when are without any of your Favours, I have now only to Confirm the same of Inclose the Award And as I Expect Charles Stedman hurly to Call for the Balance of the Account which have Promised to pay him to Remitt & this… Request you to send it me & return of Capt. Mason who Carries this and you’ll Oblige.  

Planters like Drayton relied on factors in Europe to conduct business and purchase wares for their estates. John Drayton used his agents to sell his plantation products, mainly rice, and to purchase needed goods, from clothing to silver to furniture. Gentlemen like Samuel Morris were John Drayton’s link to European fashion.

To furnish a house as large as Drayton Hall, Drayton purchased furniture in Charleston and Europe. Locally, Drayton purchased over forty pieces of furniture from Charleston cabinetmaker Thomas Elfe in the early 1770s. However, surviving furniture with clear provenance to Drayton Hall emphasizes that twenty years earlier he imported furniture attuned to the same classical hierarchy that organized the house. A suite of

---

1 Samuel Morris to John Drayton, June 24, 1764, Drayton Papers Collection (Special Collections, College of Charleston Libraries: Charleston, S.C.).
rococo style hairy paw furniture including at least four side chairs, three slab tables, and a settee survive from a large suite of furniture John Drayton purchased around the time Drayton Hall was constructed, ca. 1748. Drayton commissioned a bureau bookcase en suite to this set. It was not an exact match but complimented the suite of furniture. A rococo hairy paw easy chair made in Charleston, located at Winterthur, presents a strong resemblance to the Drayton furniture and may also have been made en suite to this suite. A pair of pier tables, more restrained stylistically and earlier than the other pieces, also survive.

This significant group of imported furniture is the focus of this chapter. Each piece reflects John Drayton’s taste. In 1748 Drayton Hall was nearing completion. During the same period, attention to hospitality and entertainment by the colonial gentry was growing. Even more than in the years before, a planter’s house and the goods within emerged as emblems of status, wealth, and political aspirations. While not the only cultural symbol employed by Drayton, these imported pieces of furniture survive as an example of such emblems.

While the use of material objects as status emblems by American gentry is not a new concept, exploring John Drayton’s use of furniture at Drayton Hall is. The origins of a group of furniture has probably never been as debated or questioned as this group. England, Ireland, Scotland, Portugal, the Caribbean, and Charleston have all been suggested

---


as sources for the group of rococo furniture. These attributions considered the furniture alone, focusing on stylistic evidence and wood analysis, without broadening the analysis into a study of John Drayton’s intellect, status, taste, and consumption patterns. Widening the study to these four areas provides the best answer to origin.

Eleven pieces with clear provenance to John Drayton survive as a testament to the refined first generation interior of Drayton Hall. A pair of pier tables is the earliest group of furniture from the period in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection. The tables were donated to the National Trust in 1998 by Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood. Their presence at Drayton Hall is further corroborated by their inclusion in the ca. 1845 sketchbook of Lewis Reeve Gibbes, grandson of John Drayton. The drawing provides a view of one of the tables in good condition with its ornamentation still in tact.

Wood analysis conducted by Brad Rauschenberg

---

For catalogue descriptions of each surviving piece of furniture see Appendix B.
in 1978 at the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts identified larch as the secondary wood, with an overlaid mahogany veneer placing the set’s area of origin in Europe. Based on the pad feet, a large central shell and restrained cabriole legs, the pair date from ca. 1730-1740. Identifying obvious differences in appearance such as more precise carving on pier table 1 and visible attempts at height adjustment on the top of the legs on pier table 2 exist between the two tables. The most apparent differences appear in measurement comparisons, attention to detail and proportions. As illustrated, the ornamentation on the knees of pier table 1 are entirely proportionate. The ornamentation measures 2.5” in breadth and 5” in length with the flower maintaining a diameter measuring 2.5” in all directions. Ornamentation on the knees of pier table 2, however, are not proportionate nor do measurements correspond between legs. The right facing leg ornamentation measures identically in length to pier table 1, but the flower diameter fluctuates between 2.5” and 2.75”. The left facing leg also matches in length, but the diameter of the flower ranges from 2.75” to 3”. These discrepancies continue to support the supposition that the tables were made in different shops with pier table 1 as the likely prototype.

These obvious differences between the two tables suggest different makers. Pier table 1, with its rationed proportions, intentional carving and attention to shaping of the frame, appears to be the prototype. Shops during this period typically constructed components such as legs from a pattern despite the intended use of the piece of furniture.\textsuperscript{6} If these tables were made in the same shop, just carved by different hands, their overall leg circumferences and heights would have almost identical proportions. While visually the pier tables are considered mates, the marked differences between the tables support their inception at different shops. Continuity in wood analysis results, however, suggests origin in the same region.

A settee, four side chairs and three marble slab tables with direct provenance to Drayton Hall evidence a large suite of furniture purchased by John Drayton to decorate Drayton Hall’s formal rooms. The early rococo style suite terminating in hairy paw feet date ca. 1740-1760 was likely purchased by Drayton for Drayton Hall. With dendrochronology placing the completion of Drayton Hall around 1748, the furniture was likely commissioned and imported in the mid-to-late 1740s.

The settee, with a double chairback, matches the side chairs in overall form and

\textsuperscript{6} Bivens and Rauschenberg, \textit{The Furniture of Charleston}, 53.
ornamentation. The carved serpentine crest rail boasts c-scrolls, stylized acanthus leaves and unique gouge work, all indicative motifs of rococo ornamentation. The pierced splats exhibit similar motifs, but incorporate s-scrolls as well. Armrests terminate in carved lion heads with flowing manes and grimacing smiles. Similar to the side chairs, the facing rail boasts a carved rocaille design with swirling shells and blossoming flowers. The highly carved knees of the cabriole legs exhibit outward scrolling volutes, c-scrolls, s-scrolls and rocaille work. Gouge work is incorporated in many components of the settee. Especially indicative of the suite, and present on the knees of the settee legs, is a sunburst motif. The motif is incorporated in various ways throughout the suite and in the ornamentation of each piece in one way or another. The cabriole legs terminate in a carved hairy paw foot with five talons and with distinctive claws. The detailed paw is carved around the entire circumference of the foot.

The four side chairs are held in four collections (Historic Charleston Foundation
Museum Collection, Drayton Hall Museum

Collection, Henry Ford Museum and Middleton Place). They match the settee in overall form and detailing. The slats are identically pierced, rail ornamentation exact, knee carving the same and hairy paw feet uniform. While stylistically connected to the settee and each other, gouged roman numerals numbering the set of chairs further solidifies their inception as a set. Numbered I, VII, VIII, and X, the chairs were at least a set of ten, but more likely a set of twelve or more. In all of the surviving documents regarding the Drayton’s furniture purchases, sets of six or twelve were always utilized, strengthening this supposition.

Rocaille motifs, hairy paw feet and gouge work group the slab tables with the settee and side chair. The slab sits atop the mahogany frame, carved with typical rococo forms. The cornice running just below the slab top shows a simplified alternating flower and leaf design with stippling in the background. The frieze of the frame exhibits a
carved Greek key composition. The apron is deeply carved with pierced holes along the element. Rocaille decoration scrolls along the main form of the apron and gouged diaper work in a diamond pattern fills the background. The sunburst motif present on the chairs and settee is also represented on the apron of slab table frames. The facing cabriole legs have carved knees with central grouped c-scrolls and rococo stylized acanthus leaves called raffles around the knee design. A scrolled volute, similar to those on the settee and chair, curl from the top of each leg; all of the legs on the slab table terminate in hairy paws. The four legs exhibit the same design motifs, however, the detailing on the rear facing legs terminate where the wall veils it, confirming that the slab tables were designed to remain stationary on the boundaries of a room.

While forms and motifs appear identical, distinctly different hairy paw feet on two of the three tables suggest a different maker, and possibly, origin. Identical paws on the settee, chairs and slab table 1 suggest they are part of a suite by the same cabinetmaker.
A bill of sale between Rebecca Perry Drayton and Charles Drayton evidence that another slab table, likely a match to slab table 1 complimented the suite. More detailed feet with lifelike hair and claws present obvious differences between the other paws. Upon further inspection of original legs on the three tables, like the more definitive, intentional, carving of the paws on table 2 and 3, minor differences in shape, movement, precision and gouge work exist. These slight differences, only visible upon careful inspection, emphasize that like the pier tables, Drayton commissioned the slab tables from different makers. Drayton likely imported the settee, chairs and one, potentially two, slab tables from the United Kingdom and commissioned a local craftsman to complete the set of four slab tables.

The visual identification of pine in the carcass frame on slab table 2 further supports
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8 Pairs were preferred during the eighteenth-century. As such, it would be logical to assume that Drayton purchased the set of four slab tables in pairs of two. That would leave the second imported table to be the one not part of the known group. For more on the preference of pairs by eighteenth-century colonial gentry see: Elisabeth Donaghy Garrett, *At Home: The American Family 1750-1870*, 1st Edition (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1990), 43.
the supposition that the two unrestored frames were made in Charleston to supplement the imported pair. The Gibbes sketchbook also contains a draft of the imported slab tables used at Drayton Hall. It also contains another slab table, appearing to be similar in size, but with a wave pattern on the frieze and straighter legs. That table likely dated to either John’s period or his son Charles’ time at Drayton Hall. Nonetheless, it presents another slab table used at Drayton Hall.

The bureau bookcase was commissioned en suite to the side chairs, settee and slab tables during the same period. Unlike the rest of the suite, the overall style and design of the bureau bookcase draws inspiration from Palladian students William Kent and Inigo Jones creating a tie to the architecture of Drayton Hall. Despite this, the bureau bookcase presents enough elements to solidify its origin in the suite of furniture. Identical paws are the first connection. Gouge work and stippling, incorporated throughout the other suite objects, is also represented on the bureau bookcase. However, enough differences exist in style and ornamentation on the bureau bookcase to suggest it as an en suite item constructed in the same shop as the other pieces making up the suite. The piece combines both rococo and classical elements,
acting as a bridge between furniture and architecture. While used as one piece, the bureau bookcase was constructed in two parts with a lower desk and upper case.

The upper case exhibits refined classical details and mimics elements seen in the house. For example, the broken pediment is topped with various classical motifs such as egg-and-dart and pierced dentils. A Greek key fret, like that on the slab tables and architecturally on the mantel in the hall, is present on the frieze of the bureau bookcase. The central focus of the upper case is a cartouche-shaped beveled mirror – recently restored by Colonial Williamsburg following analysis on the inner edge of the door. Two Corinthian pilasters flank the mirror with capitals boasting acanthus leaves and volutes.9

The lower portion, a fall front desk, is separated from the upper case with a medial molding. Two small drawers on the top row are preceded by three larger drawers spanning the entire length of the desk. Original rococo-style drawer pulls and escutcheons are still present on the piece. The case terminates with a ro-

---

coco style carved base molding, of similar style but not matching the suite of side chairs, settle and slab tables. The short cabriole legs terminate in hairy paws identical to those on the suite of other furniture.

The upper case door opens to a space of vertical pigeonholes and small horizontal drawers; delicate inlays are present throughout the interior and highlight these features. A central prospect and its surround continue to imitate architectural forms with an inlaid arch and pilasters; a pediment tops the design with an inlaid sunburst in the center. The interior of the fall front desk also exhibits an architecturally based prospect, of similar style as the one on the upper case but on a smaller scale. The central prospect stretches to the height of the interior and is flanked on either side by a row of pigeonholes with inlaid drawers above and below. Another piece of case furniture also with prominent egg-and-dart molding and a broken pediment is sketched in the Gibbes book and likely dates to the first generation at Drayton Hall.

An easy chair with mysterious provenance, in the Winterthur Museum Collection, presents the final item po-

Figure 3.22: Bureau Bookcase, London, England, ca. 1730-1740.
tentially purchased and used by the Draytons. Stylistically, the chair was long considered a Philadelphia piece, however, the discovery of cypress used for portions of the framing definitively place the chair’s origin to Charleston. The connection between the Draytons and the chair has previously not been explored. However, stylistic elements of the piece – in the rococo style and boasting hairy paw feet – in conjunction with the proposed dating of the piece and Charleston as place of origin suggest the Draytons as potential original owners of the easy chair. The chair was likely commissioned en suite to the group of side chairs, slab tables and settee. The chair boasts short cabriole legs enriched with c-scrolls and stylized acanthus leaves. The legs terminate in hairy paws. While no connections between motifs on the easy chair and other remaining Drayton pieces can be made, the overall style of the chair complements the Drayton furniture from the period. No other suites of rococo style hairy paw furniture are documented in Charleston presenting an even stronger connection between the Drayton suite and the Winterthur chair.
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10 For an in depth analysis of the chair’s origins and history see: Bivens and Rauschenberg, The Furniture of Charleston, 414-415.

11 60.1058 Easy Chair Blackwell Parlor (Winterthur Museum: Winterthur, DE).
With the date of the chair being placed at 1765-1766, the need for an easy chair in the Drayton household is quite plausible. Cursed by ill health in her later years, Margaret Glen was forced to retire to England in 1766 where she eventually succumbed in September 1772. Not only would Margaret have found use for such an invalid’s chair, but John Drayton himself who died crossing the Cooper River nearly a decade later in 1779 could have also found need for such a chair.¹²

The winged easy chair is upholstered over a wood frame. Originally fitted with casters for easy movement and a commode seat, it terminates in mahogany legs. The similarity of the serpentine crest and scrolled arms to other Charleston-made easy chairs solidify the chair’s origination in Charleston.¹³ Front facing cabriole legs terminate in detailed hairy paw feet with no connection to the two styles of feet on the other furniture. Large knee responds boast swirling acanthus leaf decoration springing from the carved knees. Simplified rear facing legs terminate in a square pad foot. In typical colonial Charleston fashion, the chair, upholstered from physical evidence and period precedents, has rounded inner wing faces but little to no padding on the exterior. The desire for crisp, straight lines on the exterior and padded, soft lines on the interior drove these upholstery decisions.¹⁴

¹³ For more on Charleston-made easy chairs see: Bivens and Rauschenberg, The Furniture of Charleston, 402-426.
While a close examination of the furniture shows its connection and significance, an understanding of the historiography of the collection brings to light the puzzling nature of the pieces. Since the National Trust for Historic Preservation purchased Drayton Hall in 1974, many scholars have studied, if briefly, the surviving furniture from the estate. One question never raised was the provenance of the furniture and its connection to Drayton Hall. All of the furniture, with exception of the easy chair at Winterthur, studied in this thesis presents clear provenance to the John Drayton era at Drayton Hall. The bureau bookcase, two slab tables and the two pier tables descended through nine generations of the Drayton family. Charles H. Drayton III, Francis B. Drayton, and Martha Drayton Mood donated the objects to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1976 and 1998, respectively, for use at Drayton Hall. The furniture bestowed upon the Charleston Museum in 1954 – a side chair, settee and a third slab table – descended through the Porcher family. Mrs. James Lawrence donated the objects to the museum and had purchased them from her nephew Arthur G. Porcher II with the intention to give them to the Museum. Arthur inherited the group of furniture from Wilmot D. Porcher, a descendant of Dr. Francis Y. Porcher. Dr. Francis Y. Porcher inherited all of Rebecca Perry Drayton’s, John Drayton’s fourth wife, furniture upon her death in 1840. A reference to “two marble slabbs and stands” in a 1783 bill of sale between Rebecca Perry Drayton and Charles Drayton support that the table originated at Drayton Hall, but further that it had a mate.\(^{15}\)

During the first years of ownership by the National Trust, there was an attempt to acquire furniture for use in the house. Objects were not intended to furnish the house, but be used in the house to provide visitors with a sense of scale. Put into motion by the Trust’s Board of Trustees in May 1975, the first major report on the preservation of Drayton Hall, called the “Initial Report on the Preservation of the John Drayton House (Drayton Hall)” by the Architects Advisory Committee, defined the site’s furnishing philosophy. The committee defined the philosophy within the pages of that report as follows:

Only enough original Drayton Hall furniture should be returned to give a sense of scale to the interior. The preservation is not concerned with people, family, or a way of life. No attempt should be made to furnish the house completely, nor any room therein. Pieces should be selected for their scale and appropriateness, rather than any inherent or associative values.  

These three sentences continued to be referred to by National Trust and Drayton Hall employees as the basis for Drayton Hall’s furnishing philosophy early on at the site. They continuously purported that furnishing the entire house, or even parts of it, would corrupt its architectural integrity.

Curators for the National Trust and Drayton Hall staff fulfilled this philosophy by acquiring specific pieces from the Drayton family or other private collections. For example, they wanted to purchase the two pier tables to use in the house to compliment the architecture. The pier table’s dilapidated condition made them suitable to life in the unairconditioned house. In comparison, a side chair owned at the time by Mrs. Blake
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Hagen (now the side chair owned by Middleton Place Foundation) was intended for museum standard display in the Visitor’s Orientation Center. Neither of these plans ever came to fruition, but their intention illustrates employees’ attempts in fulfilling the furnishings philosophy of the 1970s – 1980s.18

Resulting from this desire to acquire some pieces of Drayton furniture and eventually accepting the donation of the two slab tables, the bureau bookcase and the pier tables in 1976 and 1998, research commenced on the furniture.19 The group was expanded to the settee, slab table and side chairs owned by the Charleston Museum and Historic Charleston Foundation with known provenance to Drayton Hall. In April 1976, Letitia Galbraith, Associate Curator for the National Trust at the time and eventual Director of Drayton Hall, admitted in a letter to David B. Warren, Associate Director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, that the group of Drayton furniture “continue[d] to be something of a ‘puzzlement.’”20

The mystery of the Drayton furniture remains evident in future correspondence. While Galbraith refrained from guessing the group’s origin, future scholars did not hesitate to do so. In response to her April 1976 letter, Warren suggested that the chairs were representative of English modes. He ruled Philadelphia out as a place of origin by comparing the chairs to Benjamin Randolph examples. However, he further suggests that the settee might have been made in England and used as a prototype for an American cabinet-

---

19 Drayton and Drayton, Deed of Gift; Drayton and Mood, Deed of Gift.
maker to produce the set of side chairs.²¹

The following month, William W. Stahl, Jr. of Sotheby Parke Burnet, Inc. provided the first attributed origin for many of the pieces in an appraisal of the Drayton furniture for the Trust. He labeled the two mahogany pier tables with the central shell motif as Irish, ca. 1740-1750. The pair of slab tables was attributed as eighteenth century and “possibly Southern.” The most puzzling piece to Stahl proved to be the bureau bookcase. He guessed nineteenth century for the construction date and attributed no area of origin.²²

An undated report likely from 1976-1978 outlined the furniture “situation” at Drayton Hall; the focus on Irish influences in the architecture and furniture persisted. Despite the fact that the author acknowledged the Draytons claimed no “Anglo-Irish” connection, they purported that the house was “influenced by Irish Palladianism” and “an early set of furniture is almost certainly Irish.”²³

In 1977 Wendy Cooper published “American Chippendale Chairback Settees: Some Sources and Related Examples.” She uses the settee as a comparison to a similar settee owned by the Hancocks of Boston. Cooper states that although previous arguments claimed the settee was made in Charleston, the comparison to the British-made Hancock settee suggests a likely English origin for the Drayton settee.²⁴

Research by Trust employees on the Drayton furniture lagged in 1977, but picked
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²³ Report on Drayton Hall, 1978 or earlier, Drayton Hall Curatorial Archive (Drayton Hall: Charleston, S.C.).
²⁴ Cooper, “American Chippendale Chairback Settees,” 38.
up momentum in early 1978 when they hired Brad Rauschenberg of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts (MESDA) to conduct microscopic wood analysis.\textsuperscript{25} The results of the wood analysis led National Trust Associate Curator Nancy Richards to believe that the pier tables, with the use of larch as the secondary wood, were English or “more probably Irish or Scottish.”\textsuperscript{26} The use of larch for secondary wood was typical in European cabinetmaking. In conjunction with the presence of mahogany veneer, the results solidified that the pier tables were not American made pieces, but indeed imported. A draft report from July 3, 1978, confirmed this early understanding between National Trust employees that the furniture was of English or Irish origin.\textsuperscript{27}

In 1998, a short piece on the Drayton furniture was published in \textit{In Pursuit of Refinement}. J. Thomas Savage presents the settee and chair as important items imported into Charleston by John Drayton ca. 1750-1760 from the United Kingdom. He outlines the puzzling nature of the objects being “dubbed Charleston, Philadelphia, English, Irish, Portuguese and even dismissed as nineteenth-century Georgian revival products” and provided an attribution of his own. Wright and Elwick, a Wakefield, Yorkshire, firm built side chairs for two Yorkshire houses – Nostell Priory and Kippax Park – with striking resemblance to the Drayton chairs. Another set of chairs published in \textit{The English Chair}

\textsuperscript{25} Also referred to as wood analysis or wood microscopy, it is a method of identifying wood that involves the processing and analysis of a sample from the object in a lab. Successful analysis result in the species of wood the sample was removed from. It is helpful in identifying the origin of furniture as it can test the secondary woods, allowing for a comparison to cabinetmaking techniques in specific areas. As explained in: Rauschenberg, \textit{Wood Analysis}, Report.

\textsuperscript{26} Nancy Richards to Dennis Lawson, March 7, 1978, Drayton Hall Curatorial Archive (Drayton Hall: Charleston, S.C.); Rauschenberg, \textit{Wood Analysis}.

in 1936 also bear resemblance to the Drayton Chairs.\textsuperscript{28}

Read and Mullin conducted an appraisal of the Drayton Hall Museum Collection in 2008; the final appraisal included research notes on many of the objects. Their understanding of the bureau bookcase purported an early nineteenth century construction date in the \textit{retardataire} style. Meaning, it was produced in a style no longer popular. Therefore, they believed the bureau bookcase to have been produced not in the rococo Palladian style of the mid-eighteenth-century, but in the early nineteenth.\textsuperscript{29}

In the same appraisal, the pier tables were also analyzed. Read explains the previous Irish attribution on stylistic grounds considering the large central shell, but concludes that other details presented on the tables have no precedent in Irish work. They suggest Edinburgh, Scotland, as a potential place of origin as pieces do exist with similar details from the area.\textsuperscript{30} During the same time, researchers were also considering well-known English cabinetmakers to whom they attribute the piece. Giles Grendey, English cabinetmaker, working during the middle of the eighteenth century and in a similar style, appeared as a potential maker for the slab tables, chairs and bureau bookcase as late as 2009.\textsuperscript{31}

During the colonial period in Charleston, the elite consumer world revolved around three main characters: the planter, the factor, and the merchant. Thomas Savage

\textsuperscript{28} McInnis, \textit{In Pursuit of Refinement}, 247-249; Moss Harris, \textit{The English Chair: Its History and Evolution} (London: M. Harris and Sons, 1946) 59, 117, 123.
\textsuperscript{29} George Read, \textit{Read & Mullin Appraisal}, September 3, 2008, Drayton Hall Curatorial Archive (Drayton Hall: Charleston, S.C.).
\textsuperscript{30} George Read, \textit{Read & Mullin Appraisal}.
defines the roles these individuals played and their connections to each other, as well as the group’s importance in Charleston in *In Pursuit of Refinement*. He emphasizes that Charlestonians used factors and merchants to fulfill their need for fashionable goods. They desired to emulate the genteel lifestyle of their British cousins. Not only did they imitate them, but they considered themselves English. Therefore, “emulation became a passport to refinement.” A European factor was the needed representation for the elite planter to purchase refined goods from the merchant abroad. Taking care of business, purchasing fashionable goods and dispersing funds and necessities to children studying abroad were the main roles performed by the agent.  

John Drayton utilized factors in main European port cities to sell his plantation goods. James Glen, former royal governor to South Carolina and brother-in-law to John Drayton, acted as Drayton’s representative in London, Glasgow and Edinburgh for the sale of plantation crops. Rice was the staple exported by Drayton during the colonial period and Glen acted as the point of contact for the dispersion of this plantation product to European markets.

James Glen remained Drayton’s agent, and Drayton Glen’s, from the 1760s through at least 1774 as documented in surviving correspondence between the two men. Each performed necessary duties for the other man and the individual with the higher balance would pay the difference at the end of the allotted time. Glen was not only

---


33 John Drayton to Sir from Scotland, August 20, 1774, Drayton Papers Collection (Special Collections, College of Charleston Libraries: Charleston, S.C.).
Drayton’s representative for the sale of his crop in Europe, but also remained the contact allocating money and necessities to members of Drayton’s family in Europe. The most vivid account of their relationship is evidenced in a 1772 letter regarding Margaret Glen, Drayton’s wife, and son Glen’s trip abroad to London around 1772. Margaret was abroad for health reasons and Glen to receive proper English schooling.  

In an authoritative letter from August 1772, John meticulously outlines extravagant sums of money expended by the pair. Bills from Mss. Ross & Mill Merchants and Mss. Graham & Clark, both of London, totaled over £210 for mystery items. Drayton summed £672 5s 1d depleted by mother and son, which his factor was now begging for repayment. Drayton’s harsh tone, especially the threat of cutting Margaret off if spending was not curtailed, make it clear that Drayton was angry at the high sum Margaret and Glen incurred during their stay in London. While it is left to the imagination what “Glennie” and Margaret purchased from Mss. Ross & Mill Merchants and Mss. Graham & Clark and surely other merchants, the hefty sums spent leave no doubt as to the fashionable goods consumed by the pair.

Not only does John support Margaret and Glen’s European escapades, he also finances the genteel education of William Henry and Charles, sons to his second wife Charlotta Bull, in Scotland and England. James Glen endures as the distribution point for Drayton’s money to the young scholars abroad. Letters outline his provision of the boys

34 John Drayton to Margaret Glen Drayton, August 1772, Drayton Papers Collection (Special Collections, College of Charleston Libraries: Charleston, S.C.).
35 John Drayton to Margaret Glen Drayton, August 1772.
with clothes, schooling and any monetary supported during their training.\textsuperscript{36}

While letters tell the story of Margaret and Glen’s overspending in Europe they do not enlighten the twenty-first century reader as to what wares were arriving at Drayton Hall from 1738-1779. The names Charles Stedman, James Bulloch of Lisbon, Mr. Hogin of Edinburgh, Mess. Weinhem & Burmsfer of London, and Robert Smith of London fill the pages of letters written to and from John Drayton regarding bills, purchases and dealings in the main European metropolises. Despite their ambiguity as to what was purchased, the documentation of business in main European trading ports and accrued debts to well-known merchants do illustrate that Drayton conducted business and purchased goods from fashionable ports. They emphasize Drayton’s consumer patterns and support the idea that Drayton was no doubt importing goods from these cities for use in Drayton Hall.\textsuperscript{37}

Drayton, like so many other elites of similar standing, had vast connections to Europe and conducted business in popular European capitals of the time. Illuminating his connections in European communities are letters showing that Drayton did business in London, England; Glasgow, Scotland; Lisbon, Portugal; and Edinburgh, Scotland, with a plethora of factors and merchants. Strong connection in these areas, even without surviving orders for consumer wares – furniture, porcelain, books, and other material items – reveal Drayton’s taste for purchasing goods and his European consumer patterns.

\textsuperscript{36} John Drayton to Sir from Scotland, August 20, 1774.
\textsuperscript{37} Samuel Morris to John Drayton, June 24, 1764; John Drayton to Margaret Glen Drayton, August 1772; John Drayton to unknown recipient, March 17, 1767, Drayton Papers Collection (Special Collections, College of Charleston Libraries: Charleston, S.C.).
These areas, especially London, set the standard for gentry taste. Julie Flavell in *When London was the Capital of America* argues that London met the standard for both consumerist needs and for culture.\(^{38}\) Material goods, like fashionable clothing and Chinese export porcelain were “outward symbols of their owner’s wealth and taste, but they also reveal cultural affinities” by seeking to “follow the latest English fashions by acquiring goods that were trendy in the Mother Country” explained Hurst and Pritchard in “A Rich and Varied Culture: The Material World of the Early South.”\(^{39}\) European factors were the link to outward symbols of wealth for men like Drayton. Documented transaction records in these powerful eighteenth-century European capitals of commerce leave no doubt that Drayton was also purchasing wares abroad to furnish Drayton Hall. They were his connection in the Old World, his judgment of fashionable taste and his purchasing representatives. These middle men enabled Drayton in pursuing refinement in taste and status by connecting him to fashionable Europe.

Surviving furniture from the era indicates that Drayton’s taste in furniture complemented the fully executed Palladian architecture of the house. The use of the rococo style with its scrolling asymmetrical designs was likewise at the height of European fashion when Drayton furnished his homeseat plantation in the mid-eighteenth century. The ornately carved Jacobean inspired ceiling of the withdrawing room, overmantle designs and various carved details in the house all mimic the overall style the rococo furniture exudes. This amalgamation of rococo and Palladian ideals brings together the furnishing standards

\(^{38}\) Flavell, *When London Was Capital of America*, 69.
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employed by Drayton. The use of hairy paws on the feet of nearly every piece of surviving furniture from the era represents Drayton’s desire to furnish Drayton Hall in the most fashionable standard of the time. While both pad feet or claw-and-ball feet were still in good taste during the period, the hairy paw foot was the most desirable style. A suite of furniture commissioned by the Cadwalader family in Philadelphia nearly twenty years later, further evidencing the superiority of the Drayton furniture for its time, only rivals John Drayton’s use of hairy paws.

As one of the only suites of hairy paw furniture surviving with a similar breadth as that imported by Drayton, the suite of furniture commissioned by John and Elizabeth Cadwalader in 1769 to furnish their newly purchased Philadelphia house acts as an appropriate comparison for the Drayton pieces. Not only does a comparison between the two suites bring to light key elements of the Drayton suite, it also emphasizes the status of Drayton and what furnishing a house in this style meant to the social status of the colonial elite in the eighteenth century.

Both of the suites of furniture were constructed in the rococo style and boast hairy paw feet. However, their origins differ greatly. Drayton imported his suite of hairy paw furniture from the United Kingdom to furnish his house which was nearing completion in 1748. In preparation for the completion of his dwelling, John Drayton would probably have ordered the group of furniture during construction to have it upon completion of Drayton Hall. As such, this dates the hairy paw furniture to around the middle of the 1740s. John and Elizabeth Cadwalader likewise commissioned their suite of hairy paw furniture upon purchase of a house on Second Street in Philadelphia. However, they did
not purchase many of their items until the 1770s and did not import the pieces, but rather commissioned local Philadelphia cabinetmakers to complete the job. Understanding that Drayton purchased his set of furniture nearly thirty years prior to the Cadwalader’s procurement of theirs emphasizes just how fashion-forward Drayton was and how unique the set of Drayton hairy paw furniture was when it was originally used in Drayton Hall.

Like the Drayton family of Charleston, the Cadwaladers of Philadelphia were distinguished elite leaders in colonial Philadelphia. Cadwalader began his career in Philadelphia following schooling in England as a merchant with his brother Lambert. As Jack Lindsey wrote in “Colonial Philadelphia and the Cadwalader Family,” the Cadwalader family “continued to play a pivotal role in the city’s political, intellectual, and cultural circles during the Revolution and in later Federal periods.”

Following the purchase of their house in 1769, the Cadwaladers began a major redecorating campaign stretching from architectural improvements to furniture procurement. They hired Thomas Nevell to complete the restoration work on their new house and embellished the interior of the house with rococo ornamentation so extensive that nearly all of the old interior of the house was removed and replaced. Not only did the Cadwaladers employ a local contractor to complete the restoration work, but also many well known Philadelphia cabinetmakers for the construction of their furniture.

In keeping with the eighteenth-century taste, Cadwalader similarly commissioned
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commode-seat side chairs and marble slab tables for use in his Philadelphia house. Benjamin Randolph and Thomas Affleck are some of the best known Philadelphia cabinetmakers commissioned by Cadwalader for the production of his hairy paw furniture. The commode-seat side chairs are attributed to Benjamin Randolph, however, vague bills to the cabinetmaker make the attribution difficult. Many of the carving details and style are identical to chairs with his shop label; Randolph employed London-trained John Pollard as carver during the period and the carving on the set of chairs is thought to be his work.43 Graves and Beckerdite in *New Insights on John Cadwalader’s Commode-Seat Side Chairs* in *American Furniture* explain that many other pieces “made by Thomas Affleck and carved by James Reynolds and by the firm of Bernard and Jugiez” were en suite with the Randolph chairs. They further explain that the furniture was made not only to complement the other pieces, but also to work in tandem with the new interior decoration in the

---

renovated house.\textsuperscript{44}

Similar to the Drayton suite of furniture, the Cadwalader group utilizes popular motifs and forms of the rococo style. A side by side comparison of similar pieces commissioned by each man for use in his genteel house clearly shows the furniture commissioned by Cadwalader as more elegant and refined. However, the Drayton suite of furniture was likely some of the earliest rococo style hairy paw pieces imported into the colonies; the lack of similar comparisons to groups of furniture like the Cadwalader’s and the Drayton’s furniture emphasize the rarity, importance and superiority of the style. The fact that Drayton imported his furniture at least twenty years prior to that of Cadwalader emphasizes Drayton’s refined taste and provides an explanation for the provincial nature of the pieces.

Taking Drayton’s use of European factors and refined taste in expensive imported goods into consideration, his consumption patterns become clear. He used European factors to facilitate his fashionable taste in expensive imported goods. Drayton may have collaborated with cabinetmakers in the design of furniture. They were, like his house, designed with a set of standards in mind. The hairy paw furniture was imported to complement Drayton’s Palladian architecture and showcase his exquisite taste in imported wares. They were used to fulfill his gentry need for entertainment and hospitality, but also fulfilled the purpose of demonstrating that he had not just good taste, but the highest of taste. The furniture worked hand and hand with his designed architecture to exude his genteel status.

\textsuperscript{44} Graves and Beckerdite, \textit{New Insights on John Cadwalader’s Commode-Seat Side Chairs}, 160-161.
Drayton’s design standards and fashionable taste leave no doubt that the rococo style hairy paw furniture was imported. Secondary woods and construction methods corroborate that the original suite was imported. Surviving Drayton correspondence between various factors documenting business transactions evidences strong connections in England and Scotland.

Drayton’s strong connections to England and Scotland suggest the importation of his rococo furniture plausibly came from one of these places. James and Margaret Glen were born in Scotland and Charles attended school in Edinburgh. Drayton alluded to business in Scotland in his letters to James Glen, wife Margaret, and various agents. At the same time, he also presented strong ties to England. Following his term as royal governor, Glen retired to London; his sister Margaret and nephew Glen resided there during the later half of the eighteenth century. Both Charles and William Henry attended school in London as well. Drayton records show business with factors and merchants throughout London. The fact that London was the center of fashion for American gentry further supports the idea that the imported Drayton furniture originated in the metropolis. Edinburgh, Scotland, and London, England, each present a strong case as the city the Drayton suite of furniture was made in. Taking into stylistic considerations, the connections become even stronger.

Attracting wealthy patrons with its elegant movement, the rococo style began in Italian Baroque designs, was refined in the early eighteenth century in France and adopted by the English shortly thereafter. Matthias Lock and Henry Copeland developed the English interpretation of the Rococo style in their books; however, most indicative of their
early influence is their joint publication *A New Book of Ornament with Twelve Leaves* from 1752. The most notable rococo design is of course Thomas Chippendale. His *Director* was published two years later in 1754 and further marks the growing popularity of the style in England. This burgeoning in England of the style in the 1730s-1740s and maturation through the 1750s became a desired style by the gentry who used it to portray their refined taste. It emerged in the colonies in the ensuing decade, but was not at the height of fashion until nearly twenty years later in the 1770s.

Drayton likely would have made furnishing preparations prior to the completion of his house. With Drayton Hall nearing completion in 1748, John probably commissioned the furniture around the same date or earlier. In either instance, it remains clear that Drayton’s furnishing preferences fell in line with the fashionable tastes of Europe. His importation of the rococo style hairy paw furniture marks some of the earliest known imports of the style in the colonies. This is what makes the Drayton furniture so unique. He likely imported the furniture prior to the publication of Lock and Copeland’s design book and even more importantly Chippendale’s *Director*. Not only does this attest to how abreast Drayton was on the current fashions, but also lends explanation for the almost provincial carving embodied on many of the pieces.

One of the reasons the suite has puzzled researchers is because it exhibits elements that appear provincial in nature. At times the carving is rough and looks to be done of an unsure hand. Shallow gouge work – a diamond diaper pattern, sunburst and stitching
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around elements – is not indicative of later works and is perplexing. The proportions of the pieces are not as exaggerated and there is a lack of movement in the overall body when compared to examples from the height of the period. However, the early nature of the pieces, at a time when the rococo style was just beginning in England and before design books were published, helps explain these puzzling elements. The early date of the pieces in reference to the popularity of the style suggests that cabinetmakers may not have been very familiar with the style and had little experience or basis for design. These items, in essence, could have been some of the first produced by the cabinetmaker, leading to the slightly different proportions, quality of carving and style of detailing.

In *A Dictionary of Edinburgh Wrights and Furniture Makers* (1983) Francis Bamford debunks the idea that no cabinetmakers worked in Edinburgh, Scotland, during the eighteenth century. He describes at length the detailed discovery of furniture made in Scotland and at the end provides images of examples of furniture with known provenance to Edinburgh. In that compilation of images, several elements also found on the Drayton Hall furniture are pictured. The popular rosette, similar to the one on the side chairs and settee, is seen in a detail of a dining chair crest made by Alexander Peter in 1759 for the Dumfries House.47 The same floral motif is also viewed the splat of a mahogany child’s armchair by from 1760.48 A pattern chair originally from London and held in the shop of Thomas Welsh, an estate wright, was used as a guide for designing various chair styles. It presented different patterns on each seat rail to be used for a patron to pick his preferred
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style and then as a guide for the cabinetmaker. It presents a similar gouged sunburst motif, sans the central circle, at the termination of the armrest. The facing seat rail boasts a Greek key pattern, very similar to the one on the frieze of the slab tables. A bordering acanthus leaf with gouged detailing frames the knee respond; a similar motif is once again seen on the responds of the slab tables. The chair itself appears to also lack exaggerated proportions and movement, another indicative trait of the Drayton side chairs.49

While some of the design motifs referenced above – the rosette and the acanthus leaf knee respond – were typical of the style, the other elements – the gouge work and overall proportions and movement – suggest a possible origin to Edinburgh. At the same time, they also present an association with England. In their recent restoration and analysis of the bureau bookcase, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation conservators and curators attributed the piece to London cabinetmaker Giles Grendey. Through tracking the name painted on the backboard of the lower case, Rot. Wise, it was discovered that he apprenticed for Grendey during the 1740s when the bureau bookcase was made. With it being solidly attributed to Giles Grendey, a comparison of other attributed Grendey pieces also presents similarities to the Drayton suite of furniture. Like the Scottish cabinetmakers, Grendey also utilized the rosette found on the Drayton pieces. Library armchairs firmly attributed to the maker boast the floral motif; a stylized acanthus leaf running along the outward curving arm is present on both a library chair made by Grendey and the Drayton settee. The carved lion heads on the settee are present on two arm chairs matching a set of dining chairs also attributed to Grendey and appear very similar in style. Many of the

Grendey examples contain minute details connecting them to the Drayton chairs. Gouge work is present on the stylized acanthus leaves and rocaille carving as well as stitching boarding some elements.\textsuperscript{50}

Not only do stylistic motifs used by Grendey appear on the settee, but there is a double-chairback settee in the manner of Grendey of a very similar form, but different stylistic embellishments. To this point the pier tables and suite of hairy paw furniture have been attributed with different carvers and different periods. However, Grendey produced furniture in London from 1716 through the late 1760s. Prior to working in the rococo style, he produced many pieces in the Queen Anne taste and a surviving example exhibits a form very similar to the pier tables. Simple stylized acanthus leaf motifs run down the cabriole legs of both tables present a potential connection not previously considered. An image of a mysterious chair, with no associated information, connected to Grendey, contains the exact back the Drayton Hall side chairs boast. These strong connections to Grendey suggest that the Drayton furniture was either made by the cabinetmaker in his London shop or in the style


Both Scotland and London were thriving metropolises for John Drayton to conduct plantation business and purchase wares for his Anglo-Palladian plantation house through his European factors. As the centers of fashion, each gave Drayton options for furnishing his house in the highest genteel taste. However, throughout the eighteenth century, London remained the center of fashion for metropolises in Europe as well as the colonies. The pattern chair cited in \textit{A Dictionary of Edinburgh Wrights and Furniture Makers} testifies to such. Cabinetmakers understood their clientele were searching for the best style of furniture for use in their house and used London as precedent when an original was unattainable.

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig3.28.jpg}
\caption{Settee in the Manner of Giles Grendey, ca. 1745}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig3.29.jpg}
\caption{Side TableAttributed to Grendey, ca. 1740}
\end{figure}
However, John Drayton consistently proves himself a man not content with mediocrity. His visible taste illustrated in his Palladian architecture and rococo furniture is obvious. London was the place to import from as an elite Charlestonian and the presented evidence points to the British capital as the origin for the Drayton furniture. Drayton’s taste and beneficial connections in the city combined with the strong stylistic connections to Giles Grendey’s work and stature as a prominent cabinetmaker present a solid patronage to London, England.

Physical evidence and historic documents point to London, England, as the place of origin for the imported suite of furniture. The use of larch as a secondary wood in the pier tables and bureau bookcase place Europe as the area of origin. The stylistic connection to Grendey with the similar acanthus leaf motifs, gouge work and lion heads present Grendey as a potential maker. The connection becomes even stronger in Colonial Williamsburg’s attribution of Grendey as maker of the bureau bookcase. Drayton’s strong ties in London through James Glen and multiple factors continue to strengthen the argument. Physical evidence, stylistic traits and strong connections present London as a strong possibility for the origin of the suite.
CHAPTER 4
FOR A BREAKFAST TABLE: JOHN DRAYTON’S CHARLESTON FURNITURE

John Drayton purchased his first piece of furniture from cabinetmaker Thomas Elfe in January 1772. It would not be his last. Elfe recorded this first purchase, a breakfast table, in his Account Book. There were three other pieces of furniture in this order, a tea table and a set of dining tables, and Elfe noted additional charges for covering twelve chairs with dammast [sic] and taking down and putting up bedsteads. The total of the order was £72 3s 9d.\(^1\) However, previous business dealings can be found, as a nondescript payment by Drayton appears in Leidger A [sic] in October 1769 for £22 5s.\(^2\) John Drayton purchased many objects from Elfe during his long career in Charleston (ca. 1745-1775). Between 1768 and 1775 Elfe’s last account book recorded fourteen transactions, three of them payments on Drayton’s account, #102, for forty-one pieces of furniture and eight “sundry jobs,” tasks like taking down and putting up bedsteads and mending chairs.

Recorded within the faded pages of the Thomas Elfe Account Book are purchases that form a pattern suggesting that Drayton commissioned furniture for specific uses at Drayton Hall. The transactions reveal that mahogany was Drayton’s material of choice. Further, analysis of Drayton’s purchases against Elfe’s pricing suggest that Drayton

\(^1\) For this thesis, based on the way it is written in the Thomas Elfe Account Book in conjunction with how it is referred to in *The 1772 Philadelphia Furniture Price Book: A Facsimile*, the reference to monetary pounds, shillings and pence is written as follows: A “£” preceding the amount of pounds, “s” follows the amount of shillings and “d” follows the amount of pence. Alexandra Alevizatos Kirtley, *The 1772 Philadelphia Furniture Price Book: A Facsimile* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2006).

utilized Elfe pieces to furnish the less formal family spaces in Drayton Hall. For better rooms Drayton ordered pieces from England or Scotland. With few exceptions, Drayton purchased items from Elfe of fashionable quality, yet these items can be described as ordinary based on their low-to-mid range prices. Comparisons on a piece-by-piece level, as well as a customer level, place the Drayton goods within the broad context of Elfe and his Charlestonian customer base. Increased understanding of how Drayton utilized Elfe place a piece in the puzzle that is the eighteenth-century furnishings used at Drayton Hall by John Drayton.

Just as John Drayton imported stylish European furniture through factors to furnish the formal spaces it Drayton Hall, he likewise recognized and used Charleston for consuming needs at a local level. Indeed, recent literature recognizes the consumption patterns of Charleston as similar to London. Charleston was the height of consumption for Carolina elites because there were, as Emma Hart in *Building Charleston* emphasizes, places to go, things to do, and goods to consume. She builds upon the assertion that “London remained at the epicenter of fashionable society” but Charleston, as a provincial town “also became very important as” a “cultural center” that functioned alongside London. Charleston “fostered the creation of a South Carolinian provincial gentility.” Carter C. Hudgins, in “The Material World of John Drayton” further confirms this point by writing that as “conceived as the capital of the Carolina colony, the city was largely fueled by the wealth of its surrounding plantations.” This “resulted in levels of wealth and

---

consumption unprecedented in the American colonies.”4 Artisans like Elfe with connections in the Old and New World provided for the consumption patterns exercised by patrons like John Drayton.

Thomas Elfe is the best-known Charleston cabinetmaker due to the survival of his account book. While many attributed pieces exist, not one piece of furniture can be solidly traced to the cabinetmaker through documentary evidence.5 Elfe worked in Charleston from 1745-1775, arriving, both E. Milby Burton and Samuel Humphrey suggest, following an apprenticeship in London.6 Burton, a Charleston furniture scholar, cites “family tradition” for London as the source of Elfe’s training. Elfe scholar Samuel Humphrey, supports this, noting that Elfe apprenticed under his uncle since he inherited his tools. There is, however, no evidence to support this theory. Nevertheless, Elfe scholars do agree that the sophistication of work attributed to him suggests training by a master cabinetmaker.7

In Building Charleston Emma Hart equates Elfe and his furniture production workshop with some of London’s most prominent cabinetmakers. Hart suggests that

---

5 One of the most documented attributions to Thomas Elfe remains the Royal Governor’s Chair. Samuel Humphrey in Thomas Elfe Cabinetmaker, who cited a surviving Bill of Sale from Elfe & Hutchinson in 1758 as evidence, attributed the chair to Elfe. This bill, for “Furniture for the Council Chamber,” listed chairs and tables for a total of £728 2s 6d. However, the lack of detail in the bill, as noted by Gary Albert in The Furniture of Charleston, 1680-1820 for Antiques and Fine Arts Magazine, cannot lead to a solid attribution. Albert further notes that the carving and stylistic details hint at New York craftsmanship. For more on Elfe attributions see: Samuel A. Humphrey, Thomas Elfe Cabinetmaker (Charleston, SC: Wyrick, 1995); Gary J. Albert, “The Furniture of Charleston 1680-1820,” Antiques and Fine Arts Magazine, Accessed January 25, 2015, http://www.antiquesandfineart.com/articles/article.cfm?request=371; E. Milby Burton, Thomas Elfe, Charleston Cabinet-Maker (Charleston, SC: Charleston Museum, 1952).
7 Humphrey, Thomas Elfe Cabinetmaker, 1; Burton, Thomas Elfe, 5.
“innovations implemented by Elfe in his workshop were almost as striking as the craftsmanship of his tea tables, bookcases, and dining chairs.”

The process extensively described by Hart in *Building Charleston*, collaborated by an analysis of the Elfe Account Book, shows that Elfe’s cabinetmaking business in Charleston was not a one man shop. Rather, it flourished with the employment of white artisans, enslaved labor and beneficial partnerships. Elfe completed orders for over 1000 pieces of furniture and repaired other items frequently. He also had a steady business of setting up, taking down and moving furniture in client’s homes.

Elfe’s Account Book records orders from over 200 patrons. Elfe gave each customer an account number, yet on occasion multiple individuals. John Drayton orders were always listed in Account #102 which was shared with another client, Roger Smith. An apparent connection between Drayton and Smith exists, as they shared an account with Elfe and appear together in documents along with James Glen. From left to right an order took the form of: the account number, the patron, item and the price.

In many of the transactions he recorded, Elfe did not describe the items in detail. He reserved descriptors for very expensive or out of the ordinary purchases. Typical items were simply called by their basic name. For example, in February 1775 John Dutarque purchased “A scallop tea table with eagles claws” for £25. In contrast, Dutarque
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12 The relationship between Smith, Drayton, and Glen should be explored in a future research project.
had previously purchased a tea table in February of the preceding year for £13, which was simply described as “1 tea table.” Elfe’s notations are consistent, suggesting that he described the atypical and most expensive pieces, labeling his most frequently purchased items – tea tables for £12 or 3 ½ foot dining tables for £16 – in straightforward and simple terms.\footnote{Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” February 1775, February 1774.}

Elfe adjusted his prices according to the level of detail and ornamentation on a piece, the type of wood and complexity of form was also taken into consideration in the total price. The tea tables Dutarque purchased are one such example. Despite this, as a cabinetmaker with London connections – as evidenced throughout the Account Book and most specifically by his account with London merchants Alexander & Shrimpton – and a strong relationship with both elite clients and other cabinetmakers in Charleston, suggest that the furniture produced by Elfe likely conformed to the latest fashion.

Elfe’s prices hewed to transatlantic practice.\footnote{The 1772 Philadelphia Furniture Price Book, reproduced as a facsimile with an introduction and guide by the Philadelphia Museum of Art, confirms the same to be true during this period in Philadelphia. The introduction by Kirtley explains that since cabinetmakers were “constrained by the need to sell furniture for profit” they in turn “paid close attention to evolving fashions, and the furniture they made reflected the aspirations of their cultured patronage.” For more on cabinetmakers pricing see: Kirtley, The 1772 Philadelphia Furniture Price Book, 21.} With clients such as Arthur Middleton, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Nathaniel Russell, Daniel Heyward, and John and William Henry Drayton, Elfe was exposed to and commissioned to produce the most up to date, high quality furniture. His continued accounts with each of these men attest to the fashionable furniture produced by Elfe’s shop.\footnote{Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”} His detailed Account Book and those of other cabinetmakers, like the surviving Daybook of James Poyas and their long-standing
careers in Charleston attest to the continued confidence and patronage of Charleston’s most elite families.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, their final products rivaled contemporary imported pieces from across the Atlantic.

Thomas Elfe’s Account Book and other surviving information provides a glimpse into his daily workings and his connections to Charleston’s artisan community. He was the master of his furniture business but twice in his career created business partnerships. His first partner was Thomas Hutchinson, with whom he operated under the name Elfe & Hutchinson from 1756 to around 1768. Together, they completed orders for significant patrons including the Royal Council and St. Michael’s Church wardens.\textsuperscript{17} The last documented evidence of the Elfe & Hutchinson partnership is present in the Thomas Elfe Account Book. On January 19, 1768, Elfe records paying Alexander & Shrimpton of London, account #2, the “balance of their account due them from Elfe & Hutchinson” for £161 14s 8d sterling.\textsuperscript{18} Thomas Hutchinson’s account with Elfe, #31, reveals no further references or transactions in regards to the partnership. Therefore, the end date of 1768 for the dissolution of the partnership between Elfe & Hutchinson based on the reference in the Alexander & Shrimpton account is quite plausible.\textsuperscript{19}

Thomas Elfe also formed a partnership with another fellow Charleston cabinet-
maker during his tenure as cabinetmaker in the colonial city. The first records of the partnership of Elfe & Fisher appear in the Account Book in April of 1768, less than four months following the hypothetical dissolution of the Elfe & Hutchinson partnership. Account #45 is devoted to Elfe’s partnership with Fisher. Fisher arrived from London in 1767 and advertised his arrival in the *South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal* by writing “JOHN FISHER, Cabinet-Maker, FROM LONDON; TAKES this Method to acquaint the PUBLICK [sic], That he has taken Part of the House in Tradd-street…and intends carrying on the CABINET BUSINESS in all its Branches.” The advertisement continues to explain that Fisher hoped that those who used Mr. Wise for their cabinetmaking needs, previous owner of the Tradd Street house, would now bring their business to him. It continues by promising that “These Gentlemen and Ladies who please to favour him [Wise] with their command, may depend on having their Orders well executed, and on the shortest Notice.” While the Account Books includes payments to Elfe & Fisher well into 1775, a duplicate advertisement in the *South Carolina Gazette* and the *South Carolina and American General Gazette* solidifies that the duo split in May 1771. The advertisement explained:

> THE copartnership of ELFE & FISHER having been some time dissolved, and all debts due thereto assigned to THOMAS ELFE; the said Elfe hopes, that all persons indebted to the said copartnership, will speedily pay or settle the same with him. And as he continues carrying on THE CABINET-MAKER’S Business, at this OLD SHOP in BROAD-STREET, will be much

---


obliged to his Friends, for a continuance of their favours [sic]. All persons having any demands are desired to bring them in for payment.\textsuperscript{22}

A subsequent advertisement in June of the same year, this time only in the \textit{South Carolina and American General Gazette} further explains the reason for the split:

JOHN FISHER, Cabinet and Chair Maker, acquaints his Friends that he has purchased of Mr. Stephen Townsend his STOCK in TRADE and NEGROES brought up in the Business, which he now carries on at the House in Meeting-Street, where Mr. Townsend formerly lived. Those who chuse [sic] to employ him will be supplied at the most reasonable Rates, and may depend on his Diligence in executing their Orders. The Books of the Co-partnership of ELFE & FISHER are assigned over the Mr. Elfe; those who have any Demands are desired to call on him for payment.\textsuperscript{23}

Fisher, upon recent arrival from London collaborated with or used the reputation of established cabinetmakers to bolster his newly begun business in Charleston. Surely his recent immersion in the cabinetmaker scene in London not only attracted patrons, but also other cabinetmakers. The collaboration of Elfe & Fisher would have been beneficial to both partners, as Elfe could learn the latest London styles and Fisher could build a favorable reputation with the established Elfe clientele. The purchase and execution of his newly established business at Mr. Townsend’s, backed with his association with Elfe, probably set Fisher up for his own successful cabinetmaking venture in Charleston. His dates of tenure as a cabinetmaker in Charleston as cited by Bivens and Rauchenberg – 1767-1782


– solidify Fisher’s success as a cabinetmaker after his split with Elfe.\textsuperscript{24}

Elfe increased his business by setting up a factory-like type of workshop. His furniture production relied not only on him, but also heavily on the members within his shop network. Between twenty at the low end and thirty at the high end, Elfe relied on other white artisans in Charleston for the completion of pieces.\textsuperscript{25} This list includes other artisans involved in the furniture trade such as cabinetmakers, turners, joiners, looking glass makers, upholsterers, carvers and gilders. Elfe owned multiple slave artisans that helped in furniture production and were also rented out to other cabinetmakers or Charleston gentry for the completion of sundry jobs. Hart explains that this network of connections places Elfe’s shop as an equal contemporary to those of some of the most prominent London cabinetmakers at the time.\textsuperscript{26}

Elfe operated a tight shop, quite similar to that of London cabinetmakers of the time; this, in combination with other business ventures outlined in his Account Book, depicts him as an astute and wealthy businessman. His connections with firms in London and partnerships with individuals recently from London evidence that Elfe’s furniture was in the most current style desired by elite Charlestonians with exquisite London taste. More evidence for his business acumen, artisan skill and wide clientele made up of elite Charlestonians is the fact that he advertised rarely. As Bivens and Rauschenberg wrote,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Bivens and Rauschenberg, \textit{The Furniture of Charleston}, 1017.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Bivens and Rauschenberg list twenty-nine white artisans listed in the Account Book, however, Hart places her number at twenty-three. Following an analysis of the Account Book, and the validity of Bivens and Rauschenberg’s cabinetmaker researcher for their extensive book \textit{The Furniture of Charleston}, and their reputation within the field of Southern decorative arts, the number probably reaches closer to thirty. Bivens and Rauschenberg, \textit{The Furniture of Charleston}, 995; Hart, \textit{Building Charleston}, 104; Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
\item \textsuperscript{26} Hart, \textit{Building Charleston}, 105.
\end{itemize}
“it is interesting that as Charleston’s wealthiest cabinetmaker of all time, and probably one of the most successful, Elfe advertised little… It is likely that his work needed little advertisement, especially as most of his competition had accounts with him. It was probably up to other artisans of Elfe’s day to advertise in order to survive Elfe’s already-established popularity.”

Elfe continued working in Charleston until his death in 1775. His cabinetmaking business, however, lived on through the work of his son, Thomas Elfe II, to whom he bequeathed his shop, tools and slaves.

John Drayton spent a total of £538 8s 9d in account #102 at Thomas Elfe’s cabinetmaking shop purchasing wares to furnish Drayton Hall. Recorded orders in the Account Book begin in January 1772, however, a payment by Drayton to Leidger A [sic] for £22 5d suggests that Drayton was a frequent customer of Elfe’s and had done business with the cabinetmaker at least three years earlier than this documented purchase. While their previous relationship and the purchases made therein are unknown, transactions recorded after and including that initial purchase illustrate the items Drayton was ordering from Elfe and subsequently using to furnish his homeseat.

The use of the Drayton purchases in the Elfe Account Book in this thesis is done for three reasons. First, it lists pieces John Drayton used to furnish Drayton Hall. An analysis of this list in comparison to other similar purchases in the book explains the style and quality of these pieces. Second, that analysis not only lends to the understanding of

27 Bivens and Rauschenberg, The Furniture of Charleston, 1002.
what Drayton was purchasing, but places the Drayton pieces in context in terms of Elfe’s
typical price list. Third, a comparison between Drayton and consumers of a similar status
based on frequency of use, purchase amount and type places Drayton within the elite con-
sumer base purchasing from Elfe in colonial Charleston.

In order to set the stage for the comparison and placement of Drayton within the
Elfe customer base, a breakdown and analysis of the Drayton pieces is first necessary.
This is best explained by grouping furniture into types and sub types.

**Tables**

Tables ranging in forms from tea tables to dining tables grace the pages of the Elfe
Account Book. Drayton purchased a total of nine tables from the cabinetmaker, varying
in style and quality, as evidenced by the price. Many of the tables fall in line with most
of the Drayton purchases. They are of the average price and description in comparison
to other similar items purchased from Elfe. Each table form purchased by Drayton was
indicative of eighteenth-century life and speaks to fashionable trends conformed to by
elites.

**Breakfast Tables**

Drayton’s first purchase in January 1772 was for a breakfast table. He paid £16
for the item, as did four other patrons between 1772 and 1775. As one of the most dis-
tinctive forms of rococo style furniture in the South, the breakfast table is equally referred
to as a pembroke table.\(^{29}\) While eighteenth-century examples vary in applied details, they
remained true to a defined form. The rectangular drop leaf tabletop could be used with its

\(^{29}\) Heckscher, and Bowman, *American Rococo*, 177.
side leaves raised or folded depending on current needs. The lightness of the form began an emphasis on the desire for furniture to be movable and its versatility made it popular. The style remained fashionable into the nineteenth century. When not in use, the table fit nicely at room boundaries. Flat, joined stretchers and blocked feet are typical of American made pembroke tables of the period. Two drawers in the central core are commonly present, however, it is possible to have examples without drawers.

The price of £16 was the most common amount charged by Elfe for a breakfast table and was just above the median amount paid. Plainer tables were available for as low as £12, but more detailed examples were as expensive as £28. For example, in January 1772, the same month as the breakfast table purchased by Drayton, Roger Smith purchased a “mahogany breakfast table the ends carved” for £28. While Drayton’s breakfast table includes no descriptive information, a table sold for £2 more to Thomas Skottowe in April 1772 included “draws and stretches” suggesting this Drayton breakfast table was rather plain without drawers or stretchers.

In a May 1772 purchase that stepped outside of the normal consumer patterns of Drayton in the Elfe book, an item listed as “One P. Table” is contained in a large order. Drayton paid £28 for this item; while the “P” leaves the description of the table to the imagination, the only tables sold by Elfe beginning with the letter “P” are pembroke tables. Therefore, this questionable item was likely a pembroke table. In August 1775

30 Garrett, At Home, 39.
Elliot Sabina purchased the only defined pembroke table for £15. While this price is almost half of what Drayton paid Elfe for his “P. Table,” prices fluctuated greatly on items even of the same name. Drayton’s pembroke table was distinctively of higher quality than the breakfast table ordered four months earlier. It likely exhibited a drawer and carved edge as did the breakfast table made for Thomas Skottwe; an Elfe fret is also a possibility for this order.33

The price and style difference between the two breakfast tables purchased by Drayton emphasizes their intended placement within the house. The obviously ornate pembroke table would have been utilized in the more formal spaces in the house; probably the withdrawing room with its role as the best parlor during John Drayton’s time at Drayton Hall. In contrast, the more ordinary breakfast table, nearly half the cost of the pembroke table, would have been used in the back parlor space dominated by everyday family activities.34

Two existing breakfast tables at the Heyward-Washington House and Middleton Place, both in Charleston, South Carolina, have been attributed to Elfe; they are of similar form and bear the figure eight diamond fret indicative of Elfe. Rectangular with two drop leaves and carved serpentine edges, the two surviving breakfast tables do not contain drawers and balance upon four straight legs. The carved edges of the top, a detailed fret and carved joined stretchers suggest a level of quality quite similar to the pembroke table purchased by Drayton in May 1772. The general form of the surviving tables also

34 Garrett, At Home, 39, 65.
provide a solid base point for the simpler table purchased by Drayton.

**Tea Tables**

Tea tables of varied price and descriptions were purchased by John Drayton and are contained in three different orders. He purchased two tea tables, one in January 1772 and another in June of 1773 for £12; no description of either of these tables was recorded by the cabinetmaker aside from the distinction that one was of mahogany. However, in May 1772, a third tea table was purchased for £16 with more description.³⁵ This tea table at £4 more was described as a “turned top teatable” and was probably what would be considered a tilt-top tea table. This contraption allowed for the top of the table to be tilted as necessary to accommodate moving the table from a stationary position at the wall when not in use.³⁶

£11 and £12 were the most common prices charged for tea tables sold by Thomas Elfe. Most were noted as being constructed of mahogany, as was one of Drayton’s. Only one mention of a square tea table at the price of £12 is mentioned, being sold to Colonel Daniel Heyward with a rim in January 1773. This suggests that the other recorded tea tables for £12 were round. No other tea tables were purchased at the price of £16, leaving one with no reference as to the style or quality of that purchase by Drayton. The closest comparison are two tea tables purchased for £13 described as a “large mahogany round tea table” purchased by Francis Young in August 1773 and a “China frett tea table” made for John Duetart in February 1774. The only reasonable assumptions to be made about

---
the £16 table purchased by Drayton is that was probably of mahogany, large, round and boasting some form of ornamentation.\textsuperscript{37}

Scholarly literature on tea tables confirm that round top tea tables with a tilting top was the most common form of tea table during Drayton’s period. As explained in \textit{Early American Decorative Arts}, these tea tables “had tops that pivoted into a vertical position when not in use, worked by a metal catch.” They are supported by a central pillar with three joined legs protruding at the base for stability. The versatility to fold the top parallel with the stem made the table “easily fit either into a corner…or against a wall” when not in use.\textsuperscript{38} All three tea tables purchased by Drayton probably took this form and would have been intended for use in the informal rooms; their lightweight nature potentially allowed them to be moved about the house as needed.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{Dining Tables}

Another style of table purchased by Drayton were dining tables. Drayton ordered three mahogany dining tables from Elfe and one non-descriptive 3 ½ foot mahogany table all for £16 each. In the mid-eighteenth century “paired forms were particularly admired;” a majority of the purchased dining tables from Elfe were done so as duos reflecting this trend.\textsuperscript{40} Drayton did so in his order in January 1772, as did at least ten other customers who purchased dining tables of the same size and wood – 3 ½ feet and of mahogany. Many of the tables, often described as for dining, listed at £16 for a single or £32 for a

\textsuperscript{38} Krill, \textit{Early American Decorative Arts}, 56, 70.
\textsuperscript{39} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 39.
\textsuperscript{40} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 43.
pair, measured at 3 ½ feet. They were, more often than not, rectangular; only one is listed as being square. While not included in a description from Elfe, they more than likely contained risible leaves able to suit the current needs of their owners. Within the Account Book, size played the largest factor in determining the price of a dining table and a lack of descriptors leave, once again, the details of the dining tables a mystery. However, it likely remained true to what is considered the typical dining table of the era as a rectangular, sometimes oval, drop leaf table which could at its most expanded position seat eight diners comfortably.

The four mahogany tables purchased by Drayton fall in step with the smaller dining tables purchased from Elfe, all which lack specific descriptors. Since he purchased four, they were probably utilized throughout the house where needed. Without a doubt, one or possibly a set lived in the family sitting room to be used regularly for meals. As Garrett writes in *At Home* “from 1750 to 1870, the sitting room was often used as a dining room and the dining room, in turn, frequently doubled as a sitting room” emphasizing the lack of a dedicated dining space during the early years at Drayton Hall. The set of four, however, speaks to Drayton’s need to have tables available for entertainment purposes. In appropriate situations as many tables as number of guests called upon would have been moved together to accommodate the party.

**A Side Board Table**

The precursor for what would later evolve into a sideboard, a side board table, like

---

that purchased Drayton in May 1772, was used as either an extension of a dining table or as a serving table utilized to hold food. Drayton purchased his table for £10 and while no descriptive evidence is contained in Drayton’s order, other purchases of similar pieces explain the use. In August 1775 William Skirving purchased “2 side board tables to fit to a square.” Similarly, Thomas Scotto (same man referred to as Skottowe for the purchase of a breakfast table) purchased in October 1773 “two sideboard tables to fit to a large table.” The use of a side board table, such as the one purchased by Drayton and illustrated by the Scotto and Skirving purchases, would have been used in tandem with either other side board tables or to fit with another table to make it larger.44

As Garrett further explains in At Home, many of these contraptions were rectangular and some even held a drawer for storage purposes. The table could also be semi-circular and intended for the extension of a dining table. Whether Drayton’s side board table was rectangular or semi-circular is unknown, however, would have been used to aid in dining as an extension or for serving. “Extra plates, the cold meats and salad for supper, and in some cases silver spoons, forks, and knives were placed on these serving tables during meals” and were at times covered with a cloth. This side board table would have worked in tandem with Drayton’s previously purchased dining tables in the family sitting rooms to be utilized for everyday dining.45

**Mahogany Desk**

Drayton purchased, in May 1772, a mahogany desk from Thomas Elfe for £40.

---

45 Garrett, At Home, 87.
Quite interestingly, this desk only contained one price match throughout the entire Account Book; its similar match was sold to Robert Ballingall in May 1774 also for £40. This was the second lowest amount paid for a mahogany desk. However, many of the mahogany desks sold by Elfe were done so at £45 and £50, not much more than the £40 paid by Drayton. Only one descriptor exists in the group of orders for mahogany desks. In March 1773, Leger & Greenwood purchased a “small mahogany desk” for the price of £25. This suggests that the other desks were larger in size and also points to the idea that Drayton’s desk was probably smaller than the other desks listed in the Account Book. The only other potential decrease in price would be for a simple form with lack of ornamentation. While both size and ornamentation played into the price, as evidenced through various accounts throughout the book, it is unknown which played a part in the lower price for the mahogany desk purchased by Drayton in May 1772.\footnote{Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” May 1772, May 1774, March 1773.}

**Seating**

Drayton purchased two types of seating from Elfe during his time as a customer. Throughout his patronage of Thomas Elfe, John Drayton purchased a total of two dozen mahogany chairs in three different orders. Quite different in nature, he also purchased a “close stool chair” from the cabinetmaker. Both of these seating types were quite common purchases from Elfe and their forms reflect mid-eighteenth-century household needs.

**Chairs**

Of the chairs purchased by Drayton, not much descriptive information was recorded to explain the style of the chair. Two out of the three orders for chairs were purchased
at the same time in May 1772. In this order, Drayton purchased eighteen mahogany chairs with hair bottom. Six were first purchased at a price of £42 16s and listed later was a dozen mahogany chairs, also hair bottom for £85. This pricing suggests that the chairs were all purchased for nearly the same price, with the dozen about 12s less, but that potentially suggests a discount for purchasing a greater number. A little over a year later, in June 1773, six more mahogany chairs were purchased for a total of £42 10s, 6s less than the price for six in 1772.\footnote{Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” May 1772, June 1773.}

While the purchases for the two dozen chairs lack description aside from knowing that they were of mahogany and had hair bottoms, other orders at similar prices suggest the type of chairs potentially ordered in 1772 and 1773 by John Drayton. One of the more descriptive orders for chairs of the price of £85 was the order of a dozen chairs by Elias Ball in July 1772. He purchased “a dozen of mahogany chairs scrole backs.” John Gaillard in May 1775 also purchased mahogany chairs with “scrole backs,” this time six instead of a full dozen, for £42 10s; the exact price of Drayton’s order for six in 1773. These two descriptive purchases for the exact monetary amount as the Drayton purchase suggest that the mahogany hair bottom chairs purchased by Drayton were in fact “scrole” backed chairs.\footnote{Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” July 1772, May 1775.}

Other orders for chairs contained within the pages of the Elfe Account Book continue to place the Drayton chairs within context. Further analysis shows, despite the hefty price of £85 for a dozen chairs, that these chairs ordered by Drayton were actually
on the low end of the price spectrum. Elfe charged over double that price for what he termed “splat back” chairs. And about the same price as the “splat back” were “carved backs” chairs. For example, in February 1772, Thomas Skottowe purchased “12 splatt back chairs carved” for £160 and two elbow chairs to match for an additional £31, bringing his total for the order to £191. Two of the most expensive orders for a dozen chairs were nearly triple the price of the Drayton chairs. In March 1773 John Steward purchased a dozen chairs “carved backs compass scaled and brass nailed” for £230. Coming in just below Steward’s purchase is that of Merchant James Smith who purchased “12 mahogany chairs carved backs and 2 elbo chairs carved backs” for £215.49

While the Drayton chairs would have paled in comparison to the probably stunning chairs purchased by Steward and Smith in March 1773, their price and garnered description – scroll back – still suggest a chair of fashion and quality. The chairs purchased by Steward and Smith were in all likelihood used as their best set of chairs and in their best space. Drayton, however, already had a suite of chairs for such a purpose. The chairs made by Elfe, while still of quality, were probably meant to serve a lesser purpose than the imported rococo hairy paw chairs owned by Drayton.

As Elfe was likely working within the rococo style, the chairs purchased by Drayton probably would have boasted rococo ornamentation and more than likely a claw and ball foot to compliment the hairy paw foot of the surviving Drayton Hall furniture. Six, but more often a dozen side chairs were preferred in Charleston, often complemented by two elbow chairs. Drayton chose to not complete his sets with elbow chairs, even though

other Charlestonians did. By the end of the eighteenth century, haircloth (a horsehair fabric) became one of the popular covers for side chairs. Drayton, abreast of the latest fashion, ordered a dozen side chairs covered that way.  

Close Stool Chair

Purchased by Drayton in May 1772 was a close stool chair and pan. This purchase was more utilitarian, but nonetheless indicative of life in the eighteenth century. Purchased for £14 5s, the close stool chair and pan may have been more reserved in style than the previously recorded seating furniture and would have graced one of the bed chambers in Drayton Hall. A close stool chair was used in wealthy households to disguise a chamber pot for relief. It offered a semblance of convenience before the introduction of indoor plumbing.

Through analysis, it appears as though the typical price for a close stool chair by Elfe was £12. Such chairs at £12 were purchased by both James Smith and Windsor Shad in November 1773. Descriptive records by Elfe for more expensive pieces help explain that the close stool chair purchased by Drayton was probably quite plain, unlike much of the other furniture used by the planter, further evidencing the proposed use of the chair in one of the private bed chambers. Noted additions, such as casters or arms show the base price of a close stool chair to be £12. If casters were added to a close stool chair, the price was raised to £13 5s, not including the pan. For an elbow close stool chair, as purchased by Francis Young in November 1772, an additional £4 was charged, bringing the total for

---
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the chair alone to £16. Henry Timrod also purchased a close stool elbow chair in February 1775 for the same price. For a close stool chair with a pewter pan the charge was £14 10s lending one to believe Drayton either received a pan of lesser quality than pewter for use with his close stool.\textsuperscript{52}

**Bedsteads**

Drayton purchased three bedsteads from Thomas Elfe, all in May 1772. Despite the fact that the bedsteads were all purchased in the same month and all of mahogany, they were not all of the same style. The first bedstead purchased by John Drayton, this one on May 6, was a “filed mahogany bedstead for Chs. Drayton” for £25. The second two were on casters and priced at £28 each, bringing the total to £56 for two. Both £25 and £28 were common prices for bedstead made by Thomas Elfe. For example, Alexander Chovin purchased a “mahogany bedstead sacking bottom” for £25 in December 1772. Pheope Thomas also purchased a sacking bottom bedstead for the same price in August 1774. George Evans, similarly to Drayton, purchased a mahogany bedstead with casters for £28 on July 8, 1774.\textsuperscript{53}

One interesting observation is that no other “filed” bedsteads exist within the pages of the Account Book. This leads one to wonder what this bedstead made for Charles Drayton resembled. Elfe mentions “fluted” bedsteads multiple times, however, the price for bedsteads with fluted posts begin at £40. James Frazier purchased such a bedstead on July 12, 1775, when he ordered “a mahogany bedstead square posts and fluted.”


potential solution to the mysterious filed bedstead is a spelling error. While Elfe exhibited excellent penmanship, he did at times misspell words. In two orders, one in October 1772 and another in December 1772, John Steward purchased four mahogany field bedsteads, one described as having a “larth bottom” all for £25 each. While it is, of course, unknown whether the “filed” bedstead was actually a “field” bedstead, the chances are high based on misspellings throughout the Account Book combined with the match in price that it was in fact a field bedstead purchased for Charles Drayton. Another plausible explanation pointing to the idea that it was a field bedstead, versus a bedstead to be used by Charles in his bedchamber at Drayton Hall, is the fact that the £25 is the lowest priced bed available by Elfe. With the status of the Drayton family, combined with the surviving hairy paw furniture, the plausibility of Charles Drayton’s main bedstead being the cheapest one available is not likely. Therefore, the potential of the order as a field bedstead more of a possibility.54

While none of the bedsteads made by Elfe plunge below that £25 price, many reach above, noting that bedsteads of great extravagance were purchased by customers. The bedsteads purchased by Drayton remained rather ordinary. Bedsteads boasting eagles claws and carved knees were common entries in the Account Book. The most expensive bedstead was described as a “mahogany bedstead, eagle claws and knees and casters” and purchased by Stephen Bull in June 1768 for £50. Daniel Heyward purchased a similar bedstead in November 1771 but with plain knees for £40. Likewise, James Smith purchased on February 3, 1772 “a mahogany bedstead, eagles, claws and knees with casters”.

for £42. While it is unknown what bedsteads were owned by the Draytons for use at Drayton Hall, the purchase of some of the lower end bedsteads from Elfe suggest that the two purchased for £28 with casters were probably not placed in the more important bed chambers, but rather the more informal ones. In keeping with the style of the surviving rococo furniture, the bedsteads utilized in the most important bed chambers of Drayton Hall were most likely more indicative of the carved eagle claw bedsteads sold by Elfe at nearly double what Drayton purchased his bedsteads for.  

**Coffin**

In August 1774 Drayton purchased a “cypress coffin blackened for a child” for the price of £3 10s. Analysis reveals that the coffin was purchased for one of Drayton’s enslaved children. While none of the coffins purchased from Elfe are an exact price match to the £3 10s Drayton paid for his blackened coffin, many descriptions and prices are close enough to confirm this conjecture. In October 1772, Isaac Godin purchased a cypress coffin “for a negro” for £3. Similarly, Alexander Wright purchased a “black cypress coffin for a negro boy” for £5 in February 1773.  

Listings for coffins purchased for children by elite white families solidify that this coffin was used for a slave child. In July 1771, John Beale purchased a “cedar coffin for his son plates handles and nails” for £12. While of cedar instead of cypress, as purchased by Drayton, the vast price difference shows the distinction between coffins used for each ethnicity. Furthering this point, John Giles paid £8 for a coffin with “handles and nails”

---

for a child also in July 1771. These examples, in conjunction with the reported examples purchased for deceased slaves, solidify that the “cypress coffin blacked for child” was in fact for a deceased Drayton enslaved child.57

**Sundry Jobs**

Thomas Elfe was not just producing new wares, but also profited on performing “sundry” jobs, as he termed them. He routinely mended or repaired various pieces of furniture for his clients. Items from chairs, to tables, to bedsteads, were consistently noted in the Account Book as being brought to Elfe for mending. Not only did he mend, he also moved, took down and put up various pieces of furniture. One of the most common pieces of furniture he worked with was bedsteads. Elfe or even more likely his enslaved workers, would take down and put up bedsteads for clients.

John Drayton, similarly to many of the other clients holding accounts with Elfe, utilized the cabinetmaker, or his “handycraft slaves” (as Elfe listed them and much of their work in Account #42) for taking down and putting up bedsteads, as well as moving various pieces of furniture. Documented in his first order with Elfe, Drayton used the cabinetmaker’s workforce to take down and put up two bedsteads for the price of £1. Similarly in November 1775 Drayton hired Elfe for “taking down 7 glasses and 3 bedsteads” for only £1 15s. As seen throughout the Account Book, a typical price for utilizing the cabinetmaker’s services cost a patron between 10s and £1 for taking down and putting a bedstead, probably a determining factor in the price was the amount of travel

---

involved in the job and the difficulty of the task.\textsuperscript{58}

For example, in December 1772, Humphry Sommers, who resided at 128 Tradd Street, utilized Elfe for taking down and putting up a bedstead for the cost of 15s whereas he only charged John Dutarque as little as 10s for taking down and putting up three bedsteads in February 1775.\textsuperscript{59} Similar to the second Drayton usage of the cabinetmaker for moving furniture, grouping various tasks together was also common and caused an increase to the price.\textsuperscript{60}

Elfe’s Account Book indicate that he covered seating in a specified manor. Drayton’s account provides two examples of such use of the cabinetmaker’s services and emphasizes Drayton’s desire to have his furnishings match the latest fashion. In January 1772, prior to the purchase of chairs from Elfe, Drayton paid the cabinetmaker £3 15s for covering a dozen chairs with damask. He separately charged Drayton for the eight and a half yards of damask used for the job at £7 8s 9d. Only a month later in February 1772, Drayton commissioned Elfe to cover a dozen seats, only this time with “hair seating.” He charged Drayton £3 for the work and once again separately for six and a half yards of “hair seating” needed to cover the chairs, but the price for this seating was at £13. Not only does this show that Drayton preferred damask and hair seating for his chairs, it also indicates that Drayton had two separate suites of a dozen chairs as the covering was done prior to the purchase of the two dozen chairs from Elfe. This documentation shows the total number of chairs owned by Drayton and used in Drayton Hall by June 1773 to be at

\textsuperscript{58} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” May 1772, November 1775.
\textsuperscript{59} Humphrey, \textit{Thomas Elfe Cabinetmaker}, 1.
\textsuperscript{60} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775,” December 1772, February 1775.
least four dozen chairs.  

While wool and leather remained popular seat covering materials for much of the eighteenth century, at the time of the recovering of Drayton’s chairs, haircloth was emerging as the most fashionable covering material. This commission continues to emphasize Drayton’s consistent desire to furnish Drayton Hall in the most modern mode.

Elfe may not have completed the upholstery orders in his shop, but rather out sourced them to an upholsterer in Charleston. However, a newspaper advertisement in the *South Carolina Gazette* ran by Thomas Elfe in January 1751 explained he had recently employed an upholsterer from London. This advertisement suggests that the upholstery work was, in fact, done in house. The two entries, and separate pricing for the covering material, also suggest that the work was done in Elfe’s shop. Whether the work was done in the Elfe shop as supported by the newspaper advertisement from 1751 or out sourced as suggested by Emma Hart in *Building Charleston*, it sheds light on the type of covering preferred by Drayton for his seating.

The final sundry job Drayton used Elfe for was mending and repairing various furniture items. He used Elfe five times for mending between 1772 and 1775 with transactions ranging from 15s to £2 10s. Drayton unsurprisingly hired Elfe to mend chairs, tea tables and a teaster larth on a bedstead. Many other clients used Elfe for similar jobs. The frequent use of these items and their fragility – especially tea tables and chairs –
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make it not surprising that they made up a majority of items Elfe mended.\textsuperscript{64} Garrett in \textit{At Home} confirms the need to repair chairs and tea tables often; she also includes table legs as a typically repaired object. The constant rearrangement of these items led to obvious wear and tear and the need for mending.\textsuperscript{65}

Through an analysis of exact items purchased, similar items purchased and similar items owned, a group of individuals emerged from the pages of the Account Book who presented strong comparisons to John Drayton. In comparison of that list to a list of Elfe’s top ten customers further explains Drayton as a top customer of Elfe. It presents a list of men with similar purchasing habits to Drayton, explaining the importance of many of the items Drayton purchased from Elfe in the world of the eighteenth-century Charleston elite. Furthermore, it illustrates Drayton as a man with taste above many of the other Elfe customers. Drayton purchased items for use in the less formal spaces for Drayton Hall, whereas many of the men comparable to Drayton and the top Elfe customers purchased items for both the formal and informal spaces in their residences.\textsuperscript{66}

In the list of men comparable to Drayton on purchases alone, eleven of the forty individuals purchased slab tables or frames from Elfe.\textsuperscript{67} This is significant in terms of the Drayton furniture for multiple reasons. It illustrates the popularity of the style of table among elite Charlestonians contemporary to John Drayton. While these eleven patrons

\textsuperscript{64} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
\textsuperscript{65} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 40.
\textsuperscript{66} See Appendix C for more information on the Elfe customer analysis.
\textsuperscript{67} John Gaillard, Arnoldus Vanderhorst, John Duetart, Alexander Chovin, Thomas Osborne, Thomas Phepoe, Elias Ball, James Black, Moses Lindo, John Stewart, and Robert Ballingall all purchased slab table frames from Elfe.
only purchased one slab table, Drayton owned at least five. The presence of the slab
tables in the Account Book collaborated with the Drayton owned pieces, solidifies that the
slab table was a fashionable form in the late eighteenth-century elite Charleston house-
hold.68

Another necessity in the homes of elite Charlestonians emphasized through the
purchases of this group associated with Drayton is the reliance on dining tables. Not only
would they have been used by the family, but the presence of sets or multiples emphasizes
a focus on entertaining. Four men with the closest accounts to Drayton – John Deutart,
Alexander Chovin, John Gaillard, and Arnoldus Vanderhorst – purchased at least two
dining tables from Elfe. Gaillard and Chovin had three. Drayton, with four, had the most
of all. This use of the dining table, especially multiples, evidences their need for accom-
modating guests for dining. The purchasing of side boards – as done by Drayton and
Chovin – further show that these men needed to have a way of enlarging dining tables or
serving food during entertaining. The need for side board tables further emphasize the
importance of dining and entertaining in eighteenth-century life.69

The need for dozens of chairs in the eighteenth-century home continues to empha-
size the heavy role entertaining played in every day life of colonial elite. Elfe’s Account
Book and especially Drayton’s account shows just how many were needed for a colonial
gentleman to entertain his compatriots. Drayton owned at least forty-eight mahogany
chairs. Duetart purchased thirty from Elfe and Gaillard eighteen. Both Chovin and

Vanderhorst purchased a dozen. The importance of side chairs in the domestic life of eighteenth-century gentry was second to none. The need for and to show forty-eight chairs even if not in use would tell visitors, among other cues, that Drayton was a refined gentleman. Not only does it emphasize the importance of entertaining, but confirms scholarly literature that chairs were purchased in multiples of six or twelve.\textsuperscript{70}

Broadening the analysis to Elfe’s top ten customers reveals a group of ten men, Drayton included, who averaged spending £557, ordering eleven times, and purchasing twenty-two items or sets from Elfe. The list and breakdown by item indicate the most popular items purchased by the group. Ninety percent of the men purchased chairs and utilized Elfe for “sundry jobs.” Similarly, eighty percent purchased dining tables or mahogany tables of similar size and price. Tea tables were another highly purchased item at seventy percent. Mahogany bedsteads were purchased by sixty percent of the men. These six items represent the most popular items collectively purchased by the men and solidify the importance of Drayton’s account with Elfe.\textsuperscript{71}

Ninety percent of the patrons, with only the exception of Nathaniel Russell, purchased sets of chairs from the cabinetmaker. Further supporting the distinction between Drayton’s imported and Charleston-made furniture and Elfe customers of similar status, price indicates that seven of the men purchased very elaborate chairs. James Smith, in March 1773, purchased a dozen carved back chairs and two commode arm chairs for £215. Thomas Skottowe, William Skerving, and Thomas Osborne all ordered a dozen

\textsuperscript{70} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 40.

\textsuperscript{71} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
chairs costing between £160 and £165.\textsuperscript{72} Only the chairs purchased by Drayton and Du-
etart fall in line with Elfe’s lower priced items for only £85.\textsuperscript{73}

The importance of tables to men comparable to Drayton and Elfe’s top customers is illustrated by eighty percent of the top ten customers purchasing at least one dining table, seventy percent purchasing at least one tea table and forty percent purchasing breakfast/pembrook tables. Merchant James Smith purchased at least one of each. In March 1773, he ordered a pair of large dining tables with two commode card tables for £106. He purchased a carved tea table that in the same order for £35, nearly triple the price of Dray-
ton’s £12 tea tables. In June 1773, he purchased a commode breakfast table with three tea boards for £28 pounds. These pieces, and similar purchases by other top Elfe customers, illustrate the importance of tables to men of similar status to Drayton.\textsuperscript{74}

Mahogany bedsteads, at sixty percent, were another item in demand to Elfe’s top customers. Sixty percent of the men purchased at least one from Elfe. Most of the ma-
hogany bedsteads purchased by the men fall in line price wise with the bedsteads pur-
chased by Drayton. For example, Thomas Phaepoe purchased one with casters for £30 in August 1771, Alexander Wright paid £26 for one with sacking bottom in February 1773 and John Duetart paid the same in May 1774. James Smith purchased the most elaborate bedstead in February 1772 with “eagles, claws and knees with casters” for £42.\textsuperscript{75}

The most interesting information from the Drayton purchases recorded in the

\textsuperscript{72} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
\textsuperscript{73} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
\textsuperscript{74} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
\textsuperscript{75} Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
Account Book is that Drayton was using Elfe items to furnish the informal spaces at Drayton Hall. With limited exceptions, each transaction falls in line with Elfe’s frequently purchased everyday items in both price and style. For example, Drayton purchased tea tables from Elfe for £12 and £16. While they were no doubt of good quality and execution, they paled in comparison to the “scallop tea table with eagles claws” sold to John Duetart for £25. Elfe wares purchased by Drayton were never the least expensive, however, other purchases in the Account Book illustrate that Elfe was selling items of much more detailed ornamentation and design for a significantly higher price than what Drayton was paying.  

This realization solidifies that the Charleston-made furniture purchased by John Drayton was of good quality and popular style, but used to furnish the informal spaces of Drayton Hall. In comparison, the formal spaces hierarchically, were to be reserved for the most exquisite furniture purchased by John Drayton. As such, the surviving hairy paw furniture would have been used to furnish the classically defined rooms of Drayton Hall – the Doric Great Hall, Ionic Withdrawing Room, and Corinthian Upper Great Hall intended as public entertaining spaces. The purchases made from Elfe were meant to furnish the informal family spaces in Drayton Hall, not intended for entertaining.

Only two exceptions to this pattern exist. The first exception is based on price and is the Pembroke table purchased by Drayton for £26. Its price is close to double many of the tables purchased by Drayton thus emphasizing its importance. As such, it probably was intended to work alongside the hairy paw furniture, not be used in the private fam-

76 Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
ily spaces. The second exception is the two dozen chairs purchased by Drayton. These chairs were purchased for entertainment purposes and would have supplemented the imported chairs – the surviving mahogany hairy paw chairs, once at least a set of twelve – when necessary. The scroll back design of the Elfe chairs would have blended with the hairy paw side chairs and the ordered number emphasizes Drayton’s need to use them for more purposes than just family spaces.

The Elfe Account Book and descriptive orders within illuminates how Drayton utilized Charleston-made furniture to furnish the informal spaces of Drayton Hall and supplement his imported rococo furniture when necessary. The furniture was of sound quality boasting the current style and would have fulfilled these two desires nicely. The analysis of the Account Book solidifies that these items purchased by Drayton from Elfe – breakfast tables, dining tables, tea tables, dozens of mahogany chairs and many other items – show that Drayton purchased not the most expensive and elaborate pieces, but rather Elfe’s typical wares. The commissioning of ordinary items indicate that not all the furniture in Drayton Hall was as or meant to be as extraordinary as the surviving hairy paw furniture. They were all of quality craftsmanship and in the current fashion, however, not meant to be or compete with the best suite of furniture. Similar to the architecture dictating the use of each room, it also dictated what style of furniture was placed in it. Even men as wealthy as John Drayton needed utilitarian pieces to fill the vast spaces of Drayton Hall. He used Elfe, the most well known cabinetmaker in Charleston, to do this. Drayton wanted affordable, but not cheap; he needed quality, but not a best suite. Elfe’s Account Book shows that he provided Drayton with solutions for these needs and aided in
the furnishing of Drayton Hall to meet John Drayton’s genteel taste.
Drayton Hall is today a shadow of what once was John Drayton’s thriving and bustling homeseat. Significant eighteenth-century cultural artifacts still there show that Drayton expertly planned every aspect of his life to be a representation of his refined taste. Surviving furniture and documentation of other purchases further reveal his taste used in furnishing Drayton Hall to portray his fashionable connections with the highest standard of goods. Drayton Hall is considered an architectural masterpiece and the preservation of the building and chosen interpretation represents that understanding. However, the furniture Drayton ordered to be used in this architectural masterpiece were commissioned and designed to work in tandem with that architecture. His taste was reflected not just with architecture, but equally with furniture.

However, a study of the furniture from the John Drayton era reveals more than simply the understanding that Drayton had fashionable taste. His fully executed Anglo-Palladian residence tells us as much. A study of the furniture reveals his purchasing patterns and enlightens us to how he furnished Drayton Hall. His importation of early rococo style hairy paw furniture and Elfe purchases emphasize his adherence to eighteenth-century standards. The imported furniture was meant to furnish the best, classically defined spaces whereas the Elfe items were less formal and worked well in the private rooms of Drayton Hall. The time period of each large purchase further reveals redecorating campaigns taken on by John Drayton as a widower upon the completion of Drayton...
Hall and as a widower following Margaret’s death in 1772. These themes solidify that the furniture represents more than John’s fashionable taste. They represent eighteenth-century furnishing standards. They represent family dynamics and redecorating schemes. They provide a glimpse into the eighteenth-century world of Drayton Hall an empty building cannot do and represent the importance of material culture at the site.

On the surface, the study of the items purchased by John Drayton during the first generation of occupation at Drayton Hall illustrates how Drayton Hall was furnished. An all-encompassing study of this, combined with the intended room usage at the house, provides a better understanding of the building during the first generation. While a fully executed furnishing plan would be enlightening, for the purpose of this study joined with available documentation, it would be more conjecture than fact. Coupled with that is the fact that thanks to the furnishing philosophy determined by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Drayton Hall will never be fully furnished. Digital endeavors to furnish the house by Patricia Smith in the Drayton Hall Digital Modeling Project are a step in allowing scholars to reimagine Drayton Hall in specific time periods. The limited approach used in this thesis will still contribute to that project. This approach will define the original room usage at Drayton Hall and explain how the surviving furniture, purchased pieces from Thomas Elfe, and furniture illustrated by Lewis Reeve Gibbes would have fit into that broad eighteenth-century framework.

While no records of John Drayton’s spatial arrangement at Drayton Hall exists, architectural clues and eighteenth-century standards help delineate room usage. As a nearly fully executed Palladian residence, Drayton Hall is laid out symmetrically on each
floor and throughout the house. The plan on each floor, with slight variation, is a six-room plan. The basement plan, the simplest, boasts a large central space, flanked by two rooms on each side. As a utilitarian space, the basement was a hub of activity for Drayton’s house slaves during this era. A tight circular staircase in the north passage connects the service area to the two primary floors with openings to the rooms above. Service entrances exist in the two passages and under each main entrance on the primary facades.

The first floor holds true to the six-room plan with a partition dividing the central core into a large hall (Room 101) and smaller stairhall (Room 109). The recessed portico acts as public space and a buffer to the semi-public reception area, as it dictated entrance to the space. The room layout, with special attention paid to the hall, adheres to the tradition of the English country house with the hall as the largest room and one of the most important spaces in the house. In the English tradition, the hall was a direct representation of the social status of the owner. The architecture in the space conveyed this idea. The furnishings used in the hall also symbolized this.¹ In the Doric order, the hall is the third most important space in the house and acted as a semi-public reception area for guests.

Marking the hall’s importance as an entertaining space and movement indicator are entrances to all four connecting rooms. If deemed appropriate, it led to the southeast flanking room. The Ionic order present in the room mark it as the second best parlor during Drayton’s occupation (Room 102).\(^2\) The rigid adherence to the Ionic order emphasizes the formal importance as an entertaining space.\(^3\)

The room opposite the best parlor, the northeast flanking space (Room 108), would more than likely have acted as the common parlor, as termed by Cary Carson in *The Chesapeake House* or the back parlor or sitting room as referred to by Elisabeth Garrett in *At Home*. Both scholars agree that areas like this were designated as family spaces in the eighteenth century.\(^4\) The restrained classical detailing in both rooms on the site-north side of the house on the first floor and their connection to the service stair emphasize the spaces as family rooms.

With doorways leading to the public portico, the northwest (Room 104) and southwest (Room 105) rooms could have been semi-public spaces. However, the southwest room is detailed in the Doric order, significantly restrained compared to its connect-


\(^3\) Garrett, *At Home*, 31; Carson and Lounsbury, 122.

ing hall, leading to the idea that this side could have taken on the semi-public role of library, study or office. The northeast room could have acted as a chamber or another family space.\(^5\) The stairhall (Room 109), the final first floor room, with an entrance to the hall and means to the second floor acts as a navigation space to either the hall or the upper story. As such, it is a semi-public reception space mean to shuffle the visitor to their determined level of access.

The second floor, with the two-story stairhall, holds to the basic six-room plan. The centrally located great hall (Room 201) acted as the most formal space at Drayton Hall. It would have been the best parlor in the house and was the largest symbol of hospitality and refinement during John Drayton’s period.\(^6\) It was the ultimate destination for a person of stature. The journey would have began on the recessed Doric hall, passed into the stairhall and

---

\(^5\) Room interpretation at Gunston Hall as explained in: “Tour of Gunston Hall,” (Gunston Hall: Lorton, V.A., March 1, 2015).

ascended the double stairs culminating at the top with their entrance to the Corinthian defined great hall (room 201). Designed to impress, a genteel visitor’s journey was specifically planned to end here. Flanking the great hall are, similar to the first floor, four rooms. Each of these four spaces likely acted as chambers or family apartments; they were private, family spaces. The architectural clues in each space, combined with the furnishings Drayton would have used in each room, represented the importance of each chamber in reference to the others. The southwest best chamber boasts greater classical ornamentation that the three remaining chambers. In a world designed to impress visitors, guests would have used this best chamber during their stay. It would have been furnished in a more elaborate manner than the others.

The furnishings purchased by John Drayton for Drayton Hall followed the hierarchy still dictated architecturally in the house today. The discussion of the first generation furniture at Drayton Hall has relied on the surviving group of hairy paw furniture and Drayton’s purchases from Elfe thus far. However, documentation survives presenting clues to other items working in tandem with the two discussed groups. Assessed in chronological order, they continue

---

to draft a narrative, telling the story of the furniture used by John Drayton.

Thomas Drayton died thirty-seven years after settling in the colony in 1717. In his last will and testament, Thomas bequeathed his entire estate to wife Ann. However, if she remarried, it was to be divided between his three sons and daughter. Thomas’ original will only bequeaths items to children Thomas, Stephen Fox and Mary; John, recently born, was added to the will in either 1714 or 1716 by codicil (two copies exist, each with differing dates). Thomas’ estate was inventoried in 1724. Ann remained a widow and upon her death in 1742 willed her furniture be split between son and daughter, John Drayton and Mary Drayton Fuller. Interestingly, when Mary Drayton Fuller died seven years later in 1749, she bequeathed her entire estate to John who acted as executor of her will. As a result, John ended up with much of the family furniture from Magnolia plantation as well as that of his sister Mary Drayton Fuller.9

He did, in fact, receive much of the furniture listed in his father’s inventory. However, as much of the furniture was considered old or out of date even when Thomas’s appraisal was conducted in 1724, it was not fit for use at Drayton Hall. As a result, Drayton sold a large number of items listed in Thomas’s appraisal to Thomas Ladson, along with other items, for £229 19s in August 1745. This chain of events shows that Drayton purchased new furniture when furnishing Drayton Hall.10 While he potentially kept some

---

9 Thomas Drayton, will dated July 7, 1724; Thomas Drayton, inventory and appraisement dated June 12, 1724, vol. 60, pg. 65, Wills and Miscellaneous Probate Records, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.; Ann Drayton, will dated June 23, 1741, book 72-A, pg. 139, Wills of Charleston County, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.; Mary Fuller, will dated February 27, 1749, vol. 6, pg. 498, Wills of Charleston County, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.
10 John Drayton to Thomas Ladson, bill of sale dated August 26, 1745, vol. 69-5, pg. 697, miscellaneous records of Charleston County, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.
furniture from the various estates, much was likely out of fashion by the time it came to furnish Drayton Hall. As such, if John Drayton did use any of the objects at Drayton Hall, they would have been used in the informal family spaces out of the public eye.  

In the winter of 1748 the construction of Drayton Hall was nearing completion. By this time, or shortly thereafter, John had likely purchased the latest fashions for his new Palladian mansion. Just coming into fashion in England at this time was the English rococo style emphasizing asymmetrical designs, c- and s-scrolls and rocaille motifs. Drayton favored the style and incorporated it into architectural elements of his house, especially in the classically defined hall, upper great hall and best parlor where overmantles and ceilings boast rococo and jacobean style elements. Margaret’s overspending during her trip abroad beginning in 1766 illustrates her keen taste for expensive English goods; this fashionable taste was likely reflected in many of the furnishings for their new homeseat twenty years earlier.

To compliment the high style Palladian architecture of the house and ornamental rococo details, Drayton procured the rococo style hairy paw suite of furniture, en suite bureau bookcase and restrained pier tables from the fashionable metropolises in the United Kingdom to complement the high style architecture of his new house. At the same time, he likely imported other items of similar stature to furnish the semi-public spaces in Drayton Hall. The surviving hairy paw pieces were appropriate for use in any of the three classically defined spaces, but the use of the rococo style and hairy paw feet suggest

---

11 For a complete list of items potentially used by John Drayton at Drayton Hall, see appendix D.
12 John Drayton to Margaret Glen Drayton, August 1772.
that they were reserved for either of the best parlors. They were of the highest form and would have complimented each space nicely. While the rooms are large, there is enough surviving furniture to emphasize that more of a similar style were once part of the set and that they were not all used within the same room, but rather spread out amongst appropriate spaces. Their details, use and size indicate their eighteenth-century placement within the house.

Beginning in the hall, the pier tables with their restrained ornamentation, yet preferred form among elites probably would have been used in tandem in the lowest of the classical rooms. The two tables would have been paired with pier glasses and placed in between openings and against the wall. Other pieces of furniture in a similar style to the pier tables or more complementary to the hairy paw furniture could have been used to furnish the hall in the most up-to-date fashion, furnished to impress guests upon entry. The case furniture illustrated in the Gibbes sketchbook, meant to display best export wares could have been placed in the hall as a representation of the Drayton’s hospitality and wealth.\(^{13}\)

Moving to the Ionic best parlor off the hall, the room would have held at least some of the surviving furniture. The bureau bookcase emphasizing male acumen

\(^{13}\) Carson and Lounsbury, *The Chesapeake House*, 122.
in business and intellect with its classical forms would have been a good fit for this best parlor space.\textsuperscript{14} Two of what would have originally been at least five slab tables would also have been appropriate for the room. The side chairs, at least a set of twelve originally, while movable to wherever necessary at the time, would have functioned as the best or one of the best sets of chairs owned by Drayton; their use – either in part or as a whole – in this room is quite plausible. If a better set of chairs existed, the surviving suite would have had more of a presence in this room; if not, a similar set would have been utilized in the space.\textsuperscript{15}

The great hall on the second floor is defined as the best room in Drayton Hall by the rigid application of the Corinthian order. As the best space hierarchically, the genteel visitor’s journey through the house culminated in this room. To compliment the architecture, the room was furnished in the most fashionable manner. Drayton reserved his most impressive furniture for this room. To date, the rococo hairy paw furniture survives as the best suite of furniture. As such, many of its members would have been utilized in the room. Two of the remaining slab tables would have been utilized in the space. The entire

\textsuperscript{14} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 43.
\textsuperscript{15} Garrett, \textit{At Home}, 39-60.
set of twelve chairs would have been placed around the walls and moved out as needed and the settee likely lived here. Not only would the full set be appropriate for the large entertaining space, but more than likely additional chairs supplemented the set.16

The rococo style hairy paw easy chair, Charleston made, is a potential piece purchased en suite to the surviving rococo hairy paw furniture by John Drayton as he began to age or during the illness of wife Margaret. This chair by nature, with its original commode fitting, would have been used in the best bed chamber. Ghost marks from casters attest to its movability, so the chair could have been easily moved to wherever John or Margaret desired.17

To supplement the surviving rococo furniture, John and Margaret Drayton likely purchased furniture of similar stature. These other pieces, either imported from abroad like the surviving items or commissioned from a Charlestonian cabinetmaker, would have also been in the most up to date fashion. They would have complimented, perhaps even rivaled, the existing pieces. In either instance, as fashion-forward individuals, they would have commissioned pieces to compliment the architectural spaces they were intended to furnish.

The sale of items inherited from his parents to Thomas Ladson solidify that Drayton purchased new items to furnish the informal family spaces. While no record of these items exist, they would have been still of quality, but more than likely of more ordinary style as they were used only by the family and not needed to impress.

16 Garrett, At Home, 39-60.
17 Garrett, At Home, 70.
While it proves to be his longest marriage, death once again hit the Drayton family when Margaret succumbed to illness in 1772 during her time in England. Drayton remarried quickly, this time to Rebecca Perry daughter of a local plantation owner, in March 1775. Interestingly, between the time of the death of Margaret Glen and marriage to Rebecca Perry, Drayton begins a redecorating campaign at Drayton Hall with objects purchased from Thomas Elfe. He purchased over forty pieces of furniture from the cabinetmaker; repairs and other tasks recorded by the cabinetmaker provide a glimpse into other items owned by Drayton during the period.

While the items purchased from Elfe, with few exceptions, were certainly of quality craftsmanship and fashionable, a comparison against Elfe’s typical price list shows that the items were purchased for use in the less formal family spaces of the house. Many clients of equal status to Drayton purchased exquisite and quite costly items from Elfe, but Drayton com-

missioned what would be considered Elfe’s shop or window pieces. They were of the low to medium price range and what descriptions do exist point to them being average. While the Elfe items were not suited to work alongside the hairy paw furniture, they were more than appropriate for use in the family spaces of Drayton Hall.

The back parlor would have been the place of residence for many of the utilitarian pieces purchased from Elfe. The breakfast table, one of the lower end tea tables, two of the dining tables, some of the mahogany chairs and the sideboard table would have worked nicely in the space. As a family space for daily sitting and dining activity, the utilization of all of these objects would have been necessary. In the adjacent room, more chairs and the other low end tea table could have been arranged with other items previously purchased by Drayton. In the southwest corner room, probably utilized as an office, study or library, the mahogany desk would have been suitable.19

A few of the items purchased from Elfe would have been appropriate for supplemental use in the first floor best parlor. The turned top tea table would have been used for tea, but folded down and placed along the border of the room or in a storage area when not in use. The pembroke table would no doubt have been placed in this room as its function served useful purpose in the room. Its high cost at £26 illustrates its importance in reference to other tables purchased from Elfe. The mahogany chairs purchased from Elfe could have been utilized in this room if necessary. Their style was probably more restrained, but still tasteful.

Moving to the chambers on the second floor, many of the bedroom pieces would

---

have been split among these spaces. The two mahogany bedsteads purchased for £28 would no doubt have been placed in two of the chambers, but perhaps the best chamber was reserved for the best bedstead owned by the Draytons. One of the £12 tea tables could have been placed in a chamber or moved there when needed. Certainly the close stool chair and pan purchased from Elfe would have found itself in one of the bed chambers; the best chamber would have provided such a convenience for guests, so the possibility of its placement there is high.

The Elfe Account Book documents more than orders for furniture. Elfe conducted a side business mending broken furniture, moving furniture and covering seating. Drayton utilized the cabinetmaker at various times for such tasks, providing a glimpse into other items used in the furnishing of Drayton Hall. Based on Drayton’s account with the cabinetmaker, he owned at least forty-eight side chairs. Whether the hairy paw set is included in that number is unknown, however, the need for Drayton to own that many chairs emphasizes that in typical eighteenth-century fashion chairs were utilized in abundance in the most important entertaining spaces in the house. At least a dozen chairs would have been present in each of the three best rooms in the house at any given time; more if the Draytons were entertaining visitors. Elfe documents moving seven looking glasses, showing the importance of the glass in the furnishing of Drayton Hall. Evidence of gilding and use of mirrors survives in the sitting room and best parlor on the first floor. These glasses would have been used in overmantles as well as paired with the pier tables and slab tables.20

As John fled across the Cooper River from the British army in 1779, he suffered a seizure and died. Rebecca Perry Drayton inherited the plantation and house. His will does not survive to shed light on the dispersal of his estate. In 1783, Charles sold a portion of the furniture to Rebecca. The bill of sale outlined that Rebecca received life rights to furnishings, however, further down in the document, Charles reevaluates the decision and sells the group of goods to Rebecca. It appears as though many of the items sold to Rebecca were items purchased by John from Elfe. For example, listed are nine mahogany tables, the exact number purchased from Elfe. Two of the marble slabs and stands were among the list; two others descended through the Drayton family and another was illustrated by Gibbes in 1845, showing that originally at least five were present in the house during Drayton’s period. Four armed chairs are listed in the sale; however, furniture descending through the Porcher family with provenance traced through Rebecca Drayton such as the side chairs and settee are not listed. This list from 1783 and Rebecca’s 1840 will listing Francis Y. Porcher as executor who received her furniture, show the possibility of much of the first generation furniture descending through the Porcher family.21

An inventory of Charles Drayton’s assets, taken after his death in 1820, survives showing room usage and furniture placement in Drayton Hall. However, Charles’ extensive documentation in his journals from 1779 through his death and surviving changes made to the house show that he completed an extensive redecorating campaign after his acquisition of the house in 1784. Some of the items detailed in his inventory are also

21 Drayton and Drayton, *Bill of Sale* dated September 10, 1783; Rebecca Drayton, will dated October 5, 1840; Elfe, “Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775.”
items known to have been owned by John, for example a settee, however, a lack of descriptions leaves no indication that they were the same item.  

The Drayton Hall furniture, both tangible remains and items recorded in documents, survive as a testament to the elaborate furnishings utilized by John Drayton and his wives at Drayton Hall during the first generation of occupation. As the head of one of the most prominent planter families in the Lowcountry, John Drayton furnished Drayton Hall with both imported rococo furniture from London and domestic furniture, likely from Charleston. Drayton utilized imported furniture for display in the classically defined formal spaces of the Palladian house, expertly commissioning furniture to work in tandem with the architecture. It was of the highest quality and style; meant to impress genteel visitors. Not only does the furniture reveal how Drayton furnished Drayton Hall, but also portrays his fashionable connections to both London and Charleston, both metropolises setting the standard for refined elite taste. The detailed study of Drayton furniture further exposes Drayton’s purchasing patterns and solidifies his refined taste. His use of imported furniture for the formal spaces and Charleston furniture for the informal spaces represents his interpretation of eighteenth-century elite furnishing standards. The best furniture was meant to impress and work in tandem with the classically defined spaces and the ordinary pieces were reserved for family use.

In conjunction with the house and formally designed landscape, John Drayton’s

---

22 Charles Drayton, will dated September 20, 1820, vol. 34 & 35, pg. 344, Wills of Charleston County, Charleston County Public Library, Charleston, SC.; Charles Drayton, inventory and appraisement, dated December 6, 1820, Charleston County Inventories, vol. F, pg. 246, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.
status and intellect within the eighteenth-century colonial world becomes clear. Drayton molded his material world to comply with eighteenth-century gentry standards. With a heavy hand in the design of architecture and furniture, his interpretation of those standards are revealed in the surviving architecture and furniture. Of great importance during this period is the distinction between public and private spaces. Drayton’s architectural design and furniture choices reflect his understanding of this principle. By utilizing Charleston-made furniture in the less formal rooms and the imported furniture in the formal rooms, Drayton created an even bigger delineation between areas. He incorporated specific pieces of furniture to work in tandem with the architecture. Designed to work together, Drayton clearly defined each space in Drayton Hall with furniture and obvious architectural clues as a way of conforming to eighteenth-century gentry standards.

The new research findings regarding the first generation furniture of Drayton Hall shows the uniqueness and rarity of John Drayton’s refined taste and his suite of furniture. The rarity of the suite is evidenced by John’s focus on matching sets and pairs, as well as its early design for the completion of Drayton Hall, ca. 1748. The furniture was likely procured in London, England, and is representative of Drayton’s genteel taste. It was designed to work in tandem with the architecture of the house. An analysis of Drayton’s relationship with Thomas Elfe’s places his purchases in context and reveals how John Drayton used the pieces in Drayton Hall. For the first time, a collaborative study of the surviving furniture, Elfe purchases, and other known pieces used by Drayton found in historic documents presents a cohesive picture of John Drayton’s taste and how he translated it into furnishing Drayton Hall.
Viewed and understood together, the first generation furniture of Drayton Hall illustrates how John Drayton furnished Drayton Hall and their continued importance to the historic site today. While the fully executed Anglo-Palladian architecture of the plantation house designed by John Drayton is extremely significant, the remaining material culture of the site works with the architecture not against it. The furniture John Drayton purchased to furnish his newly completed plantation house evidence the importance of every material aspect of eighteenth-century life; not just the architecture. The furniture contains an equally important story to Drayton Hall as a site and the eighteenth-century culture that once dictated life at the plantation.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION: REEVALUATE, DEDICATE, EXHIBIT AND ACQUIRE

Objects are a vessel for revealing history. Their preservation is integral to telling stories that bring history to life and inspire individuals. Cultural artifacts are uniquely suited to illustrate life during specific time periods, stories from the sites they came from and a narrative of the people who used them. In turn, museums dedicate themselves to displaying and telling the stories of the objects in their care. As the experts, they are obligated to tell the accurate story in a creative way to the public.

The Drayton Hall Museum Collection is as significant, as important and as enlightening as the architecture of the Anglo-Palladian house. It narrates the story of the seven generations that lived, worked, and played at Drayton Hall. The collection, built environment, and historic landscape of Drayton Hall can collectively present a holistic, historically accurate interpretation of the site to visitors and researchers.

There is only one problem. The unique interpretation at the site presents an awe-inspiring architectural masterpiece to visitors but excludes the significant material collection from the story. Yes, the fully developed Anglo-Palladian architecture of Drayton Hall is uniquely compelling, deserving of the research, preservation and presentation to the public it receives. However, an interpretation and presentation of the site’s collection to the public and its growth potential will bolster the architecture of the house. A collaborative presentation at the site of architecture and collections will present a holistic understanding of Drayton Hall a building alone struggles to do.
The vast importance of the collection at Drayton Hall calls for a reevaluation of the current interpretation to include the collection. The provenance and significance of the John Drayton era furniture alone demands this; with the remainder of the collection, the need becomes even more glaring. An obligation to the public insists its inclusion in the site interpretation and its importance to the story of Drayton Hall. With the enhanced interpretation, staff will be able to acquire additional items, conserve current pieces, and create an intriguing and relevant museum exhibition. As a whole, the collection and the stories it tells are equally important to the interpretation of Drayton Hall. The following steps should be implemented at Drayton Hall to begin the incorporation of the collection in the interpretation at the site.

Reevaluate

The preservation approach at the site reveals layers of history and the most well preserved Palladian masterpiece in North America. Unique and trend setting at the time of its inception, it has and continues to preserve Drayton Hall. The house was never intended to be fully furnished. As continually explained in countless early documents, the main point of the interpretation and furnishing plan was as follows:

Only enough original Drayton Hall furniture should be returned to give a sense of scale to the interior. The preservation is not concerned with people, family, or a way of life. No attempt should be made to furnish the house completely, nor any room therein. Pieces should be selected for their scale and appropriateness, rather than any inherent or associative values.  

The use of the significant furniture for such a purpose fails to allow the pieces to be

---

viewed together as the Draytons originally would have, takes away from their significance as decorative arts pieces and creates even more of a false context than no furniture at all in the house.

In a co-stewardship endeavor with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Drayton Hall is now managed by the Drayton Hall Preservation Trust as of January 2015. Due to the National Trust still owning the property and existing collection, policies regarding the collection still follow the antiquated approach determined by the Trust in the mid-1970s. The current furnishing philosophy, still rooted in that 1974 mindset, calls for the house to be viewed entirely unfurnished. While the current approach does not follow the original interpretation verbatim, it continues to dictate that the house will never see the introduction of modern conveniences such as climate control. As such, furniture will never be able to be reintroduced to house. Plans continue to discuss the construction of a museum building to exhibit the collection, however, these plans have proved elusive since the 1970s.

As a newly formed entity, charged with managing Drayton Hall, its collections and environs, Drayton Hall Preservation Trust needs to reevaluate the interpretation at the site to clearly include the collections and material culture to the public. Their working mission is “to research, preserve, and interpret Drayton Hall and its collections and environs, in order to educate the public and to inspire people to embrace historic preservation.”2 As Elizabeth Merritt, Center for the Future of Museums director explained in National

---

Standards and Best Practices for U.S. Museums, “nonprofit museums exist to serve the
public, and a museum explains whom it will serve and how in its mission statement.”
Therefore, Drayton Hall Preservation Trust needs to utilize the over one million artifacts
in the existing collection to educate the public at a publicly accessible space. The same
dedication to architecture needs to be placed on the collection so the significant artifacts
can bolster the current site interpretation.³

Dedicate

Drayton Hall Preservation Trust needs to be dedicated to the collection. This
thesis set the groundwork for research on the John Drayton era furniture, however, it is
the first of its kind. Additional research needs conducted on the remaining furniture and
material culture artifacts at Drayton Hall. Rooted in the architectural interpretation at the
site, research is scarce on both individual pieces and the collection as a whole. Significant
archaeological and decorative arts objects survive at the site. A knowledgeable individual
with a background in collections should be hired with the sole purpose of researching,
conserving, interpreting and exhibiting the collection. Currently at the site, one staff
member manages both the Drayton Hall Archaeological Collection and Drayton Hall
Museum Collection. With over one million artifacts in the Drayton Hall Archaeological
Collection and nearly 500 objects in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the collections
insist more attention than one individual split between the two can provide. The Museum
Collection needs its own dedicated staff person for proper inclusion and exhibition at the

³ Elizabeth E. Merritt, National Standards and Best Practices for U.S. Museums, (Washington, DC: Ameri-
can Association of Museums, 2008), 11.
Exhibit

The collection needs to be exhibited at the site. The individual pieces of the collection are significant on their own, but collectively are extremely important to the interpretation of the site. Viewing the architecture of Drayton Hall, the formally designed landscape and collections at one property will present a holistic view to visitors the current interpretation lacks. A building does not stand alone; the collaborative use of historic narrative, the built environment, surrounding environs and material culture objects presents the best well-rounded interpretation and aids in the education of the public. As explained by Anne Bergeron and Beth Tuttle in Magnetic: The Art and Science of Engagement, “a holistic, 360-degree, continuous approach to engagement, empowerment, and community building...results in increased relevance, loyalty, motivation, and satisfaction, as well as stronger overall organizational performance.”

Incorporating the collections into the interpretation at Drayton Hall will benefit the public and the organization.

The collections need to be interpreted and exhibited in the best context possible to bolster the interpretation of the historic site. The ideal location for interpretation of an object is in its historic location. However, the chosen interpretation at Drayton Hall does not allow for modern conveniences, thus excluding original collection items from being displayed in their original context under this interpretation. The introduction of many of

---
6 Bergeron and Tuttle, Magnetic, 196.
the items into the house would require a climate controlled system, an act obviously in opposition to the interpretation.

However, Patricia Smith is currently working on the Drayton Hall Digital Modeling Project, transforming the house to significant historic periods and allowing viewers to imagine Drayton Hall in a restored state. In this endeavor, she is accurately incorporating the surviving decorative arts objects into the restoration. This reimagining of Drayton Hall presents a means of furnishing the homeseat of the Drayton family based on historic records without adverse affects on the historic building. The innovative project presents a restored Drayton Hall while allowing for the continued preservation of the house. The project is an innovative method of preservation, setting the stage for future methods at other significant sites and should be continued to include current research on the collection. A digital restoration does not replace the object though and the collection still needs to find a public home on site at Drayton Hall.

The material culture artifacts need to be displayed at Drayton Hall. Plans for a museum-like space, exhibiting the collection and tying it into the house tour, have been discussed since the acquisition of the site in 1974. An interpretive center at Drayton Hall presents the best option for introduction of the collection at the site. Incorporating the tangible objects with the digital reconstruction by Smith would present the piece to visitors while allowing them to accurately picture where it would have been placed in the house. It presents the best option of incorporating the collection to the public and in its historic context.

The construction of an interpretive center for the exhibition of the collection
would allow the collection to be viewed in context and show the significance of it to the site. Currently, the conserved pieces of furniture in the collection are forced to be displayed out of context at other sites. The settee and slab table 1 are on loan to the Charleston Museum and help furnish the withdrawing room at the Heyward-Washington House, a Historic House Museum in downtown Charleston. Similarly, one of the side chairs is displayed in the exhibit room at the Nathaniel Russell House, another Historic House Museum, and owned by Historic Charleston Foundation. At both sites, interpretive signage indicates their origination with John Drayton and Drayton Hall, however, incorporation at Drayton Hall is more appropriate.

Currently on loan to Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the bureau bookcase and side chair, as well as a very early nineteenth-century Charleston-made linen press and twenty-four more objects are on display in the Rich and Varied Culture: The Material World of the Early South. The exhibition brings together early Southern material objects from Maryland to Georgia to collectively illustrate the sophistication and culture of the early South. The bureau bookcase, side chair and linen press are exhibited among other objects to show early Southern consumerism. While the Drayton objects fit into this chosen interpretation, their use far from context weakens their significance and interpretation.

A well-interpreted exhibition at Drayton Hall would represent each item’s significance individually and collectively with the site. They represent John Drayton’s taste and genteel status as one of the most accomplished planters in the colonies. Combining the interpretation of material culture with exquisite architecture of Drayton Hall would present the most accurate, contextual interpretation of history at Drayton Hall. Drayton Hall’s
material culture is equally important to the site; a well-designed exhibition space with intriguing interpretive descriptions would bring the collection to life in the most appropriate way possible.\footnote{Merritt, \textit{National Standards and Best Practices for U.S. Museums}, 59.}

**Acquire**

Drayton Hall Preservation Trust should actively pursue acquiring additional Drayton items to grow its collection. Known pieces with provenance to Drayton Hall exist in private and museum collections; these objects are a starting point for expanding the collection. Additional research and an interpretive center introducing the collection to the public could help additional pieces to surface. Acquiring additional objects with provenance to Drayton Hall would continue to bolster the interpretation at the site.

While just one component of the larger collection, the John Drayton era furniture illustrates the importance of material culture objects in the interpretation of Drayton Hall. While the chosen interpretation calls for the house to be preserved and interpreted without furniture, the collection still has an important role to play in that interpretation. Equal efforts need to be placed on the collection and architecture so they can once again work in tandem as they were design to do by John Drayton at their conception. The collection is as significant, as unique and as extraordinary as the fully developed architecture of the house. Together they illustrate eighteenth-century life at Drayton Hall and narrate the lives of those who lived and worked there. A building does not stand alone, but is supported by material objects. The architecture and collection at Drayton Hall need to be
united to form an engaging, interesting and holistic site interpretation that will continue to educate and inspire.
APPENDICES
Drayton Family Tree

**Generation 1**
Thomas Drayton (1650-1724) m. Ann Daniel (1646-?)
  Michael (1675-?) and Thomas (1687-1706)

Thomas Drayton (1650-1717) m. Ann Fox (?-1742)
  Mary (1707-1749), Thomas (1708?-1760), Stephen (DH GR 8: ?:1733), **John (ca.1715-1779)**

**Generation 2**
**John (1715-1779)** m. Sarah Catell (?-1740)
  Stephen (1737 – 1742 or earlier), William (1738-1740)

  **John (1715-1779)** m. Charlotta Bull (1719- 1743)
  William Henry (1742-1779), **Charles (1743-1820)**

  **John (1715-1779)** m. Margaret Glen (1713-1772)
  Glen (1752-1796), Thomas Glen (1758-1825)

  **John (1715-1779)** m. **Rebecca Perry (1759-1840)**
  John (1778-1791), Anna (1778-?), Susannah (1777-1801)

**Generation 3**
**Charles Drayton (1743-1820)** m. Hester Middleton (1754-1789)
  Henry (1774-?), Charles (177?-?), Caroline (177?-?), Henrietta Augusta (177?-1861),
  Charlotta (1781-1855), Maria Henrietta (1783-1862), **Charles II (1785-1844)**, Henry (1789-?)

---

*First three generations of the Drayton family in South Carolina. Bold indicates owner of Drayton Hall.*
APPENDIX B: FURNITURE CATALOGUE
Pier Table 1 (NT 98.6.2.1)

**Maker:** Unknown

**Marks:** None

**Materials:**
- **Primary:** Mahogany; Marble
- **Secondary:** Larch
- **Veneer:** Mahogany

**Origin:** Europe; Possibly London, England

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1730-1740

**Measurements:**
- OH: 31.75 in
- OW: 35.5 in
- OD: 24 in

**Description:** In comparison to the rococo style hairy paw slab tables, the pier tables exhibit simplified details. Each table is constructed of larch and veneered in mahogany with mahogany legs. It was originally topped with a marble slab. The breche marble slabs, still mainly in tact, are a rare lavender color, likely Breche Violette. This specific marble was rare in Colonial America. The cabriole legs boast a simple carved flower and stylized leaf; both are similar to motifs found on the later suite of rococo chairs, settee and tables. The legs terminate in a pad foot. A large carved shell ornaments the center of the apron; remnants and ghost marks of additional ornamentation are present on the veneer around the shell. A sketch of the table in Lewis Reeve Gibbes’ Sketchbook confirms this additional ornamentation. The frame and corner braces of the table are pinked to conform to the apron shape. While upon first glance, pier table 1 and pier table 2 appear to be exact matches, they exhibit small differences suggesting that they were made in different shops and by different hands. The ornamental features on this table are carved more precisely than its mate’s. The intentional lines are more defined and carving deeper. Measurements of the legs confirm the differences in the tables. The legs of this table measure 10” in circumference under the knee respond and 6” in circumference at the skinniest part of the leg. The measurements are consistent on all legs. The legs of pier table 2 differ by measuring 9” in circumference under the respond and 6.5” in circumference at the skinniest part. Measurements are not consistent between legs varying up to 0.25”. These measure-
ments show that while the tables appear to be exact matches, they likely were not produced by the same shop. Carving by different hands in the same shop could lead to minor measurement fluctuations, but were consistent in overall measurements.

**Provenance:** Currently part of the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1998 by Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood. The table descended through the Drayton family prior to its donation to the Trust.

**Condition:** The table is in poor condition. Cracking on the front apron is visible on the underside. The right facing cabriole leg is cracking. Veneer was applied to the base frame with the grain perpendicular to the frame grain leading to expansion and contraction in different directions. As a result, the veneer is in very poor condition and pulling away from the larch frame. All of the knee returns are missing but one.
Pier Table 2 (NT 98.6.2.2)

**Maker:** Unknown

**Marks:** None

**Materials:**
- **Primary:** Mahogany; Marble
- **Secondary:** Larch
- **Veneer:** Mahogany

**Origin:** Europe; Possibly London, England

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1730-1740

**Measurements:**
- **H:** 31.75 in
- **W:** 35.5 in
- **D:** 25 in

**Description:** In comparison to the rococo style hairy paw slab tables, the pier tables exhibit simplified details. Pier table 2 is constructed of larch and veneered in mahogany with mahogany legs; it would have originally been topped with a marble slab. The breche marble slabs, still mainly in tact, are a rare lavender color, likely Breche Violette. This specific marble was rare in Colonial America. The large shell is missing, but a ghost mark attests to its presence. The cabriole legs terminate in a pad foot and boast a simple carved flower and stylized leaf motif; both are similar to designs found on the later suite of rococo hairy paw chairs, settee and tables. These features are not carved as meticulously as its mate’s. On pier table 2, the frame and corner braces are sawn without pinking. The carving is not as defined as pier table 1, however, this detailing is not present unless closely inspected. Measurements of the legs confirm the differences in the tables. The legs of this table measure 9” in circumference under the knee respond and 6.5” in circumference at the skinniest part. Measurements are not consistent between legs varying up to 0.25”. The legs of pier table 2 measure 10” in circumference under the knee respond and 6” in circumference at the skinniest part of the leg. The measurements are consistent on all legs. These measurements show that while the tables appear to be exact matches, they likely were not produced by the same shop. Carving by different hands in the same shop could lead to minor measurement fluctuations, but were consistent in overall measurements.
**Provenance:** Currently part of the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1998 by Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood. The table descended through the Drayton family prior to its donation to the Trust.

**Condition:** With exception to the knee ornamentation, much of the applied details are missing including the central shell and knee responds. The veneer is in better condition than its mate as it was applied with the grain matching that of the frame, but still in poor condition overall. The stretcher exhibits prior insect infestation, but presents no active problems.
**Settee (NT 2009.1.1)**

**Maker:** Unknown; Possibly Giles Grendey

**Marks:** None

**Materials:**
- **Primary:** Mahogany
- **Secondary:** Beech
  (Inconclusive in analysis)

**Origin:** Europe;

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1740-1760

**Measurements:**
- **OH:** 39.125 in
- **OW:** 56.75 in
- **OD:** 27.25 in

**Description:** The back of the settee is formed by two chair backs and united in the center by two connecting rails. The backs share the same form of the backs of the side chairs, only on a larger scale. The backs boast a serpentine carved crest rail with rounded ears. C-scrolls, stylized acanthus leaves and unique gouge work are some of the rococo style motifs present on the crest rail of the settee. The pierced splats boast similar detailing, but also incorporate S-scrolls into the overall design. The use of stitching is present on the border of some elements. The arms are decorated with stylized acanthus leaves and scroll under. They support shaped arm rests terminating in carved lion heads. The upholstered seat is set into the rails. The side rails are carved simply with long volutes meeting in the center. The front rail, however, boast a carved floral motif made up of shells, flowers and S-scrolls. Gouge work is present on the front rails and includes the same sunburst motif as on the slab table frames and side chairs. The knees of the front legs are highly carved with outward scrolling volutes, C-scrolls, S-scrolls, and rocaille design work. The cabriole legs terminate in a carved hairy paw foot with five talons with distinctive claws; the paw is carved in detail the whole way around. The settee is constructed with visible dowel pins at the legs and arms and the frame itself is mortised and tenoned.

**Provenance:** Currently in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the settee was gifted to
the National Trust for Historic Preservation from the Charleston Museum in 2009 on the behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III. It is currently on loan to the Charleston Museum for use at the Heyward-Washington House until a suitable display venue at Drayton Hall is erected. It was, along with a side chair and slab table 1, gifted to the Charleston Museum in 1954 by Mrs. James Lawrence who purchased the items from her nephew Arthur G. Porcher II with the intent to donate them to the Museum. The group of furniture was inherited from Wilmot D. Porcher, a descendant of Dr. Francis Y. Porcher who was bequeathed all of Rebecca Perry Drayton’s, John Drayton’s fourth wife, furniture upon her death in 1840.

**Condition:** Good condition overall, but in need of conservation to reverse minor issues from wear and tear throughout the years. Mortise and tenon connections between the rails and legs are loose at each point. Visibly loose joints between individual pieces, especially ornamental corner braces by legs, needs attention. Also in need of attention are previous repairs and visible damage on the splats; especially the right facing splat, which has a missing piece.
Side Chair (NT 2009.1.2)

**Maker:** Unknown; Possibly Giles Grendey

**Marks:** Numbered by gouge (I)

**Materials:**
- **Primary:** Mahogany
- **Secondary:** Inconclusive in analysis

**Origin:** Europe; Possibly London, England

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1740-1760

**Measurements:**
- **OH:** 40.25 in
- **OW:** 24.5 in
- **OD:** 25.75 in

**Description:** The style and motifs on the chair, especially the gouge work and matching hairy paw feet, suggest the side chairs (originally a set of at least ten or twelve) were commissioned as a suite by John Drayton with the settee and slab tables. The chair back boasts a carved serpentine crest rail with rounded ears. As is typical of the rococo style, natural motifs are represented throughout the chair. C-scrolls, stylized acanthus leafs and unique gouge work are some of the rococo style motifs present on the crest rail. The pierced splats boast similar detailing while incorporating S-scrolls into the overall design. Various gouge work patterns, stitching and a diamond and dot motif, are present on the highly carved splat. The upholstered seat is set into the rails. The side rails are carved simply with long volutes meeting in the center. The front rails, however, boast a carved floral motif made up of shells, five-pedaled flowers, S-scrolls and C-scrolls. Gouge work is once again present and includes the sunburst motif seen on the slab table frames and settee. The knees of the front facing legs are highly carved with outward scrolling volutes, C-scrolls, S-scrolls, and rocaille work. The front cabriole legs terminate in a carved hairy paw feet five talons terminating in claws; the entire circumference of the paw is carved. The rear legs are plain, terminating in a square foot. The settee is constructed with visible dowel pins at the legs and arms; the frame is mortised and tenoned.

**Provenance:** Currently in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection but on loan to Colonial Williamsburg Foundation until 2019 for display in the *A Rich and Varied Culture: The*
Material World of the Early South exhibition at the DeWitt Wallace Decorative Arts Museum. The side chair was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation from the Charleston Museum in 2009 on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III. It was, along with the settee and slab table, gifted to the Charleston Museum in 1954 by Mrs. James Lawrence who purchased the items from her nephew Arthur G. Porcher II with the intent of donating them to the Museum. The group of furniture was inherited from Wilmot D. Porcher, a descendant of Dr. Francis Y. Porcher who was bequeathed all of Rebecca Perry Drayton’s, John Drayton’s fourth wife, furniture upon her death in 1840.

**Condition:** The chair is in excellent condition having recently received conservation by Colonial Williamsburg Foundation prior to display in the *A Rich and Varied Culture.*
Slab Table 1 (NT 2009.1.3)

**Maker:** Unknown; Possibly Giles Grendey

**Marks:** None

**Materials:**
- **Primary:** Mahogany; Marble
- **Secondary:** Inconclusive in analysis

**Origin:** Europe; Possibly London, England

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1740-1760

**Measurements:**
- **OH:** 31.25 in
- **OW:** 58.5 in
- **OD:** 30 in

**Description:** The slab table, also referred to as a console or side table, is topped with a replacement marble slab and has a rococo style base of mahogany. A marble slab sits atop the frame carved with typical rococo style motifs. Fragments at Drayton Hall from slab tables 2 and 3 suggest that the original top was likely a gray veined white Carrara marble. The cornice running just below the slab top boasts a simplified alternating flower and leaf design with stippling in the background. The frieze of the frame exhibits a carved Greek key composition. The apron is deeply carved with pierced holes along the element. Rocaille decoration scrolls along the apron and gouged diaper work in a diamond pattern fills the background. The sunburst motif present on the chairs and settee is also represented on the apron of slab table frames. The front cabriole legs boast carved knees with grouped C-scrolls in the center and rococo stylized acanthus leaves around the central design. A scrolled volute, similar to those on the settee and chair, grace the top of each leg; all of the legs on the slab tables terminate with a hairy paw foot. All four legs exhibit the same design motifs, however, the detailing on the rear facing legs terminate once the table is veiled by the wall. This confirms that the slab tables were designed to remain stationary on the boundaries of a room, not placed in a stand alone position.

**Provenance:** Currently in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation from the Charleston Museum in 2009 on the behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III. It is currently on loan to the Charleston Museum
for use at the Heyward-Washington House until a suitable display venue at Drayton Hall is erected. It was, along with a side chair and settee, gifted to the Charleston Museum in 1954 by Mrs. James Lawrence who purchased the items from her nephew Arthur G. Porcher II with the intent to donate them to the Museum. The group of furniture was inherited from Wilmot D. Porcher, a descendant of Dr. Francis Y. Porcher who was bequeathed all of Rebecca Perry Drayton’s, John Drayton’s fourth wife, furniture upon her death in 1840.

**Condition:** The table is in good condition overall, but upon close inspection could use conservation. An obvious repair was conducted on the front right hairy paw foot. Some of the fretwork is missing in various places. Larger portions of the apron have been improperly repaired over time and quick remedies are visible underneath the piece. A full conservation of the table would be appropriate and would restore the table to an excellent condition.
Slab Table 2 (NT 77.13.1)

Maker: Unknown

Marks: “D.W. Ohlandt & Sons, Grocers”
label, between 1893-1903 (location: front facing left corner brace)

Materials:
Primary: Mahogany; Marble
Secondary: Yellow Pine (modern)

Origin: Unknown; Possibly Charleston, South Carolina

Date of Creation: ca. 1740-1760

Measurements:
- OH: 29.5 in
- OW: 69.5 in
- OD: 31.5 in

Description: The slab table, equally referred to as a console or side table, was originally topped with a marble slab with a rococo style mahogany base. Marble fragments from the table suggest a gray veined white, likely Carrara, marble. In its current state, only the four cabriole legs are original to the table; the frame is a nineteenth-century reconstruction with crude diagonal corner bracing. Some of the original apron fragments survive in pieces, confirming its connection to intact slab table 1. On the cabriole legs, most of the surviving rococo ornamentation is still present. The front cabriole legs boast carved knees with grouped C-scrolls and rococo stylized acanthus leaves. A scrolled volute, similarly to the settee and chair, grace the top of each leg; all of the legs on the slab tables terminate with a hairy paw foot. The legs exhibit the same design motifs, however, they terminate once the rear of the table is veiled by the wall. This confirms that the slab tables were designed to remain stationary on the boundaries of a room. Slight differences in the carving and obviously different hairy paw feet set slab table 2 and 3 apart from slab table 1. The paws of tables 2 and 3 possess more movement and defined hair. While simpler, the paws from slab table 1 are identical to those on the settee, side chair, and bureau bookcase. The matching paws present the group as a suite by the same shop. The different paws suggest that the tables were made by different shops, but their similarities visually show that they were obviously intended to be used cohesively as a suite.
**Provenance:** Currently residing in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1976 by the late Mr. Francis Beatty Drayton and Mr. Charles H. Drayton III. The table descended through the Drayton family prior to its donation to the Trust.

**Condition:** The table is in poor condition overall. The cabriole legs appear to be the only remaining original elements. Despite this, the ornamentation and legs are in fine overall condition and with slab table 1 as precedent could be restored.
Slab Table 3 (NT 77.13.2)

Maker: Unknown

Marks: None

Materials:
  Primary: Mahogany; Marble
  Secondary: Pine

Origin: Unknown;
  Possibly Charleston, South Carolina

Date of Creation: ca. 1740-1760

Measurements:
  OH: 29.5 in
  OW: 69.5 in
  OD: 31.5 in

Description: The slab table, equally referred to as a console or side table, was originally topped with a marble slab with a rococo style mahogany base. Marble fragments from the table suggest a gray veined white, likely Carrara, marble. The four cabriole legs and frame are original to the piece. Some of the original apron fragments survive in pieces, confirming its connection to the intact table at the Heyward-Washington House. On the cabriole legs, most of the surviving rococo ornamentation is still present. The front cabriole legs boast carved knees with grouped C-scrolls in the center of the knee and rococo stylized acanthus leaves surrounding the central design. A scrolled volute, similarly to the settee and chair, grace the top of each leg; all of the legs on the slab tables terminate in a hairy paw foot. The rear right leg is broken mid-way and the bottom portion is missing. A modern pole near the broken leg balances the frame providing stability. The legs exhibit the same design motifs, however, they terminate once the rear of the table is veiled by the wall. This confirms that the slab tables were designed to remain stationary on the boundaries of a room. Slight differences in the carving and obviously different hairy paw feet set slab table 2 and 3 apart from slab table 1. The paws of tables 2 and 3 possess more movement and defined hair. While simpler, the paws from slab table 1 are identical to those on the settee, side chair, and bureau bookcase. The matching paws present the group as a suite by the same shop. The different paws suggest that the tables were made
by different shops, but their similarities visually show that they were obviously intended to be used cohesively as a suite.

**Provenance:** Currently residing in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection, the table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1977 by the late Mr. Francis Beatty Drayton and Mr. Charles H. Drayton III. The table descended through the Drayton family prior to its donation to the Trust.

**Condition:** The table is in fair condition and contains the original legs and frame. Some of the apron ornamentation survives in pieces and the use of slab table 1 as a precedent could aid in a successful restoration.
**Bureau Bookcase (NT 98.6.3)**

**Maker:** Unknown; Possibly Giles Grendey

**Marks:** Ro1 Wise in red stain  
(location: backboards of lower case)

**Materials:**  
*Primary:* Mahogany  
*Secondary:* Larch; Oak;  
              Ebony; Rosewood; Holly; Pine

**Origin:** London, England

**Date of Creation:** ca. 1740

**Measurements:**  
*OH:* 96 in  
*OD:* 22 in  
*OL:* 39 in

**Description:** The overall style and design of the piece are in keeping with the house architecturally and draws inspiration from Palladian students William Kent and Inigo Jones. Not only does it mimic the architecture of Drayton Hall, it also was designed en suite to the side chairs, settee and slab tables. While displayed as a whole, the piece was constructed with a lower desk and upper case. The upper case is topped with a broken pediment; the tympanum was restored based on surviving evidence of the plinth. The broken pediment is topped with various classical motifs such as egg-and-dart and pierced dentils. The cornice below utilizes several similar patterns. A Greek key fret is present on the frieze and a simple architrave below. The central focus of the upper case is a cartouche-shaped beveled mirror – recently restored by Colonial Williamsburg following analysis on the inner edge of the door. The mirror is flanked by two Corinthian pilasters with capitals boasting acanthus leaves and volutes. The lower portion, a fall front desk, is separated from the upper case with a medial molding exhibiting an egg-and-dart motif. Two small drawers on the top row are preceded by three larger drawers spanning the entire length of the desk. Original rococo-style drawer pulls and escutcheons are still present on the piece. The case terminates with a rococo style carved base molding, of similar style but not matching the suite of side chairs, settee and slab tables. The short cabriole legs terminate in hairy paws identical to those on the suite of other furniture. The upper
case door opens to a space of vertical pigeonholes and small horizontal drawers; delicate inlays are present throughout the interior and highlight these features. A central prospect and its surround continue to imitate architectural forms with an inlaid arch and pilasters; a pediment tops the design with an inlaid sunburst in the center. The prospect opens to an interior space with a parquet floor with a central sunburst pattern surrounded by a gold and black diamond pattern. The interior of the fall front desk also exhibits an architecturally based prospect, of similar style as the one on the upper case but on a smaller scale. It likewise opens to a space exhibiting a similar parquet floor. The central prospect stretches to the height of the interior and is flanked on either side by a row of pigeon holes with inlaid drawers above and below.

**Provenance:** Currently in the Drayton Hall Museum Collection but on loan to Colonial Williamsburg Foundation until 2019 for display in the *A Rich and Varied Culture: The Material World of the Early South* exhibition at the DeWitt Wallace Decorative Arts Museum. The table was gifted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1998 by Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood. The bureau bookcase descended through the Drayton family prior to its donation to the Trust.

**Condition:** The bureau bookcase is in excellent condition following a recent conservation by Colonial Williamsburg Foundation prior to display in the *Rich and Varied Culture* exhibition.
Easy Chair (1960.1058)

Maker: Unknown

Marks: None

Materials:
  Primary: Mahogany
  Secondary: Cypress

Origin: Charleston, South Carolina

Date of Creation: ca. 1760-1770

Measurements:
  OH: 48.25 in
  OW: 36.5 in
  OD: 33 in

Description: Once considered a product of Philadelphia and New York based on stylistic motifs, the discovery of cypress as a secondary wood solidifies Charleston, South Carolina, as origin for this chair. A serpentine crest and scrolled arms indicative of Charleston-made easy chairs further promote a connection to Charleston. Upholstered over a base wood frame, the upholstery of the chair keeps the crisp, straight lines of the frame present on the exterior, but is padded on the interior to exhibit soft lines. Front facing cabriole legs terminate in a detailed hairy paw foot with no connection to the three styles of feet on the other furniture. Large knee responds boast swirling acanthus leaf decoration and c-scrolls. Rear facing legs terminate in a square pad foot.

Provenance: Unknown; gift of Henry Francis du Pont.

Condition: The Easy Chair is in excellent condition following due to continued care and conservation at Winterthur Museum.
APPENDIX C: THOMAS ELFE ANALYSIS
Table 1:
Strength of Association: John Drayton Compared to Similar Elfe Customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Acc. #</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
<th>Number of Transactions</th>
<th>Number of Pieces/Sets</th>
<th>Direct Match</th>
<th>Close Match</th>
<th>Mending</th>
<th>Other Matches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Duetart</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>666.2.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Chovin</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>353.2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gaillard</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>678.5.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnoldus Vanderhorst</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>408.2.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Osborne</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>494.10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Phepoe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>455.0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Hayward</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>201.10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Sabina</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>202.17.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>666.5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Henry</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>212.12.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias Ball</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>193.10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fardo Geo. John</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>169.0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrard Goding</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>154.10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindus Chas. Jacob</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>55.10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. John Hind</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81.19.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Scotto</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>421.19.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sanders</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>224.0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gaillard</td>
<td>163/189</td>
<td>136.0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Black</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>190.15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Unless otherwise noted, all information in this appendix was garnered from: Elfe, "Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768-1775."
Table 2:  
Top 10 Personal Patrons in Thomas Elfe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
<th>Number of Transactions</th>
<th>Number of Pieces/Sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alexander Wright</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>712.12.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Gaillard</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>678.5.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>666.5.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>John Duertart</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>666.2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Drayton</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>538.8.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>William Skerving</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>527.10.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thomas Osborne</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>494.10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thomas Phepoe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>455.0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thomas Scotto</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>421.19.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nathaniel Russell</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>412.5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average:</td>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3:

Breakdown of Pieces Purchased by Top Personal Patrons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>BT¹</th>
<th>TT²</th>
<th>DT³</th>
<th>MB⁴</th>
<th>SBT⁵</th>
<th>CSC⁶</th>
<th>MC⁷</th>
<th>MD⁸</th>
<th>C⁹</th>
<th>SJ¹⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Wright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gaillard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duertart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drayton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Skerving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Osborne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Phepoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Scotto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Russell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ BT: Breakfast Tables  
² TT: Tea Tables  
³ DT: Dining Tables  
⁴ MB: Mahogany Bedsteads  
⁵ SBT: Side Board Tables  
⁶ CSC: Close Stool Chairs  
⁷ MC: Mahogany Chairs (considered in sets as listed in each order)  
⁸ MD: Mahogany Desk  
⁹ C: Coffin  
¹⁰ SJ: Sundry Jobs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1769</td>
<td>.36 Ledger A D°. from John Drayton</td>
<td>22.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1772</td>
<td>.102 John Drayton; 6th For a Breakfast Table</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Tea Table</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Dining Tables</td>
<td>32.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th For Covering 12 Chairs seats wth Dammast</td>
<td>3.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 ½ yards of Dammast at 17/6</td>
<td>7.8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking Down &amp; putt#. up 2 Bedsteads</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1772</td>
<td>.102 John Drayton; 7 For mending 6 mahogany chairs</td>
<td>2.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covering 12 Seats with hair seating</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ½ yards of hair Seating at 20/</td>
<td>13.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1772</td>
<td>.102 John Drayton 6th for a filed mah. Bedstead for Cha.</td>
<td>25.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30th a Mahogany Table 3 ½ feet</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One p. [pembroke] Table</td>
<td>26.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Side Board Table</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Close Stoole Chair &amp; pan</td>
<td>14.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Mahog. chairs hair bottoms</td>
<td>42.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Mahogany Bedsteads &amp; Casters at L28. Each</td>
<td>56.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sets of Iron Screws Roads</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Mahogany Desk</td>
<td>40.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Turned Top Tea table</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Dozin mahogany chairs hair bottoms</td>
<td>85.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340.15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**January 1773**
.102 Drayton John 23\textsuperscript{rd} Mend\textsuperscript{g} y\textsuperscript{e} Teaster Larth of a Bed & putt\textsuperscript{g} up y\textsuperscript{e} Curtains &ca 1.10.0

**February 1773**
.102 Drayton John 13\textsuperscript{th} a New pillar & Med\textsuperscript{g} a Tea Table 2.10.0
a New Lock 0.10.0 3.0.0

**April 1773**
.102 To John Drayton 9\textsuperscript{th} on Acc\textsuperscript{t} 409.18.9

**June 1773**
.102 Drayton John Esq:\textsuperscript{t} 29\textsuperscript{th} To 6 Maho\textsuperscript{y} Chairs 42.10.0
To a maho\textsuperscript{y}. Din.\textsuperscript{g} Table L16.[illegible/smear] a d\textsuperscript{o} Tea Table L12 28.0.0
70.10.0

**August 1773**
.102 To John Drayton 17\textsuperscript{th} in full to the 1\textsuperscript{st} June last 26.0.0

**February 1774**
.102 Drayton Jn\textsuperscript{o} the 25\textsuperscript{th} putting up Tapestry and mending 2 mahog\textsuperscript{y} chairs 1.10.0

**August 1774**
.102 Drayton John 10\textsuperscript{th}: a cypress coffin blackened for Child 3.10.0

**February 1775**
.102 Drayton Jn\textsuperscript{o} 21\textsuperscript{st}: a Mahogany top to his Carriage Box 1.10.0

**March 1775**
.102 Drayton John 24\textsuperscript{th}: a new block to a tea table 0.15.0

**September 1775**
.102 To John Drayton for his order on Moncrieffe 75.10.0

**November 1775**
.102 Drayton John 30\textsuperscript{th} taking down 7 Glasses & 3 Bedsteads 1.15.0
# Alexander Wright Account

## July 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 25th mending a card table: 1.10.0
- Taking down and putting up 3 bedsteads: 1.10.0
- 2 Window larths with pullys: 4.10.0

Total: 7.10.0

## August 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 9th a dressing drawers: 24.0.0
- 17th a sopha a L90 2 bolsters to a sopha L6: 96.0.0

Total: 120.0.0

## September 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 6th a commode tea table: 40.0.0
- 12th mending a shaving stand: 1.10.0
- 28th a mahogany cradle with posts: 15.0.0

Total: 56.10.0

## October 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 21st for 12 mahogany chairs with carved backs and brass nails: 180.0.0

## November 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 22nd a spider legg table: 6.0.0

## December 1771
- .78 Alexander Wright 30th for a knife tray: 2.0.0

## May 1772
- .78 Alexander Wright reced of him in full: 372.0.0

## July 1772
- .78 Alexander Wright 23rd taking down and putting up 2 bedsteads: 1.0.0
**February 1773**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 10th 1 large square table and 2 side boards roundg. To fit the other</td>
<td>48.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>a black cypress coffin for a negro boy</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A mahogany bedstead sacking bottom</td>
<td>26.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    |                                                                       | 79.0.0|

**September 1773**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 23rd to a commode breakfast table with castors</td>
<td>28.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a knife tray</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    |                                                                       | 30.0.0|

**October 1773**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 1st to 3 poplar bedsteads L19.10 12th putting 2 new ends to a poplar bedstead 10/</td>
<td>21.10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**March 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 3rd a poplar bedstead sacking bottom</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A cypress chest with partitions and drawers</td>
<td>15.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th mending mahogany chair</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th taking down and putting up 3 bedsteads</td>
<td>1.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15th a mahogany cloaths press</td>
<td>80.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17th a large mahogany tray</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    |                                                                       | 118.0.0|

**April 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 14th mending a shaving stand</td>
<td>1.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>a sacking bottom with cord</td>
<td>5.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 staples</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yards of sail cloth 13</td>
<td>3.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 hd. tacks</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total    |                                                                       | 12.12.6|

**June 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Alexander Wright 15th a mahogany childs chair</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 1774
.78 Alexander Wright 6th 3 window larths with pullies 4.10.0
  21st a mahogany breakfast table and cast 18.0.0
  22.10.0

March 1775
.78 Alexander Wright 23rd a mahogany case for bottles &c with 21.10.0
  brass lifting handles
  A key fitted to the lock for 2 keys 1.10.0
  23.0.0

March 1775
.78 Alexander Wright in full 314.17.6

August 1775
.78 Alexander Wright 8th mending a mahogany chair 10/
  22nd mending a sopha 5/ 0.15.0

September 1775
.78 Alexander Wright 8th mending 2 chairs and the back of a 0.15.0
  desk
  A new stuffing and covering a childs chair seat with horse
  1.5.0
  hair seating
  2.0.03
John Gaillard Account

**July 1772**

.29 John Gaillard 23rd for a poplar bedstead £6, a dining table £20 26.0.0

**August 1772**

.29 John Gaillard 3rd for slab table 15.0.0
   1 dozen mahogany chairs 100.0.0
   14th a mahogany table 3 ½ feet 16.0.0 131.0.0

**September 1772**

.29 John Gaillard 30th rece'd in full 247.0.0

**September 1772**

.29 John Gaillard 4th a close stool elbo chair 15.0.0
   7th a doble chest of drawers 75.0.0
   A set of 3 wheel castors 2.0.0 92.0.0

**November 1772**

.29 John Gaillard 7th an easie chair eagle claws 30.0.0

**August 1773**

.29 John Gaillard 19th to a chineas teatable with a stretcher 26.0.0
   28th to a bason stand £9 a chamber table £10 19.0.0 45.0.0

**September 1773**

.29 John Gaillard 6th to a double chest of drawers 75.0.0
   To a bason stand 9.0.0
   13th to 2 commode card tables 70.0.0
   28th to 1 chamber table and lock 10.0.0
   To 1 chamber table with the drawers petitioned off and a lock on it 11.0.0 175.0.0

**December 1773**

.29 [no entry] 250.0.0

**January 1774**

.29 John Gaillard 15th a commode fret china table 45.0.0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1774</td>
<td>John Gaillard 16th taking down 3 bedsteads and putting up two</td>
<td>0.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 3rd mending a mahogany desk</td>
<td>2.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16th taking down and putting up a bedstead</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glewing and mending sundries</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23rd a commode breakfast table</td>
<td>27.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26th 2 French elbow chairs</td>
<td>60.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 17th a 3 ½ foot dining table</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 13th 6 mahogany chairs scrole backs</td>
<td>42.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23rd a poplar bedstead coloured</td>
<td>6.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 1st 4 laths with pullies</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 28th taking down and putting up a bedstead</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1775</td>
<td>John Gaillard 11th putting up a sett of window curtains</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### James Smith Account

#### February 1772
- 1.75 James Smith 3rd for a mahogany bedstead, eagles, claws and knees with casters: 42.0.0
- A set of screws: 5.0.0

#### September 1772
- 1.175 James Smith 30th rece'd of him in full: 122.0.0

#### September 1772
- 1.175 James Smith so much on his account: 5.0.0

#### September 1772
- 1.175 James Smith 15th for a close press: 80.0.0

#### March 1773
- 1.175 James Smith 3rd 12 mahogany chairs carved backs and 2 elbo chairs carved backs: 215.0.0
- 2 commode card tables L70 1 pr large dining tables L36: 106.0.0
- 1 carved tea table: 35.0.0

#### June 1773
- 1.175 James Smith 1st to a scalloped teaboard: 5.10.0
- 11th to commode breakfast table and 3 teabards: 28.0.0
- 22nd to a double chest of drawers with a frett: 80.0.0
- To a sett of brass castors with 3 wheels: 2.10.0
- To 2 bottle boards stands: 1.5.0

#### August 1773
- 1.175 James Smith 14th to a chamber table: 10.0.0
- To taking down and putting up a bedstead 10/ mending a chair 10/ 19th to a tea kettle stand with a frett: 10.0.0
November 1773
.175 James Smith 1st a close stool chair 12.0.0
8th an easy chair and casters carved feet 32.0.0
44.0.0

February 1775
.175 James Smith 11th putting a new hinge on a desk 1.0.0
**John Duetart Account**

**February 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 Duetart Jno. 9th 1 dozen splat back chairs</td>
<td>160.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 tea table</td>
<td>13.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dining table</td>
<td>13.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dining table 4 feet</td>
<td>22.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 slabb table</td>
<td>26.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 night table</td>
<td>26.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 large teaboard</td>
<td>2.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18th 1 dozen mahogany chairs hair bottoms</td>
<td>85.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24th chamber tables</td>
<td>18.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A china fret tea table</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>385.10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**March 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 Duetart Jno. 11th a lady’s dressing drawers</td>
<td>45.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 bason stands</td>
<td>16.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 John Duetart 17th a mahogany bedstead sacking bottom</td>
<td>26.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A set brass castors</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 John Detart 18th mending a China tea table with 2 new end rims</td>
<td>2.10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**September 1774**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 John Detart 1st a new key and ring to a tea box</td>
<td>1.5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 Jno. Dutarque 6th 8 window laths with pullies at 30/</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**February 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 Jno. Dutarque 4th a large plate tray</td>
<td>4.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15th taking down 2 bedsteads</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th 2 commode card tables</td>
<td>65.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 mahogany chairs</td>
<td>42.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A scallop tea table with eagles claws</td>
<td>25.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A scallop tea board</td>
<td>7.0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tea kettle stand scallop top</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154.0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**May 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.175</td>
<td>Jno. Dutarque 13(^{th}) a lady’s dressing draws mended</td>
<td>2.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sett of casters and mending a tea table</td>
<td>1.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August 1775**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.175</td>
<td>John Dutarque 4(^{th}) 6 mahogany covers for bowls</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22(^{nd}) mending a double chest drawers new handles &amp;c</td>
<td>4.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 brass handles @ 6.3 each</td>
<td>5.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 shs a 3/6</td>
<td>1.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: FIRST GENERATION FURNITURE
### Table 4:

Surviving, Potential and Documented First Generation Furniture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Owner/Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pier Table 1 (NT 98.6.2.1)</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>ca. 1730</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Drayton Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Table 2 (NT 98.6.2.2)</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>ca. 1730</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Drayton Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab Table 1 (NT 77.13.1)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Drayton Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab Table 1 (NT 77.13.2)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Drayton Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slab Table 1 (NT 2009.1.3)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Heyward-Washington House</td>
<td>On loan to the Charleston Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Bookcase (NT 98.6.3)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1730-1740</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Colonial Williamsburg Foundation</td>
<td>On loan to Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and on exhibit in <em>A Rich and Varied Culture: Material World of the Early South</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Chair (I)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>National Trust for Historic Preservation/Colonial Williamsburg Foundation</td>
<td>On loan to Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and on exhibit in <em>A Rich and Varied Culture: Material World of the Early South</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Chair (VII)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Historic Charleston Foundation/Nathaniel Russell House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Chair (VIII)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Middleton Place Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Chair (X)</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>ca. 1740-1760</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Henry Ford Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Chair</td>
<td>Rococo</td>
<td>Ca. 1760-1770</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Winterthur Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 old chairs at 15s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 fine cane chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unclear if these (or some) were sold to Thomas Ladson in 1745 Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Owner/Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fine glass screwstore</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An old chest of drawers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An old trunk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A writing desk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Japan table and dressing glass</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Japan chest of drawers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small old desk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Thomas Drayton Inventory and Appraisement (d. 1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheare [chair]</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early-to-mid eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Anne Drayton Will (d. 1742)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table bureau [bureau]</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early-to-mid eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Anne Drayton Will (d. 1742)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best bureau desk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early-to-mid eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Mary Fuller Will (d. 1749)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early-to-mid eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Mary Fuller Will (d. 1749)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany elbow chair</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early-to-mid eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Mary Fuller Will (d. 1749)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine mahogany tables</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three sets of chests of drawers</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One library table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three sets of bedsteads</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One chest</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>Date of Origin</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One large trunk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One crib and cradle</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two marble slabs and stands</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three chimney grates and backs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two sofas</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four armed chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One large gilt framed looking glass</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two small dressing glasses</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed furniture</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mid-to-late eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in 1783 Bill of Sale between Charles Drayton and Rebecca Drayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sofa</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tea table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 settees</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 green chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany sofa</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sett tables</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (?) slabs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 round table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 tea table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney furniture</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One lot of tables</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedstead and bedding</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early eighteenth century</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Included in Charles Drayton Inventory (d. 1820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tea tables</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dining tables</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedsteads</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book (Elfe recorded putting up two bedsteads before purchasing any from Elfe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mahogany chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book (Elfe recorded mending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book (Elfe covered with hair seating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed mahogany bedstead</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany 3 ½ feet table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side board table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close stool chair</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mahogany chairs hair bottom</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mahogany bedsteads and casters</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mahogany desk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A turned top tea table</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 mahogany chairs hair bottom</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed with teaster larth</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book (Elfe mended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mahogany chairs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 glasses</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ca. 1768-1772</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Order in Elfe Account Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble slab table with wave pattern</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pre-1845</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lewis Reeves Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case furniture</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pre-1845</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lewis Reeves Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1.1: Drayton Hall, Charleston, South Carolina, ca. 1748. A National Trust for Historic Preservation Site. Photograph by Author.

Figure 2.1: Elevation and Ground Plan of a Palace, James Gibbs, early eighteenth century. Drawing; H 264 mm., W 388 mm. Victoria and Albert Museum (E.3603-1913). Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.2: Great Hall Overmantle and Chimneypiece Reminiscent of Plate 64 from Designs of Inigo Jones. Great Hall Fireplace, Drayton Hall, between 1845-1976. Photograph by Wayne Andrews. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.3: Room 105 Overmantle Reminiscent of Plate 91 from A Book of Architecture. Fireplace, Drayton Hall, between 1845-1976. Photograph by Wayne Andrews. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.4: Watercolor of Drayton Hall, South Carolina, 1765, by Pierre-Eugène Du Simetiére (1736-1784). Dated “1765” on reverse. Watercolor, pencil, and ink on laid paper, 8 3/8 x 12 1/2 inches. Private collection of J. Lockard.

Figure 2.5: Drayton Hall First Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 4 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 2.6: Doric Great Hall. Drayton Hall, 1938. Library of Congress: Prints and Photographs Division. Photograph by Frances Benjamin Johnston. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.7: Ionic Withdrawing Room. Drayton Hall, 1938. Library of Congress: Prints and Photographs Division. Photograph by Frances Benjamin Johnston. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.8: Corinthian Upper Great Hall. Drayton Hall, 1938. Library of Congress: Prints and Photographs Division. Photograph by Frances Benjamin Johnston. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

Figure 2.9: Bureau Bookcase, London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.3). Photograph by Craig McDougal of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 2.10: Side Chair, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.2). Photograph by Craig McDougal of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.
Figure 3.1: Pier Table 1, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.2.1). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.2: Pier Table 2, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.2.2). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.3: Pier Table Illustrated by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.4: Ornamentation measurements on Pier Table 2. Pier Table 2, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.2.2). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.5: Ornamentation measurements on Pier Table 1. Pier Table 1, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.2.1). Photograph by George Williams. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.6: Settee, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.1). Photograph by George Williams. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.7: Arm rests on the settee terminate in carved lion heads. Settee, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.1). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.8: Shell and floral ornamentation on the settee. Settee, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.1). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.9: Sunburst motif present on the settee, side chair and slab table. Settee, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.1). Photograph by author.
Figure 3.10: Side Chair, Possibly London, England, ca. 1740-1760. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.2). Photograph by Craig McDougal. Image courtesy of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

Figure 3.11: Gouged “VII” numbering the Historic Charleston Foundation side chair. Side Chair, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Historic Charleston Foundation; gift of the Mr. Blake Middleton. Photograph by Author.

Figure 3.12: Slab Table 1, Possibly London, England, ca. 1740-1760. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.3). Photograph by Carter C. Hudgins. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.13: Side Chair Paw. Side Chair, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Historic Charleston Foundation; gift of the Mr. Blake Middleton. Photograph by Author.

Figure 3.14: Settee Paw. Settee, Possibly London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.1). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.15: Slab table 1 Paw. Slab Table 1, Possibly London, England, ca. 1740-1760. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of the Charleston Museum on behalf of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III (NT 2009.1.3). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.16: Bureau Bookcase Paw. Bureau Bookcase, London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.3). Photograph by Craig McDougal of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.17: Slab Table 2 Paw. Slab Table 2, Unknown, ca. 1740-1760. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mr. Francis B. Drayton (NT 77.13.1). Photograph by author.

Figure 3.18: Easy Chair Paw. Easy Chair, Charleston, South Carolina, ca. 1760-1770. Winterthur Museum; gift of Henry Francis du Pont (1960.1058). Photograph by Author.

Figure 3.19: One of the Slab Tables Illustrated by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and
the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.20: Fifth Slab Tables Illustrated by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.21: Bureau Bookcase, London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.3). Photograph by Craig McDougal of Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.22: Bureau Bookcase, London, England, ca. 1730-1740. Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 98.6.3). Photograph by George Williams. Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 3.23: Easy Chair, Charleston, South Carolina, ca. 1760-1770. Winterthur Museum; gift of Henry Francis du Pont (1960.1058). Photograph by Author.

Figure 3.24: Easy Chair, Charleston, South Carolina, ca. 1760-1770. Winterthur Museum; gift of Henry Francis du Pont (1960.1058). Photograph by Author.


Figure 3.29: Side Table Attributed to Grendey, ca. 1740. George II Side Table Attributed to Giles Grendy, Va. 1740. Walnut. Auction by Christie’s, London, England, October 2012. http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/furniture-lighting/a-george-ii-walnut-side-table-attributed-5614370-details.aspx?from=searchresults&intObjectID=5614370&sid=0c3b533b-a376-4b9e-a910-9a36f8294b4c

Figure 5.1: Drayton Hall Basement Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 3 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.2: Drayton Hall First Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 4 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.3: Drayton Hall First Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 4 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.4: Drayton Hall Second Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 5 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.5: Drayton Hall Second Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 5 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.6: Case furniture likely from the first generation at Drayton Hall, sketched by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 5.7: Sketch of one of the imported slab tables by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 5.8: Sketch of another slab table by Lewis Reeve Gibbes, ca. 1845. Lewis Reeve Gibbes Sketchbook, ca. 1845. Drayton Papers Collection, Drayton Hall, a historic site
of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; gift of Mr. Charles H. Drayton III and the late Mrs. Martha Drayton Mood (NT 80.24.24). Image courtesy of Drayton Hall.

Figure 5.9: Drayton Hall First Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 5 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.

Figure 5.10: Drayton Hall Second Floor Plan, HABS SC,10-CHAR.V,8- (sheet 5 of 14). Image courtesy of Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division. Modified by Author.
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