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Abstract

The history of consumption in the long eighteenth century has attracted much academic interest in recent decades. We now know much more about how an increasing number of consumer goods became available to growing numbers of the elite and middling classes. Yet there are still gaps in our knowledge about how these goods were produced, marketed, distributed and consumed. This case study of the luxury goods trade in English wallpaper provides a more detailed contribution to this debate and explores how issues of supply and demand intersected. Similarly, historiographies of wallpaper have also acknowledged that the market for this product came within the reach of the middle classes in this period, but we still need to know how, where, and in what way this was possible. Furthermore, although wallpaper manufacture at this time was essentially a London luxury goods trade, a significant regional industry did develop concurrently, which has previously been unexplored. Yet recognition of the impact of urbanisation in this period is essential to our understanding of the success of consumer goods at this time and the effect on people’s cultural and material lives in the provinces as well as in London.

This thesis draws on previously unused primary material from insurance and probate sources, government archives and newspaper advertisements to examine these issues in further detail. As a business history it also engages directly with the aesthetics of the material goods involved. The aim is to provide a more nuanced case study contribution to consumer, cultural and social histories and also to provide a contextual basis from which research into the material object - the historic wallpapers themselves - can be more fully undertaken.
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Introduction

In 1754, Horace Walpole wrote to his friend Richard Bentley about his difficulties in finding suitable tradesmen to execute some decorative paper hanging work during the renovation of his house Strawberry Hill, Twickenham. So short of alternatives was he that he complained that he would be 'forced to give Bromwich's man God knows what to do it'.¹ Such was the growth of the trade in decorative paper wallcoverings in the long eighteenth century however, that by the 1820s, provincial retailers like J. Poole of Taunton were able to offer for sale 'upwards of 4,000 Pieces of Paper Hangings and Borders' and also advertise that 'the best workmen are also engaged to hang papers of every description, at the most reasonable expense'.²

Walpole's comment was made in the mid eighteenth century, at the start of the period covered by this thesis and at a time when technological achievements had made it possible for the market for wallpaper to expand from a luxury good made by hand craft techniques aimed at the elite, to one accessible to those further down the social scale. The thesis ends at 1830, as during that decade the industry moved towards full mechanisation and mass production. During this period the wallpaper trade went through an important transitional phase that saw changes to its size, structure and organisation that enabled wallpaper to become a consumer good that was affordable not just by the elite, but also by a broad middling class. This thesis examines the English wallpaper trade in this period of growth, its structure, make up and business networks, in order to examine how wallpapers were manufactured, marketed and consumed.

Why study wallpapers? As a decorative domestic purchase, wallpaper can be regarded as a non-essential, luxury goods item. As such we can investigate its history within the context of historiographies of other luxury goods made for elite and middle class consumption in the long eighteenth century, and which have attracted increasing attention from historians over the last thirty years (see below). This can help us

² Taunton Courier and Western Advertiser, 9 August 1820.
explore wider issues of fashion, desirability and acquisitiveness. As a trade case study it can tell us much about the market and consumption of luxury goods and can also illuminate some larger questions concerning manufacturing and business histories to provide a more nuanced study of consumer goods in this period.

For example, wallpaper was a taxable commodity between the years 1712 and 1836. Any printing or painting of paper for walls was subject to a 'value added tax', which affected the base price at which it could be sold. How the trade responded to this challenge in order to expand markets can tell us much about business practice during this period. Furthermore, whilst wallpaperers could be marketed as a luxury item on the basis of the skill that was needed to produce them, as a reprographic technique based on wood block printing, once the means of production had been created, it could also be handled by the non-skilled. This enabled expansion of the industry, but not necessarily an improvement in quality of production. Wallpaper, unlike other portable luxury goods such as glassware, furnishings or textiles could represent a relatively large purchase and a permanent fixture. Its popularity, therefore, as a domestic decorative item can tell us much about the importance people attached to communicating their status and taste via its purchase.

The aim of this thesis has two complementary strands: Firstly, bearing in mind these unique differences between wallpaper and other consumer goods, this study furthers our understanding of the consumption of the wide range of luxury goods in the long eighteenth century. As a case study of wallpaper this thesis also makes a contribution to business histories of this period, which characteristically do not engage with the goods themselves that these firms produced. By assessing the relationship between business and aesthetics, my research offers a more nuanced perspective on how such consumer goods were produced, sold and used. The second aim is to provide a fuller understanding of these material objects - the wallpapers themselves. As part of an AHRC funded Collaborative Doctoral Award with English Heritage, this research brings new historical context to the wallpapers in our museum collections and historic buildings and informs curators about how these wallpapers were used, where geographically and also spatially within the home, and by whom. Previous collecting policies have concentrated on recording examples of good design and the social,
economic and cultural significance of these objects has often been lost. We must therefore explore the background of these objects from the viewpoint of the trade that manufactured them in order to understand their meaning more fully. This thesis provides a contextual foundation for future research on English Heritage's Architectural Study Collection of wallpapers, and wallpapers in the care of other heritage organizations. It will also add value to educational projects where interpretation of historic interiors is undertaken, and in the fuller understanding of our material past in the surviving fragments of historic wallpaper that are still being discovered in homes across the country.

**Historiography of Consumption**

Recent decades have seen the increase in the academic study of consumption in the long eighteenth century following the publication of Neil McKendrick, John Brewer and J.H. Plumb's landmark *Birth of a Consumer Society, the Commercialisation of Eighteenth Century England* in 1982. In this, McKendrick et al argued that the consumer revolution of the eighteenth century ran in tandem with the industrial revolution, emerged fully in the third quarter of the century and was stimulated by the consumer demands of the emergent middle classes, who were attempting to emulate the fashions and tastes of the upper classes. Since this work was published, historians have sought to challenge McKendrick's emulation theory in arguing that the middle classes were more accountable for their own choices in acquiring their material goods.

The history of consumption can be summarised as 'the history of things' and so covers a vast subject area. It is not surprising therefore that a wide variety of historical disciplines and methodologies have been brought to bear on the subject in order better to understand the material culture of the past. Economic historians have taken the subject further through studies of what people could afford, while social and cultural historians have further analysed the meanings behind these purchases. Historians such as Lorna Weatherill in her book *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain, 1660-1760* (1988) challenge the notion of lower class emulation of

---

the more wealthy by exploring the meanings that consumers attached to material goods. In her study of probate inventories compiled between 1675 and 1725 she argues for greater recognition of the self-determined motives behind choice of personal possessions during this time. Economic historians Ben Fine and Ellen Leopold in *The World of Consumption* (1993) argued not only for a more precise study of incomes to assess consumer spending, but also advocated a more holistic approach to the study of consumption through the amalgamation of economic, social and cultural perspectives to create a more rounded assessment of the subject.

This was provided in great measure in the seminal volume *Consumption and the World of Goods* (1993) edited by John Brewer and Roy Porter. Here essays exploring various aspects of consumer history shifted the emphasis away from the supply/demand debate to encompass the motivations and effects of education, gender, cultural dissemination, manufacturing and design, and global markets on the consumption of goods in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A further important contribution to the historiography of consumption, and indeed to this thesis, has been made by Maxine Berg. *Consumers and Luxury; Consumer Culture in Europe 1650-1850* (1999) edited with Helen Clifford focused on the consumption of luxury goods in particular. Berg and Clifford’s book explored the qualities that were sought after in the luxury goods of the eighteenth century and defined what contributed to their desirability at this time. Furthermore, they highlighted the different qualities of luxury and semi-luxury goods and described how these were aimed at a more differentiated market than had previously been thought.

Berg’s further work, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth Century England* (2005) explored issues of this differentiated market in greater detail, focussing on the facets of desirability of luxury goods, who bought them, and also how they were made. The latter aspect fed into other work on consumer goods themselves, notably John Styles’ work on product innovation and Clifford’s work on product design and imitation in the metalworking trades. Berg was able to incorporate findings from her own work in *The

---

Age of Manufactures, 1720-1820 (2nd ed., 1994) to place the production of luxury and semi-luxury goods within the broader structure of manufacturing trades and drew on business histories of other trades to inform her thesis of a new 'product revolution' that occurred in this period tailored to and at the same time driven by the requirements of the middle classes.

Also bridging the issues of supply and demand within this debate is the work of Jon Stobart, Mui and Mui, Claire Walsh and Furnée and Lesger\(^7\) who have explored the contribution of shops and shopkeepers to the availability of consumer goods in this period. Stobart in particular has studied the development of regional economies and argued for the wide availability of consumer goods in regional areas as a result of the growth in the number of urban shopkeepers.\(^8\) Helen Berry and Lawrence Klein have also helped to further this particular subject by examining the social role of 'shopping' and the purchase of goods as a means to express personal status and identity, and as an aid to interaction across social groups.\(^9\) Here they draw also on the influential work of both Peter Borsay in The English Urban Renaissance; Culture and Society in the Provincial Town, 1660-1770 (Oxford, 1989) and Paul Langford in A Polite and Commercial People, England 1727-1783 (Oxford, 1990) in establishing the contribution made by social environments, moral codes and modes of behaviour in shaping what people bought and the places in which they lived.

John Beckett and Catherine Smith have pointed out the connection between the urban renewal or 'renaissance' described by Borsay and the consumer revolution of the eighteenth century, identifying the development of an urban middling class as a major link between the two.\(^10\) This broad group grew significantly during the long eighteenth

---


century, driven by an increase in commerce, rising standards of living and the growth of towns. Here a growing body of merchants, businessmen, professionals, and a petty bourgeoisie of shopkeepers and craftsmen fuelled the economies of urban areas through their demand for housing, retail and leisure services, as well as their own contribution to provision of the same. Historians have tried to gauge the size of this middling stratum in England, but acknowledge that categorisation is difficult. Assessment by income alone is insufficient due to a lack of comprehensive and comparable numerical data on income and living costs, plus regional differences within these costs and the fact that social, political and cultural values were also important indicators of allegiance to a particular societal group.11 As a tentative estimate, Margaret Hunt suggests a possible increase of 305,000 urban middling people in England between 1700 and 1801, which comprised roughly 20 percent of the population of the average town.12

Whilst this may not have constituted a huge group, in comparison to the gentry and aristocracy, they formed a much larger body of people. The number of peers in 1700 was 173 rising to only 267 in 1801, and the broader 'gentry' classes in the eighteenth century have been estimated by Mingay to number in the region of around 13,000.13 The middling classes therefore represented a significantly larger number of people with a disposable income to spend on the new consumer goods of the 'product revolution'. Furthermore, Sarah Horrell's study of the disposable income of working class people in the first half of the nineteenth century also indicates that the largest demand for non-essential goods came from this middling rather than working class market.14

---

12 Hunt, Middling Sort, p.17.
The history of consumption has therefore become a multi-faceted discipline engaging with methodologies drawn from economic, cultural, social and business historians. I have used these works to lay the foundation for the approach taken in this thesis. However, what is still lacking in studies of consumption in the long eighteenth century is a range of trade-based case studies of the goods themselves to supplement these approaches and to provide a deeper understanding of the material culture of the time.

**Historiography of Wallpaper**

The historiography of wallpaper has followed a different path, engaging with debates about consumption only very recently. Scholarly interest in wallpapers as an historic artefact worthy of study began in the early years of the twentieth century as part of the wallpaper trade’s attempt to write its own narrative at a time when the hand-block printing of wallpaper was in significant decline. The first major work *A History of English Wallpaper, 1509 - 1914* (1925) by A.V. Sugden and J.L. Edmondson sought to chart the development of the trade from its sixteenth-century origins in a purely chronological narrative based on technological developments which led on from one phase of wallpaper design to the next. It mainly emphasised the nineteenth-century trade to which Sugden was connected, as Chairman of The Wall Paper Manufacturers Ltd, a company formed in 1899 from the merging of several wallpaper firms that came to dominate the industry in the twentieth century.\(^\text{15}\)

Neither Sugden nor Edmondson was an academic historian, and as such they did not seek to interpret their findings other than to portray an optimistic view of the state of the industry by associating modern machine produced papers with an illustrious past, firmly rooted in a noble craft-based tradition of hand printing in a pre-industrial era. This work and that of Eric Entwisle, another non-academic connected to the trade sought to attribute the development of the trade and increase in consumption of wallpapers to a gradual linear history of improvements in technology.\(^\text{16}\) The eighteenth century was seen as a part of this chronology of linear technical development and has provided a basis on which later scholarly studies have been built.

\(^{15}\) Records of the National Union of Wallcoverings, http://mrc_catalogue.warwick.ac.uk/records/WPW/G/4/1/2.

Recognition of the value of wallpaper as a decorative art worthy of academic study was established through the publication of the *Catalogue of the Victoria and Albert Museum Wallpaper Collection* by C.C. Oman in 1929. Interest was no doubt fuelled by the presence of some early sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth-century wallpapers in the V&A collection, as due to the ephemeral nature of wallpapers and their potentially limited physical durability, they had come to be seen as rare objects. Establishment of this 'national collection' and also that of the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester in 1967 was key to the reinforcement of wallpapers’ status as a decorative art at this time. Furthermore, the 1980s and 1990s saw a growth of interest in interior design and design history, led most prominently by Adrian Forty in *Objects of Desire: Design and Society, 1750 - 1980* (London, 1986) which encouraged a move away from the study of 'fine' to 'applied' arts as consumer products. The post-modernist trend for retrospective designs served to further stimulate study in the decorative arts and the effect of this on histories of wallpaper was to open up the subject from niche interest to a wider public domain.

Yet at the same time, nostalgia and concern over the post-war decline of 'the Country House,' plus the relative accessibility of country house archives led to a concentration of studies on the interiors of the wealthy elite. Many of these key works such as John Fowler and John Cornforth's *English Decoration in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1978) and Peter Thornton’s *Authentic Decor: The Domestic Interior, 1620 - 1920* (London, 1985) mention wallpaper, albeit briefly in this context. However, accounts of the wealthy elite’s use of a limited number of fashionable architects, craftsmen and wallpaper suppliers resulted in a view of wallpaper’s growth that centred on a few famous names of suppliers and wealthy customers, and therefore adherence to Veblenesque theories of emulation to explain the spread in consumption of wallpapers lower down the social scale.

---

17 This collection was largely composed of a donation of over 5,000 wallpaper samples given by The Wall Paper Manufacturers Ltd in 1967.
Concurrently, the expansion of the heritage industry from the late 1970s coupled with increasing political emphasis on education, outreach and financial justification, prompted those involved in the curation of wallpapers to produce a series of new publications which pulled together the disparate strands of past work and updating the early work of Sugden and Edmondson, adding new research to form a comprehensive history of wallpaper. This led to the publication of several books at that time including the revision of Oman’s *V&A Catalogue* by Jean Hamilton (London, 1982), Lesley Hoskins’ (ed.) *The Papered Wall: The History, Patterns and Techniques of Wallpaper* (London, 1994) and Gill Saunders’ *Wallpaper in Interior Decoration* (New York, 2002).

The intended readership for these reference works is a broad one, with content organised into a chronological narrative of different wallpaper design types. As such, it is not their intention to contextualise wallpaper history within contemporary socio-economic and cultural historiographies in order to challenge the established narrative of technological development and emulation as the main driver of wallpaper’s success. As Riello has argued, whilst ready-made historical labels have their limitations, excessive deconstruction of these can divert focus away from the main subject of study. Their preferred standpoint is an art historical one aligned with looser and broader definitions of ‘the industrial revolution’, and the ‘rise of the middle class’. Saunders’ work provides an interesting shift in approach away from object-led and towards a more thematic study of the subject with new chapter headings ‘Who used Wallpaper, Where?’ and ‘Shopping for Wallpaper’, but the main discourse concerns design types.

Other new approaches to the subject came in the form of essays to accompany exhibition catalogues from Treve Rosoman in *London Wallpapers: Their Manufacture and Use, 1690 - 1840* (London, 1992, revised, 2009) and Anthony Wells-Cole in *Historic Paper Hangings from Temple Newsam and Other English Houses* (Leeds, 1983). Rosoman’s essay looked further at the structure of the London trade, whilst Wells-Cole sought to break down traditionally defined boundaries of methodological approach in

---

the study of wallpapers and combine the disciplines of design history with building archaeology in the analysis of historic wallpaper samples. Contributing to a broader movement that acknowledged the significance of material culture in the study of history, Wells-Cole's integrated approach involved engagement with the material object themselves, observing their construction and the context of the location in which they were found, in order to draw new conclusions on the dating of wallpaper designs and on how and where certain types of wallpapers were used. Rosoman's *London Wallpapers* also marks a shift towards a more multi-disciplinary approach by highlighting the importance of salvage and the conservation of new discoveries in helping to preserve material evidence.

Some authors have benefitted from studies in the history of consumption described above. In her PhD thesis, ‘Paper for Hanging Rooms: the Manufacture, Design and Consumption of Wallpapers for English Domestic Interiors, 1740 – 1800’ (Open University, 2009) Clare Taylor uses wallpaper manufacturers' trade cards to relate to Berg's model of the eighteenth-century manufacturer's ingenuity, commercialism and entrepreneurship. The adaptability and diversification of wallpaper manufacturers' design output is considered and thus the consequent increase in consumer choice. Again the emphasis here is upon the history of design styles, and it is from this background that the development of the trade is surveyed, rather than from a study of the workings of the trade and the business that comprised it.

Amanda Vickery's chapter on wallpapers in *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (New York, 2009) signals a move away from design history contexts to that of consumer culture. Here she analyses correspondence in the letter book of the decorating firm, Trollope and Sons. Vickery acknowledges the limitations of her source in that it is representative of the clients of only one particular firm, not all of their customers, and is also restricted to 1797 -1808. However, she is able to set this work within the context of wider research on eighteenth-century social and cultural history, to examine the role played by eighteenth-century codes of 'politeness' and 'gentility' in the choices and acquisition of domestic consumer goods.
The value of this work also lies in exploring the taste of the middle class consumer, which is under-represented in other wallpaper histories. Vickery concludes that pre-occupations with ‘neatness’, ‘cheapness’ (yet value for money) and an aversion to ‘luxury’ (which could be construed as upwardly social aspiration) were the middle classes’ main requirements in purchasing wallpapers. As noted above, established secondary source narratives ascribed the technological development of the industry and consequent fall in prices to making the product more socially inclusive. Vickery's work identifies other factors at play, in describing how the middle classes took ownership of this commodity and defined it in their terms and within confident conventions of their own class identity.

Writers of wallpaper history have benefitted from the growth of interest in social, cultural and consumer history and the study of eighteenth-century wallpapers has moved on considerably from the now accepted narrative of the trades’ development, to encompass taste, consumer preference and trade responses to these. There are still gaps in our knowledge, however, no doubt due to limited and piecemeal relevant primary sources and the absence of supporting documentation to accompany surviving examples of historic wallpapers. Wallpaper historiographies in general, including debates on supply and demand have been dependent on primary sources from country house archives, and extant examples of wallpapers in country houses and gentry-status homes. Museum collections of trade cards and wallpaper samples have also been heavily relied upon, and these too possess their own limitations of selective representation, collected for example on grounds of best design, quality, interest or physical condition over other less appealing but more representative examples. Overall this has led to an elitist bias in the historiography of wallpaper. Yet crucial to wallpaper's history during this period is acknowledgement of role of the large middling class market, of increased urbanisation, and how the relationship between taste and class is understood.

Aims, Methodology and Sources
The historiography of wallpaper needs to be more firmly established within the wider contexts of socio-economic, business, manufacturing and cultural histories in order to fully understand its meaning and the extent of its use. Within this aim, the thesis also
makes a contribution to the study of the luxury goods trades in the long eighteenth century. Why were this new luxury goods product and its trade important? The simple answer lies in the popularity of decorative patterned papers for use in the home which grew over the period and came to replace other traditional wall treatments. Yet wallpaper had a major impact on the visual transformation of the domestic interior in this period, and measuring, choosing and hanging it represented a large and involved purchase in comparison to other smaller, portable luxury goods. Its popularity can therefore prompt investigations into issues of supply in the eighteenth century, the demand and spending priorities of consumers, and attitudes to taste, status and class. In addition, wallpaper, like other luxury and semi-luxury goods trades brought a homogenising effect to the market whereby both the middling and upper classes were able to buy a variation of the same product and this thesis aims to explore this concept further.

Individual histories of new commodities made for the emergent middling class market at this time are still lacking. Recent work on the manufacture and marketing of ceramics, metal-wares and printed calicos have begun to remedy this deficiency,21 but as with the wallpaper trade, we still need to know more about the relationship between business structures and motivations, entrepreneurial dynamism and production methods and how these trade practices affected the goods that were available, where and to whom. This thesis aims to shed further light on these issues through a trade case study, by examining what was required to set up in a wallpaper business (Chapter Two), how the trade was structured and inter-connected (Chapter Three) and how production was organised (Chapter Four). Thus we can further explore the relationship between these issues and the supply, demand and design of this particular example of a non-essential consumer good. In addition, examination of these elements of the trade also challenges previous assumptions regarding the scale of production of wallpapers at this time and questions our existing understanding of the 'leaders' of the trade.

21 The most comprehensive summary of the separate research strands on new commodities such as ceramics, glass and metal-ware can be found in M. Berg, Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth century Britain (Oxford, 2005).
As wallpaper production was mainly a metropolitan luxury goods trade in this period, regional manufacture has largely been ignored in previous studies. The wider issues of provincial urbanisation across England in the long eighteenth century need to be acknowledged and the implications of this upon the wallpaper trade investigated. We also need to know how manufacturers, wholesalers, upholsterers, stationers and other retailers of wallpaper interacted with their customers. In return, findings can demonstrate the trade's contribution to regional self-assertiveness against the dependence on London in matters of taste and fashion. This thesis therefore explores the production and distribution of wallpaper in the regions, shedding new light on its penetration and use in these areas. (Chapters Five and Six). Finally, Chapter Seven explores the effects of the factors discussed in the previous chapters on the provincial and metropolitan consumption of wallpapers. It also aims to redress the elitist bias in this trade history, a feature that is also not uncommon in trade histories of other luxury goods of this period.

The survival of business archives from this period is limited for wallpaper and other manufacturing and retail trades. This study aims to provide a more detailed history of the English wallpaper trade in the long eighteenth century by supplementing existing primary source material with a range of previously unused sources and methodologies. Data from directories, newspaper advertisements and insurance and probate sources has been subjected to quantitative and qualitative analysis. The digitisation of many of these sources has made it possible to explore the themes covered in the thesis more fully than before. In some cases the limited numbers of tradesmen involved have made statistical interpretation of figures problematic, but at the same time, the small size of the trade has also enabled cross checking through nominal record linkage to support the conclusions made.

The taxable status of wallpaper has also provided useful governmental data on output and correspondence associated with Excise issues. Opening up the subject to this multi-disciplinary approach has allowed further interrogation and an opportunity to present the trade in a different light. This in turn helps to further our understanding of consumer use and perception of wallpapers at this time. In a move away from design history and studies of elite consumption, this thesis aims to reconnect the wallpaper
trade with its largest body of consumers, the middle classes, and also to contribute to wider studies of manufacturing and consumption in the long eighteenth century.
Chapter One: The Wallpaper Trade in the Mid-Eighteenth Century and Expansion at Home and Abroad.

Introduction
This chapter examines the status and organisation of the trade at the start of our period, at mid eighteenth century, and describes how that structure and leadership both influenced and was affected by the increased consumer demand for wallpapers. By 1750 wallpaper as a luxury goods item was becoming increasingly affordable, and evolving from being the sole province of a rich elite to encompass a wider middling class market. As will be shown, the appearance of wallpaper in the homes of this broader market was in large measure due to the triumph of technological change and product innovation. This chapter argues that these initiatives were driven forward by a small group of metropolitan leaders of the industry who sought to extend markets to the middling classes in London and the provinces, as well as to establish a trade and reputation in markets abroad.

The Perfection of Techniques
The growth and development of the wallpaper trade should be seen in the context of historiographies of other luxury consumer goods in this period. In response to rising levels of consumption amongst a growing middle class, English manufacturers sought to imitate in cheaper ways the imported European and Far Eastern luxury goods that were traditionally associated with the wealthier classes. This process of 'import substitution' had been underway in England from the mid sixteenth century onwards. As a consequence, new processes and techniques were developed to answer these needs resulting in the evolution of entirely new products in trades such as textiles, ceramics and metalwork. Innovations in finishing processes including printing, dyeing, stamping, gilding and lacquering transformed these objects into a variety of consumer
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products which became available in an increasingly wide range of qualities and prices for the middling class markets and upwards. These new consumer goods thus became desirable objects in themselves, and their major appeal was novelty, variety and fashion.

By 1750, wallpaper manufacturers had already entered this dynamic and innovative commercial environment and established a reputable market amongst the wealthy classes and gentry for English wallpapers. At the start of the eighteenth century, wallpapers had been regarded as a product suitable for the poorer classes. As a broadside of 1712 stated: 'those that buy and make use of the said Manufacture are generally Persons of low and mean Circumstances.' By the start of our period in mid century, the quality and standard of wallpaper production had already sufficiently improved to raise it to a desirable item for the more wealthy, even though cheaper than the traditional textile, wood and stonework alternatives available. As early as the 1720s the innovative designer, William Kent had led a fashion coup by using wallpaper in the redecoration of the Great Drawing Room at Kensington Palace for George I. Using new, modern flock wallpaper, an imitation of traditional Italian damask and cut velvet textile wall hangings had, according to Payne's *Royal Residences*, 'soon led to the adoption of so cheap and elegant a manufacture in preference to the original material from which it was copied.' The popularity of wallpaper as an alternative decorative treatment for wealthier classes at this time is well understood in the secondary literature. However, it is important to emphasise the refinement of the printing technique at this point, which was crucial in raising the status of wallpaper as a luxury item.

Robert Dossie's *Handmaid to the Arts* (1758) is still the most detailed account of wallpaper printing techniques at this time and describes the three main processes as hand painting, stencilling and printing by carved wooden blocks. Of these, block printing was the most expedient as it was quicker and less labour intensive than hand
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3 *The Case of the Printers, Painters or Stainers of Papers for Hangings* (London, 1712).
painting, and had the advantage over stencilling that the wooden blocks were more durable and capable of printing in more detail. Flocked papers were made by scattering chopped textile fibres onto a pattern printed in adhesive on a paper base. Once the surplus was shaken off, the pattern was depicted in chopped, coloured wool. Convincing imitations of cut velvet could be created by the raised surface of the flock layer against the flat background paint colour. Similarly, damask weaves were also recreated by the contrast between the matt flock fibres and the glossy, coloured varnish ground layer and provided consumers with new, illusory tactile surfaces and textures with which to decorate their homes.

The trend for paper as opposed to wooden panelling and/or textile hangings as an alternative luxury wall treatment was also fuelled by the concurrent popularity of imported, hand-painted Chinese wallpapers. As part of the eighteenth century vogue for oriental luxury goods, these exotic, beautiful and well executed wallpapers also contributed to the acceptability of paper over other materials as a decorative wall treatment. By mid-century, consumption patterns in the luxury goods market had been gradually moving towards designs in lighter Indian and oriental styles. The impetus for the English wallpaper trade was to keep on top of this trend and a concerted effort was made to develop and perfect a printing technique that could also replicate these new lighter styles.

Improvements were therefore found in the type of paint used to print wallpapers, in order to better replicate these lighter fabrics and offer an English-made alternative. The use of distemper paint, (a mix of chalk, coloured pigment and glue size) for both ground layer and design produced a more opaque, richer effect than the thin-bodied watercolour paints previously used in the early eighteenth century. Image 1 below shows an example of a wallpaper printed in opaque, thick bodied distemper pigment which allowed for a more substantial, colourful and luxurious effect than simpler water based paints:
The process of block printing in distemper was also more versatile in its ability to recreate different textile weaves as well as imitations of wood, stone and stucco wall finishes. Imitation was marketed to the utmost degree, even with distemper wallpapers mimicking flock wallpapers and acclaimed as 'mock flock'. Of key importance to the growth of the trade however, was the fact that distemper is a water-based medium, and therefore had the advantage of drying more quickly than varnish-based colours, and thus these wallpapers were quicker and cheaper to produce.

The trade card of Roberts of St Albans St, Pall Mall circa 1760s illustrates the wide variety of wallpaper styles available at this time, stating that he:

makes and sells all Sorts of Paper Hangings in the greatest Perfection, Wholesale and Retail Where Gentlemen and Ladies may be serv’d with a variety of fine Chintz patterns, Embost [flock], Papers to imitate Cut Velvets.
Likewise Linnen, Cotton & Silk Damask Furniture match'd to the utmost exactness at the very lowest Prices.  

A further boost to the trade lay in industrial improvements in the production of paper. Prior to mid-century, paper for wallpapers had largely been imported from Holland where it was possible to obtain paper strong enough, with a smooth enough surface, and in large enough quantity on which to print wallpapers. Around mid-century English paper mills gradually began to adopt the Dutch 'Hollander' machine. This processed the rags from which paper was made more efficiently than the traditional method of fermentation and repeated beating with large hammers to break down the rag fibres. English output increased, including that of the smoother and stronger class of white paper required for writing, drawing and printing. Quality improved, and gradually through the course of the second half of the eighteenth century, English mills were able to supply their own home market more cheaply and quickly. 

These technical improvements in the production of wallpapers were such that in 1752 leading manufacturers and retailers described the state of the wallpaper trade as 'having by long Labour and painful Diligence, been brought to great Perfection about Ten Years since'. Moreover, for the consumer, this product innovation had led to the creation of more affordable wallpapers that were now within the reach of the middling classes who were also able to enjoy this fashion. Prestige wallpapers could be had for 9d per yard upwards from eminent manufacturers such as Thomas Bromwich, but cheaper papers were also available from 2¼d per yard from stationers’ warehouses. 

*The Covent Garden Journal* in 1752 reported that 'there is scarcely a modern house which has not one or more rooms lined with this furniture'. Thomas Gray writing to Dr Thomas Warburton in 1759 advised him that:

> I allow tapestry (if at all tolerable) to be a very proper furniture for your sort of house; but doubt if any bargain of that kind is to be met with except at some
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6 B.L.J.J.C: Trade Card 23 (95), c. 1760s-1770s
8 N.A: EXT 1/299/3, Memorial of the Principal Exporters and Manufacturers of Paper Hangings to the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations, 1752.
old mansion sale in the country where People will disdain tapestry because they hear that Paper is all the fashion.\textsuperscript{10}

**Mid Century Manufacturers and Status**

The wallpaper trade itself at this point enjoyed a fashionable and respected reputation not just in England but also abroad. Although both Paris and London were regarded as twin centres of the fashion world, by the 1770s, the French craze for English manufactured luxury goods, known as Anglomania was well established.\textsuperscript{11} The French wallpaper trade was still in its infancy at this point,\textsuperscript{12} and therefore wallpaper as a desirable commodity was identified as a uniquely English and specifically London brand product. Writing on the subject of contemporary fashions in France, Madame de Genlis commented in 1760 that 'the Ladies only wear robes à la Anglaise. They even relegate to storage their magnificent Gobelin Tapestries to put English blue paper in their place'.\textsuperscript{13}

Although the trade was well established and described by Thomas Mortimer in his *Universal Director* as 'considerable', he listed only 10 paper hanging manufacturers operating in 1763.\textsuperscript{14} The trade in making and selling wallpapers was based in London as the country's largest commercial and consumer centre. The majority of these wallpaper manufacturers at this stage were concentrated in the area around St Paul's Churchyard. Contemporary localisation of trades within specific areas of the city (clock makers in Clerkenwell, silk weavers in Spitalfields for example), is understood as a means by which particular economic sectors could be grown and efficiency increased.\textsuperscript{15} In this case, it was the proximity to the operations of wholesale stationers in this location which was of commercial importance to these manufacturers, and led in this period to the concentration of knowledge and labour skills within this area of the City.


\textsuperscript{14} T. Mortimer, *Universal Director* (London, 1963), pp. 54-55.

The wholesale stationers controlled the market for paper and wielded significant commercial power. It was they who assessed the quality and set the buying and selling-on price for the variety of paper types produced in the paper mills of Kent and Buckinghamshire and further afield. Indeed many London stationers owned the mills themselves.\textsuperscript{16} Despite Campbell's disparagement in \textit{The London Tradesman} that 'it requires no great Head-Piece to learn the Mystery of Buying and Selling (paper)',\textsuperscript{17} wholesale stationers required considerable knowledge of the market and large capital to run their operations including the selection and bulk buying of a commodity with a prime shelf life, which also required storing in spacious, secure and dry warehouses. The impact of a developing market society in the eighteenth century was evident in the paper trade as demand for all types of paper products increased. Paper was required for packaging and wrapping of goods, as well as for account books, legers, bills of exchange and correspondence. Newspaper production and circulation also increased\textsuperscript{18} it became a seller's market with wholesale stationers assured of being able to sell on as much paper as the mills could produce.\textsuperscript{19}

As distinct from retail stationers who sold wallpaper amongst other stationery wares, many wholesale stationers also dealt in the wholesale trade in paper hangings, such as William Edmonds, stationer in Poultry in 1752 or William Lepard in Tooley St, Southwark in the 1750/60s.\textsuperscript{20} Others were in partnership with those who ran paper staining workshops or had close personal friendships with them. This was particularly important as commerce in this period operated through a system of credit, with loans and advances often secured on a chain of other loans from third and more parties, some of whom may never have met.\textsuperscript{21} Trust and reputation as a reliable trader was all important in this respect, as were the preferential rates that could be offered by

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} R. Campbell, \textit{The London Tradesman} (London, 1747), p. 127
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Coleman, \textit{The British Paper Industry}, p. 166.
\end{itemize}
wholesale stationers to paper-stainers for raw materials, and then in return, back to the stationers through the finished product. Successful stationers appear as trusted executors in the wills of wallpaper manufactures, including William Edmonds, trustee for paper-stainer Robert Hands of Bethnal Green, William Lepard whose social circle included Abraham Hall, paper-stainer in Aldermanbury and Samuel Goadby, established stationer at Sweetings Alley, Cornhill who was a trusted friend of Aldersgate St stationer James Wheeley.22

Other manufacturers of wallpapers around mid-century were also men of some considerable standing. John Salt of the firm Salt and Baker was from a gentry family of clergymen and his partner Thomas Baker was from a land-owning family in Mayfield, Kent.23 Similarly, Richard Masefield, who established a successful paper staining business based in the Strand, (whose fashionable shop can be seen below) had family connections to an estate in Worcester and the family of John Young of Chiswell St also owned a family estate in Cumberland.24 Both Thomas Bromwich of the Golden Lion, Ludgate, (possibly the most well-known wallpaper manufacturer in historiographies of this period) and James Wheeley stood as Alderman in the City of London, in a move that not only indicates their social standing but would have suggested to their contemporaries that they could be relied upon as tradesmen of integrity, honesty and good character.25

---

23 N.A: PROB 11/1081/156, Will of John Salt, 16 August 1781; East Sussex Record Office catalogue, administrative history to documents KIR/ Archive of the Baker Family. Baker is likely to have owned a paper mill. Information relating to this archive states that the family may have settled on the estate as it was suited to water powered machinery. T. Rosoman lists a Baker with well known stationer-paper maker firm of Fourdrinier in Lombard St in 1757 in his index in London Wallpapers, Their Manufacture and Use, 1690 – 1840 (London 2009), p. 54.
24 N.A: PROB 11/1158/16, Will of Richard Masefield, 3 October 1787; N.A: PROB 11/1363/1, Will of John Lane, 1 September 1801.
25 Bromwich had stood against but was defeated by John Wilkes for the Ward of Farringdon Without in 1769, Rosoman, London Wallpapers p. 17; James Wheeley stood for Aldersgate Ward but was defeated in 1757, London Chronicle, 20 December 1757.
In the absence of more detailed research, the retrospective romanticism of the hand block wallpaper trade in historiographies of the twentieth century has suggested that the trade was led by firms of individual craftsmen organised into small artisan workshops. What emerges instead is a picture at this time of a hierarchy of wealthy investors, many with related business interests and trained masters-cum managers.
who wasted no time in embracing, if not helping to fund the 'perfection' of wallpaper production referred to above. As they were involved in both the retailing and production of wallpapers, they also served as an appropriate public face to this luxury goods trade supplying at this stage a middling class and upwards clientele. Below these were the craftsmen employed to carry out this work.

The trade card of Abraham Price below shows him welcoming visitors to his large shop, with sales assistants in the background.

The detail at the top shows journeymen and boy assistants printing in the workshop located elsewhere. These operations were often carried out in separate locations. Insurance policy records for wallpaper manufacturers in this period indicate that the retail end of the enterprise was often carried out in the dwelling house of the manufacturer, whilst the workshop and warehouse storage was located separately nearby. A shop on the ground floor with the proprietor living above was a typical feature of the eighteenth-century commercial landscape. It allowed for a more salubrious address for customers to view the papers, whilst the larger space required for printing workshops could be located elsewhere.

The physical size and fragility of wallpaper pieces meant that the 'putting out' system that was beneficial to other trades at this time was not workable to any great extent: with the 'dispersed factory' system different components and elements of finished and semi finished manufactured goods were made by artisans in disparate workshops. Whilst printing blocks may have been carved elsewhere, larger workshops were required where the whole printing process including the hanging and drying of lengths of wallpaper could be carried on under one roof.

For example, James Wheeley had insurance policies on stock in his shop and dwelling house in Little Britain in 1771, and in his workshop nearby in White Hart Inn Yard, Aldersgate St. Similarly, Thomas Bromwich held stock in his shop and dwelling house at the Golden Lion in Ludgate and also in a warehouse communicating with workshops above and at a further premises in Dolphin Court. Three years later, his premium had increased from £4000 to £5000 with the addition of further properties nearby in which he was also insuring his stock in trade.
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26 See for example Sun Fire Office Policy Registers, L.M.A:MS11936/112/148970, Thomas Bromwich, 1755 and MS11936/172/240981, Crompton and Spinnage, 1767.
The emphasis on the retailer’s ability to supply a variety of goods in an increasingly competitive luxury goods market meant that those involved in the retail and manufacture of wallpapers also sold other related luxury goods items. Many manufacturers made fashionable papier-mâché frames for mirrors and pictures; others such as Crompton and Spinnage of Cockspur St made floorcloths which used the same block printing process as wallpaper. From this they then further branched into the sale of carpets. Conversely retailers selling other luxury goods, such as stationers, cabinet makers and upholsters (selling carpets, curtaining and upholstery) also sold wallpapers as part of their stock in trade.

Both Bromwich and Crompton and Spinnage had already established a good reputation amongst the wealthy and fashionable, as invoices in several country house archives bear witness, and alongside the wholesale stationers they were benefitting from an extremely lucrative trade. In 1756 Crompton and Spinnage had insurance policies on their stock and warehouses to the value of £8,000. Bromwich as we have seen above had also insured his stock in trade and household goods for £5000, representing a significant sum at the time. One sale could net huge gains: a customer such as Lord Leigh of Stoneleigh Abbey spent £356 7s ½d in 1763 on wall coverings with Bromwich's firm, the equivalent of around £26,726 today. Manufacturers struggled to keep up with the demand. Horace Walpole while decorating Strawberry Hill, wrote to his friend Richard Bentley in 1754 of his 'many jaunts to hurry Bromwich'. Bromwich himself apologised for delays, writing to customers such as Sir John Griffen Griffen of Audley End, Essex in November 1766 that:
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29 Mortimer, *Universal Director*, p.54; L.M.A: MS 11936/117/154794, Crompton and Spinnage, 1756.
31 L.M.A: MS 11936/117/154794 & 5, Crompton and Spinnage, 1756; MS 11936/122/162247, Thomas Bromwich, 1758.
32 S.B.T: DR/18/5/4402 Stoneleigh/Bromwich, 1763.
33 Sugden, *Wallpaper*, p. 73.
the painted paper will be finishe [sic] with all expedition but it will be [some?] weeks before the whole can be finishe. No time shall be lost nor person spared to make ye match as near as possible.\(^{34}\)

Within the space of two decades, the trade in home produced wallpapers in London had mushroomed into a boom industry for a small group of market leaders. Output of stained paper charged with excise duty had increased almost five-fold from 380 thousand yards in 1745 to 1,843 thousand yards in 1765 (see Appendix Two: ‘National Yearly Output of Stained Paper 1730-1829’). Technical improvements had made wallpaper a more affordable and saleable commodity, both resulting in and driven by fashionable demand. Similar trajectories can be found in other luxury goods trades such as textiles at this time.\(^{35}\) The commercial response to these demands naturally brought about changes in the structure and organisation of the trade that was set to continue on into the nineteenth century. These changes in turn affected the type of wallpaper produced and the social status of the consumers who were able to afford them.

**Success and the Beginning of Changes to the Structure of the Trade**

Narrative accounts of wallpaper history have suggested that the London trade experienced a decline in standards from around the turn of the nineteenth century onwards.\(^{36}\) However, this trend was commented on as early as the 1760s by those involved in the trade. Two letters to the contemporary press from a pattern drawer in 1767, and a retired master paper-stainer styling himself ‘a Chip of (sic) the Old Block’ in 1768, both pointed to a decline in skills within the trade.\(^{37}\) Both accounts stated that the most skilled element of making wallpaper was carried out by the pattern drawers and pattern cutters. The pattern designer was responsible for the artistic creation of
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\(^{34}\) E.R.O: D/DbY A24/11, Receipt to Sir John Griffen Griffen, Audley End Household Accounts, 18 November 1766.


\(^{37}\) ‘State of the Business Depending on Paper Staining’ by A Pattern Cutter, letter to *Leeds Intelligencer*, 7 Apr 1767 and ‘To the Printer of the Gazetteer’ by A Well-wisher and Chip of the Old Block, *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 26 Feb 1768. The latter appears to be written to counter some arguments in the former, however, on points concerning de-skilling, they both agree.
new fashion designs, whilst the pattern cutter translated each component part of the pattern into carved printing blocks for wallpaper and textiles (see Appendix One: ‘The Block Printing Process’). In the case of the pattern drawer, these skilled suppliers who sold their designs from shop to shop, were then being beaten down on price by the manufacturers. The latter, on being approached by the pattern drawer:

tell them that they are overstocked with drawings, so will not look at any; however, at last, with much entreaty the master agrees for one at a price the drawer must comply with, or give it his children to eat...I know one pattern drawer who once had three hundred a year, and now can scarcely get bread to eat; this is a fact I am shocked at and really true.38

The skills of the pattern cutter were also being under-valued according to the correspondents: previously masters would employ only qualified men who had served a full apprenticeship and who would carry out all aspects of the trade, from producing the blocks through to printing with them. However, once the blocks were cut, the printing element of the process was simple and could be undertaken by ‘the meanest capacity’. Consequently trained men were being replaced for this aspect of the work by unskilled ‘articled servants’ for 10-12 shillings per week, a figure which Schwarz identifies as a labourer’s wage at this time.39 The savings for the manufacturer were huge however, as according to the contemporary account, qualified men were previously being paid around 40-50 shillings per week. This figure seems somewhat high, however, labour costs were still being cut significantly if the figure of 20 shillings per week wages for a journeyman paper-stainer indicated in The Parent’s and Guardian’s Directory of 1761 is considered.40

The retired master paper-stainer was obliged to defend fellow manufacturers by stating that the latter had been taken advantage of by the qualified employees who were perpetually drunk and only bothered to turn up at the end of the week to rush
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38 Gazetteer, 26 February 1768.
through the work. Such was the demand for wallpapers, he continued, that manufacturers could not print them fast enough and so some men were being induced to work for other firms by having debts owed to former employers paid off for them. Furthermore in order to satisfy the great demand for wallpapers, manufacturers had been forced to take on unskilled men for cheaper wages. Whether the dissolute workmen were the real reason for taking on unskilled labour is debatable, as elsewhere in other manufacturing trades a system of division of labour between the skilled and unskilled elements of production was also beginning to emerge in the second half of the eighteenth century, as a means to keep down wage costs.\footnote{S.D. Chapman and S. Chassagne, \textit{European Textile Printers in the Eighteenth Century} (London, 1981), p. 15-16. Printers in the textile trades for example were also accorded a higher status than their fellow workers.} Lesser tasks were therefore carried out by unskilled men, boys and in some cases women and girls in, for example, the textile and pottery trades.

In the case of wallpaper printing there were several jobs that could be undertaken by unskilled and semi skilled labour (grinding colours, washing printing blocks, rolling up finished wallpaper etc), and these workers were employed on an ad hoc basis as and when they were needed, thus further lowering overheads. In a move to save labour costs, girls were also employed to hand finish elements on some wallpapers by paintbrush. Mid century had also seen the emergence of the fashion for designs produced by printing blocks made of pins which had been hammered into the blocks in simple patterns. This technique, known as \textit{picotage} was extensively used in the calico printing trade at the same time. This process added detail, dimension and ornament to a design, and in the case of wallpapers could also imitate lighter needlework and embroidery. Images 4 and 5 below show examples of these.
Image 4. Examples of simple decorative devices used in calico printing, some made from metal pins and inserts. From the frontispiece of Charles O'Brien's *The British Manufacturers Companion, and Calico Printers Assistant*, vol. 1 (London, 1795). Eighteenth Century Collections Online, Gale, University of Leicester.

However, this product innovation also had the advantage for both trades that the work could be carried out by unskilled girls or boys, who could produce this type of printing block quickly and cheaply. Attempts to save on labour costs in order to increase profits were greeted with concern on behalf of those skilled in the trade. Wallpaper manufacturers were urged by the contemporary commentators in their letters to the Gazetteer to 'act like men of spirit, as most of you are men of fortune' by placing more value upon the skills of the pattern drawer and cutter, as there was a genuine concern that many had already left the country for better work prospects in France, and from where trade competition could easily begin.

Further cost savings, however, were also made in the production of the printing blocks by reducing the size of the pattern. The design repeat of Baroque damask and cut velvet patterns was characteristically long, in some cases more than two yards, and
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42 The Eckhardt brothers of Chelsea are noted in Sugden's History of Wallpaper to have employed 50 girls for finishing designs by hand, see p. 112; Chapman and Chassagne, Textiles, p.19.

43 Gazetteer, 26 Feb. 1768.
thus required large, or a numerous number of blocks to print them. By reducing the size of the pattern to smaller repeating motifs, such as in the illustration below, manufacturers were able to reduce the outlay on block production. Selling these relatively cheaper smaller pattern designs alongside existing more involved patterns allowed wallpaper manufacturers to expand their consumer base.

Image 6. Small scale flock pattern in red, with grey and white distemper detail on crimson ground, c. 1760s. From 6 St James’ Place, London W 1. English Heritage Architectural Study Collection: 88082050/1.

A seven year apprenticeship system was in place, however, which theoretically would train up a new wave of craftsmen to carry out the more skilled aspects of wallpaper production. Yet, the apprenticeship system generally was a tradition in retreat as the eighteenth century progressed. As older trades declined and new ones developed, old institutions such as guild and apprenticeship structures became increasingly irrelevant. Indeed regulations specifying employment of only ‘freemen’ and not ‘foreigners’ were a positive hindrance to those trades that had increased profits by dividing their

—

production processes into skilled and semi-skilled labour. Furthermore, in some cases the terms of apprenticeship engagement were shortened from seven to five years and masters withdrew from some responsibilities, such as offering board and lodging as part of the agreement. It was not uncommon for apprentices therefore to be seen merely as a form of cheap or free labour.\textsuperscript{45}

This decline varied from trade to trade and from firm to firm, but the overall trend was downward until the apprenticeship system was formally abolished in 1814. Comprehensive data sets for the number of apprentices bound to trades in this period are not available however. The Inland Revenue record of duties paid on apprentices’ indentures does not therefore include apprentices who were taken on for a 'consideration' of no money. Records are available for the Stationers Company apprentices in McKenzie’s volume,\textsuperscript{46} however not all paper-stainer masters were members of this Guild.\textsuperscript{47} Records from these sources indicate that those involved in the paper staining trade did take on apprentices, with a significant number from the Stationers Company records being taken on for seven years without a premium.

For example, the Hands family of paper-stainers in Bethnal Green took on 13 apprentices between 1749 and 1766 all for no money. Cornelius Taylor, followed by his son Joseph also took on eleven apprentices between 1751 and 1770, for only one of whom was a premium of £5 paid by the Treasurers of Christ’s Hospital. Similarly, William Moore, paper-stainer at Panton Square took on two apprentices, again both for seven years and for no money.\textsuperscript{48} In contemporary directories the standard consideration paid for an apprentice in this trade was perceived to be £20-£50, however according to Kearsley’s \textit{Table of Trades}, this upper level does not compare favourably with the rates for other luxury goods trades: a toyman for example could

\textsuperscript{47} J.R. Kellet describes the reasons behind the decline of Guild influence in this period. See 'The Breakdown of Guild and Corporation Control over the Handicraft and Retail Trade in London', \textit{Economic History Review}, 10, 3 (1958), pp. 381-394. Kellet’s thesis that by this period membership of any Company was sufficient lip service in order to practise a trade is supported by the instances of wallpaper tradesmen applying for membership of a wide variety of different Companies. L.M.A: COL/CHD/FR/02, Livery Freedom Records.
\textsuperscript{48} McKenzie, \textit{Apprentices}, pp. 156-157; 345-6 & p. 239.
ask between £10-100, an upholcher between £50-150, a mathematical instrument maker between £20-100 and a linen draper between £100-200. 49

Pat Kirkham in her study of eighteenth century furniture makers in London describes the widely varying considerations paid for apprentices in this trade. Not only was there a difference from firm to firm but also within a particular firm, and she suggests that these variant premiums reflected differing levels and types of training that would be given. 50 Similar observations can be made in the wallpaper trade: Thomas Cox, running a wallpaper manufactory in Thomas St, Southwark took on five apprentices in the 1790s, for which he charged £5, £10 and £50. 51 The disparity in these figures suggest that different roles would indeed be assigned to these apprentices; those coming for free or under the perceived going rate were more likely to be assigned simple menial tasks, whilst those for whom a sum had been paid may well have been taught pattern interpretation and block carving, or the shop and business management side of the trade. The general picture is thus suggestive of a core of skilled craftsmen-employees at the top of a hierarchy of semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Foremen such as Joseph Hemmings who worked for Salt and Baker in 1761, 52 would run the workshop whilst a distinct managerial and retail branch operated in the counting house and shop.

A further indicator that this may have been the case lies in the fact that many masters apprenticed their own relatives to the paper staining trade. Joseph Taylor of Smithfield, William Lovell of Fleet Street, John Roper of Upper Thames St as well as Bromwich’s partner Henry Isherwood are some examples of several who apprenticed sons or relatives to the trade. 53 Apprentices who were fully trained after seven years would generate a supply of qualified journeymen, however, there was a possibility that these men could then set up on their own in competition. The lax apprenticeship

49 G. Kearsley, Table of Trades for the Assistance of Parents and Guardians (London, 1786).
51 McKenzie, Apprentices, p. 92.
52 O.B.P.C.T., 16 January 1761. Hemmings had previously run his own business at Garlick Hill before becoming bankrupt and subsequently working as foreman for Salt and Baker’s firm. London Gazette, 8 May 1756.
53 McKenzie, Apprentices, p. 346 (Taylor), p.189 (Isherwood); L.M.A: Livery Freedom Records: FR/02/1256/088 (Lovell); FR/02/1266/096 (Roper).
regulations allowed employers to control and influence the supply of people who were fully trained in this small trade, whilst at the same time making use of free apprenticeship labour.

The more skilled elements and the business side of the operation could then be apportioned to junior members of the family, thus helping to form a natural limitation on the trade. Furthermore, it also enabled owners of paper staining concerns to exercise quality control over the production of their wallpapers by placing the expertise in the hands of a small hierarchy of skilled craftsmen and family members. This was particularly pertinent as the method of production by hand block printing remained the same throughout the period until the 1830s. This central core would therefore be able to concentrate on the creative elements of the process and production of the better quality, more expensive papers. While unskilled workers attended to the simpler printing tasks, the core of skilled workers could also concentrate on the expediency and adaptability of new pattern designs as the financial and fashion markets changed in response to increasing demand.

**Market Expansion at Home: Building Booms and Effects of Urbanisation**

As noted above, the growth of the wallpaper trade was given impetus by technological changes within the craft of paper making and wallpaper printing, achieved through capital investment and propelled by fashionable demand. The expansion of the wallpaper trade was not solely a response to these factors, however, but was also fuelled by an increase in population and the high rate of urbanisation which took place in the period under study.

The growth of urban centres in Britain during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is regarded by historians as principally due to the increase in migration to British towns, a process that went hand in hand with industrialisation at this time. By far the greatest growth was experienced by London, which was already the largest city in Europe by the start of the eighteenth century, with between 10 and 11 per cent of the population of England and Wales living there. Figures for the growth in London’s population as a whole in this period are difficult establish precisely, however Schwarz
summarises the position as an increase in population of broadly 50 per cent between the years 1750 and 1800.\textsuperscript{54}

By the 1750s the building trade in London was beginning to emerge from a period of stagnation with activity focussed mainly in the fashionable West End. By the 1760s, London was experiencing a wave of development that Summerson attributes to ‘country gentlemen gaining a foothold in the town and from the citizen migrating to the west end’.\textsuperscript{55} Ashton cites a contemporary pamphlet of 1767 that stated ‘London now extends to Marylebone, to Tyburn, to Chelsea, to Brumpton and some thousands of houses have been built within these last 3 or 4 years which has drained the country of all sorts of labourers and mechanics and raised wages’. Ashton describes the extent of this building boom as so great that supply outran demand and in one case, bricks were delivered to site still hot from the kilns, which set fire to the cart on which they were delivered.\textsuperscript{56} The long term rate of building development in the capital continued in an upward trend, albeit punctuated by short-lived slumps but with large surges of construction that occurred in each decade to 1800. Booms and slumps in the building trade continued on into the first few decades of the nineteenth century in addition.\textsuperscript{57}

Historians looking at the composition of the population in London during this period have tended to rely on Schwarz’s figures gathered from the London land tax assessments. Here he concludes that by 1798, 2-3 percent of the capitals’ population was composed of those in the ‘upper income’ bracket (Schwarz’s average of which is £200 per year), 16-21 per cent were in the ‘middling’ bracket (average £80-£139 per year) and the remaining 75 per cent were composed of a diverse group of small shopkeepers, artisans, wage labourers and the unemployed.\textsuperscript{58} Whilst the percentage of those in the middling and upper income groups are proportionately small, the size

\textsuperscript{57} Schwarz, \textit{London}, p. 85. Schwarz indicates that slumps in the trade occurred as a result of wartime activity against France with lows in 1804 and again in 1815. Slump followed boom again in 1826.
of the metropolitan population as a whole meant that they represent a significant number of houses being built, which would require furnishing, equipping and decorating with new and fashionable consumer goods. The London Season also swelled the population of middling sorts and above from winter through to spring, either to enjoy the cultural rounds of assemblies, theatre visits and shopping or to benefit from the commercial opportunities that the Season's visitors offered. This all contributed to the demand for accommodation and the emergence of squares and streets of uniform terraced houses consisting of several floors of rooms that could be leased or rented by resident and visitor.

Urbanisation itself was not confined to the capital however, but occurred across the whole of Britain during the long eighteenth century with many towns and regional centres seeing similar patterns of growth over this period. Margaret Hunt states that the number of English people living in cities rose sharply during the course of the eighteenth century estimating that almost two-thirds of this growth occurred outside London. 59 Both Chalklin and Corfield have described the growth in number and size of provincial towns such as Lincoln, Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bath and Stamford during the long eighteenth century. Trading, manufacturing and resort towns saw increasing development over this period as a whole, as a result of the expansion of industrial and commercial life. This was accompanied by periods of considerable building activity, with new housing being created in new and re-modelled existing town centres. 60

Urban growth outside London is discussed in more detail in Chapter Five where we examine the concurrent development of a regional wallpaper trade. However, it is important to note here the dynamic period of house building that had already begun in Britain by the start of our period in 1750, with some centres seeing unprecedented levels of building development at mid-century and thereafter. Liverpool for example saw an increase in housing stock from 4,200 in 1760 to 6,340 in 1773, and in Birmingham the number of houses grew from 6,025 to 8,042 between 1770 and

59 Hunt, Middling Sort, p. 17.
1778.\textsuperscript{61} This period of urbanisation provided increasing commercial opportunities for the wallpaper trade as the demand for wallpapers to decorate these houses grew. The effect of this on the production of the trades was an increase in taxed wallpaper output from 737 thousand yards in 1750 to 3403 thousand yards in 1800. See Appendix Two: ‘Taxed Wallpaper Output, 1730-1829’. This significant rise in production helps support the theory that the wallpaper trade benefitted in no small measure from the huge growth in house building for all but the poorest classes in this period.

**House Building and Wallpaper**

What then were the advantages of using wallpaper in these new developments? Wallpaper as a commodity operated on a number of levels of quality and status. It benefitted not only from its status as a desirable, fashionable luxury commodity but it also enjoyed a role as an integral part of the house building process for the broad middling classes upwards. This practical application was noted by Mortimer in 1763 when he stated that:

not only is [wallpaper] cheap, but it saves the builders the expense of wainscotting; for which reason they have brought it into vogue, and most of the new houses lately erected are lined throughout with Paper.\textsuperscript{62}

The London wallpaper manufacturers were therefore in the fortunate position to be able to offer their papers to customers on an aspirational and acquisitive level as well as meeting their pragmatic and economic requirements. This two-fold approach ensured that sales were able to appeal to a wider market.

As noted above, the ability of wallpaper manufacturers to successfully imitate other types of wall surface such as stucco and stonework in their designs also gave wallpaper added value in the building trade. Messrs Eckhardts and Co in 1793, one of the many manufacturers who made fashionable imitation stucco wallpapers, advertised that their papers offered the

\textsuperscript{61} Chalklin, *Provincial Towns*, pp. 259-263.

\textsuperscript{62} Mortimer, *Universal Director*, p.54. Mortimer's directory and those of other contemporaries were aimed at a middling and upper class readership and as such the new houses are likely to refer to bourgeois premises and upwards.
beauty, elegance and convenience of a well-stuccoed apartment, and perfectly free from the echo so universally complained of in stuccoed rooms at much less expense and without having to wait for the drying of the stucco.\footnote{Sugden, \textit{Wallpaper}, p. 111.}

The advantages of expediency and cost are clear for the speculative builder and landlord wishing to see the highest return on investment. For the growing number of middle class consumers, this type of product substitution enabled them to enjoy an affordable luxury which again was associated with the decorative finishes of the very wealthy. Furthermore, by adding the benefits of convenience and lower price, it was possible for manufacturers to suggest that this type of wallpaper was in fact better than the original that it imitated and more suitable to the specific demands of the middle class consumer.

Wallpaper manufacturers and retailers openly advertised their stock of wallpapers to builders, whom they included alongside stationers and upholders as a part of their wholesale market. Bulk sales were key here and builders in turn could benefit from the expediency of this fashionable but affordable alternative wallcovering.\footnote{For example, \textit{St James' Chronicle}, 7 April 1787 and \textit{Morning Chronicle}, 19 June 1794.} Of course, once houses had been built, seasonal changes in pattern and colours driven by the luxury goods market in general would ensure repeat sales in these new homes and thereby increase the market yet further.

\textbf{London's Country Trade}

The response of some London wallpaper manufacturers to the growing market for wallpapers was to open a second branch of their shops in these regional towns. Aside from their newly built premises in Cockspur Street called 'the Paper Warehouse', the Crompton family of Crompton and Spinnage opened a second retail outlet in Leeds in 1763. J Crompton advertised in the local press that he had:

\begin{quote}
open'd a Wholesale and Retail Paper Hanging Warehouse, opposite the Cross, Leedes from \textit{Cromptons} manufactory, Charing Cross, London, where the
\end{quote}
Nobility Gentry, Tradesmen and others, may be served with the same Variety as in London, and on the Lowest Terms.  

Not all wallpaper manufacturers had branches in regional towns however. Many relied on the metropolitan trade; on footfall of customers and wholesale sales through upholsters and stationers outlets. Out of town customers had included the landed classes and gentry who visited London for the Season and for shopping and for many this continued as means to sales: the order books of the firms Duppa and Trollope from the 1790s demonstrate a high level of correspondence between regional retail customers, who contacted these London firms directly.

Wallpapers could be mail ordered from the country, and sent out by coach in packing cases, particularly as road transport continued to improve in the second half of the century. Samples were also posted from London to interested customers. These were sent with increasing convenience and speed as the number of mail coach routes increased from the 1780s with connections from London to places as far afield as Edinburgh, Exeter, Dover and Liverpool. Advertisements and trade cards such as that of Thomas Hall of 85 Cheapside offered the latest fashionable paper hangings, borders and a variety of ornamental schemes and borders not just to London customers but also further afield, with 'workmen sent to any part of the Kingdom, also patterns by Orders sent per post'.

The buoyant urban markets outside London were highly profitable and the London wallpaper trade responded to this demand by selling wholesale to regional upholsters and stationers. Enterprising shop keepers would source stock from their own visits to London, and the contemporary press frequently contained advertisements from all sorts of shopkeepers claiming that they are 'lately returned from London' with the

---

65 Leeds Intelligencer 3 May 1763; J Crompton was either brother John or Joseph who ran the family business in partnership with Benjamin, after the death of their brother William in 1759. N.A: PROB 11/851/411, Will of William Crompton, 29 December 1759.
67 Thomas Bromwich describes a box of paper to be sent by York carrier in a letter dated 26 June 1783, reproduced in Entwisle, Literary History, p. 58. His invoice for wallpaper sent to Sir John Griffen Griffen of Audley End, Essex also includes the cost of three shillings for 'a keg and a box'. E.R.O: D/DBy A24/11, Household Accounts, 18 November 1766.
68 Entwisle, Literary History, p. 68.
latest fashionable goods. However, London luxury goods manufacturers also proactively courted wholesale commissions by employing 'travellers', equipped with pattern books and samples of such items as glassware, pottery, metal-ware and wallpapers to act on their behalf in securing regional sales.69 One such sales representative, placing a newspaper advertisement for employment selling wallpapers in 1803 described the position thus:

A Person who has been in the habit of travelling in the North and West of England, also through the County of Kent &tc...having a knowledge of the persons in general who deal in those articles in the country or would have no objection to travel in the commission line.70

Indeed, knowledge of the regional markets and those who operated in them were vital to the London wallpaper manufacturers, particularly in the commercial environment of the second half of the eighteenth century where much was taken on trust and credit was the main means of exchange. Some successful wallpaper manufacturers were less fortunate in their business outside London. James Wheeley, whose prestigious premises in Aldersgate Street can be seen in his trade below, described in his will what 'a great sufferer I have been in the Country by their continually breaking in my debt or I might have had many thousands of pounds to leave to my friends and Relations'. His advice to his nephew was to give up the country trade as 'it takes much money and credit and the debts are difficult to be recovered. I rather recommend him to serve the Upholders warehouses and town trade as most secure'.71

69 Berg, Luxury, pp. 123, 140 & 186.
70 Morning Post, 23 December 1803.
However, the numerous advertisements for the sale of London wallpapers in the contemporary provincial press indicate that for many, this was a very worthwhile trade. P. Birchall’s advertisement in 1787 for his ‘extensive variety’ of wallpapers from several London firms for sale at his upholstery and cabinet warehouse in Queens Square, Bath is typical of the regional response to the outreach of the London trade. Other London manufacturers grasped the regional market more directly with a named advertising campaign: James Woodmason, already a wealthy stationer and now

---

72 Gazetteer, 9 April 1797.
wallpaper manufacturer of 21 New Bond St, launched an advertising campaign in the press surrounding his 'new invented paper hangings' which had owners of Bath's cabinet and upholstery warehouses, including Birchall, vying with each other to present the public every assortment of his wallpapers at the fairest prices ranging broadly from 2½d to 2s 6d.\(^73\)

The ability to compete for a growing number of regional customers, as well as supply the increasing number of shops and retail outlets in London that sold wallpapers meant that the competition for market share was fierce. As such, those who could operate on a wholesale level were more likely to succeed than others. The ability to extend credit on large orders, to employ a travelling representative, or indeed leave the premises in charge of paid workman if this was undertaken by the master himself, plus the sending out of pattern samples, on which excise tax was also payable, required initial financial outlay and such would have precluded many smaller tradesmen from operating in and benefitting from these lucrative arenas.

**Overseas Markets and the Export Trade in Wallpapers**

The successful growth of the London wallpaper trade in the eighteenth century lay also in its ability to harness consumer markets abroad. During the second half of the eighteenth century British manufactured goods enjoyed a popularity and reputation for fashion, quality and desirability in international markets as well as her own colonies. Commercial interests stretched from North America, Canada and the Caribbean to Europe and as far as Asia for her ceramics, glassware, metal ornaments and objects, coaches, clocks and clothing.\(^74\) Markets for these goods all experienced an energetic growth that contributed to the expansion of these industries at home. The London wallpaper trade also engaged with this rising tide of demand for British manufactured goods, embarking on an export market that it ran in parallel to its own home trade. Mortimer, again commenting on the health of the trade in 1763, wrote that wallpaper had 'lately become a considerable branch of commerce in this country

---

\(^73\) Bath Chronicle, 19 July 1787; 21 August 1788.

\(^74\) Berg, Luxury, p. 283.
for we annually export vast quantities of this admired article and the home consumption is not less considerable...”

The English market in export wallpaper was certainly a profitable one. Treasury records indicate that in 1772 England had exported 828,937 square yards of stained paper. Similarly figures available for the export of wallpaper per decade to Canada in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, indicate a dramatic increase from 13,076 pieces exported in 1760 to 59473 by the 1780s. McKendrick touches on the conflicting theories around the importance of Britain’s export markets to the growth of home trade. Without reliable comparative data for quantity of wallpapers exported versus home consumption, the importance of the wallpaper trade’s exports to its overall growth is difficult to gauge. However, the fashionable consumption abroad of English-manufactured luxury goods is not in dispute and as Berg describes, in the case of North America, ‘the response to...British goods was not just habitual; it was enthusiastic.’ Breen describes the mutual benefits of the Anglo-American trade in British manufactured goods, outlining the bewildering array of choice in luxury and household goods by the 1760s that would have amazed American consumers thirty or so years earlier.

The vogue for English wallpapers abroad in the second half of the eighteenth century has been well established, particularly in the case of France and America. High status consumers of English wallpapers, such as Madame de Pompadour in 1754 and Benjamin Franklin and George Washington in the 1760s are often cited as an indication of the success of these papers. However, the trade with the rest of Europe is less well documented. In addition to the export of English wallpapers to France and

75 Mortimer, Universal Director, p.54.
76 N.A: T64/276B/407, Treasury records: 1766 Xmas-1772 Xmas, Quantity of painted or stained paper exported annually, 16 June 1773.
78 McKendrick, Consumer Society, p.30. Theorists are divided as to whether economic growth in this period owed more to the success of export markets rather than home demand, or whether the export trade was simply an adjunct to a successful home market.
79 Berg, Luxury, p.296. Berg’s chapter on ‘Mercantile Theatres: British Commodities and American Consumers’ pp. 279-325 also outlines the popularity of British made luxury goods in Northern Europe.
81 See for example, Hoskins, Papered Wall, p. 78 and pp. 144-120; Entwisle, Literary History p. 31.
America, there was also a successful trade with Germany, Russia, the Netherlands and Portugal and with northern Europe, as with other British exports, being serviced in part through trade with the commercial centre of Hamburg.\(^{82}\)

Trade was carried out through a number of different channels. Dependence on the surviving archive material from wealthy customers and colonial elites has emphasised the personal contact directly between the richer consumer and their agent with wallpaper manufacturers and retail outlets in London. George Washington for example, in 1763 was ordering wallpapers directly from London manufacturers, and the manufacturing firm Duppa and Co of Lombard St was also exporting on this personal level.\(^{83}\)

However, a much larger wholesale trade was clearly established, serving middle class customers in Britain's colonies and in Europe. As with England's export trade in general, business was transacted by numerous independent merchants, who would carry on the trade on behalf of wallpaper manufacturers. In the Austrian Netherlands for example, a line of trade operated from the manufacturer through the London merchant Aaron Sharpe of Walbrook who supplied wallpapers and sent samples to Brussels lace seller Caroline D'Halluin. She in turn supplied a local market, but also sent orders on to Frankfurt and Aix-le Chapelle.\(^{84}\) Wallpaper manufacturers and merchants such as Sharpe may well have been exploiting existing networks and contacts already established through other British luxury goods such as textiles.

Certainly access to British manufactured goods such as wallpaper appears to have been fairly trouble-free. Mrs Calderwood of Polton, Midlothian wrote in her diary of her visit to Brussels in 1756 that 'the rent of the house in Brussels was only 191

---


guilders and this was furnished, hung with an English flowered paper, all within the space of 10 days'.

As the pace of Britain's export trade quickened in the second half of the eighteenth century, entrepreneurial manufacturers and retailers of wallpaper sought to further extend the market for London wallpapers. Wholesale stationers, who also controlled the exports of paper from the paper mills, were active in this development. William Lepard, who had a stationery shop in Tooley St, Southwark in 1757, described in his journal how he embarked upon 'an adventure' to New York on the Queen of Sheba, with two cases of paper hangings to sell valued at £36 1s 9d. Not content to wait for the result of the sales in America, he also embarked on a second enterprise to Philadelphia with a Captain Bradshaw and a total outlay worth £53 14s 1d. As Lepard's annual turnover at this time was £800, the £53 represents a significant commitment to this enterprise and betrays a confidence in the potential for profitable reward.

Speculative enterprises such as this were not without high risk however. Although Lepard went on to establish a very successful stationery business, these two ventures did not end profitably. In the case of the Philadelphia trip, the ship was seized by the Crown and pressed into service to carry troops to New York. Bradshaw was eventually able to sell the wallpapers on to an American merchant, however it took almost five years for Lepard to receive his payment.

Lack of control over both the operations and the actions of overseas agents were typical problems for manufacturers trading abroad at this time. Those hungry for trade also might be tempted to accept orders on credit without knowing the credentials of the merchants. This was the case with Cornelius Taylor, London paper-stainer, who was defrauded of a large quantity of wallpapers in 1768 by Roger Prate masquerading as a merchant with promises of several interested contacts overseas.

---

85 Entwisle, Literary History, p.31.
87 It seems some insurance was available to Lepard at 8%, but in the event this premium covered the whole stock of the ship rather than just his own goods and therefore was worth considerably less when realised. Owen, Lepard and Smiths Ltd, 1757-1957 (1957), p.4.
88 O.B.P.C.T., 6 December 1769. In the 1790s Moore and Co of Cornhill were more cautious in their transactions, advertising wallpapers for export at the 'short' (wholesale) prices to merchants and
Furthermore, the slow return on sales on such large initial outlays meant that like other British traders, wallpaper manufacturers and retailers wishing to take advantage of this lucrative trade would necessarily have to be sufficiently well established in the first place, in order to absorb the loss in the short term. Nonetheless, the potential for success was huge for those enterprising enough to become involved in markets abroad. James Woodmason, operating his wholesale and retail stationery business in Leadenhall Street, for example, wrote to Parliament in 1785 appealing for a drawback on the tax payable on exported English wallpapers. Woodmason stated that should a drawback be instated he intended to pursue a new patent for manufacture with the intention of capitalising on the market for wallpaper overseas.\textsuperscript{89} By the 1790s, scientific author, Johannes Beckmann bemoaned the state of his home trade in Germany stating:

\begin{quote}
My countrymen are indeed only imitators, not through want of talents to invent or to improve, but because our great people, for whom they must labour, consider nothing as fashionable or beautiful except what has been first made by the French or the English.\textsuperscript{90}
\end{quote}

English exporters however, were indeed worried about competition from foreign manufacturers and guarded their interests carefully. As early as 1752 the key manufacturers and stationers involved in the export of wallpaper had written to Parliament regarding a challenge to their interests in Russia. This had come in the form of a bankrupted fellow wallpaper tradesman whom they described as:

\begin{quote}
one Butler an extravagant and debauched Manufacturer, [who] having a few years since left this Kingdom (although endeavours were used to prevent him) and got into Russia, has been attempting ever since to supplant his Country captains and also to the country trade, provided that 'reference for payment was made in Town'.\end{quote}

\textit{Whitehall Evening Post}, 22 June 1790.

\textsuperscript{89} N.A: T1/624/343-344.

\textsuperscript{90} J. Beckmann, \textit{A History of Inventions and Discoveries} (London, 1797), vol. 2, p.166.
Men, by engaging to direct and instruct the people there in this Branch of Business.\textsuperscript{91}

As we have seen, similar concerns were raised in 1768 when talented wallpaper pattern drawers were seen to be emigrating to France for a better standard of living.\textsuperscript{92}

Although there was a free exchange of wallpaper trade personnel between Britain and Europe in this period, the prospect of industrial espionage was a different matter. Entrepreneurial wallpaper manufacturers on the other hand sought to secure and develop further markets abroad, at least in Britain’s colonies, by setting up branches of their own manufactories there. Birch and Ouvry of Fleet St for example had a satellite business in Augusta Richmond, Georgia. In addition, a newspaper notice of 1766 describes the establishment of a manufactory in New York in which 100 journeymen had been sent over to work.\textsuperscript{93} Other colonies such as Jamaica also saw the establishment of manufactories with investment from home.\textsuperscript{94}

The existence of these outposts of the London trade must have provided a financial cushion for some home firms following the disruption to trade during the American Revolutionary Wars of 1775-1783. In the new mercantile climate that emerged after Independence was established, there was still a market for English wallpapers in America despite competition from an enthusiastic, developing American home industry, and also from the growing popularity of French wallpapers there.\textsuperscript{95} Similarly, although trade in general was disrupted during wars with France between 1793 and 1815, figures for overall exports of wallpaper continued to rise in the period.

\textsuperscript{91} N.A: EXT 1/299/3, Memorial of the Principal Exporters, 1752. Butler, who had had a manufactory in Legg Alley in Long Acre, had got into financial difficulties and had fled abroad. He left at least two apprentices mid-contract who in later life appealed for poor relief. O.B.P.P.E., 22 April 1773 & 4 August 1784.

\textsuperscript{92} Gazetteer, 26 February 1768.

\textsuperscript{93} N.A: PROB 11/1317/63 Will of Chamberlain Birch, 10 January 1799; Bath Chronicle, 7 August 1766. The figure of 100 journeymen seems very high for the size of the trade in the 1760’s. Typographical error is a possibility, however, there is no further documentation on who established this huge enterprise.

\textsuperscript{94} Bath Chronicle, 23 April 1767. The manufactory, established in Port Royal may have had connections with the firm Salt and Baker, paper-stainers and stationers in Cheapside, through family connections with Thomas Elsley of Jamaica. See N.A: PROB 11/1081/156 Will of John Salt, 16 August 1781; East Sussex Record Office administrative history to documents KIR/ Archive of the Baker Family.

thereafter, from a total of 3,436,503 square yards exported in 1816 to 6,342,596 in 1829. According to the Irish wallpaper manufacturer Patrick Boylan commenting in 1822, there was both a home and a foreign trade in wallpapers in England, and English manufacturers who were experimenting with new pattern designs had the advantage of being able to pass off any unsuccessful styles on their export markets. Emphasis could also be placed on cheapness and cut price designs, including those made by papermaker, stationer and wallpaper manufacturer Thomas Vallance of Cheapside who advertised his wallpapers as 'suitable for foreign climates' in 1803.

Maxine Berg argues that eighteenth-century merchants in North America at any rate, were more discerning than has previously been thought in their handling of stock from English manufacturers. She outlines a similar strategy in the ceramics and indigo trades, for example, in passing off old stock on the American market. However, she suggests that there was a backlash against this from the American merchants with many insisting on dealing only in good quality imported goods. What seems likely for the London wallpaper trade is that it was possible to operate on a variety of levels of quality. Of course, high quality wallpapers could be had in England's overseas markets but there was also clearly a wider market for cheaper goods, which in the highly competitive European and post-Revolutionary North American markets would involve the capacity to make a profit on goods sold for lower prices.

Certainly during the second half of the eighteenth century onwards, the profits to be made from markets overseas contributed greatly to the growth of the home industry in wallpapers. Established commercial links and personal trade networks across the Atlantic, particularly where manufactories had been set up by businesses still with connections to home, should have made the survival of British interests here possible. Elsewhere, supplying the British diaspora in the colonies also ensured the health of the home trade. The British army in Canada in 1807 for example were supplied with N.A: CUST 145/48 Board of Customs and Excise Quarterly Revenue Accounts, 1816 - 1829. Third Report of the Commissioners of Enquiry into the Collection and Management of the Revenue Arising in Ireland, (1822), H.C.P.P., pp. 24-30. Bath Chronicle, 22 September 1803; Salisbury and Winchester Journal, 25 July 1803. Berg, Luxury, p. 314 and p. 324.
British wallpapers for the decoration of quarters across several different ranks. The consumer culture established at home during this period spread to other countries and therefore strengthened those in the wallpaper trade who were sufficiently successful in the home market to be able to operate on a large scale abroad.

**Conclusion**

The connections between the London wholesale stationery trade and the wallpaper trade were influential in establishing the hierarchical structure of the latter by the mid-eighteenth century. Stationers either branched into printing wallpapers themselves or were able to supply a small group of associates in the wallpaper trade with raw materials in a mutually beneficial commercial relationship that meant that the trade at this stage was led by a core of wholesale traders and upper bourgeoisie. Consumers in the first few years following the perfection of the printing process were also confined to the wealthier classes. However, a broader market soon emerged amongst the growing number of middle classes, a large proportion of which were living in burgeoning towns and newly developed areas of London or belonged to a similar demographic in countries overseas. It can be argued therefore that the market for new affordable consumer goods such as wallpaper from this point was largely an urban phenomenon formed by middling class consumers in the main. This provides an important corrective to many studies that have focussed on the better documented survivals of wallpaper in country houses as the drivers of the success of the trade.

In addition, rather than emulate the taste of wealthier classes, a more affordable range of wallpapers was made available to these groups, driven by the manufacturers and involving the reduction of production and labour costs. Whilst all these middling groups bought the same intrinsic product as the wealthy, they did so for very different reasons. The ability to offer an expedient, practical and economical method of house decoration at the same time fulfilling the requirements of fashionable appeal in a new middle class consumer culture ensured that the London wallpaper manufacturers were in train to establish themselves as an internationally admired trade mark.

---

chapter looks at the effect of this success on the structure of the trade and the implications for the production of wallpapers.
Chapter Two: Wealth and Growth of the Trade in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century.

Introduction

The second half of the eighteenth century was a period of expansion for many trades producing goods for the home. Unprecedented levels of house building took place in the 1770s and 1780s, particularly in London but also across the country including many estates of houses built in Liverpool, Bristol, Newcastle, Manchester, Birmingham and Nottingham.¹ Many of these new houses were built for a new emerging demographic of middling classes, of skilled and semi-skilled tradesmen, shopkeepers, professionals and urban gentry who sought to furnish, decorate and equip their homes as best their income could allow. Historians studying the luxury goods trades in the second half of the eighteenth century have shown that the growth and success of these trades were due to the emergence of this new broad group of middling class consumers with disposal income to spend on personal and domestic goods. Consumption patterns previously confined to a narrow elite now spread to a much larger group of consumers. The market for these goods was not homogenised however, and manufacturers of goods such as pottery, metal-wares and textiles all sought to meet rising consumer demand by offering a range of products at different prices.²

This was made possible in no small measure by to the use of new, cheaper or lightweight materials such as Sheffield plate instead of solid silver, printed cottons instead of heavy wool worsteds and cheaper earthenware pottery alongside porcelain.³ The novelty of these products also contributed to their success as well as their cheaper price. The fashionable appeal of new drinks such as tea and chocolate helped in the spread of demand for new pottery from mid-century onwards for example.⁴ In the luxury silver-ware trades too, Clifford has shown how manufacturers successfully sold Sheffield plate, a cheaper and lighter alternative to solid silver to the wealthy elite as well as the broader middle class market on the grounds of its new and

¹ M. Berg, Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth Century Britain (Oxford, 2005), p.224-5. Berg states that 40-50 percent of houses built between 1750-1800 were in towns.
² Berg’s Luxury provides the most comprehensive over-view of work to date.
fashionable appeal. We can see a similar incidence in the wallpaper trade, whereby fashion for this product gave it appeal across several social groups, whilst as a cheaper form of wall decoration, appealing on grounds of economy and expediency to the middle classes and the building trade. (See Chapter One). The wallpaper trade therefore represented an increasingly segmented market, in which manufacturers varied the complexity of their patterns, the number of colours used and the quality of materials employed, in order to produce a more or less expensive product. Many manufacturers advertised their stock 'from the common to the richest papers'. Here elegant compositions produced by skilled craftsmen were offered alongside what was termed 'common papers' of simpler designs with fewer colours and aimed at a more modest market.

The manufacturing methods used to produce these consumer goods including wallpaper, were essentially based on hand craft techniques. The increased demand for these products brought about changes in how these trades were structured, operated and financed. McKendrick and Chapman have both shown how in the pottery and calico printing trades respectively, demand was met in large part by the organisation of the trade into large firms run by small groups of energetic entrepreneurs such as Josiah Wedgewood and the Peel family of Lancashire. Yet wallpapers were a larger and less essential item than ceramics or textiles and whilst it was a desirable product, it was less easily sold on such a wide scale. Nonetheless, London directory figures for those manufacturing wallpaper increased from 10 in the 1760s to 28 by the 1790s.

The numbers involved in the luxury goods trades in this period are difficult to quantify, however. Historians have identified some of the problems associated with data
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6 See for example Newcastle Courant, 22 June 1782 & Public Advertiser, 31 August 1754.
7 Chapter Four deals more fully with the organisation of labour in luxury goods trades.
gathering from trade directories, not least the often limited data coverage to major streets only and inaccuracies in nomenclature of trades.\(^{10}\) In the latter for example, the terms paper-stainer, paper hanging maker and paper hanging manufacturer can be interchangeable within the same directory. We may assume that the former implies a craftsman labourer, whilst the manufacturer implies the owner of a firm. Similarly the term paper hanger used in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to mean a retailer of wallpapers but additionally by the nineteenth to also mean 'decorator' as well.

Many of the growing number of wholesalers, small producers and shopkeepers in the expanding consumer goods market were from the broad and disparate group of the middle classes, and the amounts required to set up and operate in a trade varied widely. Nonetheless, the small size of the wallpaper trade makes it easier to cross reference data on those involved using nominal record linkage and thus it is possible to build up a clearer picture of the size and extent of the trade at this time. This chapter examines what was required to set up in business as a 'maker of wallpaper' and discusses the structure of the trade in the second half of the eighteenth century. This allows us to look more closely at the expansion in numbers involved in the trade, and, more widely, at what this may have meant to the practice of the trade.

**How Much Did it Cost to Set up as a Paper-stainer?**

In 1786, George Kearsley’s *Table of Trades for the Assistance of Parents and Guardians* described the costs of setting up in business as a 'paper hanging maker' as between £200 - £600.\(^ {11} \) Comparable costs for other luxury goods trades in Kearsley's figures have a much wider margin: for example, to set up as a cabinet maker could cost between £100 - 3000; a calico printer £300- 3000; and a 'chinaman' who dealt in the ceramics trade plus a 'toyman' who manufactured ornamental metal-wares both required £100 - 5000. The top figure in these cases is likely to represent the costs required in setting up a shop front, in operating at the upper end of a more affluent
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market, or at a wholesale level. The lower figures cited for starting up in the wallpaper business would seem to suggest that Kearsley saw this trade as that of a maker rather than both maker and retailer as well, possibly with the merchandising and therefore associated shop overheads being carried out by stationers and upholsters. In this respect, whilst the trade was seen as requiring more capital to set up at base level, in comparison to the other trades it was deemed possible to operate within the trade at a more artisanal level than with some other luxury goods trades.

By the second half of the eighteenth century involvement in trade was no longer seen as an ignoble activity. Fortunes could be made by merchants who were then able afford luxury commodities and clothing as well as to enjoy the same genteel leisure pursuits and refinements that had previously been the preserve of the 'gentleman'. Amongst the growing number of middle class tradesmen associated with this increasingly consumer orientated society, a hierarchy of trade 'respectability' also came to be established. This was not just based on personal reputation and trust, but also on grounds of the physical cleanliness of a trade or on the artistic skill required to practise it. Trades ranged from 'genteel' to 'dirty genteel' through 'genteelish' to 'ordinary',' mean' or 'mean nasty and stinking'. Not only were there recognised criteria for acceptability and refinement amongst professions, but also between roles within individual professions themselves. The paper-staining trade was seen as ranking among the 'useful and genteel' occupations by contemporary commentators, alongside the professions of upholsterer and cabinet maker, no doubt due to their association with a luxury goods market.

As Penelope Corfield has suggested, over the course of the eighteenth century, the emergence of more specialist yet also interconnected occupations were in part a cause, and part an effect of Britain’s commercial expansion through new manufactured
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14 Mortimer, Dictionary, p.44; Gazetteer, 26 February 1768; P. Kirkham points out the grading of status within the cabinet making trade, with craftsmen producing finer work at a much higher status than general furniture makers, ‘Furniture Making in London c 1700-1870: Craft, Design, Business and Labour’, PhD thesis (Queen Mary, University of London, 1982), p. 81.
goods both at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, new trades setting up in business both within the City of London and its surrounding areas were less confined than established trades by the regulations and traditional structure of the City's guild system and were therefore freer to shape their own hierarchical arrangements. Journeymen able to put some savings by, or benefit from an inheritance, for example, would thus have been able to gain a foothold on the ladder of self-employment.

We can expect that a range of wage levels was paid within the industry itself. Semi-skilled paper-stainers could be paid very little, at 10-12s per week,\textsuperscript{16} however, a core of skilled paper-stainers was clearly required to operate a successful business. These men would have been paid closer to the figures identified by contemporary trade manuals, at between 14shillings to £1 1shilling per week, no doubt dependant on their level of expertise and the individual firm employing them.\textsuperscript{17} Journeymen paper-stainers such as John Lindley from York, who worked for the established concern run by Abraham Hall in Aldermanbury (formerly Price's Blue Paper Warehouse, Image 3), earned enough to be able to afford a leasehold property in City Garden Row, and leave a legacy of £125 to his son Robert on his death in 1790. Similarly, an incident of theft recorded in the proceedings of the Old Bailey in 1774, from the home of journeyman paper-stainer Lewis Hales, is suggestive of a comfortable standard of living. Hales lost several items of clothing and small items worth 65 shillings. He was evidently able to afford to give his daughter a half guinea and a quarter guinea, as these coins were also stolen from the child's money box.\textsuperscript{18}

Nonetheless, setting up a reputable paper-staining enterprise would have required some investment in capital assets. Amongst these would have been hand tools, printing tables and blocks (either pre-carved, or with tools by which to carve them) and utensils to prepare paints, including colour mills to grind pigments.\textsuperscript{19} Working capital would also be required for premises rental, wages for a boy to assist with the printing,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} P. J. Corfield, 'Business Leaders and Town Gentry in Early Industrial Britain: Specialist Occupations and Shared Urbanism' Urban History, 39, 1 (February 2012), pp. 49-50.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Gazetteer, 26 February 1768, see Chapter One, p. 31.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Collyer (1761) suggests a figure of 20s per week, Parent's Directory, p.208. Kearsley (1786) suggests a range of 14s - £1 1s, Table of Trades, p.13.
\item \textsuperscript{18} N.A: PROB 11/1189/233, Will of John Lindley, 22 March 1790; O.B.P.C.T., 12th Jan 1774.
\item \textsuperscript{19} See Appendix One: The Block Printing Process.
\end{itemize}
and the ability to extend credit to customers from the start. Outlay on the raw materials of paper and paint would also be required. James Wheeley's will indicates that he kept reams of 'unworked paper' in his workshop, and the bankruptcy sale of Robert Pickering in 1794 listed 400 reams of paper amongst his assets.\footnote{N.A: PROB 11/1180/310, Will of James Wheeley, 27 June 1789; Whitehall Evening Post, 2 January 1794.} There was also the matter of the excise duties to be paid on the paper once decorated. From 1714 this stood at \(1\frac{1}{2}\) per square yard until 1779 when it rose incrementally through the 1780s to \(1\frac{3}{4}\)d per square yard by 1788, remaining at this rate until the tax was repealed in 1836.\footnote{The Fourteenth Report of the Commissioners of Enquiry into the Excise Establishment and into the Management and Collection of the Excise Revenue throughout the United Kingdom, H.C.P.P., 1835, p. 73; H. Dagnall, The Tax On Wallpaper; An Account of the Excise Duty on Stained Paper: 1712-1836 (London, 1990), p.17.} From 1784, in a further revenue generating exercise and to keep track of those from whom excise was due, an annual licence costing £2 was also required for those operating a paper-staining business.\footnote{Sixteenth Parliament of Britain; First Session (18 May 1784 - 20 August 1784), 1 July 1784, p. 279.} Throughout the period, the excise regulations on the wallpaper trade, whether viewed as restrictive or not, were seen by some as a protective measure that ensured that the unqualified were prevented from joining the trade and damaging its reputation by the lowering of standards.\footnote{Gazetteer, 26 February 1768; Fourteenth Report, H.C.P.P., p. 129. See also Chapter Six.}

Those who did not run their trade from a shop premises, but sold on to stationers and uphololders, may well have been able to operate on a much smaller scale and with less capital outlay. A fall in the price of paper in the 1780s caused by an overstocked market may have benefitted these smaller tradesmen.\footnote{Evidence given to Parliament by Henry Fourdrinier in N.A: CUST 103/15 Excise Trials Vol. 531, February 1785 to March 1785, p. 218.} Furthermore, the simplicity of the printing process meant that production was possible in a small workshop environment, where a paper-stainer could print simple patterns with a small stock of wooden blocks on a domestic table. This level of operation leaves very little trace in the primary sources and is difficult to quantify. However, in a market place dominated by wealthy stationers and manufacturers associated with them, their individual output must have constituted only a small proportion of the overall trade.
Defining the Trade

As noted above, the setting up costs described in contemporary guides are broad bracketed figures. Within these figures were a myriad of permutations representing different operating levels of businesses. Attempts to assess the nature of trades in the second half of the eighteenth century and quantify the numbers involved in them are further complicated by the seasonality of some trades, the holding of multiple occupations and the crossover of cognate occupations at this time. Wallpaper production was one such seasonal trade. The demand for wallpapers, like many metropolitan luxury goods in the eighteenth century, was affected by the influx of visitors generated by the London 'Season'. Campbell in *The London Tradesman* describes how some occupations connected with interior and exterior house decoration were idle from winter to spring when the 'Company' were in town.25 Comments in *The Observer* on the 8 May 1796 also describe an eight month season for the paper hanging trade. Wallpaper production itself in the second half of the eighteenth century followed a seasonal pattern, which was characteristically less busy in the winter, with most production done in the early spring and summer months. This was not least because of a dependency on warmer weather for the making and drying of the paper itself, and also the longer daylight hours necessary to facilitate the printing of the designs. The contemporary press bears witness to the increase in advertisements for the sale of wallpaper which experienced a boost in demand for new fashions each spring.26

In order to overcome the problems associated with the seasonality of many trades and also as a response to the unreliability of steady employment, the holding of multiple occupations was a common practice in the eighteenth century.27 Many paper-stainers also diversified into other trades such as innkeeper or draper in order to make ends meet. Clement Mumford, dealer in coals and paper-stainer in Jerwin Street managed to operate two seasonal trades that were complementary. Others also ran separate businesses concurrently, such as Thomas Dicker who had a small paper-staining business and also a 'Bunn Shop' in City Rd in the 1790s. Dicker was clearly a man of
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26 For example see St James' Chronicle, 7 April 1787 & 17 April 1790
modest means as his will dictates that aside from stock in trade of both businesses, his disposable income left for his 'beloved son' amounted to one shilling, while to his wife he left his savings of £15 held in the Free and Easy Society.\textsuperscript{28}

This type of flexible employment structure was typical for many trades in the Capital in the second half of the eighteenth century and meant that small scale production based on little fixed capital and carried out on an ad hoc basis was likely to be a feature of the paper-staining trade. We can expect a similar pattern amongst some journeymen and semi-skilled paper-stainers who were employed by a master and who might have been laid off when the seasonal demand had passed, and thus were only temporary craftsmen for a period of time. Those laid off may have worked at a different trade entirely or as a self-employed paper-stainer operating on a very small scale as a single artisan. Similarly acquisition of pre-carved printing blocks and some basic tools, perhaps inherited or second hand, might allow the semi-skilled workers within the trade to operate their own small concern producing basic simple designs for a period of time.

This temporary, seasonal fluidity within the trade in the second half of the eighteenth century, makes it difficult to quantify the number of paper-stainers and businesses operating in the London trade outside those listed in the trade directories. Furthermore the nomenclature used to describe tradesmen in these sources can be misleading. For example, the term 'paper-stainer' used in trade directories, wills and bankruptcy notices could encompass a single artisan-craftsman or owner of a very large concern. Similarly the term 'paper hanger' could mean a large wholesaler or small retailer of wallpapers, plus also a literal interpretation of the term as a 'decorator' in the sense that we recognise today. Difficulties in quantifying the size of the paper-staining trade in London at this time are also increased due to the traditional overlapping relationship between stationers and wallpaper makers. In particular there is a blurring of lines between small scale stationers who both made and sold their own wallpapers and those selling wallpapers made by others amongst their other stationery wares.

\textsuperscript{28} N.A: PROB 11/1551/393 Will of Clement Mumford, 29 January 1814; PROB 11/1224/236 Will of Thomas Dicker, 13 November 1792.
Image 8. shows an example of a notebook backed with wallpaper - part of the stock in trade of stationers. It is difficult to establish if these wallpapers were made by stationers and sold as wallpapers as well as being used as decorative covers for stationery or if they had been bought as already made wallpapers and used then to cover books.

Some stationers also supplied paper hanging labour alongside the wallpapers that they sold. Advertisements for a position as stationer in the *General Evening Post* on 2 September 1790 for example, indicates that 'bookbinding, paper hanging, colouring and ornamenting of rooms' was seen as a likely range of skills for a stationer. The 'colouring and ornamenting of rooms' also included the painting of plain, single colour schemes upon papered walls which were finished with a pre-printed decorative border. This type of scheme, shown in Image 9 below, was very fashionable in this period, at least from the last quarter of the eighteenth century and on into the nineteenth. Its execution meant that it was also subject to excise payment as it involved the 'painting or staining' of paper. The fact that stationers who carried out this type of work could also been termed as paper-stainers in some contemporary sources must be borne in mind when estimating the organisation of the trade at this point.

Image 9. Portrait of John Middleton with his Family in his Drawing Room, Unknown Artist, c. 1797. Middleton himself was a successful colourman in St Martin's Lane, who also diversified into the manufacture of wallpaper. The portrait of his family within this fashionable interior provides a positive
reinforcement to the observer of the success of his two businesses. Museum of London Collection: 93.28.

There were also crossovers with other occupations sharing cognate skills, such as print engravers, printers and book binders. Other forms of printed or ornamental paper are likely to have been used as wall decoration in some capacity, for example wallpapers produced by engraving, and marbled papers. The extent of the trade in wallpapers made from engraved metal plates rather than relief printing by carved blocks is not well understood. Again, as with wood block printing, it had close associations with the methods also used by the calico printing trade. Engraving involves incising a pattern onto metal plates with a sharp pointed tool and thus makes possible the production of a much finer detailed, elegant design than is possible via the more humble wood block. As such the engraved process lent itself to the reproduction of patterns depicting detailed pictorial subjects, including figures in bucolic landscapes and romantic architectural imagery. English textile printers were leaders in this production by the 1760s, although the French Toiles de Jouy also became very fashionable for use as wall hangings, bed curtains and upholstery in the second half of the eighteenth century.29 Naturally the wallpaper trade in general took advantage of this opportunity for product innovation, particularly when driven by the fashion for matching and displaying wallpaper, curtain and upholstery fabrics in the same setting.30 Thus, in 1753, Edward Deighton obtained a patent for producing wallpapers by engraved metal plates which were then coloured and gilded by hand using 'camell hair pencils'.31

Intaglio printing on paper also requires the use of finer grade, oil based paints which have a much longer drying time than the more chalky, water based distemper paints used for wood block printing. As such engraved wallpapers were likely to have taken longer to produce and so therefore also to have been more expensive.32 Deighton was in business with John Sigrist by the 1770s, who sold this type of wallpaper from his shop in Piccadilly in styles imitating 'India Landscapes [Chinese export wallpapers],

29 Chapman and Chassagne, Textiles, p. 18.
32 Chapman and Chassagne suggest that the printed textiles produced by copper plate were also more likely to have been made for an upper class market and those by block printing for a more popular market. Textiles, p. 133.
Figures, Flowers, Birds etc and Matches Silks, Chintzs, Cotton, Linens etc’.  

Munns and Co of Knightsbridge also produced engraved wallpapers alongside block printed ones, as the sale for their business in 1804 offered 'several hundred blocks...[and] a valuable copper-plate printing press'.  

Mathius Darly, at the Golden Acorn Facing Hungerford in the Strand, also produced engraved wallpapers as well as practising as a copper plate printer generally, producing amongst other things engraved plates for Chippendale's *Gentleman's and Cabinetmakers' Directory*. Darly's trade card in the British Library shows that he advertised as an engraved wallpaper manufacturer as well as engraver.  

We can hypothesize therefore, that others who survive listed in trade directories only as engravers may also have been involved in some aspect of the wallpaper trade, even on a small scale, producing forms of ornamental wall decorations such as engraved borders, pictures for chimney pieces, print rooms and over-door decorations.

This may also have been the case with the manufacture of ornamental marbled paper. As a product of the stationery and bookbinding trades it is likely that this type of paper was used in some interior decorative context, particularly as the vogue for wallpapers imitating marble progressed in the last quarter of the century. These were made by floating coloured oil paints in abstract patterns on a water-based surface and gently laying over sheets of paper to pick up the pattern. A lack of sufficient extant examples of wallpapers made by both the marbling and engraving processes make quantification of these trades difficult. However, both processes were slower than distemper printing and as such lay outside the trades' mainstream production. Yet both the trades of copper plate engraver and marbled paper maker had lower entry thresholds than that of conventional paper-stainer: Kearsley suggests a required start up figure of
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34 *Morning Post*, 8 May 1804.
£50-£200 and £30-£80 respectively for a copper plate printer and marble paper maker.  

In attempting to evaluate the size and arrangement of the wallpaper trade as a whole in this period, it is worth noting that at this small scale production level, the maker and retailer of wallpapers was a more nuanced profession, involving a range of other concurrent and inter linking professions. The selling and making of wallpapers either by block printing, engraving or otherwise may have been a secondary or tertiary occupation for some and carried out on such a small scale as to go unmarked in trade directories and other listings.

**Personal Wealth**

The 'minute social distinctions' within eighteenth century trades, between artisan, labourer, journeyman and master, and the possibility for fluidity of movement between these roles was established by Dorothy George as early as 1925. It was not uncommon for journeymen to work for a master and also have his own business, possibly employing unskilled labourer or apprentices. Historians have echoed these observations on upward mobility when explaining the growth of middling social and commercial groups in the late Georgian period, which saw the emergence of masters turned manufacturers, specialist shopkeepers and new professional roles such as auctioneers, accountants and surveyors. More recently, Penelope Corfield has argued for a confident 'shared urbanism' between middle class and aristocracy based on overlapping commercial and social networks and manifest in contiguous entries in contemporary trade directories.

However, it is possible to make some further observations on the income status of those who were joining the London wallpaper trade in the second half of the eighteenth century. In order to quantify occupational and income distinctions between tradespeople in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, historians have examined data found in probate records and the policy registers of fire insurance
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37 Kearsley, *Table of Trades*, pp. 5 & 11.
companies. This methodology has been adopted in this study in order to ascertain income distribution amongst those involved in the London wallpaper trade. Although the number of businesses and the output of the trade increased in this period, recognisable names occurring in trade directories, and found again in insurance policy registers and probate documents suggest that the trade was composed of a significant proportion of manufacturers from the wealthier end of the middle classes upwards, who would have delegated work, rather than populated by increasing numbers of individual trading artisans working in small-scale workshops.

Let us look first at the evidence from Probate records: For this the records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and the Consistory Court of the Bishop of London were consulted. These indicate that a significant number of those involved in the wallpaper trade were at least moderately wealthy. There is a continuation of the trend outlined in Chapter One for the trade to include some wealthy individuals, whose customers would have included more affluent middle classes, gentry and elite clientele. Robert Stark of Ludgate Hill for example (whose customers included Sir John Cust, Speaker of the House of Commons, at Belton, Lincolnshire and George Lucy at Charlote Park), on his death circa 1783 left cash legacies amounting to over £2800 and a house in Edmonton with a pleasure garden, fish pond, paddock and coach house. Similarly, Abraham Hall whose large business was a wholesale concern and therefore served a wider consumer base, also left a large freehold estate in the City Road, over £4,500 and jewellery including a gold watch and a diamond ring in a red leather case.

It is acknowledged that the Prerogative Court of Canterbury dealt mainly with the wills of relatively wealthy people.\textsuperscript{45} However, evidence can also be found of paper-stainers of more modest means who also used this court and who left relatively small cash legacies below £30 to counterbalance this.\textsuperscript{46} These wills indicate that for many involved in the wallpaper trade, surplus funds were being generated, which were in turn invested elsewhere outside the business. Of a sample survey of 30 testators involved in the wallpaper trade who wrote wills between 1750 and 1810, at least 16 were able to afford additional investments in stock and annuity schemes in the Bank of England, in particular in consolidated government stock, with a small number of those placing savings in friendly and benefit societies.\textsuperscript{47}

Mary Rose in her study of the Greg family of cotton manufacturers identifies government stock as among the traditional outlets for external business investment in this period, the purpose of which was to protect businessmen and their families against the vagaries of the trade cycle. Alastair Owens also stresses the importance accorded to government stock investments as a low risk investment strategy in his case study of Stockport’s cotton manufacturers, drapers and tailors in the early Industrial Revolution.\textsuperscript{48} Whilst long term trends show an overall growth in the wallpaper trade, fortunes could be both made and lost, as the trade was susceptible to seasonal fluctuations, the disruption caused by foreign wars, building booms and busts, and witnessed increasing competition for customers. Statements given at a court case concerning the successful wallpaper manufacturer and retailers Johnston and Morant of Ludgate Hill in 1806 indicated that business profits could vary

\textsuperscript{45} Goose and Evans describe how the Prerogative Courts were mainly used by the more wealthy testator and reserved for those with property in more than one diocese, although they point out that there is evidence of considerable flexibility within this criterion. See N. Goose, and N. Evans, 'Wills as an Historical Source' in T. Arkell, N. Goose and N. Evans, \textit{When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early-Modern England} (Oxford, 200), p. 40-44.


\textsuperscript{47} It should be noted that this number is likely to be an under estimation as it only represents those who actively mention their stocks. Testators who did not specifically mention savings accounts have been counted as having none, although broad references to their 'estates' may well have included such schemes.

dramatically from year to year, from a profit of £101 in 1801 to £59 in 1802, and to a
loss of £36 in 1803.\textsuperscript{49} The return on government stocks varied in this period, with
interest from consuls ranging from 3.8 to 5.9%.\textsuperscript{50} Although the profit from this type of
investment was not particularly high, it represented a low risk, safe investment that
would provide a steady return as a buffer against difficult trade years and help
maintain the continuity of a firm.

The same survey of 30 wills also indicated that half the testators were capable of
affording leases on multiple properties in London and elsewhere, from which they
were also able to benefit from a rental income.\textsuperscript{51} As well as investment in government
stock, property ownership that could generate a rental return has been identified as a
typical investment strategy for the middling classes in this period, as again it
represented a similar safe investment for surplus profits outside a business. Maxine
Berg has explored this concept in further detail in relation to the metal working trades
in Birmingham and the Nottingham and Manchester textile industries in the
eighteenth century and concludes that multiple property ownership was common for
some trades and not others.\textsuperscript{52}

London's rapid urban development in this period clearly had obvious benefits to those
in the wallpaper trade who wished to spread their investments to areas of steady
profit. William Lovell of Fleet St, for example, owned a second house in Fleet Street
which he let out to a Mr Hardacre for an annual rent of £100 and a further leasehold
property in Hatton Garden, let out to Reverend Mr Smith for £40 per year.\textsuperscript{53} Other
manufacturers owned several rental properties such as Joseph Cox, paper hanging
manufacturer in Southwark for example, who acquired at least six additional

\textsuperscript{49} N.A: C13/72/55, Litigation, Young v Johnston, 1806.
\textsuperscript{50} H. Barker and M. Ishizu, 'Inheritance and Continuity in Small Family Businesses during the Industrial
\textsuperscript{51} Again this is likely to be an under estimation as the 15 testators who did not specifically mention
additional rental property in their wills have been counted as having none, although broad references to
their 'estates' may well have included rental properties.
\textsuperscript{52} R.J. Morris, \textit{Men, Women and Property in England, 1780-1870} (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 148-149; M.
34-35.
properties, three of which he had advantageously bought as part of a bankruptcy sale and one from the sale of a deceased's estate.\textsuperscript{54}

Some business partners also bought property together as part of their companies' investments, such as the firm of Birch and Ouvry who held joint insurance policies on three houses in Knightsbridge in 1788 and an untenanted property in rural Camberwell in 1794.\textsuperscript{55} In this respect, it can be seen that the development of urban areas (in both London and elsewhere) represented a twofold benefit for the wallpaper trade: in creating a wider market for the product itself and also in providing a fairly reliable opportunity for the investment of business profits.

In addition to the purchase of leases on houses for rent, some wallpaper manufacturers and retailers had sufficient income to become involved in the speculative building of rental properties. Chalklin describes this practice as fairly common at this time amongst 'merchants, well-to-do tradesmen, professional men or manufacturers, and also craftsmen who had amassed some capital and had access to credit'.\textsuperscript{56} Property development offered greater profits but required a wealthier investor than did leasehold purchasing for rental. Profits were greater, but so were the risks as the building trade was easily affected by external factors such as wars and bad harvests, as well as fluctuations in the demand and costs of housing.

The progress of William Grant, paper-stainer in Compton Street illustrates this point: Grant was listed in the Sun Fire Office policy registers in 1777, insuring two, as yet unfinished properties at 7 and 8 Chapel Street, off Portland Chapel for £700 each. By 1786, Grant was listed at nearby 47 Greek Street, by which point his business comprised that property plus a warehouse in the grounds and a second warehouse in nearby Rose Street, the collective property of which was insured for a total of £900. Grant's business appears to have continued to grow, as by 1792 he was registered as insuring a further house in the process of being built in Pratt Street near Mother Red Cap's, Camden Town for £300. However, by 1793, Grant was bankrupt. One of his

\textsuperscript{54} N.A: PROB 11/1421/233, Will of Joseph Cox, 2nd March 1805.
\textsuperscript{55} L.M.A: MS 11936/353/543902 & MS 11936/392/611194.
assignees, was Daniel Bunning, a carpenter and it is reasonable to assume that Grant had struggled to pay his debts to tradesmen like Bunning in connection with the building works, as a result of over stretching his financial resources.57

Others in the wallpaper trade enjoyed more success as building developers. Thomas Burford of 68 Ratcliffe Highway, stationer and retailer of paper hangings for example, not only owned rental properties in West Ham and Bethnal Green, but was also involved in the purchase of plots of land in Poplar in 1808, some of which he sold on for development and some on which he built a complex of ten cottages named Burford Court.58 This suggests that those in the wallpaper trade sought diversify to mitigate against fluctuating trade cycles. It also suggests that the trade supported a number of smaller scale tradesman/craftsman who had sufficient surplus capital to invest in the development of one or two properties or were also of a higher social status with considerable capital to extend to even larger scale projects.

**Business Values**

An examination of the personal wealth of those involved in the wallpaper trade can shed some light on the success of the industry. However, it is unclear to what extent this personal wealth may have been accrued from family sources and other businesses unconnected to the wallpaper trade. In order to gain a fuller understanding of the success of the trade in this period, it is necessary to also examine the wealth values of the businesses themselves through an assessment of the insurance premiums for their work premises and stock in trade.

Criticisms have been made of insurance sources on the grounds that policy premiums may have been undervalued by insurance companies. This may be a consideration, although John A. James in his study of wealth distribution drawn from these sources suggests that there is no substantial evidence that underinsuring was a standard policy at this time.59 The risk of fire to wallpaper manufacturers must have been of concern,
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however. Workshops contained flammable stocks of paper, wooden blocks and in some cases oil paints and turpentine, as well as sources of ignition from stoves used to heat drying areas and on which to prepare the glue size for distemper paints. At least two firms experienced major fires in their workshops which were widely publicised.  

Nonetheless, despite the caveats of possible under-insurance, these rich sources of data, combined with evidence from probate records have been useful to help establish the social and economic standing of those involved in the wallpaper trade in the period in question. Due to the small size of the trade it is possible, through nominal record linkage, to cross check these sources and the likely income brackets for some named individuals involved.

A sample of 32 policies (representing the total number of wallpaper manufacturers insured), was taken from the Sun Alliance Insurance Company registers for the period 1750-1800 in order to examine the range of policy values taken out by tradesmen manufacturing wallpaper and to show the distribution of wealth within this group.  

Working within the information available in these policies, three areas of insurance were examined: firstly, the insurance value of the stock in trade; secondly, of the property (either home and/or trade) and thirdly, the total value of the policy. As not all policies included values for the first two categories, the total policy value was examined to indicate an aggregate figure for the possible wealth of the policy holder.

The insurers themselves were divided into four groups representing very small policy values of below £100 through to large values of £1000 and over. The small and medium categories fall below and above the £500 figure which Schwarz identifies as the ceiling for artisan accumulation. The policies fall naturally into these brackets, however, they were also chosen in order to compare conclusions from this methodology with a similar study undertaken by Maxine Berg for the light

60 Both the firms Birch and Co in Fleet Street and Goodlad and Co in Newcastle experienced substantial fires at their premises for example. Bury and Norwich Post or Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex and Cambridge Advertiser. 26 August 1807 (Birch); E. Mackenzie, A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Town and County of Newcastle upon Tyne (Newcastle, 1827), p. 77 (Goodlad in 1813).

61 For consistency of premium valuations, the sample was taken from just one insurance company. Records of the Sun Fire Office proved the most comprehensive surviving archive of policies for wallpaper manufacturers. See series L.M.A: MS 11936, Sun Fire Office Policy Registers.

metalworking trades in Birmingham and Sheffield in the 1770s and 80s. Whilst the wallpaper trade survey is necessarily small, the results are nonetheless indicative. The results for this are expressed in Table 1. below:

Table 1: Insurance policy values for wallpaper manufacturers, 1750-1800.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V Small</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Total of relevant policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of Stock in Trade</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>8(33%)</td>
<td>5(21%)</td>
<td>10(42%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of House/Property</td>
<td>1(7%)</td>
<td>7(50%)</td>
<td>2(14%)</td>
<td>4(29%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Total Policy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13(38%)</td>
<td>7(21%)</td>
<td>14(41%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: L.M.A: Sun Fire Office Policy Registers 1750-1800. Where multiple policies occur for the same policy holder, only one policy example has been used, taking the highest value as an indication of optimum degree of wealth.

We can see from the results that for those insuring stock in trade and for total policy value that the largest group are those insuring assets for £1000 and over. For those insuring property, there appears to have been a larger number of insurers in the 'small' category, however, even here, a closer look at the individual policies shows that all of the insurers in this category were insuring additional houses to their own, either as extra work premises or in the case of four policy holders, George Britton, William...
Grant, John Owen and John Salt on properties providing an additional rental income. This also has a bearing on the number of insurers falling into the 'small' category for Value of Total Policy, which may be an underestimation of that individual’s total wealth. Here is it important to point out that whilst insurance policy sources have provided historians with an accessible and useful proxy, these sources are not as straightforward as previously thought when used for quantitative analysis. This qualitative survey of the wallpaper trade combined with cross referencing with other sources using nominal record linkage indicates some discrepancies when taking the data at face value. The policy of John Salt for example, highlights the need for supplementary data to support arguments based on these sources. Salt’s only policy, here for £200 on the value of his house, suggests that he belongs in the small producer bracket. However his will indicates that Salt, a wealthy stationer in Cheapside, was from the gentry class with family estates in Kent, Essex, Yorkshire and Cambridgeshire. Thus insurance data can underestimate true values of the individual wealth of tradesmen and collectively this can affect our view of the wealth and status of individual trades themselves.

Looking at the lowest value category, only one tradesman insured property assets in the 'very small' bracket of under £100, and this policy was taken out for £50 on a house and communicating workshop at 8 Seward St in 1791, rented by John Wheeley, paper-stainer. It is not clear whether John Wheeley was connected to James Wheeley of Aldersgate St (See trade card, Image 7). However John Wheeley appears to have been living and working at the Seward St address, as a second policy covers insurance for his clothes and possessions here. This is suggestive of a small scale enterprise run by an artisan master and perhaps employing one or two assistants. In the other categories no policies were found in the sample that insured assets below £100.
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64 L.M.A: MS 11936/ 392/627996; MS 11936/389/600570; MS 11936/366/566292; MS 11936/174/243739. Grant was a major property owner, see above, Britton and Owen were major manufacturers by the 1790s. See page 104.

65 L.M.A: MS 11936/174/243739; See also Chapter One page 22.

66 L.M.A: MS 11936/ 381/590145 & MS 11936/386/598892.

67 It is not clear if this is John Wheeley the nephew of James Wheeley of Aldersgate St (d. circa 1789) and who provided avuncular advice regarding his misfortunes collecting repayment from customers he had supplied outside London. See page 43.
Berg’s study of the values of insurance policies taken out by tradesmen in the metal working trades of Birmingham and Sheffield provides some useful comparisons here. Firstly Berg’s results indicate that a small proportion of persons took out policies for £100 or less, indicating that very small tradesmen did take out insurance through these sources, and thus the absence of all but one paper-stainer in this bracket may not be a function of middle and upper middle class bias in this primary source. Caution should be exercised when comparing directly the monetary values for London property and stock with that of Birmingham and Sheffield as these assets may have been relatively cheaper outside the metropolis. It is therefore the conclusions drawn from the studies that are useful to compare. Berg’s study concludes that the largest category of insurers in her study fall into the small to medium size producers insuring in the £100.1-500 bracket, with the next largest group in the £500.1-£1000 bracket. She argues that industrial growth in the eighteenth century was achieved on the back of a myriad of smaller and medium-scale producers and not on the spectacular but isolated successes of small numbers of giant industrialists and financial elites. The former, like the metal working trades, operated an organised workshop economy of multiple moderate sized and interconnected production units based on specialisation, outsourcing and division of labour. Other historians, including Jones and Rose have also stressed the important contribution to industrial growth played by the small-scale family firm at this time.

This challenges previous, more simplistic historiographies that have regarded the transformation of industries in the early industrial revolution as attributable to the successes of a handful of large scale enterprises. These historiographies also see the consequent polarisation of production between the small scale artisan workshop and the large scale factory system that emerged in the nineteenth century, as germinating

from this eighteenth century structure of small scale individual artisan production. Berg describes this concept as myth telling by large manufactures of the nineteenth century onwards of their trades' humble beginnings. Indeed Sugden and Edmondson follow a similar theme in their *History of Wallpaper* in which they describe the trade in this period as run by artisan-craftsmen with a more organised capitalist system only emerging much later in the nineteenth century.  

As with Berg's study, the survey of the wallpaper trade indicates that there was also a significant number of tradesmen in this small to medium group. However unlike the metal working trades, only a negligible number insured assets in the very small category with an even more significant bias towards those in the larger scale production bracket. The high values for those in the upper bracket (with some wallpaper manufacturers insuring assets at four, five, six and seven thousand pounds) suggests a different level of organisation and capitalisation to those in the lower bracket. Schwarz has also conducted a survey of insurance values for those working in London trades, using the same insurance data sources as Berg. In this he notes that there are breaks in the progression of insurance values from small to large in many trades examined, citing silversmiths, bookbinders and printers as examples. Whilst some trades were richer than others, Schwarz's findings show that in most cases progression in London trades from small scale to large scale was difficult and in many trades the majority of the insured were in the small to medium bracket, with the limit on insured property for most being around £400-£600.

Schwarz describes this as a pyramidal structure with the majority operating at small producer level at a wide base with a steep ascent to a minority of rich tradesmen at the apex. This more detailed, individual study of the wallpaper trade suggests that a reverse structure may well have been the case, although we cannot measure the number of paper-stainers who operated on a very small, ad hoc and seasonal level and who did not appear in directories, or earned sufficient to insure their property and leave wills. Of those whose existence is documented however, some were operating at a small to medium level, but a higher number were operating on a larger scale with
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asset valuations in thousands rather than hundreds of pounds. Progression within the trade is therefore likely to have been more difficult in this respect as well. As the larger concerns began to consolidate their businesses following the increased demand from home and export markets, it would have become increasingly difficult for smaller concerns to compete on an equal level.

As wallpaper was a luxury good rather than a necessity, cornering the wider middle class market as well as the gentry and elite was a key business aim for producers. These figures suggest that this was undertaken in larger measure by the more wealthy large scale producer and wholesaler, rather than smaller artisan tradesman despite the fact that the production process was still a handicraft system. In order to maximise potential profits through increased production therefore, even larger premises were required, the absence of which would also place the smaller tradesman at a distinct disadvantage.

**Conclusion**

As we have seen, the growing demand for wallpapers over the course of the second half of the eighteenth century prompted a growth in the number of those involved in the trade. It is difficult to quantify precisely how many wallpaper producers were in operation in this period however. This is particularly difficult for those who have left little trace in the records, including the very small scale producer, the seasonal worker and those operating under the aegis of other allied trades. In addition, surviving sources such as trade directories, wills and insurance records have an innate bourgeois bias which tends to lead towards the assumption that the trade was dominated by these groups.

Trade manuals such as Kearsley's *Table of Trades* indicates that there was potential for mobility and fluidity within occupations at this time. Gillian Cookson, however, has shown in her study of the textile engineering trade in this period that whilst some successful businessmen did rise from poverty, for most, some form of financial assistance would be required for those who wanted to expand their business beyond a
According to Kearlsey, less capital was required to set up in business in the wallpaper trade than in other luxury goods trades such as those selling chinaware or metal 'toys'. Indeed, setting up as a paper-stainer in a small capacity may well have been relatively less expensive than in other luxury goods trades.

Yet as a luxury product rather than a necessary item, more profits were to be found by paper-stainers capable of reaching wider markets, including regional and international spheres as well as operating on a wholesale level, supplying upholsters and stationers in London itself. Examination of insurance values balanced against other sources such as probate evidence indicate, however, that in terms of wealth and status, there was a bias towards the more affluent amongst those operating businesses in the wallpaper trade in the second half of the eighteenth century. This challenges the perception of the trade as run by artisan-craftsmen and also mirrors the historiographies of other trades which, as Berg states, were often retold as a myth of stemming from artisanal roots.

---

Chapter Three: Family Ties, Entrepreneurialism and Business Networks in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century.

Introduction
The burgeoning London wallpaper trade was an attractive business proposition to the increasing number of firms joining the trade in the second half of the eighteenth century. What then were the financial options to raise capital, and what kind of business formations were available for those wishing to set up at this time in a potentially lucrative luxury goods trade such as wallpaper manufacture? Standard bank loans were unavailable, and following the financial crisis of the South Sea Bubble, the Government’s Bubble Act of 1720 precluded the emergence of the limited liability joint stock firm until 1825. The formation of partnerships therefore became the main business structure. This could be an informal partnership where people worked in collaboration, or a more formal Partnership underpinned by legal agreement and where all business associates were liable for the debts and a share in the profits.

Key to all these types of business associations however, was the element of trust within relationships and here a businessman’s character and reputation were all important, particularly in this period when business transactions were carried out through a system of credit. As Julian Hoppit has demonstrated, in the increasingly dynamic economic climate of the second half of the eighteenth century an ethos of risk taking and speculation had developed. Business collapse and bankruptcy were a frequent feature of the commercial environment, not just as a result of personal circumstances, misfortune or mis-management but also due to the influence of external factors such as wars, financial crises and economic downturns. In an uncertain commercial environment, family and kinship networks provided useful trustworthy and low risk sources of capital, loans, labour and contacts for both large and small businesses alike. This chapter looks at how those already involved in, or
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2 J. Hoppit, Risk and Failure in English Business, 1700-1800 (Cambridge, 2002). See Appendix Six for bankruptcy figures in the wallpaper trade.
drawn towards the business of making wallpaper took advantage of the financial opportunities available to them in the second half of the eighteenth century. It looks at the role played by the family, including female family members, and the importance of business associations and networks in securing a firm’s financial stability and success. The successes of individual firms in turn influenced the strength of the wallpaper trade as a whole at this time.

**Legacies and Investments**

The emergence of the family firm has been described as central to the development of Britain’s commercial environment and its consequent economic expansion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\(^4\) This organisational response to the insecurities of commerce was also a key feature of the wallpaper trade, which relied in great measure on the participation and financial support of family members to consolidate and expand. Legacies and financial investments from relations were frequently used as a source of funds to set a family member up in a trade, or buy into or advance an existing business. The wallpaper trade was seen as a profitable investment for such an activity and capital secured in this way helped to secure the continuity of existing businesses as well as allow new investors to join in this growing trade.

Ralph Crompton, nephew of William Crompton, for example, was left £500 by his uncle and was urged to use it to buy into the Crompton and Spinnage partnership. Similarly Benjamin Bradley, former clerk and shop-man to Thomas Bromwich, used a lump sum investment advanced by his wife to buy into a share of his employer’s profitable business.\(^5\) Firms could also be made to grow with an injection of capital from the family. However, although investment in a business run by the family could represent a trustworthy option through shared interests, an element of risk was still attached in comparison to other options. Lydia Noble, a spinster, for example, wound up her three percent interest bank stock in order to lend the funds to her relative Fredrick

---


Noble to invest in a wallpaper manufactory at Chelsea with Nathaniel Hinchliffe in 1803. Whilst we do not know what family pressures were put upon Lydia to lend the money, a joint bond was signed between the three parties that stated that she would be provided with the same three percent annuity as before but paid from the profits of the business.

Similarly, Thomas Bromwich also followed this investment model on retiring from his business in the 1780s: the value of his share in the lucrative Bromwich, Isherwood and Bradley firm on Ludgate Hill was £24,000, however, he left £12,000 of this sum invested in the partnership as a successful going concern. A bond signed between all three parties guaranteed Bromwich an annuity of five percent on his £12,000 investment. Again this demonstrates Bromwich's confidence in the enterprise, and also faith in his nephew and business partner, Henry Isherwood as the investment was to remain in place after Bromwich's death for the benefit of his wife, Elisabeth.

Not all extended family members shared the same commercial optimism however. Differences of opinion between family members over the operation of a business or a simple lack of trust in those running it could jeopardise investment in the long term. In the case of the Bromwich, Isherwood and Bradley firm, relatives of Benjamin Bradley complained after the latter's death in 1792 that Isherwood had re-invested profits in the business and not put them into safe government securities as the former had willed Isherwood as his executor to do. There were also differences of opinion over the practicalities of operating the business, and in a fickle fashion market, what type of stock to hold; Bradley's family criticised Isherwood for the 'imprudent' purchase of a costly consignment of damaged imported Chinese wallpapers which by then had become unfashionable and thus unsalable through their prestigious Ludgate shop. They also differed over the usual method of supplying goods on credit, with Bradley's family criticising Isherwood for his 'ingratiating' approach to customers with outstanding debts, rather than pressing them to settle their accounts. Nonetheless in
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6 W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 2., Dissolution of Co-partnership, Hinchliffe and Noble, 24 March 1804.
7 N.A: C13/656/8; N.A: PROB 11/1156/119, Will of Thomas Bromwich, 10th August 1787.
the time that Bradley’s investment had contributed to the partnership, the business had been able to grow and his speculation had paid off.8

Following the death of the family member involved in the firm, problems could therefore occur in continuing a business, particularly in cases where relatives, as in Bradley’s case, had not previously played an active part in the firm. Some family members overcame this problem by placing their savings outside the family firm, in bank and stock investments as a means to provide for their family after their death. Historians have suggested that this emphasis on outside investments resulted in an eighteenth and early nineteenth-century business model that was backward and conservative, and deprived the main business of capital investment and injections of funds to aid growth.9 Whilst the family helped to build up and run the business, its primary aim was the immediate support of the family. This concept of 'family capitalism' has supported the argument that the family business was seen as sacrificial and of secondary importance to the ancillary investments in stocks, shares and property.10 The lifecycle of the family business in this period is seen therefore as short lived and cyclical, in that it is created by the family and the profits are invested elsewhere. On the death of the main breadwinner the business is sold on or wound up and the surviving family are able to live off the interest from the proceeds from new or existing augmented investments.

The wallpaper trade shows a different approach to this problem however. This may be because several of its firms operated on a wider scale, encompassing extended family members, with cousins, uncles and brothers-in-law involved as well as immediate siblings. Therefore the continuation of the family business had wider implications. Although those involved in the wallpaper trade did place investments outside the
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9 A. Owens describes the deliberate emphasis on the security of the family rather than the family firm as the main priority in this period in 'Inheritance and the Life-Cycle of Family Firms in the Early Industrial Revolution', Business History, 44, 1 (2002), pp. 21-46. See also R.J. Morris, Men, Women and Property in England, 1780-1870 (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 16-17.
family firm, many acknowledged the value tied up in their family businesses. Hall and Co's longstanding enterprise, for example, began as early as 1752 in partnership with Abraham Price in Aldermanbury and was run continually by sons and uncles of the family until at least 1817.11 Other firms such as Birch and Ouvry were led by brothers-in-law and then by mother and son. In this case, Charles Ouvry provided knowledge of the trade whilst his brother-in-law Chamberlain Birch, who had involvements in a drapery business perhaps brought business skills and investment to the firm. Whether extended family members were brought into a business, or existing business partners became family following a marriage introduction, this connection enabled wallpaper firms of various sizes to consolidate skills and investment through shared vested family interests.12 It is possible to see here how this new, booming luxury goods trade would also be attractive to extended family members, not just in bringing increased investment in, but also support for the wider family.

Female Family Members in the Wallpaper Trade

In examining the importance of the family in general to the wallpaper trade it would be useful to explore the contribution played by female family members in the trade. Historians studying the economic opportunities for women in the eighteenth century agree that these were limited by women's maternal responsibilities and also by their legal status under the law of coverture, which vested ultimate control of a married woman's financial dealings in the hands of her husband.13 Previously however, historians have suggested that women therefore gave up work upon marriage in order to raise children. Furthermore whilst many women undertook work before and after rearing children, this was often in gender segregated occupations demarcated as female, such as domestic service and work in the food and drink and retailing trades.14 The role of married women within the family is now more widely understood and as

12 Chamberlain Birch appears as linen draper in the 1800 edition of Kent's Directory.
13 For a detailed account of the legal implications of the doctrine of coverture for women, see chapters 2 and 3 in N. Phillips, Women in Business 1700-1850, (Woodbridge, 2006).
Amy Louise Erickson has shown, women were in fact expected to work once they married, and in London in particular men and women's work was much more interchangeable. Furthermore, in some entrepreneurial retail and artisan trades they also worked alongside their husbands.\textsuperscript{15} Other studies of the role of middling class females within family enterprises also indicate that their involvement contributed significantly to the financial stability, success and reputation of a family business.\textsuperscript{16}

What role then, did women play in the wallpaper business, connected as it was to the traditionally male dominated retail upholstery and wholesale stationery trades?\textsuperscript{17} Certainly, the trade cards of eighteenth-century wallpaper makers, Abraham Price, James Wheeley and Richard Masefield place the male owner of the shop in centre stage surrounded by a plentiful stock and busy male sales assistants.\textsuperscript{18} Yet Margaret Hunt argues for the increased involvement of women in the comparatively new trades associated with retailing of luxury goods such as china and glassware for example. This she suggests signifies the 'increasingly consumer-oriented nature of the eighteenth century economy and the centrality of women in a culture and an economy of material objects'.\textsuperscript{19}

It is plausible of course that many women worked as part of the family business alongside their husbands in the retailing of wallpaper, particularly in smaller scale shops. This is suggested by decorator Thomas Scrivens' account of his several trips to purchase wallpaper during which each time, selection of patterns and credit terms were dictated by the wife of the shopkeeper.\textsuperscript{20} Barker and others have described the less patriarchal and more co-reliant structure of lower middling families in the

\textsuperscript{17}Here I am excluding women whose husbands involved in this trade were wealthy enough for them not to need to work.
\textsuperscript{18}See Images 2, 3 & 7.
\textsuperscript{20}N.A: HO 17/37/50 Petitions of the Prisoner Thomas Scrivens, a Paper Hanger, Convicted at the Middlesex Sessions, 1832. Crucial to Scrivens' plea was the fact that the shopkeeper Mr Burford had accused him of fraud, yet he maintained his transactions were handled and agreed only with Mrs Burford.
commercial sphere, however, it is interesting to note that this dynamic also operated in the wallpaper trade at a slightly higher socio-economic level as well. Dinah Brooks for example, inherited her husband William's prestigious west end wallpaper shop at 28 Old Bond Street on his death in circa 1807, which she then continued to run in her own name until 1822. Directory entries and an account listed at Martin's Bank indicate that she continued to operate the business at the same fashionable address of 28 Old Bond Street.

Further down the social scale, the increased consumption of luxury and semi luxury goods in the second half of the eighteenth century may well have provided labour opportunities for women in the lower middling orders. Trades such as calico printing and pottery production used the labour of women and girls for lighter decorative work, and we have seen in Chapter One that women and girls were used in Eckhart's manufactory to 'pencil' in decorative details. It is likely that this was also the case in small, single artisan-run workshops where wallpaper was made as well. Erickson has argued that more women than previously thought worked alongside their husbands in skilled trades. The degree of involvement in such work is difficult to prove, and indeed whether it was in a seasonal, part or full time capacity. It is reasonable to presume however that wives (and children) of artisan paper-stainers could have assisted to a degree in the workshops of family businesses, performing semi-skilled tasks such as sticking hand-made paper sheets together ready to print, or stencilling and painting in of pattern details.

There are several examples of wives and widows in the wallpaper trade, however, who actively engaged in the management of both the retail and the manufacturing elements of the family business: Susanna Dunbar wife of Robert Dunbar of Aldermanbury in the 1750's, Elizabeth Hands, wife of Robert Hands of Bethnal Green, who took over administration of apprenticeship indentures in her own right in the 1760s and Elizabeth Birch of Birch and Ouvry, of 76 Fleet St, who was involved in the
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21 Barker, Business of Women, p. 6. and Hunt, Middling Sort, p.139.
24 Erickson, 'Married Women', p.294.
business both before and after the death of her husband Chamberlain Birch in 1799. These three women represented concerns that were of a significant size. These numbers are noteworthy for the small size of the wallpaper trade and support recent research that women’s roles were beginning to broaden as employers as well as employees.

We can presume that as these women took over the running of the family concern, prior knowledge of the trade and familiarisation with at least some aspects of the businesses' management is implicit. This suggests that they, like Dinah Brooks, had already established her own reputation for trustworthiness, reliability and good credit in order to be able to smoothly take over the reins of these established family businesses. With this in mind, it is interesting to see that women were involved in business at this socio-economic level, where the husband was clearly a master-manufacturer rather than an artisan-craftsman employing journeymen and assistants to carry out the practical side of the concern.

According to Barker, it was not uncommon for wives of middling class families to take over the family business on the death of their husbands, although some historians have debated just how frequently this occurred. What is clear from the wills of men involved in the wallpaper trade and the actions of their executors is that the family business was regarded as an important asset and profitable enough to continue supporting the family after the demise of its male head. Wives were instructed to control the business until it could be passed on to one or more sons on their coming of age. In some cases a widow might run the family business along with her children. Again this presumes a level of competence but also indicates a level of seniority based on age rather than gender. Ann Armitage, for example on inheriting the family manufacturing business in c 1804, continued to run it with her sons, who supplied the requisite trade skills, with their mother as ‘senior’ partner. According to the terms of William Armitage’s will, if Ann was ‘desirous to quit and give up the said trade, she
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26 Key studies here are Phillips, Women in Business and Barker, Business of Women.
should be allowed and paid the sum of £60 per annum for...[life]...by such and both of my Sons who shall continue in carrying on the same'.

Frances Lovell’s, husband William had run a long and successful paper hanging business at 138 Fleet Street with his son William until his death in 1808. According to the terms of William senior’s will, on his death the partnership was to be discontinued and the business given over to Frances. William junior was entreated to 'assist her in carrying on the trade and manage and conduct it for her, which I am sure he will do out of filial duty'. In return for this, Frances was to pay her son £200 per year for his maintenance and support, the business finally going to him upon his mother's death.

It is not clear what practical involvement Frances may have had in the day to day running of the shop and certainly the business was advertised under the male family name of William Lovell from 1794 - 1827. It would appear therefore that in these cases the inherited businesses were identified less as a new female enterprise than as an established, reliable and trusted family concern.

It is not known, of course, exactly what involvement wives like Ann Armitage and Frances Lovell would have had in the family business. Similarly we should be cautious in general not to mistake a husband's will to financially provide for his wife after his death, via a bequest of nominal ownership of his business, as an indication of her hands-on involvement in that trade, particularly where a business was successful enough for the wife not to work in first place. In many cases, however, with the wife as senior partner, retaining the family name of the business and appending that of the son ensured a key requirement - maintaining a firm's reputation for trustworthiness, reliability and business viability during the period of transition of business control from father to son. In a marketplace where the number of wallpaper manufacturers and retailers was expanding, established reputations of this sort could give a business a distinct competitive advantage. Furthermore, as Nenadic describes in her work on the value of reputation in family firms, in a commercial environment of low business ethics

and instability, identifiable family values of loyalty, trust and altruism had a market value for those who wanted to demonstrate the moral integrity of their businesses.\textsuperscript{31} That the family enterprise was regarded as an important asset in the wallpaper trade is evident in the number of testators in this occupation who left instructions for its future continuance. In a survey of 40 wills, 70 percent of those who actively mention their business expressed a desire for the family to continue the same, rather than to liquidate the firm in order to realise the capital.\textsuperscript{32} Barker and Ishizu describe a similar regard for the family firm amongst the petite bourgeoisie of Manchester and Liverpool during the same period. Their research shows that whilst testators often did advise the liquidation of the family firm after their death in order to realise capital, a degree of flexibility and discretion was possible and many beneficiaries chose to keep the business going as it was viewed as a valuable asset.\textsuperscript{33}

In contrast, Alastair Owens' work on the lifecycle of family firms in Stockport in the early industrial revolution argues that differences of opinion and a lack of understanding of the operation of the business as well as problems finding suitable heirs were among the reasons why the duration of many family businesses in his Stockport study was short lived and viewed as of sacrificial value.\textsuperscript{34} The different inheritance strategies of those in the wallpaper trade and the continuance of their family businesses is suggestive of a much more integrated and extended family enterprise, involving family members at an earlier stage in the firm’s lifecycle. In contrast to the regional Stockport businesses, this suggests a confidence in the metropolitan wallpaper trade as a prospective profitable business, and an assessment


\textsuperscript{32} Wills were sampled from the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, N.A: PROB 11 series between 1750-1830. Of the total, 27 testators specifically give instruction regarding their business, and of these 19 requested continuance of the same.

\textsuperscript{33} Barker and Ishizu's survey concentrated on wills of tradesmen of middle income and below, excluding those with estates valued over £2000. H. Barker and M. Ishizu, 'Inheritance and Continuity in Small Family Businesses during the Industrial Revolution', Business History, 54, 2 (2012), pp. 227-244. Due to the small size of the wallpaper trade, wills of tradesmen of all values were examined to determine trends in the trade as a whole. These were taken from the NA: PROB 11 series, which is generally although not exclusively representative of a more affluent testator.

\textsuperscript{34} Owens, 'Inheritance', pp. 32-33 & p.39.
that the family business often had more value to beneficiaries as a going concern than the realisation of its worth.

Caution should also be exercised of course, when using wills as an indicator of investment priorities and preferences, as testator evidence represents in the main, a near end point in a businessman's life when he has already built up his business and may now be gathering his assets into a more transferrable means to pass on. This thesis has described so far how wallpaper making on this scale was a relatively new trade, and one which was reliant in some respects on the vagaries of the fashion market, prompting those involved to choose channels of supplementary investment characteristic of the period in order to support their families. However, what is evident is that the potential for the success of a business venture in this trade also prompted a less typical approach to the family firm at this time and indicates that these businesses were valued as ongoing assets, capable of continued provision for the family on into the second generation often through the help of women working within the trade.

**Business Partnerships and Networks**

As Britain began to benefit from the energetic period of commercial expansion that occurred in the second half of the eighteenth century, and particularly from the 1770s onward,\(^\text{35}\) so businessmen found traditional family structures and family financial investment were less adequate to meet the requirements of commercial growth. Leaders of industries producing luxury and semi luxury goods such as Wedgewood in ceramics, Boulton in decorative metal-wares and Peel in printed fabrics, as well those in the wallpaper trade, began to form more complex business associations in marketing and finance as well as manufacturing which helped underpin the foundations of their commercial concerns.\(^\text{36}\) Thus commercial acumen and managerial skills could be added to technological expertise in order to expand. During this period there was an increasing move away from master-manufacturers towards the investor-entrepreneur model in the establishment of businesses.


\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 216.
The porcelain trade for example, enjoying a burgeoning market as a new luxury good, drew entrepreneurial interest from other sectors of the luxury trades, including gold and silver smiths, and artists with little business experience keen to be involved in new market opportunities.\textsuperscript{37} Similarly, Hudson describes how the worsted industry in Yorkshire, which involved relatively complex and lengthy production processes and was required to respond to a rapidly changing fashion market, needed the input of significant capital to succeed. Thus 'the typical worsted businessman was a person of some means and capital with no necessary prior connection with the trade.'\textsuperscript{38}

The following advertisement is typical in the contemporary press, and illustrates the attraction for the keen investor wishing to take advantage of the financial opportunities presented by the advancing market in fashionable consumer goods:

\begin{quote}
a gentleman who can advance Eight Hundred Pounds, wishes to take an active part, with a Gentleman who is established in the WHOLESALE HAT or PAPER-HANGING MANUFACTORY, or in any other respectable established concern.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

Conversely, those already established in business might also appeal for an injection of capital to aid a business venture, thus:

\begin{quote}
to be disposed of...a PAPER HANGING MANUFACTORY in the wholesale and retail line, which may be greatly extended...every article for carrying on the Paper Staining Business is now on the premises and may be had to work immediately. The reason for parting with it is, the Proprietor has not a sufficient capital to carry it on; Should any gentleman purchase it the proprietor will take an active part, if agreeable. The sum to be advanced will not exceed 1000l or 1200l.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

Others commenced business with little specific knowledge of the paper staining craft but with investment, marketing experience and business acumen learnt from other spheres. George Cooke and Nathaniel Hinchcliffe owners of the Whitelands

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} M. Berg, \textit{Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth Century Britain} (Oxford, 2005), p. 128.
\item \textsuperscript{39} \textit{Morning Post}, 25 March 1803.
\item \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Morning Post}, 8 June 1801.
\end{itemize}
manufactory in Chelsea for example, had no practical training in the trade, but were from legal and ironmongery backgrounds respectively.\textsuperscript{41} Cooke himself had already invested £650 in the paper-staining business of John East at 22 Old Bond St, from which he had managed to extricate himself months before East went bankrupt in 1797. Cooke continued to run a business at the Bond Street address and then embarked upon a further investment interest with Hinchliffe at the thriving Whitelands manufactory in Chelsea.\textsuperscript{42} It is possible to see therefore how the spectacular opportunities for investment in the luxury goods trades could attract the ambitious entrepreneur with the necessary capital, skills and connections.

Corfield's study of specialist occupations in early industrial urban Britain identifies a growing trend for businesses to form companies at this time, with a significant proportion of these occurring amongst large scale firms requiring the management and capital of more than one person.\textsuperscript{43} The formation of partnerships and companies was also common in the wallpaper trade, where as well as the family firm, this more open structure allowed for further risk sharing and resource pooling. The Birch family business at 76 Fleet St for example was not unique in having a series of different partnerships, in their case at least five, outside the family participants in the firm.\textsuperscript{44} The extent of partnerships within a concern is not always evident from trade directories where often only one or two of the names involved are listed. Indeed, further nominal record linkage investigation beyond the scope of this thesis may highlight more involved multi-partnerships within the trade.

As the industry expanded so did the opportunities for partnership, co-operation and networking. Part cause and part effect of the growth of the demand for wallpapers and the growth of the trade, the trend towards partnership formation and business corporatism was essential in order to compete in the market place at all but the

\textsuperscript{41} Report from Committee on the Several Petitions Presented to this House Respecting the Apprentice Laws of this Kingdom, H.C.P.P., 31 May 1813.
\textsuperscript{42} London Gazette, 12 August 1797; 2 May 1797 and 27 June 1797.
\textsuperscript{43} P. J. Corfield, 'Business Leaders and Town Gentry in Early Industrial Britain: Specialist Occupations and Shared Urbanism' Urban History, 39, 1 (February 2012), pp. 30-31.
\textsuperscript{44} N.A: PROB 11/1317/63, Will of Chamberlain Birch, 10 January 1799; London Gazette, 7 May 1805; 8 September 1810; 14 January 1812. The Birch business over time included Charles Ouvry, William Tyler, William Marsh, Thomas Wright, John Lucas.
smallest levels of operation. Partnerships of course meant injections of capital, plus the sharing of skills, trade experience and craft expertise and thus allowed firms to strengthen their position in a competitive market place.

The business of Johnston and Morant provides a good example of how this type of partnership operated in the wallpaper trade; In 1784 Archibald Johnston, in partnership with John Young, a business investor originally from Cumberland, had taken on the successful and reputable business of the late Robert Stark. Stark’s enterprise had involved the manufacture and retail of wallpapers plus ‘a great Variety of papier mache...Ornaments modern and antique...Glass and Picture-Frames, and Girandoles’ from his shop at 41 Ludgate, one of the City’s fashionable shopping streets. Articles of agreement were drawn up between Johnston and Young, but by 1791 they chose to expand their business further by merging it with that of John Tootle who ran a large paper hanging manufactory at Playhouse Yard, Whitecross St, also in the City.

The Playhouse Yard partnership was run under the name of ‘John Tootle' and was one of the largest wholesale operations by the 1790s. By 1799 the firm had acquired a fourth partner, George Morant who had shares in the Ludgate Hill concern only, and which operated under the title Johnston and Morant. Along the way, further capital was provided by investor Charles Terret who also contributed a lump sum of £230 for which he was paid an annual return on his investment of 5 percent. Johnston, Young, Tootle and Morant all had shares in the Ludgate concern, but Morant was not part of the Playhouse Yard group. The large size of the latter lent itself to the manufacture of the wallpaper while the Ludgate Hill shop formed the fashionable retail outlet. In this respect, some partners were able to benefit from both manufacturing and retail arms of the business, whilst capital could be introduced in areas where it was needed, without having to share the profits of the whole.

---

Mergers, partnerships and takeovers of businesses were important ways to consolidate and expand a wallpaper enterprise, not just through the integration of capital funds but also as an easy and expedient method by which to increase stock in trade and equipment. Output could potentially be increased several-fold, allowing a firm to operate at both a wholesale and retail level. Furthermore, with the accumulation of other printing blocks and patterns, firms were able to satisfy the key customer requirements of wide variety of choice, plus the lowest prices. Businesses benefited from the takeover of those paper staining firms that were ceasing to trade, not only by increasing their economies of scale but also through acquired customer goodwill and credit networks of the retiring firm. Contemporary newspapers frequently advertised the sale of the stock and goodwill of drapers’, upholsterers’ and cabinet makers’ businesses and this allowed opportunities for existing successful businesses in general to expand easily. An advertisement of 1804 announcing the cessation of one firm illustrates the value of its business network as well as its stock:

To be DISPOSED OF, the LEASE, STOCK and GOODWILL of an old established PAPER HANGING MANUFACTORY, with a respectable and valuable connection, capable of still further extension. ¹⁴⁸

Those taking over other concerns were also keen to stress the continuity of product standards and business profile: James Wheeley was able to expand his business at an early stage in 1754, and announced that he:

begs leave to acquaint all Stationers, Upholders & others that he has purchased all the Art Stock in Trade, working Tools and Prints belonging to Messrs Wagg & Garnett, Paper Hanging Maker, Wheeler Street Spitalfields…..all who have any occasion for any of the above Person’s Patterns, may be supplied with the same or any other Sorts, as imboss’d Chints, and common papers. ¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ Morning Post, 5 November 1804.
Although the wallpaper trade enjoyed commercial success in the second half of the eighteenth century, bankruptcy and insolvency were a frequent occurrence for both small and large firms in the trade (see Appendix Six). Yet the business failure of other wallpaper firms provided useful opportunities for many to acquire stock and equipment at reduced prices. Following the bankruptcy of manufacturer William Whittle in 1760, the newspaper announcement of William Squire in the same year illustrates how stronger firms could benefit from the misfortune of others:

*The Large Manufactory for Making Paper Hangings, lately carried on by Mr Whittle, near the Church in Old Street...Is now continued by WILLIAM SQUIRE, who has purchased all the Materials and New Prints, in various Patterns; where Merchants, for Exportation, Country Shopkeepers, and others may depend on being serv'd at very low Prices there, and at his Warehouse in the Poultry, London.*

In order to make the collection of taxes on paper more efficient, paper manufacturers followed standardised paper sizes, with paper-stainers most commonly using larger category sheets in 'elephant' or to a lesser extent, 'double demy' sizes.

Standardisation in sizing of cloth and yarn counts in textiles as well as in the sizes of readymade clothing, shoes and hats was becoming more widespread as component parts of consumer products were increasingly produced in different locations and taken to be made up in another. This meant that printing blocks and equipment could be compatible and interchangeable between manufacturers, allowing them to easily amalgamate each other's assets. Both Phyllis Deane, and more recently Alastair Owens, have argued that the demise of some businesses in the early nineteenth century led to the freeing up of capital, stock, equipment and machinery, which in turn

---

51 *London Evening Post*, 18 December 1760. For other examples of wallpaper business/bankruptcy sales see for example, *World*, 16 January 1794; *Morning Post*, 8 May 1804 and 7 November 1814.
allowed for the birth of new firms with new rounds of investment to take advantage of rising market opportunities.\textsuperscript{54}

It was not just equipment that could be freed up as a result of the termination or bankruptcy of a business. Skilled tradesmen also became available on the London job market to be taken on by other firms. Berg describes the takeover of competing firms’ workforces as a method by which skills and knowledge could be disseminated in the Birmingham luxury metal-ware trades.\textsuperscript{55} As noted in Chapter One, the structure of many paper staining firms consisted of a core of experienced journeymen and/or foremen in place working under a managerial master. Following his bankruptcy in 1756, Joseph Hemmings of Garlick Hill wound up his paper staining business and shop, however he remained at Garlick Hill running the same operation as foreman for wealthy stationers Salt and Baker, who had seized the opportunity to capitalise on the fashion for wallpapers by branching into the paper staining trade.\textsuperscript{56} By this means, investors were able to take advantage of the vacillations and fluidity in the supply of labour to buy into the wallpaper trade. Furthermore, the business value and importance of loyalties of a small core of skilled journeymen is evident in the legacies bequeathed to employees in the wills of some successful manufacturers, such as John Salt (1781) and Abraham Hall (1801). In the case of Hall, the legacies to John Ryley (£100) John Tennant (£100), James Holmes (£50) and James Scott (£25), were also conditional on them remaining in the employ of Hall's firm at their same 'salleries' for a period of time after his decease.\textsuperscript{57}

The importance of trust within commercial enterprises and networks has been highlighted recently by historians studying economic growth during the course of the Industrial Revolution. Here the emphasis has moved away from the traditional understanding of this growth purely in terms of individual entrepreneurship.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} Berg, \textit{Luxury}, p. 172.
\textsuperscript{56} O.B.P: 26 February 1755 & 16 January 1761. Hemmings’ bankruptcy is in \textit{London Gazette}, 8 May 1756. For Salt and Baker see page 25.
\textsuperscript{57} N.A: PROB 11/1081/156, Will of John Salt, 16 August 1781; PROB 11/1356/182, Will of Abraham Hall, 20 April 1801.
\textsuperscript{58} For further discussion on the move away from this traditional viewpoint, see R. Pearson and D. Richardson, 'Business Networking in the Industrial Revolution' \textit{Economic History Review}, 54, 4 (2001),
value of shared credit and social networks between paper-stainers and stationers at the start of the wallpaper trade's growth mid-eighteenth century has been described in Chapter One. These tenets continued to play a vital role during the expansion of the trade in the second half of the century and onwards. Where transactions were carried out in this period though a system of buying on credit, trust and a gentleman's word were key. Partnership agreements were in place in wallpaper firms to underpin trust based agreements, (although it was not uncommon for partners to let these elapse without renewal).59 Others had more informal agreements such as that between Bailey and Brooks who ran a Paper Hanging Warehouse at 28 Old Bond Street. In this, Bailey as a gentleman investor and property owner advanced money to the business in return for wallpapers and work done on his private estate.60

Some manufacturers formed networks where shared religious identity was a collective feature. This type of association has been described by Pearson and Richardson as a risk-averse formation, as trust is implied through shared values and morals of an external religious authority. Nenadic argues further that many tradesmen belonging to the Quaker religion in the eighteenth century were able to 'harness the beliefs and values that where characteristic of the sect and re-invent them as business virtues'.61 One such trust network was that of Abraham and John Hall of Aldermanbury, Protestant Dissenters whose circle included co-religionists William Lepard, stationer and papermaker, and employees John Lindley and John Lindley junior.62 The Hall factory was also cited on the City Road, a socially mixed area, but traditionally associated with the home of nonconformity in London.63 Further research beyond the scope of this thesis may highlight whether this type of religious association was more common in the wallpaper trade.


59 For example see N.A: C13/656/8, Litigation, Isherwood v Bradley, 1794; C13/72/55, Litigation, Young v Johnston, 1806. Deeds of partnership were not legally binding in this period, but their existence did provide a perception that a level of security was in place. Pearson and Richardson, 'Networking', p. 660.


Organisation into specific trade-related guilds was less important to those wallpaper manufacturers operating in the City. Aside from some manufacturers who were also stationers and belonged in any case to the Stationers Company, many wallpaper manufacturers belonged to an assortment of different guilds including the Girdlers, Fishmongers and Farriers Companies. 64 This is suggestive of a need to take up membership of any Livery Company in order to be able to trade within the City, but also no doubt to network with other general business professionals. 65 As Stobart suggests, in commercial spheres, membership of a network or group implied acceptability and trustworthiness, and 'common business interests easily bridged political or religious divisions'. 66 As a newly emerging luxury goods industry, alliance to a specific trade related Company was of less importance to wallpaper firms in the City than access to a growing business infrastructure with benefits of wider networks and commercial opportunities.

Of more immediate value were the business partnerships and networks formed between wallpaper manufacturers and stationers. Wallpaper historiographies have maintained that the influence of stationers in the wallpaper trade became less as the latter expanded, however this long standing connection remained equally as important on into the nineteenth century. Whilst the industry grew as an entity in itself, the manufacture of wallpapers remained closely connected to the paper trade with several of the major wallpaper firms in partnership, or closely connected to stationers. Two prominent examples of this combination are Moore and Gough who had a substantial business in Coleman St and 6 Aldgate in the 1770s, 67 and the family-linked paper-staining and stationery firm of Williams, Coopers and Boyle of 85 West Smithfield, who became one of the market leaders by the early nineteenth century. 68

---


65 See also Erickson, ‘Married Women’, pp. 286-7.


67 O.B.P: 21st February 1776; L.M.A: MS 11936/197/282160

68 The family business of Cornelius and then Joseph Taylor at 85 Smithfield was taken over by their relatives in the Boyle family, Cornelius Boyle also being Joseph Taylor’s apprentice. James Williams, previously a stationer in Holborn was also connected to Joseph Taylor and acted as executor to the
The merging of these business may have created economies of scale and beneficial capital and credit arrangements, however the structure and growth of the trade was further strengthened and embedded by ties of both kinship and association. These elements are regarded by historians of business culture in this period as key to the economic development of middling class business groups at this time. Rose describes effective business networks which were based on trust between non-related ‘extended families’ of associates, while Offer and Fukuyama have preferred to emphasise the economic value of reputation and ‘regard’ in creating a ‘radius of trust’ which expanded and encompassed the various participants within the network. This was not least the case in the wallpaper trade where family, trusted friends and business associates operated across the same network.

Figure 1. shows the interconnectivity of one these groups which was typical within the wallpaper trade in the long eighteenth century. Not only did these connections exist between individual concerns, but also extended to other firms within the trade. Place names marked in bold text indicate prominent firms.
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Figure 1: Case Study of Networks in the Wallpaper Trade
Haggerty and Haggerty have described some of the pitfalls associated with trade networks in this period, including poor choices of involvement with incompetent or dishonest people. However, they stress that a much more significant sense of obligation was also at large, that was embedded in a culture of respect for these networks. The following example also shows how these networks of contacts based on trust and business experience operated in practice, in order to increase profits: James Woodmason already a successful wholesale stationer in Leadenhall Street and stationer to the East India Company had bought the rights to a method of ruling continuous lines on paper suitable for account books from the brothers F and G Eckhardt from Utrecht. The Eckhardts had adapted this principle to the manufacture of wallpaper and had taken their proposition to Thomas Bromwich and Co, who unhappy with the terms offered, had passed up the opportunity. Woodmason however, decided to take on the enterprise and going into business with the Eckhardts, set up in the large scale out of town manufactory at Cheyne Lane in Chelsea in 1786 and with a fashionable shop at 21 Old Bond Street.

Woodmason launched a campaign extending from London to fashionable towns such as Bath, by which he bombarded the public with advertisements for his new 'superior' style of wallpaper. Although the Ladies of Langollen were unimpressed with the wallpapers, condemning them as 'dingy, wholly deficient in colour, lustre and effect', Woodmason’s wallpapers were feted by others as the epitome of good taste, with customers such as Lord Howard of Audley End ranking amongst Woodmason’s customers. The large size of the factory necessitated a manager to run it, and this was found in John Boover Brooke, who prior to his bankruptcy in 1774 had run his own wallpaper and papier-mâché manufactory at Great Queens St, Lincoln's Inn.

---

71 Morning Post, 25 October 1786; World and Fashionable Advertiser, 26 April 1787.
72 World, 13 June 1787; Bath Chronicle, 12 July 1787. No attributable examples survive, however, we may hypothesize that this type of wallpaper may have been composed of straight lines in a striped or trellis style.
Fields.\textsuperscript{74} That Brookes possessed the skills to manage the scale of this operation was clear from the size of his own concern, the sale of which listed:

- upwards of 1000 blocks, 27 reams of elephant paper, 750 papier mache moulds for glass frames,...printing tables, two colour mills, prepared colours,
- 600 weight of East India indigo and a large bell.\textsuperscript{75}

Image 10. shows an example of a wallpaper attributable to Boover Brookes’ firm.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image10.png}
\caption{Trailing floral wallpaper, block print and stencil, c. 1770s - 1780s. Inscribed on the back \textit{Brook Great Queen St N 61} (the rest illegible). Victoria and Albert Museum: E192-1955. ©Victoria and Albert Museum, London.}
\end{figure}

Contemporary attitudes to bankruptcy could be sympathetic, as honest tradesmen could easily be the victim of a chain reaction of credit failure, misfortune or unforeseen circumstance. Such was the attitude towards the bankruptcy of Boover Brookes in 1774.\textsuperscript{76} The newspapers of the day reported how as a consequence of the bankruptcy, Brookes' wife had taken up a career on the stage to help support the

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{London Gazette}, 12 August 1797. This late date indicates final settlements of this drawn out bankruptcy case.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Gazetteer}, 10 February 1785.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{London Gazette}, 9 July 1774.
family. In a review of the somewhat unfortunately entitled play, 'The Provok’d Husband', the *Morning Chronicle* on 21 July 1786 related how in the light of her unfavourable circumstances her first performance was met with great public sympathy and:

vast applause throughout the house....[as]...Mrs Brookes is the wife of a person who has been in a very capital line of business, but from the unlucky vicissitudes of fortune, has been rendered incapable of maintaining her and a numerous family, for which purpose she has, to her great merit, embarked in the theatrical line.

Both Boover Brookes and his wife knew Woodmason in a social capacity at this time, and thus it was possible for Brookes to continue to operate as an experienced businessman of integrity within this professional and social network. Once Woodmason sold his share in the business to Peter Bowers and William Harwood in 1789, Brookes continued to run the Chelsea factory. By the early 1800s, Brooks had taken over ownership of the factory with two new associates, James McClary and Hugh Stevens, under the title Harwood and Co. Woodmason and Brookes both retired to estates in the West Country, while McClary and Stevens continued as Harwood and Co from 1810 onwards, and with input from other investors continued the success of the firm as one of the largest market leaders by the end of the period.

The benefit of these formations for a relatively small trade, geographically concentrated in London, allows for collaborative working, ideas exchange, design innovation and awareness of fashion markets. The several petitions to Parliament during the course of the period, mainly in protest against the threat of foreign competition, indicate a propensity to form a consolidated front of vested interest.

77 *World*, 21 July 1787.
78 *World*, 24 June 1789, Brookes is mentioned as foreman in a petition to Parliament on behalf of paper hanging manufacturers regarding imports, *Seventeenth Parliament of Great Britain; Second Session*, H.C.P.P., 9 March 1792, p. 73. For the dissolution of Brookes' partnership with McClary and Stevens see *London Gazette*, 20 June 1810.
79 N.A: PROB 11/1665/75, Will of John Boover Brookes, 8 January 1823; Obituary of James Woodmason, *The Standard*, 2 August 1831. It is not clear whether either retained their interests in the firms on retirement.
amongst the larger manufacturers.\footnote{80} It is likely that enterprises operating in the same commercial sphere formed trade based relationships, where reciprocal benefits could be had, perhaps in terms of specialist outsourcing, subcontracting or sharing of information. Reeder and Rodger describe the value of similar urban business networks in controlling sharp practice and standards of quality as well as access to credit, suppliers and customers. Wallpaper trade networks therefore may well have overlapped rather than conflicted in what was ostensibly a competitive market.\footnote{81}

The bankruptcy of John Sherringham of Great Marlborough Street suggests that this may have been the case: Sherringham specialised in high-end ornamental paper hangings for a more affluent market.\footnote{82} By 1790 his business was in trouble with his main creditors being Robert Evans, a goldbeater, and Robert Pickering, another wallpaper manufacturer of Cheapside.\footnote{83} By 1796 Sherringham was bankrupt,\footnote{84} however, in the meantime, Robert Pickering himself had also become bankrupt. A notice in the \textit{London Gazette} in 1793 invited Pickering's creditors to meet at his house to consider 'the most proper means to be adopted in recovering the said Bankrupt's property from John Sherringham, a Debtor to the said Bankrupt's estate'.\footnote{85} Similarly entries throughout the 1790s memorandum book of the manufacturing and retailing firm Duppa and Co of 314 Oxford St indicate that they also sold wallpapers that were made by other firms such as Woollams, Harwood, Turners and Bowers and Co alongside wallpapers of their own manufacture.\footnote{86}

Associations with trades allied to the industry also brought business expertise and marketing experience to the wallpaper trade. Several owners of the larger firms were also involved in other enterprises; both Boover Brookes and Pickering had interests in

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{80}{For example N.A: EXT 1/299/3, Memorial of the Principal Exporters, 1752 & T 11/36 Treasury Excise Letters 1789-91.}
\footnote{81}{D. Reeder and R. Rodger 'Industrialisation and the City Economy' in M. Daunton (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Urban History of Britain} Vol. III (Cambridge, 200), p 561.}
\footnote{82}{In a lecture given in 1844, the credited wallpaper manufacturer Mawer Cowtan described Sherringham in retrospective reverence as the 'Wedgwood of Paper-stainers'. F. Teynac, P. Nolot, J.D. Vivien, \textit{Wallpaper, A History} (London, 1982), p.81.}
\footnote{83}{\textit{London Gazette}, 21 August 1790.}
\footnote{84}{\textit{London Gazette}, April 28 1787.}
\footnote{85}{\textit{London Gazette}, 7 December 1793.}
\footnote{86}{N.A.L: 86. AA. 13, Memobook.}
\end{footnotes}
the calico printing and linen trade, whilst others had shared interests in the colour making and floor cloth printing trades. Chapman sees this multilateral integration of entrepreneurial manufacturing and mercantile concerns as symptomatic of the dynamic period of industrial growth in Britain in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. For the wallpaper trade, contact, awareness of and involvement with other trades manufacturing consumer goods allowed them to keep ahead of the market in anticipating the next season’s fashions.

Whilst engaging in these commercial arrangements, however, wallpaper manufacturers also tended to restrict themselves to involvement in cognate trades, with shared processes, market information or shared scales of operation. This culture of prudence allowed the market leaders in the wallpaper trade to consolidate their position by the end of the century. As with the paper trade, whose output rose between 1738-1800 by 400 percent while the number of paper mills only rose by 50 percent, control of the trade was in very few hands. In the wallpaper trade, production increased by 2.4 times between 1760 and 1800 and the number of manufacturers increased by a similar amount. (See Chapter Two). However, this apparently simple correlation between output and number of producers disguises the fact that a significant proportion of production was carried out by a smaller proportion of major firms who dominated the market. As wallpaper manufacturer Robert Pickering explained when called to give evidence to a Parliamentary committee on the threat of foreign imports, three quarters of the London manufacturing trade was now in the hands of only 14 major firms.

The table below lists the 14 major firms alongside their dates of establishment and origin of the businesses. This demonstrates the importance of both family firm

---

87 For Boover Brookes see London Gazette, 22 October 1793, for Pickering, Derby Mercury, 4 July 1811.
88 Other examples include John Middleton, leading colour manufacturer of St Martin’s Lane who was also involved in the manufacture of wallpaper and inventor of improvements to the block printing table, J. Smith, The Mechanic or Compendium of Practical Inventions (Liverpool, 1816), vol. 1., p. 168; David Gordon who owned a large wallpaper and carpet making concern in the Kent Rd, Southwark, N.A: PROB 11/1420/70, Will of David Gordon, 1st February 1805.
89 Chapman, 'British Marketing Enterprise', p. 216.
91 Evidence of Robert Pickering, Seventeenth Parliament, 1792, H.C.P.P., p. 73.
continuity and business takeovers to the market leaders of the wallpaper trade by the end of the eighteenth century.

Table 2: *Pedigrees of the 14 Largest English Wallpaper Manufacturers by the 1790s*.\(^\text{92}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowers and Co</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>1780s ex Woodmason</td>
<td>Takeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eckhart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton and Son</td>
<td>Knightsbridge</td>
<td>1750s Crompton and</td>
<td>Family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spinnage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Knight</td>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>1750 ex (i) Pope and</td>
<td>Takeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McLellan ex (ii)</td>
<td>(apprentice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Masefield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isherwood and Co</td>
<td>Ludgate, City</td>
<td>1750 ex Bromwich,</td>
<td>Family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isherwood and Bradley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gough</td>
<td>Aldgate Without,</td>
<td>1755 ex (i) Sam Smith, ex</td>
<td>Takeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>(ii) Moore and Gough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Hall</td>
<td>Aldermanbury, City</td>
<td>Pre 1750 Price and Hall</td>
<td>Family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch and Ouvry</td>
<td>Fleet St, City</td>
<td>1760s, possibly ex</td>
<td>Takeover and family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Hands 1749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tootle</td>
<td>Playhouse Yard,</td>
<td>1760s ex Robert Stark</td>
<td>Takeover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wheeley</td>
<td>Aldersgate, City</td>
<td>1750s ex Wagg and</td>
<td>Takeover and family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Taylor</td>
<td>Smithfield, City</td>
<td>1749 Taylor senior</td>
<td>Family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Owen</td>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>No information pre 1791</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cox</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>1772 William Cox calico and wallpaper printer</td>
<td>Family business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Britton</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>No information before 1789</td>
<td>Formerly apprentice to Taylor above 1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reekes and Sharp</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{92}\) Taken from Robert Pickering's list of the 14 market leaders by 1792. *Seventeenth Parliament*, 1792, H.C.P.P., p.73.
Conclusion

Those involved in the wallpaper trade were typical of many businesses in the eighteenth century in that they relied in significant measure on the investment and participation of family members. Continuation of a business in other trades after the owner’s death was not always a common practice at this time. In contrast to this, however, family continuation did occur in the wallpaper trade which betrays an optimism in the industry and its growing markets, as well as a confidence in the individual firms' success. Of equal importance however, was the ability to expand the profitability of these businesses by attracting capital from outside the family. To some extent this was even possible through open advertisements in newspapers offering investment opportunities in businesses that also included producing wallpapers. Here investors and entrepreneurs also saw the potential for the success of the trade, often advancing sizeable amounts of money to embark upon a venture in paper hanging manufacture.

Both large and smaller businesses did require some form of amalgamation or partnership with others either in the trade, or in cognate trades, in order to expand. This often involved taking advantage of the business failures of other firms who had been less fortunate in the dynamic yet fluctuating commercial climate of the second half of the eighteenth century. As Mathias has summarised, histories of the early Industrial Revolution traditionally focussed on ‘the self made man’ and the business success of individual entrepreneurs, failing to take into account the value of support networks.93 The latter were crucial to firms of all sizes in the wallpaper trade who wished to expand. The route to success was a combination of both financial capital and access to business networks. These included those firms run by wealthy stationers established in the mid eighteenth century and those embarking upon new enterprises taking over existing premises and business infrastructures.

---

This meant more than ever a dependence on a loyal staff of trusted and skilled journeymen to run the concern. Working closely with existing skilled employees and foremen allowed manufacturers to concentrate on networking at a higher level, sharing not craft skills, but business skills and strategies in order to facilitate further profits. Thus those with the necessary skills, capital and connections were more likely to succeed and to consolidate their position as market leaders and large wholesale suppliers. Consolidation of family ties and close/allied trade networks allowed firms to ride the wave of popularity in the market for wallpaper. Whilst the number of firms and the size of these networks expanded in this period, those most likely to succeed were already established businesses, including some from mid-century, particularly when they merged and consolidated. In this environment therefore it became increasingly difficult for smaller wallpaper producer-retailers to gain an equal share of the market. The following chapter looks at the implications of this trend into the early nineteenth century and how this affected the type and availability of the wallpapers produced.
Chapter Four: Expansion, Enterprise and Innovation, 1750-1815.

Introduction

By the end of the eighteenth century a small group of large-scale, wholesale London manufacturers had emerged as market leaders, at the apex of the trade and with a majority share of the market. Their aim was to produce a range of fashionable wallpapers across a rapidly rising market. This chapter explores how they were able to maintain this position through the organisation of their workforce and within the parameters of the technological processes available to them.

The ability to respond to the increased market for consumer goods in the long eighteenth century has been the subject of much historical debate: traditionally the onset of the Industrial Revolution and mass consumption was seen as the result of a transition from a pre-industrial, small artisan workshop economy to a factory based system of organised labour and increased productivity, through the harnessing of machine power to replace hand craft techniques. Often this has centred on the high profile 'leaders' of the Industrial Revolution, the textile, metal and mining industries. What has emerged from recent studies is the need for a more nuanced approach to assess this progress which acknowledges the wider and more complex political, cultural and social forces at play. These include the freer exchange of knowledge and expertise on processes and markets, and the part played by product innovation and consumption patterns, as well as improvements to productivity made by both workers and masters across a range of trades and industries.¹

Instead of the simplistic 'workshop to factory' shift, a range of different occupational structures were in fact in place that were constantly modifying and adapting to changes in demand for consumer goods. Whilst profitability and the reduction of labour costs were the common denominators in the organisation of trades at this time, each trade had its own specific structure, work practices and technologies which

adapted to its own commercial environment. In effect, in the second half of the eighteenth century, various permutations in occupational structures co-existed in Britain, and this period can be seen as one of transition as Britain moved towards the capitalist, industrialised society that emerged in the nineteenth century.  

Historians have now begun to think differently about the size of firms in this period. It is now contended that a larger role was played by small and medium sized firms in responding to the demands of a developing market society than had previously been thought. Lloyd-Jones and Le Roux for example point out that quantitative studies of the cotton industry have often counted single premises as one business, when in fact they were tenanted by many small firms in this industry. Furthermore, organisational structures previously identified with traditional modes of operation, such as the subcontracting of work out to domestic workshops (the 'putting out' system) could be large and highly organised arrangements led by merchant manufacturers. Such was the case in the hosiery, lace, shoe, hat and glove industries as well as those producing watches, buttons and buckles. Furthermore, putting out systems could often exist alongside large manufactory concerns within the same trade. These large scale non-mechanised factories or 'proto-factories' produced consumer goods in high volumes for a broad market via centralised manufacture under one roof, but often using handicraft labour. Yet elements of these trades were organised along both these lines.  

---

5 The term is originally derived from F.F. Mendels theory of ‘proto-industrialisation’ that described a preceding phase in the development of modern industrial economics. This emerged from the growth of rural domestic manufacturing which began to connect more and more people to national and international markets and contributed to a drive towards capitalist centralised urban production. The term is now used by historians of the Industrial Revolution to describe this intermediary stage in both urban and rural contexts. A discussion on this usage is found in P. Hudson, ‘Proto-industrialisation’ Recent Findings of Research in Economic and Social History, 10 (1990), pp. 1-4 and R.Leboutte, ‘Introduction’ in R. Leboutte (ed.), Proto-industrialisation: Recent Research and New Perspectives, (Geneva, 1996), pp.1-8.
6 Berg, Age of Manufactures, pp. 70, 75 & 267.
overlapping. For the wallpaper trade as well as other industries, highly capitalised firms could exist alongside smaller operations.

The process towards mechanised production was also uneven. Sabel and Zeitlin have also highlighted the difficulties of applying classical economic ideologies to the mechanisation of various European industries at this time. Instead they suggest that the gradual take up of innovative mechanised processes within trades was embraced equally by smaller firms and those working in artisan workshops as well as large factory concerns and was motivated by a more collective approach by both workers and employees.\(^7\) Each trade had its own peculiarities and responses to the steadily growing market for luxury goods. Wallpaper manufacturers also responded to this demand and were able to increase sales by embracing and adapting the technologies available to them. In this they demonstrated an ability to anticipate and shape market trends, and showed creativity and understanding of the hand block printing process in order to skilfully manipulate it to best maximise their profits.

\section*{Why Did the Wallpaper Trade Remain in London?}

In response to increased demand and rising costs, manufacturers of some consumer wares began to leave the capital from mid-century onwards in order to take advantage of lower rents and building costs and cheaper labour elsewhere. The calico printing trade, a close relation to wallpaper in terms of printing technology, had begun to leave London in the 1760s in order to further expand.\(^8\) Other trades such as stocking frame knitting were also part of this exodus from London, and others grew up ab initio in the regions. As a result, areas of trade concentration began to emerge in places such as Staffordshire for the pottery trades and Birmingham and Sheffield for the metal toy and cutlery trade. Here manufacturers producing luxury and consumer wares could benefit from the opportunity of cheaper capital and running costs as well as an ability to structure the workforce in new, more efficient ways in order to be able to respond to the increased demand for their products.

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Leonard Schwarz, writing on the progress and decline of London’s trades during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century represents the Industrial Revolution as, in large measure, a process of provincial industrial growth. The capital’s response to this general exodus of manufacturing was to concentrate on producing specialised, up-market goods which were labour intensive.\(^9\) Thus finishing trades dependant on high levels of specialist skills such as silk weaving, coach building and watch and clock making remained in the capital.\(^10\) This naturally resulted in the convergence of skilled labour in the capital in search of employment opportunities. In the case of the wallpaper trade the pool of skilled journeymen was small and as the concept of a waged labour force had not materialised in this period, it would have been essential to be able to access this skilled labour during periods of increased consumer demand. Chapter Five shows how some provincial centres did develop their own wallpaper manufactories, however, the bulk of production remained in London. The tax on wallpaper, ranging from 1½d to 1¾d per square yard between 1750-1830, kept its price out of the range of a mass market.\(^11\) As a non-essential consumer item requiring skilled and semi-skilled workers to produce it, wallpaper fell within the category of finished, luxury good.

Proximity to the commercial hub of the paper trade was also necessary. Whether these manufacturers shared business concerns directly with the wholesale stationery trade or not, involvement in its infrastructure afforded immediacy of supply and commercial advantage. Printed up rolls of wallpaper were bulky and fragile, therefore a base within the country’s largest concentration of stationers and upholsters shops for retailing wallpapers kept transport costs down. As we have seen in Chapter Three, the largest wholesale manufacturers had built up a distribution network with London’s luxury goods shops, and this extended to their regional retail contacts as well. London was still the largest port in Britain in the second half of the eighteenth century, and

---


closeness to the merchant community and facilities for export provided another benefit to staying in the capital.\textsuperscript{12}

Proximity to the capital’s huge and constantly changing fashion market was an important consideration for both the finishing and luxury trades, enabling manufacturers to keep an eye on what patterns were current and saleable and regularly to update their stock with new designs.\textsuperscript{13} For the market leaders, keeping one step ahead of competition was an important business strategy and we can posit that quick responses to a volatile fashion market ensured custom was not lost to other competitors.

The reputation of the wallpaper trade as a London-manufactured item was also important. In both domestic and export markets, luxury goods manufactured or finished in London had a recognised kudos. Coach-building, cabinet-making, upholstered furniture, gold and silver ware and wallpapers all enjoyed an enviable global reputation in the second half of the eighteenth century. Historians have recognised the ‘cultural cachet’ as Stobart terms it, of London-made or designed products that suggested fashion and quality and heightened the desirability of goods.\textsuperscript{14}

Branding is usually associated with the later nineteenth century; however, this may have occurred earlier and more commonly than previously thought. John Styles has shown how the branding of goods such as books and medicines was increasingly adopted in the eighteenth century as a marketing tool.\textsuperscript{15} Consumers could identify and associate new purchases with an established, endorsed quality product and reassured by this, were thus encouraged to spend. Wallpaper manufacturers also carried on this practice with many printing their names on the selvedge of their papers or stamping them the reverse. See trade card script in Image 3 and the trade stamp in Image 11 below.

\textsuperscript{12} See Chapters One and Five for exports abroad and to the North of England.
\textsuperscript{13} Schwarz, London, pp. 206-7.
London firms such as Woodmason and Bowers and Co actively marketed their wallpapers in London and regionally under their own names as a recognisable brand for fashion and quality.\textsuperscript{16} In addition, the metropolitan market leaders had established a good reputation over the second half of the eighteenth century and the Capital was intrinsically wrapped up in this. By early 1800's regional retailers used the association of the Capital to increase sales by advertising wallpapers from the 'first houses in London'.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Manufacturing Workshops and Scale of Production}

As the demand for luxury goods grew in the second half of the eighteenth century, those luxury goods trades that remained in London began to outgrow their existing premises and looked for ways to expand their trade. Trades operating artisanal modes

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Hereford Journal}, 6 May 1789; \textit{Morning Chronicle}, 19 June 1794.

\textsuperscript{17} For example, \textit{Isle of Man Weekly Gazette}, 4 July 1816. See also Chapter Five.
of production where component parts of an item were made in separate independent workshops to be assembled together elsewhere, responded by colonising particular neighbourhoods where, as Jerry White puts it, 'subdivision of labour...turned a single street into a factory in all but name'. Coachmaking, cabinetmaking, tailoring and shoemaking all followed this pattern.\textsuperscript{18} High rents in the metropolis meant that these trades continued to be operated by outsourcing to a variety of small producers who could work in their own homes where these small domestic units could easily function within the existing built environment.\textsuperscript{19} Some of the firms involved in the London luxury goods industry that operated putting out systems were extremely large, for example the silverware trade operated a sophisticated network of subcontractors, which in the case of one firm amounted to a network of 75 specialist manufacturers between 1765 and 1770.\textsuperscript{20}

The fragile nature of printed wallpapers and their large size meant that the dispersal of these processes across a production system of separate individual workshops was inefficient and impractical. Production required large light airy premises to operate efficiently as is indicated in Images 12 & 13 below.

\textsuperscript{18} J. White, \textit{London in the Eighteenth Century; a Great and Monstrous Thing} (London, 2013), p. 215. White contends however, that this practice was on the wane as the eighteenth century progressed as space became more contested in these traditional zones.

\textsuperscript{19} Schwarz, \textit{London}, pp. 33-34.

Image 12. Trade Card of Ballard and Co, Cross Street, London, c. 1800. The printer uses a levered press and is assisted by his 'tear boy' (See Appendix One: The Block Printing Process). In some workshops, the printed paper would be laid onto a long table to the left of the press. Here it is hung straight up to dry. British Museum Heal Collection: 91.4. ©Trustees of the British Museum.
Image 13. Interior of Hardy's Wallpaper Manufactory, Hull. Oil on canvas. English School, Eighteenth Century/Ferens Art Gallery, Hull Museums, UK/ Bridgeman Images. The printer on the left is using a weighted treadle to imprint the pattern on the wooden block onto the paper. The assistant at the back applies colour onto the bed of stretched cloth or leather from which the printer charges his block with paint. Other cloths that have been used for different colours are hung up to dry on the back wall. The assistant on the right rolls up the finished wallpaper.

Each printer not only required a table long enough on which to print each 12 yard length, but also sufficient room height to hang up several lengths to dry between the printing of each colour. The tables themselves needed to be sited by a window in order for the printer to have sufficient light for the exact registering of the printing work. Additional space was also required for an assistant to work on the initial stages of joining the hand-made sheets together into a printable length and to brush over them with the background colour of paint. These lengths had then to be hung up to dry, requiring further space. Ancillary space or extra rooms were also necessary to carry out the design work, i.e. interpreting the pattern into individual print impressions and carving the blocks accordingly, as well as separate areas for grinding and mixing pigments for the paint. Finally provision had to be made for a clean, secure and dry storage area for the paper stock, wooden blocks and finished rolls of wallpaper.
This operational sequence lent itself to centralised production in large premises. By the 1790s some of the City premises belonging to the leading wholesale manufacturers were large - John Tootle's leasehold manufactory at Playhouse Yard, Whitecross St was described in *The Morning Post* as consisting of:

large warehouses, adjoining printing and colouring shops extending together 104 feet by 47....with a two stall stable, gateway and compact dwelling house and a store cellar let to Samuel Whitbread esq and Co.\(^{21}\)

Wallpaper manufacturers therefore sought to find adequate premises to operate within the increasingly densely inhabited City. By the first half of the eighteenth century, the need for more work and living space had already resulted in the filling in of gardens and development of new courts and alleys within the overcrowded City.\(^{22}\)

Many wallpaper manufacturers, such as John Tootle above, and Messrs Birch and Co shared premises with other trades. The cheek by jowl arrangement of trades at this time is indicated by an account of a fire at Birch's premises Crown Court, Fleet St in 1807: Birch and Co leased a building, which had a footprint of nearly 100 square feet, with two printing companies and a bookseller. The fire, started by boiling oil for printing, consumed the building and neighbouring area, plus a cabinet maker's warehouse and 20 other houses including one entire side of Crown court, which consisted of seven small houses 'inhabited by a great number of poor tradespeople'.\(^{23}\)

As wallpaper manufacturers sought to respond to increased demand, so larger premises were required. Where it was not possible to annex further adjoining buildings, leading manufacturers sought larger premises further afield. New and established wallpaper firms, whilst seeking to remain broadly around the City area, also began to expand to large individual premises on the outskirts of London where land was cheaper and more available. This movement fanned out in a circular pattern around the built up area of the City and Westminster.\(^{24}\)

---

21 *Morning Post*, 16 January 1806.
23 *Hull Packet*, 8 September 1807.
24 See locations in Table 2. p. 106.
For example, by 1781, Abraham Hall of the original Blue Paper Warehouse concern not only retained his shop and house in Aldermanbury, plus workshops and warehouses adjoining in Red Cross Square, but also an additional manufactory on the outskirts, 'near the turnpike' on City Road. John Owen, like Hall, was also one of the largest wallpaper manufacturers by the end of the eighteenth century and his premises were also on the periphery of the City in Shoreditch. Others such as George Britton, and Joseph and Thomas Cox established premises south of the Thames in Southwark. The area south of the River had become more accessible following improvements to London Bridge in the 1760s and the opening of Westminster and Blackfriars Bridges in 1750 and 1769. Here an industrial area developed where London's trades could expand production, and this cheaper land was increasingly filled by factories, breweries and tanneries and workhouses.

Demand for wallpapers was also sufficient to support large peripheral manufactories to the west of London. The move westward had already begun with Crompton and Spinnage, wallpaper and floor cloth manufacturers who had a factory in Knightsbridge in the 1750s. Other trades had also begun to move west of London in search of space. For example, at least two other separate ceramics factories operated in Chelsea aside from the celebrated Chelsea porcelain factory run by Sprimont (d. 1771). Other workshops included a candle manufactory as well as at least two wallpaper manufactories.

25 Hall was insuring contents and stock at these addresses for £7000. L.M.A: MS 11936/ 293/444764.  
27 L.M.A: MS 11936/ 392/627996 (Britton) & MS 11936/ 361/558580 (Cox).  
30 Sprimont's factory is credited with the production of the famous Mecklenburg-Strelitz service. Wedgewood's partner, Thomas Bentley also had a workshop in Upper Cheyne Row until 1774, and W. Ruhl commenced work in that year in Little Cheyne Row. A History of the County of Middlesex, vol. 12 Chelsea (2004).  
32 The histories of these manufactories are obscure, not least due to contradictory later accounts, properties with the same or similar names, (two Whitelands and one Blacklands House), ibid, plate 42; W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 2., Lease of Premises at Whitelands, 6 April 1830, also generic addresses in newspaper advertisements and trade directories for manufacturers at 'Chelsea' and possible multiple movement of manufacturers around the area. This area may benefit from further research to inform the degree of interconnectivity between manufacturers here.
At this point Chelsea was still largely a rural area of low lying marshy ground, which was ideal for the many market gardens it supported, but less inviting for the building developer. Established country mansions dotted around the area were becoming unfashionable as residences, and so were let on lease, providing ideal vacant premises for businesses manufacturing consumer wares and luxury goods who were seeking to expand.33 One such property was Whitelands House, an established mansion situated in Blacklands Lane, (later Marlborough Road) which ran from the Kings Road to Fulham Road.


Secondary sources disagree as to ownership of the house, but Eckhardt and Co held an insurance policy here in 1794.34 The Eckhardts themselves became bankrupts in

---

33 Chapman and Chassagne describe the taking over of large mansions on the outskirts of London for use of manufactories as not uncommon practice at this time. Textiles, p. 26.
34 T. Faulkner, An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea and its Environs (London, 2nd ed., 1829), p. 337, and D. Lysons, Environs of London (London, 1795), vol. 2, p. 148 on which most subsequent material is based, offer conflicting comments on the ownership of Whitelands and thus
1796,\textsuperscript{35} whether still at Whitelands or not is not clear. However the concern was clearly thought viable, as the lease was then bought by Samuel Brandram and Co merchants of Size Lane.\textsuperscript{36} Brandram's insurance policy on the property for 1802 reveals the size of the concern by this stage and is described below with reference to a ground plan (now lost).\textsuperscript{37}

Table 3: \textit{Insurance Policy for Whitelands Wallpaper Manufactory, 1802.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a dwelling house, offices, Boiling Shop and Blockhouse communicating marked A</td>
<td>£900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock and Utensils therein, copper plates not included, not exceeding</td>
<td>£1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounding shed and Blockhouse in one building marked B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops in one building marked C separate, not exceeding</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters shop near marked D</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed in back yard marked E</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting House, Warehouse shops and horse mill housed in one building marked F</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A second large wallpaper manufactory was also set up in Shrewsbury House, a sixteenth-century mansion in Cheyne Walk, near the Thames in Chelsea. This formed three sides of a quadrangle, with one great chamber that was wainscoted in oak and measured 120 foot long which was probably used for printing the wallpaper. Below ownership has not so far been substantiated. Eckhardt and Co used the Whitelands address at this date for an insurance policy on another unconnected property; L.M.A: MS 11936/ 397/624413.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{London Gazette}, 26 April 1796 & 9 July 1796.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Lowndes Directory} (London, 1796).

\textsuperscript{37} L.M.A: MS 11936/ 427/740042.
this was another large room 25 foot high, reputed to have been used to dry the
finished lengths.\textsuperscript{38}

The house may have been the 'Cheyney Lane manufactory' acquired by James
Woodmason, wholesale stationer and the Eckhardt Brothers around 1786.\textsuperscript{39}
Woodmason sold on his share in the business in 1789 to Peter Bowers and William
Harwood\textsuperscript{40} whose names appear in the rate books for this property from 1790 to
1800.\textsuperscript{41} Bowers and the Eckhardt brothers continued to work at this site, with the
latter's move to Whitelands possibly being a second enterprise or an independent
venture.\textsuperscript{42} The architectural advantages offered by these formerly grand houses, with
their spacious, high ceilinged rooms well lit by large windows and with useful
additional rooms, is evident for wallpaper printing on this scale. Access to the Thames
for river transport of goods may also have been useful in a period when road transport
could still be difficult and expensive.

The market leaders required considerable investment to acquire and run these large
London manufactories. Hinchliffe and Noble, taking on one of the Chelsea factories in
1803, agreed to bring £10,000 between them to the operation.\textsuperscript{43} Financial investment
at these levels meant that year round production was necessary to justify financial
outlay. Although wallpaper production could be seasonal occupation, by 1800 the
Shrewsbury House manufactory advertised that they could offer 'constant
employment' for 'a number of hands, capable of executing the best work'.
Manufacturers therefore responded by continually adapting their stock of patterns, in
order to stimulate consumer demand and offer new products all year round. Along

\textsuperscript{38} Both Alfred Beaver, \textit{Memorials of Old Chelsea} (London, 1892), pp. 199-200 and Faulkner, p.66
describe it thus. Faulkner states that the house was also called Alston House.
\textsuperscript{39} An advert for their wallpapers from the manufactory in Cheyney Lane appears in \textit{St James' Chronicle}, 7
April 1787. See p. 99ff for an account of this business as an entrepreneurial scheme.
\textsuperscript{40} L.M.A: 0/081/002 Indenture of Apprenticeship for Timothy Wilsher, 1790.
\textsuperscript{41} Rate books show Bowers and Co from 1790 - 96 & Harwood and Co from 1797-1800 when the data
\textsuperscript{42} Messrs Bowers, Eckhardts and Co announced their continuation of the Woodmason business in the
newspaper \textit{World}, 29 June 1789.
\textsuperscript{43} W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 2., Dissolution of Co-partnership, Hinchliffe and Noble, 24 March 1804. It is not
clear which Chelsea manufactory Hinchliffe and Noble were involved with in this short-lived partnership,
however Hinchliffe was involved in a second partnership at Whitelands from 11 May 1804 until beyond
the end of the period under study.
the Thames, in the City, Turners of Cornhill, for example, placed seasonal notices in the press in 1790, for their 'new assortment of Paper hangings for the present spring' and the 'present summer' and also advertised in autumn that they had 'just completed an entire new assortment of paper hangings'.

In this period, luxury and semi-luxury goods were constantly modified and developed not just to remain fashionable, but also to have the widest possible appeal across a range of consumer levels. Many manufactures in the eighteenth century produced goods in a range of styles, qualities and prices, but always with an eye on affordability and fashion. Josiah Wedgwood's selling strategy is perhaps the most well known example of this practice. Wedgwood deliberately cultivated aristocratic patronage for his ceramic ware in order to boost sales of his cheaper products to a wider market through this elite association. However, many manufacturers also adopted this strategy. Mathew Boulton, for example, aimed his production of shoe buckles at consumers of various 'gradations of society' to whom he sold his buckles in every size and every material, from diamonds to paste, from gold to pinchbeck.

We have seen in Chapter Two how from the mid-eighteenth century on, wallpapers were available in a range of prices and qualities from 'common papers' upwards and with a range of prices and permutations in between. In the larger scale wallpaper manufactories, the bulk of production was geared towards this middle class market, but prestige ranges were also produced in order to establish a firm's reputation for quality and pre-eminence. Woodmason's branded wallpapers for example, were offered in a wide range of prices from 2½d to 2 shillings per yard in 1787. In this way the reputation of the London wallpaper trade was maintained, but always with an eye on the commercial gains from the wider market of the middle ranking consumer.

---

44 St James' Chronicle, 17 April 1790; Whitehall Evening Post, 22 June 1790; Gazetteer, 18 September 1787.
47 St James' Chronicle, 7 April 1787.
Who Carried out the Work?

Old systems of casual, ad hoc labour were no longer fit for purpose in the buoyant market for consumer goods, and the demand for luxury and semi-luxury goods meant that in some trades reorganisation of the workforce under one roof became a much more efficient and cost effective way to operate. Specialist skills and continuity in the labour force were all important where significant capital outlay had been made and where a business's reputation was of utmost value. All these factors could be monitored more effectively on the one premises. Industrial re-organisation was thus taking place in some trades in this period, involving the increased division of labour and the vertical integration of production processes under one roof. Structures such as this allowed manufacturers of consumer goods to operate economies of scale in order to both meet and stimulate demand. This type of centralised production was a feature of more celebrated eighteenth century manufactories such as the Peels' textile printing enterprise in Lancashire, and in the metal-ware trades at the integrated workshop of John Taylor in Birmingham.\textsuperscript{48}

It made sense therefore for the larger wholesale wallpaper manufactories at Chelsea and around the City to organise their work this way. Indeed, as we have seen in Chapter One, this was a development of the production process that had already begun to take shape in 1760s, and emerged as an economy of scale based increasingly on the division of handicraft labour. This enabled large quantities of wallpapers to be produced in a wide range of different qualities and prices in order to reach as large a customer base as possible. In both the leading calico printing and wallpaper manufactories, the increased division of labour produced a hierarchical structure that was shaped to respond to the varying demands of the market place. In order to market affordable wallpapers to as many consumers as possible in the most cost effective way, prestige and 'common papers' were produced by printers of different skill levels, who were paid accordingly and housed under one roof.

At the top, owner-manufacturers often with no direct practical paper staining experience, but with appropriate business skills, could concentrate on anticipation of

\textsuperscript{48} Chapman and Chassagne, \textit{Textiles}, p. 25; Clifford, 'Metal-working Trades', p.246.
fashion and observation of market trends whilst the manufactory itself was increasingly run by foremen on behalf of the owners. The production of prestige ranges of wallpaper was then reserved for more skilled paper-stainers who would translate the latest patterns into carved printing blocks and print more complex designs. A similar arrangement had developed in the cabinet making trade in response to increased demand for good quality bespoke furniture amongst the middling and upper classes. Here the furniture trade, was divided into separate artisan groups of carvers, gilders, upholsterers and carpenters, each then divided into their own distinct gradation of skills and wage levels within the workplace.

Wallpaper manufacturers advertised for specialist paper-stainers in the press: One such firm in Chelsea in 1806 sought 'a steady man as a satin white grounder, one who understands that branch professedly.' This level of specialisation was required to produce more costly 'satin' papers which bore a smooth finish with a sheen imitating satin, produced with the more expensive 'satin-white' paint (a mixture of chalk and alum) using a more skilful brushing technique to lay on the ground layer of paint. Other luxury goods trades also employed different skill levels according to the quality of the goods that they were making. In the porcelain and earthenware trades for example groups of skilled painters, modellers and artists were employed on a hierarchical scale for variously priced pieces. Some manufacturers also commissioned designs from skilled decorative artists working in independent freelance workshops, and these provided fashionable patterns for more high status ranges across several luxury trades, such as ceramics, toy-making and fan painting. In the wallpaper trade too, some manufacturers such as John Sherringham at Great Marlborough Street in the 1780s, travelled to Europe to seek out artists and designers to bring to England to work on the creation of his prestige wallpapers.

49 Here the term 'paper-stainer' is used to distinguish these men from those semi-skilled workers who simply printed pre-carved blocks as described below.
51 The Observer, 27 July 1806.
In the second half of the eighteenth century, their reputation for quality workmanship and their higher rates of pay, marked some skilled craftsmen in London’s luxury goods trades out as the envy of Europe. In the West End cabinet making workshops and Spitalfields’ silk weaving workshops, the most skilled artisans were able to agree a fixed rate of prices for their specialist work with their masters. It is possible that the more skilled block printers had some sort of piece rate price list drawn up with their employers. Certainly masters in all luxury goods trades were dependant to some measure on the skills of these men in order to maintain their trade’s reputation for prestige quality work.

By the 1790s wages in the wallpaper trade could vary from 3 shillings up to 12 shillings per day for the finest quality work, whilst the majority of the workers producing more ordinary papers were paid 7 shillings, according to evidence given in Parliament by leading wallpaper manufacturers petitioning for an increase in duties on imported wallpapers. Workers were paid by the piece, a similar practice in other luxury goods trades where manufacturers were obliged to extend long periods of credit to their elite customers and therefore were more likely to produce their prestige ranges on demand. In addition, manufacturers could also exercise a measure of control over their labour costs in periods of austerity and seasonal demand by paying on a piece rate.

Journeymen may also have worked for several different manufacturers on and off, which suggests a measure of ad hoc employment, perhaps in response to a particular firm’s success or to a particular demand for a specialist skill. John Thomas Petre for example, worked as both a self-employed grocer and journeyman paper-stainer, initially serving his apprenticeship at the Harwood factory in Adam St West and then
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57 Seventeenth Parliament, 1792, H.C.P.P., p. 73. Kearsley’s Table of Trades for 1786 puts this much higher at between 14s and £1 1shilling. His figures for silk weavers and cabinet makers are also similar, both ranging from 15s and £1 1shilling. G. Kearsley, Table of Trades for the Assistance of Parents and Guardians (London, 1786).
58 Berg, Luxury, p. 169.
working alternately at both trades in and around that area and the market gardens and wallpaper manufactories at Chelsea.\textsuperscript{59}

Access to the pool of skilled paper-stainers in London enabled manufacturers to produce their smaller runs of high status ranges of wallpaper as they needed, whilst the bulk of their production of cheaper papers benefitted by association from this reputation. Labour costs were then saved by employing workers of lower skill at lower rates to print their ranges of 'common papers' from pre-carved blocks and stencils, and to carry out simpler tasks including grinding pigments for paint, or rolling up and packing the finished wallpapers. Wage costs were further reduced by the employment of children. In the calico printing trade similar tasks were carried out by juveniles who formed a large part of the workforce.\textsuperscript{60} Each calico and wallpaper block printer had a boy to assist in preparing the blocks to print and boys also helped with the flocking process. (see Appendix One). Young females were also employed in the calico and wallpaper trades as pencillers to hand finish patterns in paint. According to Lysons, girls aged between 8 and 15 were employed at the Eckhardt Whitelands factory for this purpose.\textsuperscript{61}

Image 15 shows an example of a wallpaper from this period which illustrates how two printing techniques requiring different levels of skill were combined on one paper. Here the background blue of the flowers is produced by the cheaper and more easily executed stencilling technique, with the more expensive block printed technique producing the white trellis and flower detail block printed over the blue. It is possible to see how the stenciller initially failed to register their pattern correctly in places, as the carved printing block detail printed over it does not always coincide with the blue areas.

\textsuperscript{59} London Gazette, 24 April 1832.
\textsuperscript{61} Lysons, Environs, p. 149; Sugden, Wallpaper, p.112.
Similar models of organised production based on division of labour and rationalisation of production were in operation in the manufacture of other luxury goods trades at this time, from large concerns to more limited markets in specialist luxury goods. A commentator on the workshop of Jesse Ramsden, mathematical instrument maker in Piccadilly in the 1770s and 1780s, stated that:
He availed himself to the utmost of the advantages to be derived from the division of labour, allotting to every workman his particular department from which he was never called away to another.\textsuperscript{62}

Other consumer and luxury goods trades at this time such as wallpaper, silk, calico printing and pin-making operated methods of centralised production based on the division of handicraft labour, in what can be termed 'proto factories'.\textsuperscript{63} This organisational model was not limited to the large scale entrepreneur-led firms but a variety of small to large businesses across several trades operated in this way.\textsuperscript{64} Lysons described the Shrewsbury House wallpaper manufactory as employing 100 hands and Whitelands employing above that number. This figure is comparable with the 100 or so employed in some of the leading, pre-eminent West End cabinet making firms by the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{65} Yet even amongst the market leaders in wholesale wallpaper manufacture by 1817, numbers of journeymen employed could vary from 21 to 60.\textsuperscript{66} Furthermore, these figures are small in comparison to the 800-1000 workers employed by 1770 in Matthew Boulton's Soho works making buttons, buckles and japan-ware.\textsuperscript{67}

Not all manufacturers adopted these methods however, and Chapman cautions against viewing the structure of all firms in the calico trade, for example, in the light of a handful of its market leaders. However, for wallpaper production, the different processes of assembling, grounding and printing lent itself ideally to the division of labour and we can expect this arrangement to have taken place to a certain extent in the small workshop as well as in these large manufactories. We can see from Brandram's insurance policy above, the usefulness of wings of the house and

\textsuperscript{63} Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p.532.
\textsuperscript{66} A petition of journeymen paper-stainers has 60 signatures from Harwood's Adam Street West firm, 48 from Williams, Coopers and Boyle's firm in West Smithfield and also from Hinchliffe and Co's Whitelands manufactory whilst Hall and Co in City Road and Cox and Co's Playhouse Yard manufacturies employed 21 and 24 respectively. Other smaller concerns on the petition include less than 10 signatories. See N.A: BT6/174, \textit{Petition of Paper Stainers to the Board of Trade}, 1817.
\textsuperscript{67} Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 532.
outbuildings in streamlining the division of labour to designated areas, from the blockhouses for storage, boiling shop for paint preparation, and the grounding shed plus workshops for the more specialised printing of the various paint layers.

Division of labour such as this not only increased efficiency and saved labour costs, but it could also encourage the refinement of skills in each area and ensured that a range of both high quality and simpler, cheaper patterns could be produced under one roof. Yet the division of work into these repetitive, designated tasks also meant that workers could become less skilled overall. In 1813 the Government heard a commissioned report into the decline of proper training through apprenticeships in various industrial and luxury goods trades, including that of wallpaper, to ascertain the extent of this de-skilling. Bennett Puddefoot, journeyman paper-stainer from Queens Elms, described how several manufacturers of wallpaper employed unskilled workers such as labourers and colour grinders to carry out tasks that were normally the work of qualified paper-stainers. Here they worked for low wages, undercutting the qualified workers who struggled to find work. Yet in some manufactories the unskilled were reliant on the handful of skilled journeymen colleagues to guide them in their tasks.

The wallpaper trade was not the only industry to adopt these practices at this time and skilled workers in other luxury trades such as the silver plate and silk weaving industries also reported a similar state of affairs where skilled workers were increasingly being replaced by the unskilled.\(^\text{68}\) The long term consequence of this was an overall simplification of the types of wallpaper produced. Ultimately, however, the loss of skill was made less of an issue due to the mechanization of the industry in the nineteenth century. (See Chapter Six).

Some new luxury goods trades such as wallpaper and calico printing had developed as capitalist structures from the start, and were less confined by older more rigid artisanal structures and thus enjoyed a level of occupational flexibility within the workplace.\(^\text{69}\) Although guild control had waned by the end of the eighteenth century, the apprenticeship laws had not been repealed. Entry to trades was limited in theory to

---


\(^{69}\) Berg, Age of Manufactures, p. 223.
two apprentices per master, ensuring proper training was given and preventing undercutting of qualified workers by the non-skilled. However, regulations became increasingly difficult to enforce as new types of trades sprang up in provincial towns and in other locations outside the City of London.  

Furthermore, a different style of workforce was becoming necessary in some trades in response to the introduction of machinery. Behagg has shown how one of the strategies of manufacturers in the gun trade, responding to increased demand during the Napoleonic Wars, was to re-structure roles to lessen the influence of apprenticeship laws and lower entry thresholds, thus enabling them to take on extra labour more easily.  

Although journeymen such as Bennett Puddefoot were worried about the undercutting of wages and damage to standards within trades, some manufacturers found themselves unable to meet the demands of an expanded market with such apparent constraints in place. Business growth was likely to be compromised and by 1814 Parliament declared a repeal of the legislation governing apprenticeship laws.

**Technological Advancements**

If we consider the organisation of labour that took place in the wallpaper 'proto-factories' of the market leaders, how far can we describe them as an early form of factory system that also involved the use of machinery as well as the division of labour? Whilst moves towards a fully evolved mechanised factory system for mass produced goods had not yet occurred for many English trades by the second half of the eighteenth century, many trades had begun to adopt incremental technological improvements to production processes at this time.

Technological progress leading to more efficient production in the period of the Industrial Revolution has been analysed by Mokyr in terms of great technological breakthroughs or 'macro-inventions' such as the steam engine and the spinning jenny, and smaller technological improvements and adaptations to processes, or 'micro-inventions'. Here we might think of minor improvements to hand operated lathes or

---

presses, for example. Macro inventions such as the mechanised printing of wallpaper could not take place until it was possible to harness the use of continuous lengths of paper strong enough to feed long mechanised production runs. The excise regulations governing wallpaper restricted printing to the traditional wallpaper lengths of 12 yards. Thus the printing of continuous lengths of paper was prohibited by the Government until the regulations were eventually repealed in 1836. (See Chapter Six). This governmental hindrance stifled incentive to develop a fully mechanised printing process. Mass production of wallpaper was therefore a development of the late 1830s onwards.

King and Timmins describe how the period 1700-1850 saw a 'broadly based culture of technological development' across a wide range of industries. These included industrial processes that relied upon the use of hand techniques, which also continued to be developed and applied. Whilst some hand processes were superseded by those requiring powered techniques, some remained 'as the only or best means of production available'. We can add a further contribution to this concept in the case of the wallpaper trade in that the political consideration of excise regulation provide an additional factor in the delayed development of this particular trade.

Secondary sources are unclear on the extent to which mechanised processes were used in wallpaper manufacture before the 1836 Excise repeal. Evidence is taken in the main from patent registrations, but corroboration that these methods were adopted into common practice is lacking. There is a paucity of records on technological changes in the wallpaper trade in this period, both in London and regionally. F. Aumonier's account of the trade however, describes the craft of hand block printing at this time as having changed little since its inception in the early sixteenth century. As with the textile industry in the second half of the eighteenth century however, some semi-mechanisation of the wallpaper printing process did take place in the early years
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72 King and Timmins, Making Sense of the Industrial Revolution, p. 79.
73 Some of these inventions and patents are described in more detail in Sugden, Wallpaper, pp. 114-115 & 128-129 and Papered Wall, pp. 132-3, where it is acknowledged that we know little of the extent of their applications.
of the nineteenth century and possibly before that. Printing by engraved copper rollers and rollers studded with pins rather than plates had already been introduced into the calico printing trade by 1780s, to produce simple patterns for more affordable clothing. Rollers made of both wood and copper easily sped up production and were more than ten times quicker and more profitable to use than printing by flat wooden block or plate. Chapman describes the use of this type of roller process as best suited to the fast production of single or two colour prints, with block or copper plate printing being reserved for better quality work.\textsuperscript{75}

It is not clear at what point towards the end of the eighteenth century this type of technology was employed by the wallpaper trade,\textsuperscript{76} however, an advertisement for the sale of the Whitelands concern in 1802 indicates that the stock in trade included, 'Two Running Pin Printing Machines for Paper Hangings'.\textsuperscript{77} Other manufacturers were also using some form of roller technique at this stage as the sale of Ebenezer Palmer’s concern in Woodford Green, Essex includes 'rollers' in the list of equipment for sale.\textsuperscript{78} Here then, a rudimentary printing machine had been introduced to quickly and easily create a background detail of small pin dot patterns, which would have been operable by a semi-skilled worker. Certainly there were limitations to the processing of pieces of wallpaper when restricted to 12 yard lengths, but this process was still considerably quicker and cheaper than printing background detail by means of flat printing blocks. We can see this type of background detail in Image 16 from around the turn of the nineteenth century. Here the black dot detail has been printed by means of metal pins, most likely by this date to have been set in rollers, as described in the Whitelands sale advertisement above.

\textsuperscript{75} Chapman and Chassagne, \textit{Textiles}, pp. 30-31 & pp.43-44.
\textsuperscript{76} A.V. Sugden and J.L. Edmondson in \textit{A History of English Wallpaper, 1509-1914} (London, 1925), pp. 114-115 describe a patent by stationer Jacob Burnett dated 18 March 1786 for the roller printing of calicoes, cottons, linens and paper. This may be a modification of Thomas Bells’ 1783 invention used by Hargreaves, Livesey and Co. Sugden also describes a patent as early as 10 April 1764 for engraved cylinder printing for textiles and paper by Fryer, Greenhough and Newberry, however they are of the opinion that little came of these patents regarding their use with wallpaper. Neither invention is mentioned by Chapman and Chassagne of use in the calico printing trade.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Morning Chronicle}, 23 September 1802. This is likely to be the sale of Brandram's concern at Whitelands.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Morning Chronicle}, 10 July 1815.
The success of the roller printing technique lay in its ability to quickly and cheaply give a visual depth to the wallpaper, by mechanical printing of the black dots on a simple, single colour and white print. Colourways frequently consisted of just one colour in combination with white flowers and black dots. These patterns were extremely popular with examples in yellow in the English Heritage collection and in green at Laycock Abbey and Clandon Park. As with designs in calico printing, numerous dots, dashes and chevrons could be provided as simple and quick background detail and depth, printed by means of 'pin printing machines' in use by the large manufacturers at this time. Other trailing patterns and trellis work could also be created as background interest by means of engraved metal rollers and wooden rollers with raised metal
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79 17 Carlisle St, Soho and 1 Thames St, Kingston. Treve Rosoman attributes these patterns to Harwood as the example from Thames St is stamped on the reverse with their manufacturers mark. As one of the largest manufacturers at this time, this may well be the case, however it is likely that other major manufacturers were also producing this popular style of wallpaper. *London Wallpapers, Their Manufacture and Use, 1690 – 1840* (London 2009), pp.26 &35. Unfortunately the Clandon Park paper has since been lost following the fire in 2015.
Small repeats, one colour running patterns or trellis effects added detail and dimension to the background of the more complex block printed elements of the design and provided a cheaper and quicker method than full block printing of the background detail. See Images 16 and 17 below.

Image 17. Black, green and grey block printed leaf pattern on white ground. The background dot trellis style pattern is printed by brass pins, either nailed into a block or roller, c. 1795. English Heritage Architectural Study Collection: 88082031.2.
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80 A. Bush's examination of wallpapers in the Cowtan Order Books shows that etched rollers were used to produce some background effects in combination with block printing. 'Early Cylinder Printing, a Brief Chronology', Wallpaper History Society Review 2012, pp. 29-30.
Striped background effects were also produced by means of another micro-invention, that of the 'V trough', which, as the name suggests, consisted of a V shaped container with slits in the bottom, into which paint was poured. The length of wallpaper was then slowly pulled through below the trough as the paint drained through the slits.
onto the paper.\textsuperscript{81} This provided a much quicker but also much improved method of printing stripes than attempts to print continuous straight lines from individual blocks, and required less skill to learn. The size of the slits was adjustable, and thus a variety of banded effects was possible. These papers became extremely popular from the 1790s onwards, again forming a versatile cost-effective background over which various different motifs from the manufacturer’s stock could be block printed. These striped effects however, are more often associated with the Regency classicism of the second decade of the nineteenth century, where they were used with elaborate borders, but without over printed detail. In this case the wallpaper element of this highly fashionable scheme required no block printing skills at all.

Micro-inventions such as these must no doubt have lowered production costs and increased labour productivity considerably. At the same time they made it possible for manufacturers to offer a wide range of choice of different patterns and depending on the number of coloured details requiring printing, a wide range of prices. Supplementary technologies including the use of steam to heat cotton mills and similar large premises were also adopted in the drying areas of wallpaper manufactories, which also helped speed up production and increase productivity, as less time was required to dry the lengths between each printing. Yet, although processes were becoming more mechanised in the eighteenth century, this did not result in the production of limited ranges and the regimented standardisation of goods that we now associate with Fordism and the mass production of the early twentieth century onwards. On the contrary, Styles has argued that this period experienced the reverse effect, that of increased product creativity through flexible specialisation. Here the introduction of machinery and adaptations in production encouraged manufacture of a more differentiated product, with new ranges of materials and finishes, and possibilities for new products to be further developed.\textsuperscript{82}

Capital was needed to acquire the mechanised 'micro-inventions' of roller presses and heating plants available to the wallpaper trade. As such they were more likely to have been used in the premises of the larger firms and in the proto-factories of the market

\textsuperscript{81} Aumonier, ‘Paperstaining’, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{82} Styles, ‘Manufacturing, Consumption and Design’, pp. 529-531.
leaders, rather than in the small producers workshop. Production of wallpaper was still essentially a hand-craft technique in this period, regardless of business size. The final section below examines how manufacturers of wallpapers, like others making luxury goods at this time, constantly sought new ways to produce more cost effective, better, cheaper or more novel luxury goods through the use of new materials, innovations in decoration and by adapting these existing craft skills.

**Manufacturing Ingenuity and the Block Printing Craft**

The luxury goods market in the second half of the eighteenth century offered a wide range of products to suit the needs of expanding markets of consumers who often had differing tastes and preferences. These consumers were becoming more attuned to the variety of choice, quality and visual appearance of goods for sale. Manufacturers were pressed therefore, to constantly offer a changing assortment of goods, in part to respond to shifts in fashion, but also to direct fashion itself in order to stimulate markets and open up new ones. Previous histories of the design of luxury goods have concentrated on the work of high status products for elite markets or on the work of celebrated manufacturers such as Josiah Wedgewood and Matthew Boulton, in particular their pre-emptive introduction of new products and new forms of decoration in order to secure a market lead.  

This raises the question as to how leading wallpaper manufacturers managed to constantly offer new block printed designs to a wide range of consumers, at least twice per year, but without paying for new designs and incurring significant costs in the carving of new stocks of blocks.

Both the larger producers of wallpapers and printed calicos achieved this by making slight adjustments and minor modifications of their best-selling designs, in order to meet their markets. How this was done in practice is illustrated in the closely related calico printing trade, by the instructions written by Lawrence and Joseph Peel, calico printers of Accrington to their pattern drawer between 1808 and 1812 which requested 'totally new patterns but in the same style'. Regarding the next seasons designs the Peels directed that: 'This pattern is considered by the Trade as one of the
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83 Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumpition and Design', p. 543.
84 Report on Apprentice Laws, 1813, H.C.P.P., p. 23 and Turners 1790 advertisement above suggest this frequency. As with the calico trade, this was probably spring and autumn. Chapman and Chassagne, Textiles, p. 84.
best black and whites ever printed: a few patterns in this style would be useful...’ and 'try something in this colouring on a smaller scale and with more novelty in the figure. You must do your utmost to get novelty. You may as well do nothing as to draw old figures.’

For the manufacturer, their stock of blocks was their most important capital asset. Blocks could be expensive to carve and particularly if carved rather than metal pinned, could wear out. Hinchliffe and Cooke of the Whitelands manufactory allowed for £100 each year for depreciation on their blocks. It was important therefore to get as much value as possible out of each individual block and this they achieved through a process of pattern standardisation. By standardising sizes of patterns, wallpaper manufacturers were able to produce endless variations using different combinations of blocks. Many finishing trades also relied on standard sizing of component parts made to acknowledged specifications in order to assemble consumer goods, for example in the use of cast metal elements such as feet and finials in the manufacture of silver plate objects.

Other trades recognised standard sizing at this time in order to improve efficiency in manufacture and increase saleability as was the case in the textile trades which had regional agreements on yarn counts, or in the sizing of ready-made clothing and shoes. Furthermore, the common practice of selling from pattern books meant that manufacturers were obliged to be consistent in what their customers had ordered this way and what they actually received.

For wallpaper manufacturers then, this meant the production of a large range of interchangeable small patterned wallpapers that could be aimed at the wider middling class market. Here spots, dots, dashes and small figure and diaper patterns predominated with ribbons, running sprigs and trellis patterns. In fashion terms, the simplicity of these types of wallpapers marked a move away from sombre heavy flocks or overworked gothic and rococo patterns, and reflected new neoclassical styles.
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86 W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 3., Deed of Co-partnership, Cooke, Hinchliffe and Matthews, 1 January 1823.
87 Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', pp. 531-535.
88 Styles, Product Innovation, p. 159.
Increasingly popular in wallpapers from the 1770s. Reduced scale patterns were more fitting for the smaller dimensioned rooms of the middling classes and the servants’ rooms of the elite. It was these types of patterns that were referred to by manufacturers in their newspaper advertisements and consumers in their orders as 'neat', 'pretty' and 'tasty'. For the manufacturer these understated, simple and restrained patterns represented a cost effective, easily adaptable and long lasting product. For the consumer they expressed genteel, elegant, good taste, in preference to 'showey' (or crowded) patterns of highly decorated textiles and wallpaper. See Image 19 below:

![Image 18](image18.jpg)

**Image 18.** Green and white stylised flower and trellis design on French grey ground, c. last quarter of eighteenth century. The wallpaper has been covered by a later ivy leaf design that has been partially torn away. From room SR6, former servants bedroom/workroom, second floor, Audley End House, Essex. English Heritage.

Novelty and cheapness were also major requirements for consumer goods at this time and although some designs enjoyed long runs of popularity, it was crucial to offer

---

89 See for example Trollope Letterbook, and further discussed in A. Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors; At Home in Georgian England* (New York, 2009), pp. 166-183.

90 Chapman and Chassagne, *Textiles*, p. 84.
shops, merchants and retail contacts with new and affordable patterns each season. Manufacturers of wallpapers did this by producing printing blocks that could be endlessly interchanged, substituted or new details introduced in a new colourway for the current season’s fashion. Even the simplest designs were de-constructed so that the constituent parts could be adjusted and interchanged with each other to create numerous design combinations easily from a range selected from the manufacturers stock in trade. Image 20 shows two examples of a stylised daisy pattern one printed in pink and blue on a blue ground and the other in blue and pink on a white ground. Here the flower motif, although very simple, has been printed from two blocks in order to print the central dot and surrounding petals in different colours. Other wallpapers with the same scale, (indicating that they were probably printed from the same blocks), have been found in further colour combinations at Somerset House and at Strawberry Hill, Twickenham where the central dot was omitted entirely.\footnote{E. Geldof and R. Weston, ’The Travelling Wallpaper Motif’ \textit{Wallpaper History Society Newsletter, Issue 2} (2009). I am grateful to Robert Weston for these images.}

Image 20. English manufactured and taxed wallpapers bought by English banker, Henry Hope for his summer retreat the Paviljoen Welgelegen in Haarlem, the Netherlands, c. 1800. Photograph: Robert Weston (Hamilton Weston Wallpapers) and Elspeth Geldof.
Permutations were endless as the central dot could then be combined with an alternative motif as in the image below, to create an entirely different wallpaper with a more classical appeal. Image 21 below shows a page from the Cowtan and Son Order Book from 1828, showing examples of easily interchangeable motifs. Different prices could be charged depending on the number of colours or elements, or the entire pattern could be printed in flock using the same blocks. This enabled manufacturers to produce patterns for the next season without the expense of designing and carving a set of entirely new blocks.


Designs and pattern effects in fashionable use on other luxury goods were also copied by the wallpaper trade through skilful manipulation of the hand block craft.
Technological innovations in the production of low relief patterns had produced more sophisticated two and three dimensional ornamentation; this became a popular effect in many luxury goods trades. In the metal-ware trade for example, metal goods and 'toys' could be ornamented with stamped decorative patterns, and in the ceramic trades, raised ornamentation was also added, most famously for example in the production of Wedgewood's low relief blue and white pottery. The wallpaper trade was also able to embrace the new trends for two dimensional design, again at minimal cost by further manipulation of the hand block process. Here designs were double printed using the same block but in a different colour, and slightly off-set. This technique, shown in the image below, produced a shadow effect without the need to carve further blocks to represent this, and thus easily suggested a low relief design without recourse to building up a several printing layers using multiple blocks.

Image 22. Wallpaper with a French grey ground printed in black then white with the same blocks to create a shadow or two dimensional effect to suggest a raised lace or embroidery texture, c. last quarter of the eighteenth century. Wallpaper from a private house in Richmond upon Thames. Photograph courtesy of Robert Weston (Hamilton Weston Wallpapers).

Helen Clifford describes the consumer market for luxury goods at this time as a place 'where novelty and variety were competing with quality of materials as indicators of
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92 Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 544.
Here she describes the frequent display by London silversmiths of both silverware and silver plate alongside each other as part of their standard stock in trade. Styles has also commented on the long history of product variation and product substitution in consumer goods to reach wider markets, as a practice that had already begun in the mid-sixteenth century. An acceleration of this process took place in the second half of the eighteenth century as manufacturers responded to widening commercial markets in consumer goods. In this, manufacturers of luxury goods at this time constantly sought new ways to adapt existing materials or invented new ones, in order to produce entirely new products or cheaper versions of existing ones.

Imitations were made of imitations as luxury goods manufacturers sought more and more novel and/or cheaper materials and effects. Printed calicos were made to imitate muslins, earthenware to imitate porcelain and silver plate to imitate solid silver. Some products often replaced the goods they replicated as in the case of Wedgewood’s black basalt ware: this had been produced in imitation of Greek and Etruscan black earthenware, which in turn had replicated the patina of silver. Yet by the end of the eighteenth century tea pots made in new 'Egyptian black' had become sought after items in themselves and were used in preference to or alongside silverware on the tea tables of the more wealthy.

We have seen in Chapter One how wallpapers themselves were a product of this imitative and innovative trend in that they sought to replicate in flock, the more expensive raised surface effects of damask, velvet and brocade wall hangings. Further, novel ways were also introduced to replicate the textural and low relief effects of flock itself by a cheaper, newer version termed 'mock flock' printed wholly in paint. These were deceptive to the eye and highly effective and along with flock wallpapers and borders, became part of many wallpaper manufacturers’ standard range throughout the period under study. For the consumer they represented novelty each time they replicated a new design in flock, whilst selling at around half the price. For the
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93 Clifford, 'Metal-working Trades', p. 242.
94 Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 531.
96 For example, C and W in Sheffield sold 'best London mock flocks' from 3½d per yard and 'best London flocks' at 1shilling 4d. Sheffield Independent, 9 May 1829.
manufacturer, they were cheaper to produce in labour and materials than flock. Consequently 'mock flocks' were very marketable whilst remaining constantly fashionable for as long as flock itself was in vogue.

We have also seen in Chapter One how the artifice of wallpaper replicating traditional stonework and wood panelling was admired by consumers not only because it was cheaper to acquire, but also because it was novel and accomplished. In the constant quest by eighteenth-century luxury goods manufacturers for new materials and finishes, wallpaper producers began to seek new finishes that no longer replicated bona fide wall coverings, but simply sought to contrive clever textural effects. Image 23 below shows a wallpaper fragment found at Newark Park, Gloucestershire, printed in a popular trompe l’oeil weave effect. The scale included indicates that the pattern size is too large for a woven textile. Perhaps these types of wallpaper were meant to replicate basket work? In either case, this type of wallpaper was less about realism and more about style. Image 24 is a similar example of a weave effect, produced cheaply from one block, by turning the block on its side to print the second colour.

Manufacturers often defined the markets for their luxury goods by the quality of materials used. Prestige ranges were distinguished, for example, by the addition of gold, silver and ormolu (gilded bronze) detailing. Berg describes how luxury porcelain was frequently decorated with gilded stands and handles to elevate it to a higher status category. Similarly gilding on furniture in particular on carved and papier-mâché candelabras and picture frames all created an appearance of opulence in interiors at this time. This effect was further enriched by the use of gold and silver on wallpapers either as detailing or in imitation of gold and silver brocade, and the whole ensemble further highlighted by flickering candlelight in interiors at the time. The Eckhardt brothers of Chelsea and John Sherringham of Great Marlborough St are described as using real gold on their prestige range of wallpapers in the 1780s and 90s.

Silver and gold effects could also be replicated by other manufacturers, however, using cheaper and easier to use metal powders and metal foils coated with a yellow varnish to look like gold; these were used on wallpapers as well as on lacquer ware and 
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97 Public Advertiser, 20 March 1757.
carriage decoration.\textsuperscript{99} Similar light reflecting effects were also more cheaply created on wallpapers by the use of mica or by printing selected elements of the pattern in coloured glazes to catch the light. These can be seen in Images 24 and 25 below. \textsuperscript{100}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image25.jpg}
\caption{Image 25. Flock design (probably originally red) on light mica ground, mid eighteenth century. The sparkling mica can still be seen in the centre of the image. Victoria and Albert Museum: E2233-1966. ©Victoria and Albert Museum, London.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{100} These glazes may be the 'illuminating' greens and blues mentioned in the Duppa and Co’s Daybook. See for example entries for June 1794.
In terms of basic materials a range of qualities could be had and cost was reflected in colours used. James Davenport, manufacturer in Newcastle, distinguished the different qualities of pigments that he used in his ‘elegant patterns and colours consisting of pea greens, blues and common greens’.\(^{101}\) More expensive pigments could be substituted for cheaper versions of the same colour. Fashionable neoclassical French grey, for example, (seen in Image 5) was made from a combination of white lead, Prussian blue or blue verditer with a small amount of red lake or vermillion, however, simple greys could be made by mixing cheap carbon black and chalk white.\(^{102}\) The colour manufacturers, Berger supplied a range of both cheap and expensive

\(^{101}\) *Newcastle Courant*, 12 August 1780.

versions of standard colours for bulk use by the wallpaper trade. Their more expensive range of 'satin' colours, made from a base of lime and alum which gave a sheen effect, were in turn imitated by others. Here a similar glazed result was achieved by simply polishing or varnishing over more economical chalk pigment.

The interconnectivity between the design of luxury goods at this time also allowed manufacturers to benefit from each others’ designs in constantly driving forward the market for new fashionable goods. Berg describes how designs and finishes in metal-ware were 'inextricably linked' with that of chinaware and earthenware goods. Influences of fashionable motifs and designs also spanned the wallpaper trade and its closest relation, the calico printing trade. Printed fabrics for bedspreads, tablecloths, bordered curtains and other domestic furnishings could be made to match, or co-ordinate, with wallpapers. Both J. Shave in Ipswich and James Davenport in Newcastle in the 1770s and 80s for example advertised that their wallpapers could be made to match chintz, stripe and checked furnishing fabrics as was done in London.

Both trades could not only generate their own multiple permutations of designs, but also borrow from and connect to each other via a seemingly endless variety of stripes, dots, flowers and sprigs and running and trailing patterns that were aimed particularly at the middling class market. Image 27 shows page from the Peel, Yates and Co pattern book, illustrating a small sample of the various patterns produced which were easily copied in wallpaper. By co-ordinating these simple styles in fabric and wallpaper, the cost of creative artwork was reduced. Further, the two trades could mutually benefit from each other’s creation of new markets for their latest designs, and sales of both were further increased by selling complimentary patterns.

---

103 Bristow, Housepainting, pp. 9 & 54.
104 Aumonier, 'Paperstaining', p. 53; Advertisement of William Fell, Isle of Man Weekly Gazette, 9 April 1816.
106 Ipswich Journal, 11 April 1775; Newcastle Courant, 12 August 1780. See also Image 7 trade card of James Wheeley.
Conclusion

Production methods, labour organisation and technological advancement differed across many manufacturing trades in this period. Each sought to adapt and to adopt new structures and practices in order to meet and stimulate the increased demands from expanding markets at this time. The market leaders in the wallpaper trade remained in the environs of the capital, where they consolidated their interests and contacts and benefitted from their established status as one of London's reputable luxury goods trades.

A major factor in the success of these firms was the easy adaptability of the process of wallpaper production to the division of labour and, with a pool of skilled and semi-skilled labour concentrated in London, rationalisation of production could be easily achieved. Like other luxury goods trades therefore, it was possible to maximise the potential of this labour organisation whilst still using traditional craft skills in large scale integrated 'proto-factories'. Some small technical advances must have proved an enormous advantage to the efficiency of production and the ability to help support their positions as market leaders. However, the main skill for these manufacturers lay in their knowledge of the fashion market and anticipation of what was saleable.

Attempts to cut labour and material costs were then made a virtue of at the printing stage. Skilful manipulation and imaginative use of printing techniques enabled manufacturers to produce a wide range of simple, often interchangeable designs that complemented the fashionable styles of other luxury goods. Yet, concentration on the widest market of the middle classes and the maximisation of profit through simplification of this traditional skill resulted in a move away from creative, design led production. This ultimately had an adverse effect on the reputation of the trade in the longer term, the results of which are discussed in Chapter Six.
Chapter Five: The Regional Trade, Competition and the Challenge to London, 1750-1830.

Introduction

Previous histories of wallpaper have largely ignored evidence of a regional trade in wallpapers, preferring to focus on the larger London trade. Yet this chapter demonstrates that a provincial trade in wallpapers developed gradually over the period 1750 to 1830, with an acceleration of activity from the 1800s coinciding with the growth in urbanisation during this time. In this chapter therefore, we explore the provincial reaction to the increased consumption of wallpapers, examining when and where regional manufactories were established and how they operated. We also explore the regional response to the dominance of wallpaper production by the London manufacturers and argue that in some regions by the 1820s, output of regional manufactories was significant enough to present a challenge to London’s monopoly of the country trade.

The Urban Context

The period under study falls within a wider timescale that saw the gradual transformation of England’s cities and towns, and which had been in progress since the seventeenth century. This transformation was characterised by population rise and industrial and commercial development. Whilst London saw the highest rise in population, provincial centres also expanded dramatically, so that in 1700 there was only one provincial town (Norwich) with a population of more than 25,000, yet by 1820, this figure had grown to fifteen. These developments were not felt in equal measure across all towns however. Some old established towns experienced growth whilst others declined, and other formerly less populated areas witnessed rapid development to create new industrial and manufacturing towns. Nonetheless as Chalklin states in his detailed account of regional building activities in this period, all towns experienced building booms of some sort in this period fed by demand from an increasing population.¹

In discussing urban typologies, Rosemary Sweet describes four broad groups which categorise regional towns in this period; the first and fastest growing urban areas at this point were the seaports, which benefitted greatly from their trading role, such as Newcastle, Bristol, Hull and Liverpool. Secondly, manufacturing and industrial towns including Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester also experienced significant demographic and economic growth. The third category consists of market or county towns such as York and Stamford which acted as retail, administrative and social hubs for the surrounding area; and finally the fourth category is composed of the genteel 'leisure towns' such as Bath, Tunbridge Wells and Buxton, whose populations and economies grew as a result of (and were consequently dependent upon) the middle class visitors' spending power and a finite social season.²

Regional specialisation was already an established feature of England's towns by 1750, and in this respect, the position of London as supplier-manufacturer of consumer luxury goods was beginning to be challenged.³ This was furthered in great measure by improvements in transport links by the increasing construction of turnpike roads and canal networks, particularly in the second half of the eighteenth century, linking regional areas with each other, the metropolis and coastal ports.⁴ Additionally, Peter Borsay's work on the early modern town describes a transformation of urban culture that was in place by 1760s. This 'urban renaissance' was marked by improved town planning, including the provision of civic, cultural and leisure amenities, and an increasing workforce engaged in the retail and supply of a luxury goods and leisure service industry.⁵ Peter Clark supports this in describing how the majority of local gentry chose to visit, shop and use the services of the transforming and emergent towns in preference to more expensive trips to London, so stimulating the local economy composed of a growing number of local, middling class shopkeepers and

⁴ Sweet, English Town, p. 11.
professionals.\textsuperscript{6} Thus a change in focus away from the metropolis and towards the provincial town resulted in the development of a sense of local pride and raised the status and credentials of locally produced luxury goods.

As urban growth in this period was fuelled by increased industrialisation and commercialisation, in this respect the growth was self-perpetuating: Industrial expansion and the contingent growth in internal and overseas trade resulted in increased migration to these towns by those in search of employment, whilst those in search of entrepreneurial opportunities could benefit from the concentration of skilled workers and reduced wages and operational costs outside the Capital. Industries servicing the population increase also followed, further enlarging numbers and thus the demand for more housing. As well as an increased concentration of local wealth and capacity to purchase luxury goods, the wallpaper trade was of course able to benefit from the physical expansion in the number of new houses being built in these developing regions.

\textbf{The Start of the Regional Trade}

Due to the small number of firms involved in the regional manufacture of wallpapers in England, we cannot rule out purely individual preferences and personal circumstances as the motivation for why and where regional wallpaper entrepreneurs chose to commence business. In spite of this however, some geographical trends can be observed in the location of the emerging regional trade in the second half of the eighteenth century: these indicate a difference between towns in the east and the west of the country, with the bias towards continual, sustained production situated in the North East and Yorkshire. This section looks at where regional manufacturers were located in the period up to the 1820s and examines the possible reasons for this suggested imbalance.

We might expect an early regional industry to emerge at this time in proximity to allied trades or resources. In this case however, there was only a relatively small industry operating in Manchester at this point despite the correlation between the processes of

block printing wallpaper and calico, in which latter trade Manchester played a

dominant role. Similarly we might expect to find an emergent regional industry

located close to a supply of raw materials such as a paper mill, however with the

exception of Kent and Buckinghamshire (output from which was captured by the

London market), there is little to suggest a deliberate proximity between sites chosen

for wallpaper printing and those for paper making, the latter often being located in a

rural area. In fact as Coleman suggests, there were few counties in England that lacked

a paper making industry by the end of the eighteenth century.

Hilary Young has argued in her work on the provincial porcelain trade that proximity to

raw materials was less important to businesses than good transport and

communication links. Of more importance to wallpaper manufacturers setting up

concerns in the North East and Yorkshire was undoubtedly the availability of an

established transport and business network with connections to markets farther afield.

Thus we see pockets of wallpaper manufacturers in Newcastle and Hull; James

Davenport who had a business in both Newcastle and York in 1748, John Davenport

who was in business in St Nicholas' Church Yard Newcastle by 1770, Ann Davenport at

Stony Hill, Broad Chair, Newcastle in 1776, William Appleton in Darlington in 1782 and

John Parker in Hull by 1802. In Yorkshire, Messrs Hargrave and Plowman were

running a 'paper staining manufactory' in Call Lane in Leeds, which for Hargrave proved

to be the beginning of a long established business, and likewise in York, John Mush

had also established a manufactory in Monk Bar, York, which would also continue for

several years afterwards.

---

7 William Paul paper hanging manufacturer of Dolefield, Manchester was listed in Bailey's Northern Directory, 1781, Dean and Co's Manchester and Salford Directory, 1804 and Pigott's Manchester and Salford Directory, 1813, amongst frequent entries for calico printers. Paul also advertised frequently in the Manchester Mercury in the 1780s and 1790s, seemingly with no competition. Chalklin, Provincial Towns, p. 36.

8 The exceptions to this were the East Anglian counties that lacked fast running streams with which to power the mills. See D.C. Coleman, The British Paper Industry 1495-1860, A Study in Industrial Growth (Oxford, 1958), p. 148.

9 Young, 'Porcelain', p. 261.

10 York Courant, 14 September 1748 (I am grateful to Kay Staniland for this reference); Newcastle Courant, 22 March 1770; 15 June 1776; 8 June 1782; Letter heading of John Parker and Co, 1802, Hull History Centre C DMT/9/106.

11 Bailey's Northern Directory, (1784); Leeds Intelligencer, 18 February 1783.
As noted above, the largest areas of growth at this stage were in the port towns. Newcastle and Hull were already at the heart of the successful coastal trade with London that also involved the transportation of luxury goods.\(^\text{12}\) Hull was also linked by navigation system to several major manufacturing and commercial towns including Leeds, York, Halifax, Stoke and Birmingham and from where manufactured goods were transported via Hull to London and Europe.\(^\text{13}\) Both towns also supplied large hinterlands that depended on them for goods and services. As such, these towns possessed an expanding population of wealthy merchants, businessmen, professionals and middle class consumers who could support a fashionable retail sector.\(^\text{14}\) As Weatherill observes, as a consequence of the established trading networks in the North East, inhabitants there enjoyed a greater choice and availability of consumer goods at an earlier date than most other places in England.\(^\text{15}\)

Leeds shared a similar status at the centre of a successful distribution network for the West Riding textile trade. Linked by canal and turnpike networks its population grew as a result of its strategic trading position from 17,121 in 1775 to 30,669 in 1801 and to 48,603 in 1821.\(^\text{16}\) As a result of this position, Leeds attracted other markets including ancillary trades and provisions to support its own urban population and that of its dependant hinterland. As Chalklin states, 'Leeds was the centre for entertainment and wholesale distribution, for books and newspapers, wallpapers, chinaware, bricks, tailoring, and the best wigs, medical treatment and furniture'.\(^\text{17}\) York too, whilst having no large scale industry of its own also enjoyed a position as the regional centre of Yorkshire, and as an established administrative, religious and social hub. It was served by the Great North Road, drew gentry and middle class visitors from across the county for shopping, entertainment and a winter season.

\(^\text{13}\) Ibid., Chapters II,III & IV. Jackson includes a useful diagram showing the extent of Hull’s inland connections on p. 447.
\(^\text{16}\) Chalklin, *Provincial Towns*, p. 39.
\(^\text{17}\) Ibid., p. 40.
It is clear to see how these economic and social factors might provide a suitable base for the development of a trade in regional wallpaper manufacture. We can expect early paper staining businesses to have been set up therefore in areas with good transport communications, business networks and with access to a middle class customer base. Thus as early as 1748 paper-stainers John Davenport and Co were operating warehouses in both York and Newcastle. Their advertisement from this period suggest a confidence in the demand for their products, as they state that their prices are fixed and without abatement and that their wallpapers are sold for ready money, and not the usual credit terms to which many of their contemporary retailers and customers would have been used to.18

However, other towns also enjoyed the same potentially lucrative environments: Liverpool and Bristol were also major ports with rapidly expanding urban centres and a hinterland dependant on them for trade and services. Yet the regional manufacture of wallpaper in the west of England was much later in starting than the east, with Liverpool only developing as a centre for production after the start of the nineteenth century. Directory and newspaper sampling for Bristol suggests that here there was very little manufacturing of wallpaper at all.19 This comparatively slow start in the west of England was due in no small part by the continued dominance of the market by both the London trade and by the importation of wallpapers from Ireland.

Irish wallpapers could be made more cheaply than the English product due to the availability of cheaper labour and raw materials in Ireland. Similarly the Irish trade was notorious for smuggling and evasion of the wallpaper tax. Some wallpaper printing was undertaken in unlicensed 'private manufactories' which were in secret locations or locations where, in fear of their lives, the excise officers would not dare to venture.

18 York Courant, 14 February 1748. I am grateful to Kay Staniland for this reference. The extent of credit as a method of finance at this time is discussed in J. Hoppit, Risk and Failure in English Business, 1700-1800 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 70-71. Ian Mitchell suggests that fixed prices and selling for cash not credit was becoming more common by the end of the eighteenth century. Davenport’s operation would therefore appear to be an early manifestation of this later practice. I. Mitchell, 'The Development of Urban Retailing' in Clark, Transformation, p. 278.

19 See Table 4. John Grove’s entry in Bailey’s Western and Midland Directory (1783) as paper maker and stainer is short lived as he next appears as Grove and Poutney, paper makers in Universal British Directory, vol. 2 (1791). Thereafter there is no reference to wallpaper manufacturers in the regional press or directories sampled until Matthews’ Annual Bristol Directory (1826) lists Anstice, Webb and Weston.
Other manufacturers employed evasion and stalling tactics by blocking hallways and entrances with obstacles to hinder the access of the excise man, whilst some manufacturers acted in collusion with the excise officers themselves. English merchants were no more innocent in avoiding the additional ad valorem duty payable on entrance into England on papers which had been legitimately taxed in Ireland.  

Whether by fraudulent or honest means, the Irish export of wallpapers to Liverpool in particular was very lucrative, involving the export of large quantities of a product that was cheaper in terms of both quality and price. In both 1772 and again in 1791, the principal London paper-stainers had found it necessary to send memorials to Parliament on the subject of the deleterious effects of the Irish paper staining trade on their businesses.  

This trade was handled in Liverpool and Bristol by upholsters, auctioneers and stationers who figure in contemporary directories and form the only contingent of the interested parties representing Liverpool and Bristol when the industry as a whole petitioned the Board of Trade in 1817 concerning foreign and non-excise paying competition.  

It was not until the second decade of the nineteenth century that Liverpool established its own wallpaper manufactories in any significant sense as described further below.

Some of the entrepreneurs involved in the establishment of the Liverpool manufactories at this time had formerly been manufacturers in Ireland. Evidence given by James Boswell, a Dublin manufacturer, in 1821 for a House of Commons enquiry into Irish revenue states that as a result of further additional duties on the export of Irish wallpapers into Liverpool, this trade became difficult to operate and had become greatly reduced by 1819. However, demand was so high for cheap Irish wallpapers in Liverpool and its retail distribution areas, that Boswell set up a branch of

---

21 N.A: T1 489/144 Memorial of John Salt to the Right Honorable the Lords of the Treasury, 26 March 1772 & T11/36, Memorial of Peter Bowers and Co, 21 May 1791.
22 Petition entitled Petition to the Board of Trade on Behalf of the Paper-stainers. N.A. BT6/174 Board of Trade Petitions; Paper-stainers, 1817.
23 George Morton’s anecdotal account of the wallpaper trade suggests that the Liverpool manufacturers at this time were largely composed of paper-stainers from Ireland. Paper Hangings, p. 39. Chalklin also describes the expansion of the labour force at the end of the eighteenth century caused by large numbers of Irish immigrants into Liverpool. Provincial Towns, p. 292.
his Irish manufactory in Liverpool in order to circumvent the additional duties. By 1821 Boswell was advertising his manufactory at 69 Church St in Liverpool.  

Other towns also grew rapidly at this time including the industrial centres of Birmingham, Leicester and Nottingham and we might expect the consumption of wallpapers in these areas to have risen as well. However, like Liverpool and Bristol, there is little evidence of regional wallpaper manufacture here until the 1820s. Taking Birmingham as a case study, its population grew rapidly in the second half of the eighteenth century, from 23,000 in 1750 up to 40,000 in 1770 and by 1801 had risen to 71,000. The stimulus to this development lay in Birmingham's role at the centre of the metalworking trades located in the Black Country region, and increasingly from the 1770s to the 1790s, as the hub of a canal network that connected it with local towns and distant urban centres such as Liverpool, Nottingham, Oxford and Coventry. Birmingham therefore, like Leeds and Newcastle (and Hull and York) was strategically placed as a provincial distribution centre for various good and services.

Unlike the eastern towns described above however, Birmingham's commercial status as a retail and distribution centre did not lead to the establishment of wallpaper manufactories, as they are markedly absent in local directories and in newspaper advertisements in the second half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Instead, the retail of wallpapers in Birmingham and its dependant hinterland was concentrated in the hands of auctioneers, warehousemen, upholders and stationers. This is borne out again by the absence of paper-stainers' signatures from this region in the 1817 Petition to the Board of Trade on Behalf of the Paper-stainers. The interests of Birmingham and its west midland hinterlands are represented by these dealers, upholders and retailers. The names Suffield, Ryley, Pare and Ethell, evident on the 1817 Petition, all appear in The Birmingham Gazette in the 1810s and 1820s engaged in a price war with each other to offer the most fashionable wallpapers at the lowest

---

24 Third Report, 1822, H.C.P.P., p. 28; Liverpool Mercury, 2 February 1821.
25 Sweet, English Town, p. 18.
26 Chalklin, Provincial Towns, p.42.
prices. As we shall see, the regional wallpaper manufacturers, like their metropolitan counterparts, ran some form of advertised wholesale and/or retail outlet. It is plausible to suggest that wallpaper manufacturers were not operating in the West Midlands to any great extent (at least until the end of the period), given the lack of newspaper marketing by them alongside these other retailers.

It is evident that the Birmingham wallpaper retailers, several of whom were based in the centre of town in the streets around St Phillip's church, were operating in a very competitive market to secure the custom of Birmingham residents and those from its surrounding catchment areas. Ryley, selling wallpapers from his upholstery, cabinet and carpet warehouse, for example, stated that he was 'determined to offer upon terms equally low with any advertising house in Birmingham'. Similarly a few months previously, John Pare of Colemore Row had been advertising his 'cheap Paper Hangings...from the first houses in London which he is determined to sell at unprecedentedly low prices for ready money only'. These advertisements suggest that retailers in Birmingham had the financial capacity and business connections to be able to buy wallpapers in bulk and with this large stock they were concerned with making quick sales for a rapid turnover.

Other towns in England aside from the new industrial centres had a similar function to Birmingham as a retail distribution centre for wallpapers rather than a manufacturing base. Again this warns against making too rigid a contrast between the economic and social structure of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century towns. In this respect also the consumption of luxury goods, specifically wallpaper, played a more universal, democratising role in the character of urban centres. Thus we see genteel, established towns such as Bath exceeding Nottingham, Bolton and Wolverhampton in the number of its residents engaged in the distribution and dealing trades and also regarding the retail of wallpaper, in following similar cost cutting retail practices to Birmingham.

27 N.A. BT6/174, Board of Trade Petitions, 1817; See for example Birmingham Gazette, 11 April 1814; 16 September 1824; 28 February 1825.  
28 Aris's Birmingham Gazette, 11 July & 28 February 1825.  
29 Ibid, 31 January 1825.  
30 Clark, 'Introduction', Transformation, p. 27.
Stobart and Schwarz's study of the regional provision of luxury goods at the end of the eighteenth century identifies commercial centres such as Newcastle, Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester as having the largest total number of luxury goods providers, reflecting their emerging status as regional capitals. However, their study also notes the largest number of luxury goods and services providers per capita was found in residential leisure towns and county towns as an expression of their existing 'social, cultural and service structures' within the towns themselves and extending to the hinterlands they served.\textsuperscript{31}

We can expect Bath to have provided for more affluent residents and visitors, however it also had a flourishing warehouse sector, catering for its growing population of middling class customers.\textsuperscript{32} Here proprietors of large upholstery and cabinet warehouses also fought each other for a market share and would offer wallpapers on the 'lowest terms', 'at London prices, carriage free'. It is clear that these proprietors also had the ability to buy stock in bulk from the London manufacturers on advantageous terms but were dependant on a quick turn over in order to realise a profit. This type of marketing may well have been appropriate for Bath's population of landlords catering for influxes of temporary seasonal residents.

John Stafford in Bath's Market Place advertised in April 1794 that he had over 20,000 yards of paper hangings for sale for cash rather than credit and at the wholesale price. Stafford also advertised that that he had an 'immense stock' of over 2,000 wallpapers from the London firm Bowen and Co to sell at reduced prices in any amounts and was prepared to negotiate unspecified 'discounts' so keen was he to see a rapid return on his investment.\textsuperscript{33} We can see therefore that this flourishing retail and distribution environment based firmly on discounted wallpapers from London was not a conducive environment for the establishment of a local wallpaper manufactory.

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Bath Chronicle}, 3 April 1794 & 14 March 1793.
Whilst some broad tendencies can be observed for the manufacture of wallpaper in the east of England, and the marketing of wallpaper in the west based on London and Irish supply, the small number of firms involved permits only suggestive and not conclusive comment. In addition, these conclusions are based only on the sustained existence of wallpaper manufacturing in these areas, during this period of expansion of the trade in general. Furthermore, some anomalies are present in the establishment of wallpaper manuf acturies in locations such as East Anglia, the Isle of Man and Exeter at this time.

As Stobart and Schwarz argue, those engaged in the provision of luxury goods were as evident in commercial and manufacturing towns as in county towns, however, they caution against too stringent an approach to categorisation as these trades could also be found in some less predictable locations as well. The regional manufacturing of wallpapers was apparent by 1763 in Ipswich at the manuf actuary of J. Shave, bookseller and stationer. Although this business was not sustained in Ipswich, manufacturing in East Anglia continued in Norwich in 1790s at J. Bunn’s manuf actuary in St Faith’s Lane. Both Ipswich and Norwich in particular represented significant commercial centres by the mid eighteenth century, and although their growth was far outstripped by that of the new manufacturing and port towns by the end of the century, they continued to provide a commercial, administrative and service centre for the population of East Anglia.

The Isle of Man’s position in the centre of the Irish Sea meant that it was a consumer of both Dublin and to a lesser extent, London wallpapers. Its population was small and essentially finite in that it lacked an easily accessible hinterland. Yet in 1802, the Manks Advertiser included notice of the ‘Manks Manuf actory of Paper Hangings’ opened by William Fell in the Shambles, Douglas, with the purpose of supplying the Island with a home-made product. Similarly in Exeter, wallpaper manufacturing was

---

34 Here examples of luxury goods providers such as architects and portrait painters are cited in the less genteel towns of Doncaster, Macclesfield and Wolverhampton. Stobart and Schwarz, ‘Leisure’, p. 231. 35 Ipswich Journal, 9 June 1763 & Norfolk Chronicle, 16 September 1790. 36 The first official census took place in 1821 which put the total population of the Island at 40,081. R. H. Kinvig, The Isle of Man; A Social, Cultural and Political History (Liverpool, 1975), p. 154. Manks Advertiser, 10 April 1802.
being undertaken no later than 1783 by Joseph Hunt in Fore St, Exeter. 37 Although Exeter enjoyed a role as an economic and social centre and leisure resort, its population was small, growing by only seven thousand between c. 1750 and 1821. 38 Yet like East Anglia and the Isle of Man, Exeter's more remote location meant it did have a fairly captive market of gentry and professionals, who may well have welcomed not having to wait extended delivery times for wallpapers coming from farther afield.

**How the Regional Trade Was Set Up**

As with their metropolitan counterparts, many regional paper-stainers held multiple occupations. Again these roles were often closely related to wallpaper manufacture/retail, such as that of stationer and upholsterer. 39 Many combined unrelated roles however, like the wallpaper manufacturer and druggist Joseph Hunt of Fore Street, Exeter. 40 Hunt, like many regional retailers, tradesmen and craftsmen in this period, provided a variety of diverse services and products, according to demand and seasonality, from premises serving local townsfolk and visitors. Multiple occupancy can therefore make it difficult to assess the degree of regional manufacture in this period.

In addition, skilled craftsmen such as artist, portrait painter and printer William Carroll in Hull in 1807 were also carving wooden printing blocks which they advertised for sale to calico and wallpaper printers. 41 Thus it was possible for local house painters or decorative artists to buy 'ready-made' printing blocks in order to print up simple patterns themselves. This simple adjunct to a craftsman or decorators' trade and the blending of related professions is likely to have been representative of many other contemporary towns as well. It is possible to infer that small scale printing of wallpapers could have been carried on in this unstructured, non-professional way not only in the early stages of the regional trade but also at any point during the period in question alongside dedicated manufactories.

---

37 Bailey’s *Western and Midland Directory* (Birmingham, 1783).
38 Sweet, *English Town*, p. 3.
40 Bailey’s *Western and Midland Directory* (Birmingham, 1783).
The sharing and merging of cognate skills is also evident on the Isle of Man. Wallpaper manufacturer Robert Fell was already working for the Duke of Athol at the latter’s house at Port-E-Chee and other properties around the town of Douglas, for which he appears in the Duke's accounts as 'Robert Fell the painter'. Work undertaken included painting and glazing, plus hanging wallpapers brought from suppliers off the Island.\textsuperscript{42}

Fell’s newspaper advertisement for his new manufactory states that he had:

\begin{quote}
bought the utensils necessary for carrying on a Manufactory of printed Paper Hangings, \textit{in the Island}; for the Execution of which he has with him a Man of distinguished Abilities and long Experience in such Manufactory, by whose Assistance he will be able, in future, to serve the Public well...\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

Not surprisingly the trade of painter seems to have been commonly associated with the development of paper-staining businesses in regional towns, with other firms such as that of Wright and Audaer in Coppergate, York in 1807 combining both trades. However, the wallpaper trade in the regions at this time also reflects changes in the wider urban occupational structure in its move away from the traditional systems of multiple occupation and towards a specialist trade in itself. Business partnerships were common and often based on supply of goods rather than skill duplication. This was the case for example with William Rathmell, wholesale colourman in partnership with William Hargrave an established paper-stainer in Leeds in 1794 and wallpaper manufacturers Hardy and Astrop, at 3 St John’s St, Hull in 1823 where Astrop was also involved with the paper trade in the town.\textsuperscript{44}

Such business relationships and networks were obviously as important within regional towns as they were in the metropolis. Links with London itself were also useful in embarking upon regional paper staining enterprises. As we have seen in Chapter One, some firms opened second manufactories in the regions. Robert Pickering, wallpaper manufacturer had interests and family connections in London, was also involved in the paper staining firm of R. and H. Pickering in Leeds from the 1790s where they also

\textsuperscript{42} The papers of the Duke of Athol indicate that Fell was working for him at least during the periods 1796-1816, see M.M: APX50 (4th) 40; APX50 (4th)-35; AP127 (3rd)-37, Athol Papers.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Manks Advertiser}, 10 April 1802.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{York Herald}, 28 February 1807; \textit{Leeds Intelligencer}, 7 April 1794; \textit{History, Directory and Gazetteer of Yorkshire}, vol 2, (1823).
advertised themselves as colourmen, plus also had interests in a linen bleaching business there.\textsuperscript{45} Leeds' advantageous location as a distribution hub and retail centre, plus its role as centre for the linen finishing business, suggests that the Pickerings were interested in involvement with new developing and expansive markets in the town of which the wallpaper trade was one.

McKendrick describes how Wedgewood also set up satellite provincial warehouses which supplied regional shops with his ceramic ware.\textsuperscript{46} This type of selling strategy may well be more commonplace and extensive than previously thought. Further research into the wallpaper trade at this time may reveal more connections with London firms and their involvement in regional enterprises. For example, George Kibblewhite of the Leeds firm Botterill and Kibblewhite in 1798 was also connected to leading London wallpaper firm Harwood and Co at Adam Street West in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{47} Nominal record linkage may therefore reveal the names of further regional manufacturers hidden under the general title of London-based company names.

There is other evidence of entrepreneurial involvement or investment in the regional paper staining trade by those who were not paper-stainer masters themselves but managers or owners of the concern. This indicates that some regional businesses were large enough to support employees rather than just one master and his assistant: implying a degree of investment in premises and equipment. Thus advertisements appear in the press for 'an expert and steady workman to undertake the charge of a Paper-stainers Manufactory' and also in Leeds the following advertisement stated:

\begin{quote}
wanted in a Paper Staining MANUFACTORY, a person of middle Age who perfectly understands the Paper Staining and Printing BUSINESS and who has served his time to it, to act as Foreman over the Printers and Grounders and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{45} Leeds Intelligencer, 20 April 1808; Derby Mercury, 4 July 1811. See Figure 1, p. 100.\textsuperscript{46} N. McKendrick, J. Brewer and J.H. Plumb, \textit{The Birth of a Consumer Society: the Commercialization of Eighteenth Century England} (London, 1982), p. 90.\textsuperscript{47} Universal British Directory, 1798; O.B.P., 30 November 1814.
print himself the Patterns for the Manufactory; he will have a yearly Salary on liberal terms, and must bear an undeniable Character.\textsuperscript{48}

Similarly in the \textit{Leeds Intelligencer} of 1 July 1824, Samuel Overend announced that he had taken over the large established Renton business at the back of the Shambles, Leeds, whereas Overend had formerly been involved in a tailor and drapery business in the town. Similarly, T Anderson and Co, commencing their wallpaper manufacturing business in Newcastle in 1832 advertised that they had engaged a foreman from London with 23 years of experience in one of the 'first manufactories' to oversee the running of his business.\textsuperscript{49}

Links with London were clearly important in establishing expertise in regional wallpaper manufacture, notwithstanding the metropolis' rudimentary role at the centre of this new trade. Skills were no doubt shared and developed between those working in the London and regional manufactories. The names of some London paper-stainers and members of paper-staining families appear on the 1817 \textit{Petition to Parliament on behalf of the Paper-stainers} under provincial headings, thus Bennett Puddefoot senior and junior, journeymen paper-stainers from Chelsea with many years of experience are listed at this time under the Newcastle contingent. Likewise William Wilsher and Mark Pettigrew, journeymen in Newcastle and Leeds respectively, both had family members working in the larger of the London manufactories.\textsuperscript{50} London paper-stainers migrating to regional towns were therefore finding work, or were actively sought out by regional entrepreneurs and manufacturers. Richard Goodlad of Newcastle advertised in 1815 that he had taken on workmen from London, in order to emphasise the professional quality of his wallpapers.\textsuperscript{51}

Once London expertise had been learnt it was therefore inevitable that the regional trade should develop its own infrastructure. Towns such as Leeds and Hull already enjoyed a good reputation as centres for skilled labour by the end of the eighteenth

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{York Herald}, 13 May 1809; \textit{Leeds Intelligencer}, 14 September 1795.
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Newcastle Courant}, 21 July 1832.
\textsuperscript{50} Giving evidence before a House of Commons Committee on apprentice laws in 1813, Bennett Puddefoot senior describes himself as having 27 years of experience as a paper-stainer and his son as being five years into his apprenticeship. \textit{Report on Apprentice Laws}, 1813, H.C.P.P., pp. 22-23. N.A: Board of Trade Petitions, 1817.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Durham County Advertiser}, 27 May 1815.
century. In addition, apprenticeship schemes for paper-stainers were available regionally, indicating that the provincial trade was becoming self-supporting with a formal professional structure in place for this trade in some towns. For example, John Mush junior, whose uncle had headed the family paper-staining business in York since 1784 at the latest, was able to offer at least seven apprenticeships in his York factory between the years 1806-1811.\(^\text{52}\) One of Mush's apprentice's, William Morley, then went on to take over Mush's concern in York, indicating a continuity of regional skills. Furthermore, some of the names on the 1817 *Petition to Parliament* working in northern towns also appear later in regional directories. For example, under Leeds, Samuel Hudson, George Morton and James Morton Orange are later listed as having their own paper-staining enterprises in the *Directory of Leeds* of 1826.

Advertisements for journeymen papers-stainers required for provincial manufactories are not uncommon in local newspapers suggesting that regional manufacturers were able to recruit locally.\(^\text{53}\) Thus we see for example, Botterill and Kibblewhite, whose business was in York from c 1790s - 1815 saw fit to place an advert for a journeyman paper-stainer in the *Hull Packet* in 1 Sept 1807 indicating that at this stage the regional trade was supporting itself with its own provincial skills base.\(^\text{54}\)

**How the Regional Trade Operated**

Given the self-supporting nature of the regional wallpaper manufacture, we may therefore ask to what degree the regional trade was independent of London. Like other regional trades during this period, the wallpaper trade often advertised a London connection for their products, as it was the as the hub of the luxury goods trade and centre of the latest fashions. Borsay describes the situation thus: 'because the

\(^\text{52}\) John Mush senior appears in Bailey's *British Directory* (1784). I am grateful to Kay Staniland for this reference. John Mush junior’s apprentice registrations are at Hull City Archives, C BRG/10-11 18 November 1806 - 7 September 1811.

\(^\text{53}\) For example, both William and Richard Hargrave in Leeds used the *Leeds Intelligencer* for this purpose. See 25 March 1793 & 11 April 1822.

\(^\text{54}\) This co-partnership was dissolved in 1808 (*York Herald*, 16 January 1808) however, Robert and Ann Botterill continued in business until their bankruptcy in 1812 (*London Gazette* 25 January 1812 & 4 March 1815). Helen Clifford has described a similar cross region skills transfer in the metal-working trades in the second half of the eighteenth century, however, of significance here is the direct challenge to the monopoly of what was very much a London based trade. H. Clifford, 'Concepts of Invention, Identity and Imitation in the London and Provincial Metal-working Trades, 1750-1800' *Journal of Design History*, 12, 3 (1999), p. 243.
metropolis set the standard for taste, then any goods or facilities which bore its imprint were invested with a double status value’.  
Regional manufacturers were at pains to point out therefore that designs for their wallpapers originated from pattern drawers and pattern sellers in London. Both Davenport in Newcastle and George Shaw in Leeds for example stressed this fashionable provenance. Shaw's advertisement of 1807 is typical in announcing that he had just returned from London where he 'had an Opportunity of selecting from the Drawings of the first Artists, a Collection of the Most Modern and Prevailing Fashions in the Metropolis.'  
Chapman and Chassagne describe the 'systematic piracy of London designs' by regional textile printers in the second half of the eighteenth century. Despite a short-lived Copyright Act of 1787 which protected textile designers, the practice of 'imitation' in the design of luxury goods during this period was viewed as a positive concept and fundamental to the development of new designs and products. It was easy to copy and slightly modify designs without paying for the original artwork. Regional paper-stainers were committed to using (or claiming to use) fashionable patterns drawn by London artists. By extension therefore, it could be argued that provincial consumers were also exposed to a similar choice in wallpaper styles as their metropolitan counterparts.

It was therefore not the London provenance of a wallpaper so much as the London fashion that it copied that was the important criteria for many customers buying from the regional manufacturers. These manufacturers stressed in their advertisements that their wallpapers were as good as the metropolitan product. Some manufacturers such as Davenport in Newcastle, William Fell on the Isle of Man and William Stowell in Liverpool were also sourcing paint colours in addition to pattern designs from London.

---

56 Newcastle Courant, 26 February 1780 & 12 August 1780; Leeds Intelligencer, 30 March 1807.
58 A detailed and informative comment on this act is provided in R., Deasley, (2008) 'Commentary on the Copyright Act of 1787', *Primary Sources on Copyright (1450 -1900)*, eds L. Bentley and M. Kretschmer, http://www.copyrighthistory.org, [accessed 5 July 2014].
and in the case of Davenport, the printing paper as well, and so with London-trained stainers employed in production, there is no reason why this should not be the case.

Regional manufacturers sought to compete with the London trade for provincial customers by pressing their local advantage. The London trade could supply country shopkeepers promptly with their products as a result of improved transport systems and delivery of patterns by post after the mid 1780s. Consequently the advertisements of regional manufacturers stressed how much more quickly they are able to supply local customers with equally fashionable wallpapers. Others adopted established sales strategies used by manufacturers of luxury goods at this time in offering goods carriage-free, or with a discount on their paper hangers' travelling expenses, incentives which would have compared favourably with the same service from London.61

One of the regional trades' greatest advantages over the London trade however was their ability to sell wholesale and retail directly from their own shops. This dispensed with the mark up added to the final price by merchants, upholsters, auctioneers and regional retailers selling London wallpapers. Manchester manufacturer, John Mush junior, in his attempts to secure a market amongst the gentry and professionals of Chester and its environs, declared the price of his wallpapers to be 25 percent cheaper than local upholsterers as his did not include this added commission.62

Without business archive data on wage structure and supply of raw materials, it is difficult to establish whether wallpaper could be manufactured more cheaply in the provinces than in London. Manufacturer William Paul suggests that it was when advertising in 1783 that he had:

settled [in London] a Correspondent to supply him with Drawings of the first fashion as they come out, by which means, as he Manufacturers his Goods in

60 Newcastle Courant, 26 February 1780; Isle of Man Weekly Gazette, 4 July 1816; Liverpool Mercury, 19 February 1813. This is likely to be the same William Stowell as was working on the Isle of Man (see above). Stowell disappears from the Manx newspapers during the time that he is advertising his manufactory in Liverpool.
62 Chester, Cheshire and North West Advertiser, 15 April 1825. Chester was also an important retail distribution centre for Cheshire and North Wales. See Mitchell, 'Urban Retailing', pp. 259-283.
Manchester, he has it in his Power to accommodate his Friends and the Public upon the lowest Terms.  

What can be inferred from William Paul's comments concerning Manchester manufacture? It can be assumed, although not verified, that wages for paper-stainers and leases on premises would have been higher in London, and therefore manufacturing would have been cheaper to perform outside the capital. Paul may also have been referring to the lack of additional delivery charges payable by the customer on this local product, or perhaps to both of these things. Maintaining a competitive edge in regional pricing however, may have depended as much on business skills. Securing advantageous deals with suppliers and the establishment of profitable networks of retail contacts in the surrounding areas are likely to have influenced pricing as well as geographical location.

Regional paper-stainers took advantage of trade networks, business connections and systems of credit that were becoming established in developing urban areas. Retail customers were often expected to pay by ready money, indicating a fast turnover of large stock and a healthy number of customers. Credit on the other hand was extended to wholesale customers, and this indicates that these manufacturers were integrated into the business community which relied upon trust and established reputation. As with other manufactured goods in the second half of the eighteenth century, new and existing contacts were often made in person or by employing 'riders' or travelling salesmen to promote their wares around the country. A number of provincial wallpaper manufacturers also had contacts with export merchants who sold goods abroad via their own system of contacts. William Stowell, manufacturing wallpaper in Liverpool in 1814 on the other hand, advertised directly to merchants and sea captains in the port for export orders 'to the foreign markets'.

---

63 *Manchester Mercury*, 8 February 1783.
64 *York Courant*, 1 November 1752; *Leeds Intelligencer*, 18 February 1783; N.A: IR/26/427/468, William Bennison Probate Inventory, 24 October 1806; *Leeds Intelligencer*, 23 January 1809.
66 See Gardener and Hargrave in *Leeds Intelligencer*, 4 February 1793; *Liverpool Mercury*, 29 April 1814 & 16 February 1816.
London of course remained the dominant market for luxury goods due to its vast size and position as the country's commercial and fashionable capital. The importance of the London market meant that goods manufactured in the provinces such as textiles, ceramics and metal-wares were also sent to retail outlets in the capital or also to London merchants who then sold the goods on, including back to provincial dealers. Given the profitability of this vast marketplace and distributive centre, it is not surprising to note that some regional paper hanging manufacturers also sold their wallpapers in London, despite the trade being centred there. William Paul's 1783 advertisement in the Manchester press described above, also states that his wallpapers are not only available from his own warehouse, but also in Liverpool, Birmingham, Chester and by commission from Mr Henry Frome, stationer at No 25 Bishopsgate Street Within, one of the City's fashionable shopping streets, and at this period, in the heart of the London trade.

The value of the London market is also evident in the sales strategy of the Newcastle manufacturers Goodlad and Co who also had a retail 'warehouse' at 3 Pickett Street in the Strand in 1820. Insurance policies on their London premises during the 1820s state that the goods were insured under a short period clause. This indicates that the amount or value of the stock held there varied, possibly depending on periodic consignments of new seasonal wallpapers from their manufactory which were intended for sale in London, or for selling on from there via London's commercial networks.

The relationship between London and the regional wallpaper trade was a mutually beneficial one in some respects therefore, in that the capital had provided the skills required to establish provincial wallpaper concerns, and for some it had also provided a market for their wallpapers. Not all regional manufacturers appear to have sold their wallpapers in London however, as there are scant references to what would have

---

67 Hilary Young has shown this to be the case with the manufacture of porcelain in the second half of the eighteenth century, 'Porcelain', p. 260. For the relationship between provincial metal-work manufacturers and the market in the capital see Clifford, 'Metal-working Trades', pp. 241-242; for textiles see Chapman and Chassagne, Textiles, p. 26.


69 L.M.A. MS 11936/485/970461; MS 11936/505/1049908 & MS 11936/505/1053835.
afforded them great cachet in their newspaper advertisements. Conversely, it appears that some provincial manufacturers sold London manufactured wallpapers alongside their own products. The detailed account of the finances of William Dodd, manufacturer and decorator in Liverpool bankrupted in 1824, show that aside from paper and flock suppliers, some of his largest creditors were several of the leading wallpaper manufacturers in London for 'goods sold and delivered', viz; Williams, Cooper and Co, £98; Turner, Williams and Co, £46; Cooke and Co, £20; Hinchliffe and Matthews, £74.\(^7_0\) It would appear therefore that Dodd was supplementing stock of his own manufacture with a range of superior wallpapers from these 'first houses' in London.

How far selling London-made wallpapers was the norm with regional manufacturers is difficult to assess, however it was certainly the practice in Liverpool and Leeds in the 1820s. Furthermore the ability to buy in bulk for cash as Seaton & Co manufacturers in Pleasant Street, Liverpool were able to do meant that they were then able to offer London wallpapers to the public at competitive prices.\(^7_1\) As variety and wealth of choice were requirements in any retailer of luxury goods at this time, supplementing their own wallpapers with stock from London also allowed regional manufacturers to be able to offer a wider range of wallpapers and specifically of a higher end product. Again, McKendrick's study of the rich data source that is the Wedgewood archive allows us to extrapolate what may also be behind this seemingly contradictory selling policy: as McKendrick states, Wedgewood would facilitate access for other Staffordshire potters to markets that he himself had opened up, in return for a ten percent commission on sales.\(^7_2\) It is conceivable then that regional wallpaper manufacturers may have paid a commission to London manufacturers in order to boost their own sales by association with the London brand.

This association was certainly important for the regional manufacturers with respect to the fierce competition between them and upholders and auctioneers who sold London wallpapers to both town and country customers. Many retailers in the larger urban

---

\(^7_0\) N.A: B3/1363, Bankruptcy of William Dodd, 1824.
\(^7_1\) *Liverpool Mercury*, 5 May 1826 & 18 June 1824; *Leeds Intelligencer*, 29 July 1824.
\(^7_2\) McKendrick, *Consumer Society*, p. 142.
areas acted as wholesalers as well and in this respect the sales networks of the London firms were further increased. Competitive pricing, aggressive marketing and denigration of rivals was a common aspect of salesmanship in general in the second half of the eighteenth century. However by the early nineteenth century following the growth in population and building activity, competition for market share became fiercer. All parties concerned were keen to offer the largest selection of the newest wallpapers at the cheapest prices. Ian Mitchell's assessment of urban retailing in this period identifies this type of competitive marketing based on 'fashion and price' as a typical of the provincial retailing of luxury goods at this time.

Regional upholders who were able to secure an advantageous deal with their metropolitan wholesalers were keen to stress the credentials of their London stock. P. Cadby of Colemore Row, Birmingham in the 1820s maintained that he would only stock London wallpapers, whilst John Roderick, his contemporary and also a Birmingham auctioneer stated that his new supply of London wallpapers 'in point of extent and economy, far surpasses that of any provincial dealer or manufacturer'. Regional manufacturers therefore needed to counter these claims to superior London quality without at the same time damaging the London brand name on which their own designs were dependant.

Some tried to draw in customers by stressing the superior experience of the paper hangers they supplied in comparison to those provided by upholders, auctioneers and retailers. Purchases could be ruined by the employment of an inexperienced paper hanger, and as the wallpaper trade grew, so this ancillary service was increasingly offered by a variety of tradesmen, including painters and glaziers. Even successful firms made mistakes such as Wright and Elwick in Wakefield who were obliged to write to Mr Grimston of Kilnwick, Yorkshire in 1772 to apologise for some 'Blunders' his decorators had committed. In their advertisements, regional manufacturers

---

73 Sales and marketing techniques in this period are discussed more fully in Chapter 12 of H.C. Mui and L.H. Mui, Shops and Shopping in Eighteenth Century England (London, 1989).
75 Birmingham Gazette, 2 July 1827 & 28 April 1828.
76 Newcastle Courant, 26 February 1780 & 8 March 1828.
77 Wright and Elwick also worked at Temple Newsam and Burton Constable in Yorkshire; M.E. Ingram, Leaves From a Family Tree (Hull, 1951), pp. 72-73.
therefore lost no opportunity to point out the comparative failure of regional retailers to fully understand the product that they sold.

The Growth of the Regional Trade

We can see from Table 4: *Regional Wallpaper Manufacturers, 1750s to 1830s* below, that the regional trade in wallpaper manufacture enjoyed a period of sustained growth from the early nineteenth century onward, although we must bear in mind the greater availability of newspaper, directory and census sources from the 1800s onwards which may affect the relative numbers of recorded names in this quantitative evaluation. The table therefore provides a *de minimis* list of paper hanging manufacturers operating in the regions in the period 1750-1833.78 The size of these businesses, from which to gauge the impact of the regional trade during the period in question, is not always evident here. As with the London trade, mergers and partnerships were common throughout the period, whether in order to start an operation or to grow a business by pooling of capital, equipment and skills. Similarly taking over the goodwill of an established firm was also an asset in developing trade.79

---

78 Based on directory searches, newspaper advertisements, the *Petition to Parliament* (1817), the *Fourteenth Report into Excise* (1835) H.C.P.P. and supplemented by other miscellaneous primary sources.

79 For example the Hargrave business in Leeds involved several partnerships with Plowman, Gardner and Rathmell between 1783 and 1794. *Leeds Intelligencer*, 18 February 1783; 25 March 1793 and 7 April 1794. Westoby and Bennison in Prospect Street, Hull in 1806, Battle's *Hull Directory* (1806/1807). Morley and Co and John Mush took out a double advertisement in the *York Gazette* in 2.7.1825 to announce the handover of Mush's business at Monk Bar in York to William Morley and Co in 1825; *York Gazette*, 2 July 1825.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>East Anglia</th>
<th>Hull</th>
<th>Isle of Man</th>
<th>Leeds</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
<th>Newcastle</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jms Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jms Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hargreave  &amp; Plowman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jms Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780's</td>
<td>J Hackett</td>
<td>J Bunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790's</td>
<td>J Hackett</td>
<td>J Bunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rbt Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800's</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810's</td>
<td>J Hackett</td>
<td>J Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820's</td>
<td>C Seaton</td>
<td>Galloway &amp; Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Mush jnr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830's</td>
<td>W Seaton</td>
<td>Edw Westoby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J Goodlad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Regional Wallpaper Manufacturers, 1750s to 1830s**
By 1785, Hargrave and Plowman had re-located to a new premises in Leeds, which they described as 'that large and spacious building at the back of the Shambles'. Others such as John Parker in Hull and Botterill and Kibblewhite in York were successful enough to occupy large scale premises including former coach manufactories and shared factory spaces. As individual towns developed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, traders like Richard Goodlad in Newcastle and Thomas Roberts in Hull moved premises to more fashionable commercial shopping streets. Elsewhere in Leeds and York at this time, regional wallpaper manufacturers were successful enough to afford large houses in pleasant suburbs on the outskirts of town. Robert Pickering for example had a lease on a seven bedroom property in rural Chapeltown, outside Leeds and in his will in 1796, John Mush Senior left a house with gardens 'in the suburbs' of York in addition to a quantity of plate, china, jewels and a legacy of £1000 each to both his wife and brother.

The number of manufacturers shown in Table 4, bears witness to the viability of regional production and it is clear that there was a market for the provincial product in these areas. Hannah Barker's study of regional influences in northern towns in the late Georgian period argues for the existence of a mutual respect and an acknowledgement of professional and civic achievements between northern industrial towns at this time. She goes on to state that provincial advertisements for services shared across these northern towns 'underline the inter-connectedness of provincial towns and mitigate against a sense of metropolitan superiority'. We can see a reflection of this in Tate Wilkinson's account of the newly re-furbished Theatre Royal in Hull in 1794, where he described the work of the Hull painter, Mr Fletcher as 'greatly improved to the eye, by

---

1 Leeds Intelligencer, 8 November 1785; Botterill and Kibblewhite lease York Herald, 17 February 181; Leeds Intelligencer, 14 April 1800; Parker lease, East Riding Archives Service DDML/3/2.
2 Goodlad was located in Westgate St, Newcastle, see Ellis, 'The Black Indies', p.12; Roberts in Lowgate Street, Hull and Beverley Directory (1814/1815); For Hull see Jackson, p. 264 and A. Bennett, Shops, Shambles and the Street Market: Retailing in Georgian Hull, 1770-1810 (Wetherby, 2005).
the judicious aid of Mr Pickering’s new embellishments of different paper borderings...from that gentleman’s warehouse in Leeds....and is greatly admired'.

Increased urbanisation and a rise in real wages in the 1820s saw the size of regional firms expand significantly and some larger concerns came to dominate regional trade. The taxable output of the largest regional firms for the year ending 1833 was as follows; Richard Goodlad (Newcastle) 27,886 wallpaper rolls; William Sedman (Leeds) 16617; Charles Seaton (Liverpool) and John Mush (Manchester) 10434. Comparing these figures with those for the 83 London manufacturers in the same tax year, where the largest manufacturer produced 65394 rolls (Williams, Cooper and Co) and the tenth largest produced 10697 (John Quick), we can see that the largest regional firms rank 6th, 8th, 9th and 11th respectively across the whole of England for size of output.

In 1822, the Newcastle firm Goodlad and Potter advertised their stock of nearly 4000 patterns or colours and in 1824 they claimed to have the largest stock in the kingdom 'with the Exception of those of two or three Houses in London'. By 1831 they had expanded their warehouse base in London by moving to larger premises at 162 The Strand. Similarly, other concerns also opened additional new retail branches in other developing towns, directly targeting builders and wholesale suppliers as well as retail customers. Seaton and Co. along with their manufactory-shop at Clayton Square and shop in Pleasant St, Liverpool also opened new premises at No 16 Piccadilly, Manchester in 1829.

The quest for larger potential markets and additional sophisticated merchant networks led other leading regional manufacturers to also open further premises in Manchester as opposed to London. John Mush junior for example passed his York concern over to his former employee William Morley in 1825 in favour of a move to a new manufactory in the more populous town of Manchester. By 1832 the firm of John Galloway and

---

8 Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 84; See Appendix Five; Output of Regional Manufacturers for the Tax Year 1832-33.
9 Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., pp. 84-85; See Appendix Four; Division of Market Share Amongst the London Manufacturers in- 1833.
10 Durham County Advertiser, 5 October 1822; Newcastle Courant, 21 February 1824 & 30 July 1831.
11 Manchester Guardian, 8 August 1829.
Son, previously in partnership with Goodlad also had a manufactory-shop at 87 Piccadilly in Manchester as well as the retail outlets of 17 Pickett Street in London and 'The Shakespeare Rooms' in Birmingham.\(^\text{12}\)

**A Challenge to London**

How do we explain this notable advance in the regional trade by the end of the period? In the early stages of the regional trade's growth, it appears that the quality of some papers were poor. Paper from more remote mills could be weaker or have a rougher finish than the better quality papers made in Kent and from which the London market was served.\(^\text{13}\) Robert Fell on the Isle of Man struggled initially with his use of locally sourced paper, a fact not lost on his competitor and contemporary William Stowell, who made a point of mentioning the discrepancy when advertising his Irish papers on the Island. Fell was obliged to make the statement in his advertisement that:

> he has just imported from England, a Quantity of Paper, proper for his MANKS MANUFACTORY of PAPER HANGINGS, of superior Quality to the Manx Paper he has formerly used; which makes an Advance on the Printed Paper, but not more than the Paper is superior in Quality.\(^\text{14}\)

Increased demand for paper in the second half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century however, prompted a slow but steady development in its manufacture (See Chapter Six) and by 1816 two paper mills were established in Hull, fifteen in Leeds and three in York.\(^\text{15}\) Similarly expansion of the paint making industry was also taking place in regional centres, making the production of wallpapers more self-sufficient in these locations. Both Hull and Newcastle had colour manufactories; Jackson describes Hull as having three or four by the end of the eighteenth century.\(^\text{16}\) Thomas Oliver’s tour of Newcastle in 1831 lists several paint manufactories as well as paper mills established

\(^{12}\) *Manchester Guardian*, 6 May 1826 & 29 September 1832.
\(^{13}\) N.A: *Excise Trials*, Vol. 531, 3 February 1785 - 1 March 1785, p. 158.
\(^{14}\) *Manks Advertiser*, 22 May 1802 & 11 May 1805.
along the banks of the Tyne. 17 Indeed by the second decade of the nineteenth century, advertisements placed by regional wallpaper manufacturers had begun to include specific references to their range of regionally manufactured wallpapers as distinct from those that they manufactured from London patterns. 18 The firm of Goodlad in the 1820s were even confident enough in their wallpapers to suggest that customers could expect a refund if they did not find the standard to be as good as the first houses in London. 19

Allegiance to London's prestige for fashion and quality was still important to manufacturers and retailers advertising goods such as wallpapers, drapery and ladies' clothes in the regional press at this time. This was particularly strong amongst wallpaper manufacturers in Liverpool and may well have been due to the dominance of Dublin wallpaper manufacturers setting up business there towards the end of the second decade of the nineteenth century (see above). Giving evidence in 1821 for the House of Commons enquiry into Irish revenue, James Boswell, Dublin manufacturer, had indicated that the papers he now manufactured in Liverpool were chiefly of the cheaper sort and it was generally acknowledged that the Irish papers for sale in England were of a poorer quality that those made in London. 20

Competition therefore followed between the Liverpool manufacturers to claim some connection to the London brand in order to reach a wider customer base. Charles Seaton and Co. emphasised their 'warrented London manufacture' while William Dodd (back in business after his bankruptcy) and his brother James vied with each other in their advertisements to assert who had been manufacturing 'on the London principle' for the longest in Liverpool. 21 The struggle to prove that regionally manufactured wallpapers were as good quality and as fashionable as those made in the metropolis meant that manufacturers constantly referenced London-made wallpapers in their advertisements and this perpetuated the brand image of the London wallpaper firms.

17 T. Oliver, A Picture of Newcastle Upon Tyne (Newcastle 1831), pp. 137-138, 149, 151.
18 York Gazette, 3 July 1819; Liverpool Mercury, 5 May 1826; Birmingham Gazette, 20 June 1825.
19 For example in Durham County Advertiser, 5 October 1822 & 26 April 1823.
21 Liverpool Mercury, 5 October 1827 & 5 August 1828.
The stiff competition from regional retailers and merchants selling London wallpapers and the need to be able to offer as wide a selection as these retailers, also meant that provincial manufacturers necessarily stocked and therefore advertised London made wallpapers and thus the dependence and association with the metropolitan product was maintained.

A departure from this however came in the form of a challenge from the French wallpaper trade rather than from manufacturers in the English provinces. By the early nineteenth century the fashion for French wallpapers had spread across the country as far as the Isle of Man, where in 1815 the local newspaper reported on the admiration that these elegant and accomplished articles had excited.\textsuperscript{22} By 1816, William Fell was advertising his assortment of patterns of 'London and French papers from one of the first London Houses',\textsuperscript{23} indicating that the London designers were copying and importing fashionable French patterns and marketing them as such, rather than claiming them as a London design, and that regional manufacturers were selling them as such to remain current and competitive.

Unable to compete with the public's demand for the latest French fashions in wallpaper, English manufacturers diversified their stock by embracing the market potential from this trend. The wording of the trade card of William D Dodd of Bold Street, Liverpool illustrated below indicates that his priorities for advertisement were his stock of his own manufactured wallpapers and that of foreign manufacturers.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Isle of Man Weekly Gazette}, 6 April 1815.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 4 July 1816.
Some of those whose names appeared on the 1817 Petition urging Parliament for further protection from imported French and Irish wallpapers went on to advertise French wallpapers as among their papers for sale. Richard Hargrave, in Leeds for example stated in 1824 that he had:

just returned from Paris where he had been for the purpose of personally selecting French papers and being in reality the ONLY IMPORTER of that article in Yorkshire....he is enabled to offer French Papers and Borders, at least, from
25 to 30 per Cent lower than those Houses who have to make their purchases through the medium of Agents.\textsuperscript{24}

Manufacturers such as Charles Seaton and Co also advertised a range of provenanced wallpapers for sale in their 'Paris, London and Liverpool Paper Hanging Warehouse' with 'panoramas from the works of Moliere' and 'genuine rainbow patterns' from the fashionable Parisian manufacturers, Dufour and Leroy.\textsuperscript{25}

Not surprisingly, regional manufacturers thereafter began to produce their own versions of French wallpapers, including John Mush junior in Manchester, and Goodlad and Potter in Newcastle, whose range in 1824 included 'French stripes'.\textsuperscript{26} Goodlad announced in \textit{The Durham County Advertiser} on 5 October 1822 that he was now importing his pigments directly from France in order to replicate the brighter colours associated with this imported product and maintaining that they could produce French wallpapers as well as any other English manufacturer could. In order to re-enforce their wide ranging products, in the same advertisement, Goodlad also stated that in the case of any customers who wished 'to have their patterns in the colours of any of the papers manufactured in London, they will execute them as requested', again with a money back guarantee attached. Goodlad's comments here may refer to the fashion in English wallpapers for comparatively muted and drab colours at this point.\textsuperscript{27}

It can be assumed therefore, that London wholesale manufacturers supplied regional manufacturers with London versions of French-style wallpapers along with imported French wallpapers which were sold wholesale. However, it is also clear that regional manufacturers were now by-passing the London firms and establishing their own independent relationship with manufacturers in France in tune with this fashionable movement. Borsay identifies this willingness to embrace cosmopolitan as well as metropolitan influences in arts and architecture as a feature of regional towns in the second half of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{28} \textsuperscript{28} In the case of the wallpaper trade this

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Leeds Intelligencer}, 29 July 1824.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Liverpool Mercury}, 10 February 1826 & 15 June 1827.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Manchester Guardian and British Volunteer}, 6 May 1826; \textit{Newcastle Courant}, 21 February 1824.
\textsuperscript{27} D. Jenkins, (ed.), \textit{Cambridge History of Western Textiles} (Cambridge, 2002); N.A.L: 86.AA.14, Duppa Letterbook 1817-1822 contains several references to customers' orders for plain muted colours.
\textsuperscript{28} Borsay 'Cultural Diffusion', pp. 27-29.
occurred somewhat later, in more strength in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, as a result of the supremacy and prestige that the London wallpaper trade enjoyed in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The influence of the London wallpaper trade on the provincial wallpaper market was still evident at the end of the period however. By 1830, both regional retailers and manufacturers were still acknowledging London papers or metropolitan fashion in their advertisements, as indeed did other regional manufacturers of luxury goods on the same newspaper pages. Although as noted, some manufacturers were selling high-end, more expensive London wallpapers, reference to the capital obviously added cachet to a regional product and at least implied an element of quality. However by the end of the period, several of the regional manufacturers’ concerns achieved the same level of success in terms of size of output as some of the prosperous 'first houses' in London. Richard Goodlad and Co’s output for example was almost as large as the main wholesale manufacturers in London, (see Appendix Five) indicating that their main customer base lay in the wider middling classes market. Indeed, one of their notices states that they are able to sell on very low terms as a result of the large numbers of 'common papers' that they manufactured.29

The manufacturers who were the most successful in terms of output by the end of the period however, were those who appealed to as many consumers as possible by selling a full range of wallpapers across all price ranges from cheap to expensive. This 'catch-all' strategy ensured that affluent middle class customers in the regions no longer had to look to a London-made product with which to decorate their homes, but could buy a local equivalent, as equally well made, and with an allusion to metropolitan fashion. At the same time, cheaper wallpapers were more easily accessible to the rapidly expanding middling ranks of urban areas through the regional manufacturer's own warehouse. This in turn negated the role of the middleman supplier in larger towns and thus through competition, prices were driven down.

In order to reach as wide a customer base as possible, the catch-all word in advertisements by the end of the period was 'cheap' for both regional wallpaper

29 Newcastle Courant, 21 February 1824.
retailers and manufacturers. McKendrick describes the 'cut-throat race for an expanding market' in the late eighteenth century and the propensity for manufacturers to undercut each other in order to secure the most custom.\footnote{McKendrick, Consumer Society, p.108.}

This was equally the case in the provincial wallpaper trade. Although competition to supply the cheapest wallpapers had been a constant feature of their advertisements, by the end of the period in question, low prices had become a priority statement in an attempt to draw in larger numbers of customers from the rapidly expanding and divergent mass of middle class consumers.\footnote{Examples of these include Seaton and Co inLiverpool Mercury, 18 June 1824 and Galloway and Son inBirmingham Gazette, 14 Sept 1829.}

An advertisement in the Manchester Guardian in 1827 saw the position thus:

> A Tradesman residing at Birmingham is desirous of obtaining a COMMISSION for the sale of paper hangings. An engagement with a country house would be preferred as the papers must be manufactured at a price to suit a market in which considerable competition prevails...the stock should be considerable...

In this respect, offering loss leaders as an incentive to customers would have drawn them into the manufacturers' retail premises either to buy those discounted papers or to tempt them by other more expensive wallpapers on display. This may well have been how Seaton and Co were operating in Liverpool in the 1820s when offering their papers at '15- 20 percent less than any other shop in the kingdom'.\footnote{Manchester Guardian, 21 July 1827.}

Seaton and Co also advertised that they had bought their stock of London and French manufactured wallpapers for cash, which would have been an attractive incentive to their wholesale customers, plus a statement of confidence in the health of their business. However this also meant that they were under more pressure to sell their stock faster than their competitors, including the unfortunate bankrupt William Dodd, or other retailers and wallpaper manufacturers in Liverpool who may have bought on credit, and thus aggressive undercutting of competitors would have been necessary in order to re-coup their initial outlay as quickly as possible.

\footnote{Liverpool Mercury, 10 September 1824.}
Conclusion

By 1830 it is clear that the regional manufacture of wallpapers had grown into a successful, urban-based enterprise which was large and varied enough to support both large firms and smaller concerns. Sustained regional production remained rooted for the most part in the same geographical locations from whence it had started in the second half of the eighteenth century. The main areas of production, led by Newcastle in quantity of output, were Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, Hull, York and Exeter in descending order of output, with some minor production at this stage in Birmingham, Cambridge and Bristol. (See Appendix Five which provides us with a snapshot of individual firms' output and the areas of wallpaper production in the tax year 1832-1833). Whilst this is suggestive of regional specialisation, which was also evident in textile towns such as Leeds and Manchester or metal-working centres such as Birmingham and Sheffield, the spread of the paper-staining industry was more general but with a bias towards the north of the country. In this respect, its development was less a response to the increased numbers of cheaper skilled and semi skilled workers in the growing towns and driven more by the potential markets and demand for wallpaper that resulted from the geographical and economic growth of these areas.

McKendrick has pointed out how we know all too little about the commercial skills of myriad of businessmen who helped shape economic progress in England during this period. Our evaluation of this is coloured by the survival of the business archives of such men as Wedgewood and Boulton, and our understanding of entrepreneurship and business skills are seen through the lens of their individual success. It is not possible therefore to account in detail for the achievements of the regional wallpaper trade, both for those who made fortunes and those who managed to maintain a modest business for several years; however, much can be gleaned about their business strategy through examination of their newspaper advertisements. It is clear that these obscure businessmen were capable of great entrepreneurial spirit and confidence in setting out to challenge the monopoly of London's wallpaper trade, initially starting from the third quarter of the eighteenth century, when the London trades' reputation was paramount, and from then on, when the London manufacturers had consolidated.

34 McKendrick, Consumer Society, pp. 146-147.
their primary position and grown in strength and reputation in their metropolitan, regional and overseas markets. 

Their confidence in embarking on a venture that initially relied so heavily on London for its labour skills and for materials is notable. Whilst there were bankruptcies and spells in debtors' prison for some there was a clear entrepreneurial spirit at work in seeking out potential markets and these businessmen acquired for themselves, or bought in, the necessary skills from London or Dublin to embark upon production. Also notable is their astute manipulation of the London name and its monopoly on prestige, by a seeming dependency on the London trade, which enabled them to increase their business and sell more of their own wallpapers by association. This allegiance was easily shared with the French brand name; when responding to consumer demand for fashions from abroad, regional manufacturers imported French papers and also imitated them in order to raise the status of their stock, but also to widen their own consumer base by offering their own cheaper versions.

This resolute cultivation of the popular market ensured the success of businesses like Goodlad and Co and Seaton and Co by the end of the period. We know from their advertisements that they pursued high risk, loss leader strategies, like their competitors in the retail upholstery, cabinet making and auctioneering trades. This rivalry was played out (in part at least) through the medium of the press and their ubiquitous, self-perpetuating bombardment of advertisements featuring competitive underselling, puffing and no doubt bluffing as to the variety and quality yet lowest prices of their wallpapers. Their aim was to knock out all competition by being the sole provider and manufacturer of wallpaper across all price ranges from expensive to cheap, in order to ensure that customers had no need to shop elsewhere. Their success indicates how quickly fashionable metropolitan and cosmopolitan taste in wallpapers, or what passed to be, could be felt in the regions during this time.

Chapter Six: The Early Nineteenth Century and Problems on the Eve of Change, 1815-1830.

Introduction

As we have seen in the preceding chapters, in the period of high profits in the second half of the eighteenth century, a small group of wholesale wallpaper manufacturers had established a market lead through outside investment, networked contacts and increasing economies of scale. Yet in the early nineteenth century, a new economic climate emerged following the end of war with France in 1815. This chapter explores how the few dominant metropolitan wallpaper firms responded to a different set of challenges facing the trade resulting from this new commercial environment. With increased overheads and growing foreign and domestic competition, these firms sought to balance their range of cheaper wallpapers with the prestige products that upheld their reputation. This was also a period of new opportunities however, with a rise in demand for wallpapers and the availability of new technologies to help meet that demand. In turn, these opportunities allowed a growing number of smaller and provincial manufacturers to flourish in a commercial climate that historians previously regarded as more advantageous to the large-scale manufacturer.

Growth of Large Scale Manufacturers

Despite a period of depression after the declaration of peace with France in 1815, the following years saw a rise in real wages in England. From the 1820s onwards in particular, growing numbers of people were able to enjoy better standards of comfort and domesticity in their homes, through the availability of cheaper consumer goods such as clothing, metal-wares, pottery and furniture as well as fashionable printed textiles and wallpapers. As real incomes rose, the market in manufactured goods expanded and a mass market began to develop, further fuelled by population increase and high rates of urbanisation.¹ In order to operate more effectively in an increasingly contested commercial climate, control of several trades gradually moved towards domination by larger scale enterprises. Behagg has shown for example, that in new industrialised urban areas such as Birmingham, competitive production for mass

markets saw the balance of power shift in the early nineteenth century towards large scale enterprise in both the new mechanised trades such as steel toy and button making, and also in the more traditional artisan trades such as tailoring and shoemaking.²

This trend, already evident in the wallpaper trade by the 1790s, saw the market leaders expand into even larger economies of scale as these businesses sought to consolidate and amalgamate further. London firms such as Williams, Coopers and Boyle of 85 West Smithfield, for example, were both wholesale stationers and wallpaper manufacturers with the concern at one point having seven partners.³ Others such as the Cox family who already ran one of the largest manufactories in this group in Southwark had also absorbed the Playhouse Yard concern, near Old Street by 1826.⁴

Wallpaper manufacture was still a hand printing process and so increased production was translated into a greater number of hands at work at the printing tables. John Britton commented in The Original Picture of London (1824) that 'the Oil Cloth and Paper Hanging Manufactories, in various parts of the suburbs, are on a large scale, and challenge curiosity'.⁵ Those firms which had expanded to colonise former mansions in the suburbs in the second half of the eighteenth century had now outgrown these spaces. (See Chapter Four). In Chelsea, Hinchliffe and Co's Whitelands manufactory was extended until it was several times larger than the original house.⁶ In addition, by 1813, the sixteenth-century mansion turned wallpaper manufactory, Shrewsbury House, had been purchased by a speculative builder and partially demolished, its former occupants, Harwood and Co having left by this stage to set up in new, more

---

³ L.M.A: MS 11936/486/970631.
⁴ L.M.A: MS 11936/508/104989.
⁶ W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 2., Royal Exchange Insurance Plan of Manufactory, 5 January 1836. Although the plan is dated 1836, there is reference to outbuildings A-F which are also included in a previous insurance policy with Sun Insurance dated 1825. In the latter, house and building C attached are valued at £2,200, and the other work spaces at £2,900. L.M.A: MS 11936/504/102697.
extensive premises illustrated below, in a vast building in Adam St West, on the newly developing Portman Estate, Marylebone.\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image29}
\caption{Trade card of Harwood and Co, Adam St West, c. 1813. British Museum Heal Collection: 91.33. ©Trustees of the British Museum.}
\end{figure}

Opportunities for larger scale production had also arisen following the development by the Fourdrinier brothers in 1805 of a machine for making continuous lengths of paper. A series of cumulative technical improvements in the papermaking process followed thereafter, from developments in the processing of a wider range of paper fibres, to the improved drying of the finished paper by means of heated cylinders. The effect of these advances was to greatly speed up production and increase the output of England's paper mills.\textsuperscript{8} The implications for the wallpaper trade were that it was no longer necessary to employ semi-skilled labour for the task of sticking the hand-made paper.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} T. Faulkner, \textit{An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea and its Environs} (London, 2nd ed., 1829), pp. 76-81.
\item \textsuperscript{8} Coleman states that one small papermaking machine was reputed to produce the equivalent of three or four vats, whereas a large machine could produce the equivalent of twelve vats. His chapter on mechanisation describes in more detail some of the improvements to the mechanised paper making process. D.C. Coleman, \textit{The British Paper Industry 1495-1860, A Study in Industrial Growth} (Oxford, 1958), pp. 179-199.
\end{itemize}
sheets of paper together prior to printing. Not only did this reduce labour costs but it also sped up production and increased output further. Although adoption of machine made paper by wallpaper producers was not universal, it was in use by the major manufacturers and prestigious decorating firms in the West End by the 1820s.9

This semi mechanisation of an element of production had similar effects as the technological developments in the textile trades. Here improvements in the preparatory processes of spinning yarn also served to speed up production and reduce prices in the weaving of textiles. The result of this was that the prospect of further productivity gains prompted weaving manufacturers to innovate further with their own production methods.10 For the wallpaper trade however, there was less impetus to innovate further as Government regulations restricted manufacturers to cutting up the continuous paper into excisable lengths of 12 yards, termed 'long elephant' in reference to the traditional 'elephant' size hand-made paper sheets. In these circumstances, the continuous machine printing that had so boosted the calico printing trade was less feasible here.

Nonetheless, by 1830, the output of some of the largest manufacturers was a significant size. Cornelius Boyle of Williams Coopers and Boyle in Smithfield reported that his firm often produced 4-5000 lengths of wallpaper per week.11 Certainly for the tax year 1832-33 they produced over 65,000 lengths of wallpaper, with the next largest producer, the Adam Street West manufactory now run by Lightfoot and Stutely, producing over 46,500 lengths.12

Whilst this level of manufacture cannot be viewed as mass production, and output was small in comparison to the levels reached following full mechanisation of the trade from 1836 onwards, it did involve the production of long runs of a finished commodity by large concerns. John Styles has described this level of production as typical for that of many manufactured goods at the end of the long eighteenth century, and this can

11 Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 130.
12 Ibid, p. 84; See Appendix Four: Division of Market Share Amongst the London Manufacturers which lists the number of rolls of wallpaper produced by each firm in the tax year ending January 1833.
be seen as a liminal phase in the development of many industries, before the full mass production that occurred in the nineteenth century. In this respect it can be noted that for the wallpaper trade, technology was taken as far as the excise regulations would permit it to go, but the process of arriving at that point had been from the outset, a linear trajectory of product variation driven in large part by a desire to reduce labour costs and increase productivity.

The Growth of Small Scale Manufacturers
Historians see market share at the start of the nineteenth century as falling into a divide between the traditional prevalence of small producers and the emergence of a handful of large concerns. Although both Berg and Behagg have argued for a larger role to be accorded to the middle sized firm, the consensus is that by this period the larger scale manufacturers began to dominate trade in general. In the face of increased competition, barriers to entry into a business rose through the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Schwarz sees this as 'an inexorable rise from the eighteenth century... where in order to make money one had to begin with money...and by the middle of the nineteenth century one needed yet more'. By the nineteenth century, even larger amounts of capital were required to get a foothold on the ladder, in order to compete with businesses, including those selling luxury goods, that had prospered during the energetic period of commercial expansion in the second half of the eighteenth century.

In some respects however, we can view this period in the early nineteenth century history of the wallpaper trade as a temporary reversal of that trend. From the middle of the eighteenth century, production had largely been in the hands of a limited group of prosperous manufacturers. Whilst this remained the case, the numbers of smaller scale manufacturers increased during this period. Trade directory figures for those making wallpaper indicate a continual rise in numbers to this date with the Post Office

---

15 Schwarz, London, p. 73.
16 Schwarz states that this was an ongoing trajectory that had begun in the seventeenth century, see London, pp. 72-3.
Directory listing 31 London manufacturers for 1824. (See Appendix Three).

Government Returns for 1832-33 includes a list of 105 persons licensed to 'print, paint or stain' paper in the London area.\textsuperscript{17}

As a result of the expansion of the economy and increased spending power of the middle classes, greater numbers of small businesses may well have found a place to operate on this small scale artisanal level, which suggests that barriers to entry to the wallpaper trade did not rise at this time. London finishing trades in general enjoyed the benefits of cheaper raw materials that regional industrialisation had provided. In the case of wallpaper, paper prices dropped by one third following the end of the French wars in 1815 as a result of increased competition and the improvement of machinery, as well as the discovery of new methods of processing new raw materials such as cotton, rope and sweepings from the floors of the growing number of textile mills.\textsuperscript{18} Certainly demand for paper had increased as the economy expanded, required as it was for use as card and wrapping for groceries and a multitude of consumer goods, as well as for newspapers, books and other printed matter. Excise regulations demanded that only 'first class' paper stock should be used for wallpapers, but in reality this category encompassed a wide range of quality of finish, with rougher, thinner and therefore cheaper papers also on the market.\textsuperscript{19}

Other materials used on wallpapers were also becoming more readily available. Pigments themselves were cheap and easily obtained: A colourman writing to the Editor of The Tradesman in February 1809 commented on the abundance of fellow traders in London at that time who made 'ordinary colours', (i.e. those that were relatively cheap to make and buy). The market in second hand printing blocks also cut out the need for the very skilled element of pattern interpretation and block carving.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Fourteenth Report into Excise}, H.C.P.P., pp. 84-85. The list would include decorators painting fashionable plain colour or architectural panelled schemes on paper in situ as well as wallpaper printers. For example the decorating firm of Trollope's are listed, paying a small annual duty equating to only 126 lengths of decorated paper. It seems unlikely that this small figure would represent the output of a block printing arm of this prominent decorating business, that bought from the major manufacturers and is more likely to refer to decorative painting in situ.

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Fourteenth Report into Excise}, H.C.P.P., p. 54.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., pp. 31,64, 91-2. Duppa and Co negotiated cheaper prices with their supplier, the papermaker W. Pegg, on the grounds that his paper had an uneven surface on which to print. Letterbook, 19 July 1820.
These were not only available from large sales and auctions of bankrupt stock but also available in smaller quantities from which unskilled tradesman would have been able to print cheap, simple patterns. For example, William Griffen, aged 27, from Mile End was transported for seven years in 1816 for the theft of 12 printing blocks, worth a total of £15. In Griffin's defence, he stated that he had 'bought these things honestly, and exposed them openly for sale'. Whilst this may not have been the truth, it indicates that small scale sales such as this were not uncommon.

Smaller concerns were certainly still in operation as an appeal for charitable donations in the *Morning Chronicle* 20 November 1807 attests. The appeal, addressed to the Humane and Charitable Society, described how a fire had broken out in the premises of a paper-stainer and marble paper maker of Snow Hill, who was uninsured. The materials and tools of the business had been totally destroyed leaving an 'industrious couple and their six children, four of whom [were] under seven, in great distress'. Interestingly those making the collection on behalf of the family were in part made up from business associates; Mr Spalding wholesale stationer, Drury Lane and the colour merchants Berger and Sons of Cheapside. The evidence of small tradesman output is also evident in the 1817 court case of John Byrne who stole 20 lengths of wallpaper of value £3, from a shop to sell on to Evan Davies, paper hanger, for £2. Byrne, whose father was a paper-stainer, had worked for Davies before and claimed that he was selling the small quantity on behalf of his father who needed the money to pay a bill.

Occupational diversification in the wallpaper trade was still evident in the early nineteenth century as it had been in the eighteenth, and many of the small scale wallpaper manufacturers may have been operating on a seasonal or ad hoc basis. Many of these producers would have lacked capital formation and a large labour force. As such we can hypothesise that in comparison to the market leaders, they owned a limited stock of simple block patterns and produced small numbers of wallpapers which were distributed locally.

---

20 O.B.P: 29 May 1816.
21 O.B.P: 2 July 1817.
Histories of the wallpaper trade written by those within the industry have represented this period as one where the large manufacturers of the nineteenth century began their artisan roots. Sugden and Edmondson wrote nostalgically of the lineage of William Woollams and Co, renowned for their quality block printed papers during the period of intense mechanisation in the nineteenth century, detailing Woollams' apprenticeship to Sherringham 'the Wedgewood of Paper-Stainers', and describing how he had started his business in the early nineteenth century printing wallpapers on his own kitchen table. This kind of 'rags to riches' story would have been possible at this time, for an enterprising and talented artisan paper-stainer. Yet by this period, it had become increasingly difficult to grow a business to a significant size from these small beginnings without some form of outside capital investment, or a network of contacts and business associates who could contribute financial benefits or relevant skills and experience. In terms of potential for individual wallpaper businesses to grow larger then, Schwarz's point that business success at this time was increasingly dependent on possession of sufficient capital is certainly applicable to the trade at this point.

The diagram below shows the output of wallpaper manufacturers at the end of the period and indicates to what degree the larger firms dominated the market.

---

Figure 2: Division of Market Share Amongst London Wallpaper Manufacturers in 1832/3.

We can see from Figure 2 however that by the end of the period of study, well over 50 percent of the market share was still in the hands of fewer than ten major manufacturers. This commanding position secured by the end of the eighteenth century meant that they were able to dominate the expansion of the trade and maintain control over the market in the first few decades of the nineteenth century onwards. Facing increasing competition in the marketplace and lacking the advantages of economies of scale, it became increasingly difficult for the new wave of smaller manufacturers to compete.

Source: Fourteenth Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into the Excise Establishment and into the Management and Collection of the Excise Revenue throughout the United Kingdom, (1835), House of Commons Parliamentary Papers. For a full breakdown of these figures see Appendix Four.
Oligopoly of the London Market by Large Wallpaper Manufacturers

Let us examine how these leading wallpaper manufacturers managed to secure this lead and restrain the individual growth of small scale artisan producers. This position had not come easily: huge sums had been invested in these large concerns. John Edison for example had invested £20,000 in 1814 in the Whitelands concern and William Hodgson had spent over £9,000 on equipping the Playhouse Yard firm with over 2000 new printing blocks by the same date. A period of depression in the wider economy after the end of the French wars in 1815, and increased competition from smaller producers meant that maintaining control of the market in the face of these large capital investments became all the more important.

Businesses therefore modified their strategies in the face of these pressures. The detailed partnership agreements of the Hinchliffe concern at Whitelands at this time shows a more formal approach to business, which was a far cry from the family business agreements such as that of Thomas Bromwich and his partners. (See Chapter Three). This was not atypical of the commercial climate in first few decades of the nineteenth century. Gillian Cookson, writing on manufacturing enterprise in this period, suggests that enterprises were no longer characterised by the traditional family firm, but developed a new entrepreneurial style, with new business strategies and a more corporate attitude, including forward planning for short term profit maximisation. Failure to adapt to new practices contributed to the decline of traditional centres of trade such as Wakefield, Norwich and Exeter. Behagg describes a similar attitude amongst large manufacturers in Birmingham who willingly abandoned the more traditional business ethics of gentleman's agreements and a 'moral economy' in favour of assuming more mercenary motivations and what was seen by some contemporaries as the 'dishonourable' practice of 'buying cheap and selling dear'.

25 Morning Post, 7 November 1814; London Gazette, 3 August 1816.
26 N.A: C13/656/8, Litigation, Isherwood v Bradley, 1794.
29 Behagg, Politics, p. 42.
In 1822, the Irish wallpaper manufacturer, Patrick Boylan commented on this profit driven commercial attitude within the London wallpaper trade thus:

The object of an English man of business is, that he is to meet no opposition, he has no competitor hardly anywhere, the competition of price is no consideration for a short time, he breaks down competition by making a sacrifice.\textsuperscript{30}

By the end of the eighteenth century, cash buying and fixed prices had begun to replace credit terms to facilitate faster turnovers of increasing volumes of stock held in larger warehouses.\textsuperscript{31} Business methods became even more profit-driven in the early nineteenth century. Quality, variety and price were important criteria in advertisements for wallpaper in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{32} In contrast to their eighteenth century counterparts however, nineteenth century retailers placed greater emphasis in their advertisements on cheapness, reduced prices and potential bargains, in order to draw greater numbers of customers to their premises. Advertisement in the nineteenth century were more inclined to include headlines for 'cheap paper hangings', whereas eighteenth-century advertisers prioritised the name of the firm (and therefore reputation) and placed more emphasis on the quality and value for money of their stock.\textsuperscript{33}

Competition was fierce among retailers to capture new customers as spending power increased. The wholesale wallpaper manufacturers were in the best position to negotiate on price for bulk orders and sustain loss leaders with the prospect of future volume sales. Courting and maintaining markets through commissions with metropolitan and regional shops was vital to the London manufacturers and this was achieved through active direct marketing by travelling representatives and the sending out of samples. Nathaniel Hinchliffe stated in 1834 that he was 'at this time cutting up four or five thousand pieces of paper to distribute all over the kingdom. There is not a

\textsuperscript{32} See Chapter Seven.
\textsuperscript{33} Taken from a survey of regional and metropolitan newspapers. Examples of such advertisements include Birmingham Gazette, 28 February 1825; Liverpool Mercury, 18 June 1824; Exeter Flying Post, 20 March 1823 in comparison to Ipswich Journal, 22 June 1776; Newcastle Courant, 12 August 1780.
town in the kingdom of any note, to which there are not patterns sent'. Others described the 'very existence of our manufacture' as depending on sending out pattern samples which were sent out by the manufacturers via their 'representatives'. The London manufacturers were located in the centre of this large scale distribution network. As tax was also payable on any samples printed up, it was only the large wholesale manufacturers who were able to capitalise on this fruitful marketing tool.\textsuperscript{34}

The extent of their network of retail contacts is evident in the \textit{Petition to Parliament on behalf of the Paper-stainers} of 1817, organised by the leading manufacturers in protest against competition to the trade. This included support galvanised from their metropolitan and regional wholesale and retail connections across the counties of England, including signatories from relatively small towns such as Eccleshall in Staffordshire to London decorating firms such as Trollope and Co of Parliament Street, who also employed 'travellers' to sell on London manufactured wallpapers.\textsuperscript{35} It was crucial therefore to actively market London wallpapers across the country in order to increase sales, a strategy that was not open to smaller producers who lacked both an infrastructure of networked contacts outside of the metropolis and the gravitas of a recognised name. Furthermore, cultivation and maintenance of this wide network of retail contacts allowed them to benefit from information on best-selling lines and customer preferences. As with other luxury goods trades who gathered such knowledge, this allowed them to anticipate successful lines without cutting costly trial printing blocks first.\textsuperscript{36}

Control of the market was also maintained by continuing to produce wallpapers for all consumers across a range of social groups. Here they relied on their reputation and social cachet as 'the first houses in London', and drawing on their lineage dating from the second half of the eighteenth century. A small portion of stock was now given over to prestige wallpapers, whilst the bulk of manufacture was aimed at the larger more popular market. Williams Coopers and Boyle of West Smithfield for example,

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Fourteenth Report into Excise}, H.C.P.P., pp. 130 & 132.
\textsuperscript{35} N.A: BT6/174, Board of Trade Petitions; Paper-stainers, 1817; Lloyds Bank Archives: A/25/b/24, Herries, Farquar and Co, Open and Closed Accounts, 1795-1840, 1805. Trollope’s account indicates several payments to ‘travellers’.
\textsuperscript{36} Styles, ‘Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 546.
described their output by the 1830s as 'embracing papers from 2s 6d a-piece to papers that are worth 2 guineas per piece; and we perhaps make 1,000 pieces of the lowest price, for 100 of the highest price'. It was important to maintain this status through association with a core of elite customers: Harwood and Co for example, whose considerable general output warranted the move to their large Adam St West premises, also made wallpapers for elite customers such as a blue and white striped paper with blue flock border bearing the Harwood manufacturers stamp on the reverse found in a guest dressing room at Broughton Castle, Oxford, ancestral home of the Barons Saye and Sele.  

There were further benefits for the large scale manufacturers who had accumulated profits and established a commanding position in this industry. They were also able to dominate in the export market as well. After 1815, growing European competition for markets abroad favoured larger mercantile firms who could shoulder the financial risks involved. For the wallpaper trade, it was possible to claim a drawback on tax paid on export, yet this facility only proved worthwhile on large consignments, thus penalising the smaller producer. A secondary benefit for the market leaders was also that they were able to produce large quantities of taxable stock on speculation, safe in the knowledge that if the domestic market was depressed or a particular trialled pattern was unsuccessful at home, they could still pass these goods off on the export market.

Traditional contacts with the stationery trade were of course a contributory factor in maintaining dominance over the wallpaper market. Aside from manufacturers like Williams, Coopers and Boyle who were also wholesale stationers, many still had business links to the stationery trade. On writing of such business associations to the Parliamentary Commission on Excise Enquiry in 1834, John Smith of Morton Paper Mills, stated that 'it is not very uncommon for a paper-maker to be a partner or shareholder, either directly, or indirectly as a sleeping partner' in a wallpaper trade.

---

38 This paper was found underneath a later Chinese export wallpaper in the en suite dressing room of the Chinese Bedroom at Broughton Castle during conservation work by Sandiford and Mapes and is on display at Broughton.
A lack of sources make it impossible to state whether any type of price fixing cartel was in operation between the small group of leading wallpaper manufacturers in the first few decades of the nineteenth century. The leading manufacturers had a tradition of banding together to lobby government, and by the second decade of the nineteenth century had organised themselves into the 'Society of Paperstainers' by which representation they chose to petition Parliament. Coleman has argued convincingly for the existence of price fixing amongst papermakers and stationers from at least the start of the nineteenth century. The benefits of collusion and co-operation rather than aggressive competition for small groups of market leaders in similarly developing industries at this time have also been highlighted. However, we can only hypothesize as to whether this extended into the wallpaper trade. The Government's *Fourteenth Report of the Commissioners of Enquiry into the Excise Establishment* stated that 'the trade sell their ordinary paper at 2s 6d per piece'. As tax had to be taken out of that cost before profit could be made, it may well have been beneficial for the small band of leading manufacturers with large outputs, to settle between themselves on a base price for their 'common papers' as the bulk of their trade.

Not all metropolitan luxury goods trades attempted to reach a wide market, as some chose to specialise. The London furniture trade for example, which shared a similar 'genteel' reputation as the wallpaper trade in the eighteenth century, was by the nineteenth century becoming divided into two distinct branches. The original high class trades of cabinet making, gilding and upholstery were still associated with skilled workers and high-premium apprentices based in large prestigious workshops in the West End, and supplying an affluent customer base. This ran in parallel with a cheap

41 *Fourteenth Report into Excise*, H.C.P.P., p. 52.
42 N.A. BT1/95, Board of Trade General In-Letters and Files, 1815.
45 *Fourteenth Report into Excise*, H.C.P.P., p. 32.
'slop' trade of out-sourced, ready-made furniture produced by unskilled labour and grouped around the East End of London. 46

For some luxury goods trades, however, it was more beneficial to seek profits in as wide and varied a market as possible. This was particularly suited to those luxury goods trades that were concerned with the fast production of small items that could be both utilitarian and also purely decorative, such as the pottery and porcelain and decorative metal-ware trades, and in which methods of production could easily be modified and a measure of skills easily transferred across a range of goods. Although wallpaper was a luxury good, control of the bulk of the market by the leading wholesalers allowed them to countenance loss leaders and discounted bulk orders, thus offering the opportunity for wallpaper to be bought below market rate, while their extensive network of regional contacts also meant that these possibilities were extended out across the Country.

The Oligopoly Challenged

The leading wallpaper manufacturers’ dominance of the marked did not go unchallenged, however. The economic climate that emerged at the end of the wars with France in 1815 provided greater opportunities for competition to develop. Peacetime trading with foreign markets could now flourish and competition from foreign imports strengthened. Within the domestic market as well, competition increased from providers of other cheaper forms of interior decoration. In the face of these challenges, the market leaders were forced to re-assess the business strategies and structures that had helped to underpin their prominent position.

During the French wars and the Continental Blockade (1806-1813), some English industries had been free to develop their home markets without competition from foreign imports. 47 The declaration of peace in 1815 therefore posed a real threat to some trades and several of these, such as the carpet manufacturers of Kidderminster and corn merchants of Great Yarmouth petitioned Government for increased

---

protectionist measures against an expected flood of foreign imports. The leading regional and metropolitan wallpaper manufacturers also felt this threat and, organised into the Society of Paper-stainers, embarked upon a sustained period of letter writing and petitioning to the Board of Trade between 1814 and 1817. The surviving documents from this period indicate however, that some of the causes for concern went beyond a general threat of foreign competition, and that there were further trade specific issues at stake. Aside from the worry of a potential flood of imports from French wallpaper manufacturers, the increase in fashion for French styles and designs, which had developed in England from the end of the eighteenth century onwards provided an additional level of concern to the leading manufacturers.

In contrast to the simple geometric, two dimensional patterns which many English manufacturers were concentrating their production on at this time, French wallpapers represented a fresh new approach to wallpaper design, in which artists depicted naturalistic subjects and created trompe l’oeil effects of a more vibrant and sumptuous nature. Not only did they successfully imitate decorative finishes such as marbles, pilasters and even upholstery, but they also produced pictorial subjects from classical antiquity and scenes of both grand buildings and lush, exotic landscapes designed to continue around the walls of entire rooms in non-repeating panoramas. Instead of an emphasis on drab shades of olive, buff and apricot favoured by the English manufacturers, French producers used bright, contrasting colours such as greens, blues and crimsons. Their pigments were mixed into thick bodied, opaque distemper paints which were applied in successive printing layers of multiple colours, building up an almost three dimensional, luxurious effect, often with the addition of metallic paint and flock fibres for added lustre and depth. Image 30 below is an example of their landscape panorama wallpapers:

48 N.A: BT1/103, Board of Trade, General In-Letters and Files 1 March 1816 - 30 April 1816, Nos. 31 & 33. English manufacturers had been protected from French competition during the war by a raised import duty of 1shilling per square yard. The duty was raised to 6d per pound weight in 1803 and raised again in 1809 to 1 shilling. Hills, R., *Papermaking in Britain, 1488-1988* (London, 1988), pp. 62-64.
Several English wallpaper retailers such as Joseph Trollope of Parliament St had been importing French wallpapers since the end of the eighteenth century. John Middleton, colour manufacturer and wallpaper retailer of St Martin’s Lane, advertised his latest consignments of these fashionable French papers in 1789 as 'just arrived from Paris on the Speedwell' including one which was an assortment of:

- elegant paper hangings...several of which are curious running Patterns, some in the Arabesque and others in the Etruscan style, to be hung in compartments formed by Pannels, Pillasters and Antique Figures with curious Landscapes...after the Vatican Ornament by Raphael.49

49 World, 25 February & 26 October 1789; Diary or Woodfall’s Register, 25 January 1790.
This trend for French wallpapers was set to continue through the first few decades of the nineteenth century in both London and regional areas. As they had enjoyed a healthy export market to France in the previous decades, leading wholesale manufacturers in London were indignant at this reversal of fortune. In one of the letters to the Privy Council on Trade on behalf of his fellow manufacturers, James Williams of Williams, Coopers and Boyle directed the Lords to an advertisement in the Morning Chronicle for French wallpapers which openly targeted English customers. He then stated,'...and your Memorialists are credibly informed that the French manufacturers are now bestowing much labour to manufacture articles particularly calculated to the taste of the British People'. Of concern was the fact that some of the English wholesalers' valuable retail customers were dealing direct with manufacturers in Paris. In some cases both regional and metropolitan manufacturers themselves were obliged to remain current by also selling this fashionable product through their own retail outlets.

This was not a situation specific to the English wallpaper trade however, as Chapman describes how the English calico printing industry was facing a similar situation by the end of the eighteenth century. England had previously led the market in design and output in the second half of the eighteenth century in both wallpaper and calico printing, however, in a matter of a few decades, the position of these luxury and semi luxury goods trades were beginning to be challenged in both price and quality as other countries sought to catch up with England's lead. F.A. Wenderborn, a German visitor to the Manchester textile printing firms in 1790 commented:

it is said that the English manufacturers, particularly those who employ themselves in articles of luxury, do it with less taste than some other nations, particularly their neighbours the French...they show this want of taste much in their drawings, their designs and patterns.

---

50 N.A: BT1/93/25, 12 November 1814.
52 Ibid., p.88.
In the home market for wallpaper for example, this is reflected in the choice of wallpapers for the Howard Dressing Room at Audley End House, Essex. In the 1780s, a simple brown on yellow small oak leaf motif wallpaper produced by one of the most fashionable and eminent English firm of the time, Thomas Bromwich’s partners, Isherwood and Bradley was chosen. By the 1820s when the room was redecorated, the latest fashionable multi-coloured French floral design had been chosen over an English produced wallpaper for the new scheme.\textsuperscript{53} See Images 30 and 31 below.

Image 31. Simple grey/brown printed motif on buff ground, c. 1780s. The surface of this sample has been varnished at a later date, changing the original colour slightly. This paper was found below Image 32. From the Howard Dressing Room, Audley End House, Essex. English Heritage.

Ever keen to appear up to date, metropolitan and regional manufacturers therefore aimed to reproduce French wallpaper styles themselves. Whilst they were not unused to copying design influences from abroad (See Chapter One, p. 18), replication of these complex colourful patterns was an expensive process. Some of the more elaborate patterns could involve the cutting of several thousand printing blocks; however, the skilled labour required for this was cheaper in France. Further letters to the Privy Council maintained that French journeymen paper-stainers 'are not on average paid
more than one fifth what is paid the same description of persons in London and Westminster. 54

The Board of Trade however was more concerned with protecting the wider interest of the country and in resuming a better trading relationship with France than addressing the concerns of a relatively small group of wallpaper manufacturers and retailers. Their reply suggested that an increase in the existing duty would further restrict the already established limited trade agreements with France, although they did concede to keep the existing duty as it was. 55 Even with the import duty, English wallpaper manufacturers struggled to compete on price with their French counterparts for wallpapers at the prestige end of their customer range.

In contrast to the French, British manufacturers in this period had concentrated in the main on the production of medium quality products for middle class markets at home and abroad. 56 Some trades that had cultivated a more popular market in their export trade during the second half of the eighteenth century were beginning to lose their lead in other markets too in the face of cheaper and/or better quality consumer products from elsewhere. Chapman describes the increase in competition from the American home market and European manufacturers in the first decades of the nineteenth century for printed calicos. 57 Breen has also suggested that in the highly competitive North Atlantic markets, there was a demand for better quality imports amongst cheaper goods and some American merchants were highly discerning in their choice of imported luxury and semi luxury goods. 58

This trend was also applicable to the London wallpaper trade. Although aggregate exports increased in this period (see Chapter One, page 47), the trades’ major position in its traditional American market was being challenged again by more affordable and better quality French papers. Patrick Boylan, a Dublin wallpaper manufacturer described in 1822 how the French could even undersell the Irish in the American

54 N.A: BT1/93/25, 12 November 1814.
55 N.A: BT5/25, Minutes of the Board of Trade, 1 June 1816 - 30 April 1817, p. 411.
56 Floud and McCloskey, Economic History, p. 286.
57 Chapman and Chassagne, Textiles, pp. 87-89.
market for low-priced wallpapers. Furthermore, the position in the London market to Ireland itself was also being challenged. This had previously consisted in the main of a more expensive, premium quality wallpaper range, however Boylan reported that he had not taken on any wallpaper from the London houses for the last three or four years. This was the result of a falling out with his London suppliers, because he had 'passed them by and gone to France in order to introduce a better sort of paper' for the prestige end of the Irish market.  

Letters and petitions to the Privy Council for Trade during the period 1814-18 indicate that the wallpaper trade was not just concerned with the threat to their premium range wallpapers. We have already seen in Chapter Five, how cheaper Irish wallpapers had secured a significant share of the market in the west of England, particularly in Liverpool, Bristol and Bath. Although these papers were of poorer quality than those produced by the leading London houses, both the London and regional wallpaper manufacturers saw them as a genuine threat to their sales of 'middling range' wallpapers. Concerns about Irish competition were quashed by the Government, which simply stated that the Act of Union prevented the imposition of any additional duties on imports.

It was not uncommon at this time, for other London luxury goods trades to find their previous eminence challenged from home market competition outside the metropolis. The Spitalfields silk weaving industry for example, had enjoyed a reputation in the eighteenth century as a premium luxury goods trade and associated with London as a major fashion capital. By the end of that century and the early nineteenth century however, they struggled to hold on to this prominence in the face of competition from silk weavers in the North, Midlands and Essex, who had lower overheads and wage rates. The result was a shortage of employment and a reduction in wages for London’s weavers.

---

60 N.A: BT1/95/12, 21 Jan 1815.
62 Employers and weavers had appealed to Parliament in the 1760s for a prohibition on imported French manufactured silks which they had been granted in 1766 and lasted until 1826. Schwarz, London, pp. 204-5.
Competition from French and Irish wallpaper manufacturers for the affluent and middling range customers was keenly felt. There was however, a further challenge to the London manufacturers' strategy of comprehensive appeal across a range of income groups, and this came in the form of competition for their largest market share - their range of cheap wallpapers. There was a limit moreover as to how cheaply wallpaper could be sold due to the wallpaper tax, which was in effect a value added tax on the printable paper. The average duty paid by manufacturers on 'common' wallpapers could amount to 1s 3d on a 'piece' or length, which in turn was sold for an average price of 2s 6d.\textsuperscript{63} This meant that it could not be sold for a sustained period below a certain price and a profit still made, because the added tax was built in to the final price. Due to these excise regulations, the wallpaper trade was unable to take full advantage of the possibilities to expand into further markets lower down the economic scale, like the London furniture trades for example had done, in specialising in two very distinct consumer markets.

Yet at the same time, as living standards improved for many, opportunities arose for those living in more humble homes to cheaply decorate them and make them more comfortable. This gap was filled at the low-priced end of the scale by the fashion for ornamenting walls with stencilled decoration as an alternative to wallpaper.\textsuperscript{64} Cheaply produced small, single motif designs which wallpaper manufacturers had produced in order to cultivate the popular market, were easily replicated by the stencilling process. The threat posed by this method of decoration was regarded as the most serious challenge to the trade at this time and prompted an energetic period of letter writing in protest to the Board of Trade by the wallpaper manufacturers.

Stencilling, or 'slap dash' had been carried on in the past by iterant workmen offering a cheap and cheerful alternative to wallpaper in poorer homes. It could be executed on plain lining paper which was not subject to the wallpaper tax until decorated. Furthermore, it was easy to evade paying the tax that was due post-decoration, as a

\textsuperscript{63} Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 123. This price is quoted as an average for the trade and is also borne out in newspaper advertisements from the period. However, manufacturers often sold lower than this for short periods, see p. 160-161.

\textsuperscript{64} James Ayres provides a further account of the use of stencilling in Domestic Interiors; The British Tradition, 1500-1850 (London, 2003), pp. 161-164.
proof of payment stamp was required to be made on the reverse of the paper, which was hidden when the scheme was on the wall. Cheaper still, stencilling was also carried out over old painted-out wallpaper and onto bare plaster walls. In this case no tax was due at all.

This simple decorative wall treatment could be easily adapted into a variety of styles suitable for a range of incomes. It is possible that financial constraints during war time had made a virtue out of this decorative process, and it had acquired popularity, if not respectability. James Williams writing to the Board of Trade on behalf of his fellow wallpaper manufacturers in 1817 described:

the alarming increase in stencilling which becomes more and more in use and is not confined to the lower orders of Society but is much resorted to by the respectable part of the Community for all but their better rooms...  

Again the wallpaper trade was at the mercy of a fickle fashion market and in a move away from the trend for printed wall decoration, more affluent consumers were also choosing stencilled or free hand painted schemes such as that shown below.

65 N.A: BT1/114/29, 9 April 1817.
The failure of the stencilling trade to contribute to the excise was presented as an 'evil' and the fact that they had no overheads and required no license to operate in comparison to the paper-stainers, prompted the latter to write that 'the total ruin of their Trade is likely to follow.' Indeed, they stated that, 'we believe there are few if any Paper-stainers but would not readily relinquish their business if Parties could be found to take the stock or plant off their Hands'.

The Government’s response to the deputation was less sympathetic. The petitioners had pressed for the introduction of a licence for those practising stencilling and for a duty of 6d per square yard to be paid on work carried out on bare walls and 1d 3

66 Ibid. and N.A: BT1/103/3, 12 Feb 1816.
farthings per square yard on paper. When the Board of Trade replied that this would be likely to harm the poorest in society who were trying to improve the appearance of their homes through this type of decoration, the petitioners came back with the suggestion that this could be means tested: any house chargeable to the poor rate would not have to pay, however, any builder would have to pay if fitting up a house which was then later occupied by someone eligible for poor relief. In response, the Privy Council for Trade minuted that these proposals would:

expose every person who might wish to decorate his rooms by the process of stencilling to a degree of vexatious interference on the part of the officers of the Revenue, which it is quite vain to suppose that the legislature would consent to establish.  

No further action was ordered and the trade was left to retreat and lick its wounds.

The wallpaper manufacturers’ campaign had been persistent and at times fanciful, however, it does indicate a real sense of insecurity around the end of the French wars as they faced these challenges across their entire range of customers. It is interesting to note that in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, wallpaper manufacturers were not concerned with campaigning for an abolition of the excise tax on wallpaper. Rather, they were keen to see an increase and an extension of its enforcement to their French and stenciller rivals respectively. By the 1830s however, the attitude to their own excise obligations was beginning to change. At a Parliamentary Inquiry into the excise on wallpaper in 1834, the three leading manufacturers invited to report, Williams Coopers and Boyle, Nathaniel Hinchliffe of the Whitelands factory and Bowen and Godwin of Park Walk, Chelsea were in agreement that the excise regulations governing the industry were now detrimental to their trade.

With this system in place, previous operational and marketing strategies were no longer effective for the large London manufacturers when faced with increased

---

67 N.A: BT1/114/29, 9 April 1817 and BT1/95/12, 21 January 1815.
69 See Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 133.
domestic and foreign competition. It was no longer competitive for example, to charge customers for pattern samples as firms such as Thomas Bromwich's had been able to in the 1760s. Yet sending out free pattern samples each season to the numerous regional and metropolitan retail contacts and customers could cost the manufacturers over £300 in tax per year. Whilst this could be offset in the price of the wallpaper order, the increasing number of smaller regional and metropolitan manufacturers setting up in this period and who served a more local market did not send patterns out. Their prices reflected this saving and so the larger London wholesalers were obliged to cover pattern costs themselves in order to prove competitive.

Similarly, constant updating with new and extensive pattern ranges was necessary to maintain their reputation as fashion leaders. Tax was also due, however, on the production of any wallpaper proofs. Even mistakes and spoiled sheets had to be paid for. The leading wallpaper manufacturers complained that this meant less incentive to produce new ranges in anticipation of future sales, and that it stifled any creative spirit in the trialling of new designs. Nonetheless, having established their reputation as the fashion leaders in this field, the large London manufacturers then had to maintain it through the continuous production of new season designs. For other smaller producers, it was simply a case of copying the more successful of these patterns, once they had been circulated and proved popular.

On a practical level the collection of the tax was inconvenient for manufacturers. Cornelius Boyle of Williams, Cooper and Boyle described the procedure in 1834 thus:

they come at nine in the morning and are often there till five or six in the evening, two or three of them: it is very laborious. We stamp 4,000 or 5,000

---


pieces sometime in a week and they have to write their name twice upon every one of those.\textsuperscript{74}

The Excise restrictions were becoming increasingly unworkable as the market for wallpapers expanded. What was even more restrictive for the trade however, was the fact that the tax kept the price of wallpapers unnecessarily high. As the duty was the same for all wallpapers it bore proportionally more heavily on the cheaper wallpapers. Giving evidence at the Commission of Enquiry, leading manufacturers reported that for cheaper wallpapers the average duty amounted to 1s 3d per piece, yet a piece could sell as low as 2s 3d or even 2s.\textsuperscript{75} With the duty amounting to over half the price, this left a very slight profit margin on each wallpaper piece and therefore necessitated sales in great quantity rather than quality in order to turn a profit. It also put a restrictive base price on wallpapers. For some leading manufacturers the protection of the previous decades had now become a hindrance to further market expansion.

The trade was in some measure divided on the subject of taxation, as some still held the traditional view that the need for working capital to pay the tax upfront before sales (and from 1784 the provision of a £2 licence to operate), helped to curb entry into the trade, monitor practitioners and uphold standards.\textsuperscript{76} As with the calico printing industry, the wallpaper trade had been able to flourish within a system of high degrees of protection, not least from competition in its own domestic markets.\textsuperscript{77} By 1818 however, the calico printing industry had begun to appeal for an abolition of the excise duties on the grounds that they were 'vexatious, tedious and expensive' and made the price of printed calicos uncompetitive and prevented market expansion. The duty was finally abolished in 1831; however, the wallpaper trade did not take the opportunity to join in the campaign at the same time.\textsuperscript{78} Other luxury goods trades were also struggling to survive under out-moded conventions, which were no longer beneficial in the face of market expansion and increased competition. The silk weaving industry for example, which had previously operated through informal price fixing

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, p. 130.  
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid, pp. 123 & 134.  
\textsuperscript{76} Chapter 2, p. 58.  
\textsuperscript{77} Berg, \textit{Age of Manufactures}, p. 127.  
\textsuperscript{78} G. Turnbull, \textit{A History of Calico Printing} (Atrincham, 1951), p. 131.
agreements within the trade, was forced to abandon this system in the face of French competition in cheaper silks, following the lifting of the import prohibition on these in 1826.\(^{79}\)

Yet as stencilled or cheaper wallpaper decoration became more familiar across more levels of society, there also emerged a large market in illegally printed wallpapers. As noted in Chapter Five, tax evasion in Ireland was rife and by the end of the period, it was also common in England. By the 1830s the scale of tax evasion was regarded as a significant cause for concern, particularly as it was so easy to achieve. Nathaniel Hinchliffe of the Whitelands manufactory described one method thus:

> The paper-stainer’s process is so quick, he can do enough to paper a room, and will take this to a gentleman’s house, before he is up in the morning, and cut off the tops and bottoms, where the frame mark [stamp] should be, and prepare for papering the room; and he can never find out if the tops and bottoms are cut off and thrown into the fire; there is an end to the deception.\(^{80}\)

Much of the activity was on this small scale and was rarely detected. Only a few large scale frauds were brought to justice, such as the high profile case of Morris Martin, wallpaper manufacturer of Regent Street. Martin was found guilty of owing the Excise £39,000 in penalties following a tax stamp forging enterprise that Mr Carr, solicitor for the Excise, described as 'one of the deepest laid schemes to defraud the Crown ever known'.\(^{81}\) The issue for the legitimate manufacturers of course, (some of whom found it necessary to advertise that they were licensed),\(^{82}\) was that their wallpapers could be seriously undercut on price at the lower end of the market by, in effect, tax-free wallpapers. Again, Hinchliffe’s comments on the subject indicate how difficult it was

\(^{79}\) Schwarz, London, p. 205. Prices were set regionally not nationally, the Essex silk weavers setting their piece rates at two thirds lower than the Spitalfields level.

\(^{80}\) Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 133.

\(^{81}\) A detailed account of the proceedings is described in The Morning Chronicle, 8 December 1828 & 13 February 1829; The Observer, 15 February 1829. Philip A. Sykas also describes elements of the case in 'Morris Martin, Paper-stainer of Fulham' Wallpaper History Review 2005 (Manchester), pp. 94-95.

\(^{82}\) For example, Tempany and Co of King St, Cambridge describe themselves as 'Wholesale and Retail, Licensed Paper Hanging Manufacturers' in Huntingdon, Bedfordshire and Peterborough Gazette, 12 June 1830.
becoming for the larger, capitalist and legitimate manufacturers to compete with this level of small producer black-marketeering:

We continually see sales and so many thousand pieces of paper knocked down at a certain price. I only know speaking as an experienced man who has been in business almost half a century, if goods could be sold at that price, and a profit realised, I should be glad to do it.83

Legitimate manufacturers had industriously cultivated this popular market with the production of cheap, simply designed wallpapers. The style of these wallpapers, however, was easy to imitate by those outside the trade. By the end of the period in question, there was genuine concern that even some builders were illegally printing their own simple wallpapers using a few second-hand blocks.84 This was particularly galling to the trade as the market generated by the increase in house-building had been an instrumental factor in the success of the industry from the outset.

By the time of the Parliamentary inquiry into the excise on wallpaper in 1834, both the Government and manufacturers agreed on the value of wallpaper to promote wellbeing and 'the comfort and gratification of cottagers, and the humbler classes of society, and tend to increase habits of cleanliness'. The obvious barriers to further development of the trade by the duty on wallpapers was also evident and following recommendation by the Commissioners of Inquiry, the tax on wallpaper was repealed soon after in 1836.

A Decline in Design Standards

The need to cut costs and reach a wider customer base outlined above inevitably led to a decline in the standard of design of English wallpapers being produced at this time. Designs from both legal and illegal manufacturers became increasingly simple, flat and two dimensional using a limited palette, often of cheaper colours such as browns, olives, white and black:

83Fourteenth Report into Excise, H.C.P.P., p. 133.
84Ibid, p. 102.
English wallpaper was therefore beginning to move away from its status as a luxury item that complemented other luxury goods in the home as a statement of social rank. Instead, it was becoming a more commonplace expedient, and cheap wall treatment that provided an almost pedestrian backdrop to other increasingly widely available domestic consumer goods.

The wallpaper below demonstrates a poor attempt to create depth of image, by printing two simple two dimensional designs on top of each other:
Berg, writing on consumer goods in the eighteenth century, describes how fashion items at this time 'passed from a style to an institution and eventually faced their own fashion threats.' Berg, writing on consumer goods in the eighteenth century, describes how fashion items at this time 'passed from a style to an institution and eventually faced their own fashion threats.'

Journeymen in the English wallpaper and calico printing trades enjoyed a respected reputation for their pattern interpretation and wood block carving skills, although the designs themselves had traditionally more often been copied from

---

imported patterns and textile sources. (See Chapter One). A lineage of creative pattern design was less evident here then, and this became more marked as patterns in this period were increasingly driven by the manufactory owners’ review of the previous year's sales, rather than the introduction of new design forms from a creative base within the firm.86

What had been viewed in the eighteenth century as 'a genteel manufactory' due to the quality of the product it produced was now more admired for its industry and scale of production. The editor of The Examiner in 1825 expressed this decline in artistic merit thus:

Sir Joshua Reynolds commented 'what is a well-chosen collection of pictures but walls hung round with thoughts. Those persons therefore who prefer the works of the paper-stainer to those of the artist cannot perhaps be ranked among 'thinking people'.87

Histories of wallpaper acknowledge this decline in artistic standards from the late eighteenth century and on into the second quarter of the nineteenth century. In The History of Wallpaper, Sugden and Edmondson saw this era as the 'dead period' in English wallpaper design which they attributed in part to heavy taxation but also the absence of 'healthy competition' including from Europe, which might have introduced fresh ideas to the 'semi atrophy of artistic fecundity'.88 Claire Taylor challenges this view, arguing that English manufacturers continued to produce papers of artistic merit at the end of the eighteenth century.89 Indeed there are sufficient extant examples in museum collections from the period to support this. See Image 36 below. It is important to point out, however, that these samples have survived and been collected because of their artistic merit.

86 Turnbull, Calico Printing, p. 131; Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 548.
87 The Examiner, 2 October 1825.
88 Sugden, Wallpaper, p. 119.
This chapter’s examination of the business motivations of luxury trades at this point indicates that prestige range goods formed a decreasing proportion of the luxury goods trade’s output in comparison with their cheaper range goods. Certainly, as noted above, the largest market for many English wallpaper manufacturers was in 'common papers' yet extant examples of these are the least likely to survive. Some responsibility must be accorded to the English manufacturers for their deliberate cultivation of the popular market in cheaper wallpapers.

Indeed the declining standards in design and quality was not just a characteristic of the wallpaper trade but evident in other luxury and semi luxury goods as well. As noted
above, the furniture trade responded to increased competition and market opportunity by splitting into two distinct industries, serving either more affluent or popular markets. The textile printing industries also saw a decline in design standards following their move out of London in the second half of the eighteenth century, to larger, more cost effective premises in Lancashire in order to expand their markets further.\textsuperscript{90} Behagg's study of the Birmingham gun trade during the period 1790 -1815 has shown that one of the ways this small craft-workshop based industry responded to increased demand during the French wars was by cost cutting and lowering of standards.\textsuperscript{91} There is insufficient information to establish whether the cheaper ranges of wallpapers produced by the market leaders saw a decline in overall quality however. Their reputations for well-produced wallpapers were important to their sales strategy, so quality control may therefore have been practised. George Cooke of Cooke and Co (later of Hinchliffe and Co) for example wrote to the decorating firm Trollope and Sons in 1799 to apologise for the delay in fulfilling an order for wallpaper because '...when finished we found it so ill executed that we thought it would neither give you any Satisfaction nor me no Credit, we therefore determined to make it again...\textsuperscript{92} Lack of extant wallpaper samples that can be attributable to firms both large and small make it difficult to comment on the range of qualities of wallpaper produced at the time. It is clear however that in this period, manufacturers across several scales of operation were motivated to produce cheaper goods in response to market needs and their own profit seeking entrepreneurship.

Despite the existence of such institutions as the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacturers and Commerce (established 1754) and the Royal Academy of Arts (established 1768), the poor quality of design in many English manufactured goods was commented on at intervals up until the middle of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{93} By 1837 this had prompted the establishment of state subsidized Schools of Design and Government sponsored exhibitions to tackle the perceived twin problems of lack of

\textsuperscript{90} Chapman and Chassagne, \textit{Textiles}, p. 84 & 88.
\textsuperscript{92} Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 163.
\textsuperscript{93} Chapman and Chassagne, \textit{Textiles}, p. 88.
design education in the manufacture of luxury and semi luxury goods, and a lack of good taste amongst the populace.  

For the wallpaper trade the standards of design and production took a further fall in quality as the industry struggled with the experimental first fruits of mechanised production following the repeal of the wallpaper tax in 1836. In the meantime, better quality hand block designs were still being copied from France, which continued to excel in this area, in what the prestigious interior decorator J. G. Crace described in 1839 as a ‘mortifying comparison' with the English trade. It was not until mid-century that the efforts of AW Pugin and the Movement for Design Reform, led by civil servant Henry Cole and the designer Owen Jones, succeeded in raising standards of design in the industry in order to regain something of its previous superior reputation.

Conclusion

The period following the end of the French wars can be seen as one of success for the larger concerns in the wallpaper trade. They were able to further consolidate and build upon the commanding position that they had already established in the eighteenth century, protected to a great degree by the Excise restrictions on wallpaper which had helped restrain competition. These firms were thus able to take the lead in the accumulation of profits arising from an increase in real wages and living standards by the 1820s. Although the resultant increased demand in wallpapers had helped smaller firms to join the trade, the larger concerns were able to maintain an oligopoly over the domestic and export markets. The implications of how the trade was structured at this point, how far its networked connections extended, plus this element of competition meant that wallpapers were available to an increasing number of more widely spread consumers.

96 Hoskins, Papered Wall, p. 142.
97 Schwarz, London, p.228. Schwarz attributes this in part to the lower price of bread after the years of war with France.
This was a period of adjustment, however. Competition from foreign and domestic markets, both legal and illegal meant that the large scale manufacturers were fighting a front and rear guard action across all their levels of production from their cheaper to more expensive ranges. The lack of prospects for the mechanisation of the industry, plus the wallpaper tax, kept the average price of wallpapers too high to allow the trade to attempt further expansion into mass markets as some luxury goods trades had done. In addition, strategies to increase profits through economies in production and the simplification of patterns, a trajectory begun as early as the 1760s, caused some damage to the trade's international prestige in the face of superior foreign competition.

Furthermore, set against this background of cost cutting and periods of recession, the decline in artistic quality at this time made it easy for others to copy current wallpaper fashions using other cheaper means such as stencilling or by illegally printing. In the face of these competitors, the English wallpaper trade began to find itself falling out of fashion for the first time since the mid-eighteenth century. Steps were taken to rectify the situation with the abolition of the wallpaper tax, and to hasten mass production via mechanisation of the industry, but it was to take another few decades before the industry recovered its previous illustrious reputation.
Chapter Seven: Consumers: Shopping, Choosing and the 'Meaning' of Wallpapers, 1750-1830.

Introduction

We have seen in the thesis so far how manufacturers came to produce a wide range of wallpapers at different prices and levels of quality through the second half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This chapter looks at the implications of these developments for consumers in the light of the increased spending power of the middling classes. The social structure of this group was broad, having its own hierarchies within it. These encompassed professional groups such as lawyers and doctors and the 'pseudo gentry' of provincial towns, as well as what Clark describes as 'secondary professional men', including accountants, masters cum manufacturers, shopkeepers, schoolmasters and some skilled artisans.

Hierarchies within this group were often difficult to define, including a blurring of lines with the elite at upper levels. It is difficult to identify boundaries for this group on income alone. Rosemary Sweet has described how in the long eighteenth century, inclusion in this predominantly urban middling group was dependant equally on a commonality of culture and shared values. As a result, this group became more assertive and confident in political and cultural spheres and in their position as consumers, playing a crucial role in the creation of 'polite society' which was underpinned by these values.

Klein sees this 'politeness' as 'an attentiveness to form, sociability, improvement, worldliness and gentility'. Historians of the eighteenth century have used the concept of 'politeness' to analyse cultural developments in a variety of spheres such as
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1 The term pseudo-gentry has been used by historians to describe a new, predominantly urban, leisured class whose lifestyles were similar to the gentry but did not possess a country estate. A. Everitt, 'Social Mobility in Early Modern England' Past and Present, 33, (1966), p. 71; S. Wright, 'Sojourners and Lodgers in a Provincial Town: The Evidence from Eighteenth Century Ludlow', Urban History, 17 (1990), pp. 14-35.
material, social and institutional life. These codes of behaviour are seen as a socially cohesive and democratising influence amongst all classes who shared these values. The formation of ‘polite taste’ was a material expression of this. As domestic and private spheres took on a more important cultural role, polite taste provided an opportunity to assert social status and personal values through the acquisition of appropriate domestic furnishings and decor.

In order to establish the responsiveness of consumers to the increasing availability of a wide variety of wallpaper styles and prices, it is necessary to identify the different ways by which wallpapers could be bought. Whilst this thesis is not concerned with charting in detail the changing designs of wallpaper during this period, it does explore the cultural norms behind the choices made by consumers and how this aspect of domestic material culture was used to express wider social, cultural and personal values. This chapter also aims to situate the wide range of wallpapers available within the context of the plurality of the consumers who could afford them, and explores whether wallpapers should be re-defined as a luxury product or a democratising commodity available to a broader social group than has previously been thought.

**Shopping for Wallpaper**

Let us first examine where it was possible for consumers to buy their wallpaper from. The majority of the shops selling wallpaper during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century were located in London. As early as 1725, César de Saussure described London’s four main shopping streets of the Strand, Fleet Street, Cheapside and Cornhill as ‘the finest in Europe’. Jerry White depicts this area as a long unbroken avenue of shops of about two and a half miles long that remained one of London’s great arteries throughout the century. Two thirds of this route lay in the City, but as the century progressed, it was further extended at either end, particularly to the west, up through Holborn and on to become Oxford St. Other main arteries of shops also developed extending from the City out to Covent Garden and on to Pall Mall and Piccadilly. On

---


visiting London in the early nineteenth century, Johanna Schopenhauer described in her diary the astonishing richness and elegance of the shops, noting how

The brilliant displays of precious silverware, the beautiful draperies of muslin and other materials which the merchants show...behind large plate glass windows, the fairy tale glitter of the crystal shops, all this bewitches the visitor.\(^7\)

For middling and upper class consumers, visiting these streets became part of a leisure activity where all manner of goods could be admired and or bought, including everything from silverware, glass, drapery, fans and groceries. Here was an opportunity to see and be seen, as part of a new leisure culture associated with sociability, display and the exercise of discerning taste.\(^8\) It was in this environment that the London wallpaper trade also had its shops which were described by Collyer in 1761 as 'very handsome' in his *Parents and Guardians Directory*.\(^9\) The image below shows the north side of the Strand in 1824 with its extensive range of shops, their windows displaying an array of goods for the shopper and browser. On the far right on the corner can be seen No 427, the premises formerly owned by wallpaper manufacturer Richard Masefield and then Joseph Knight.\(^10\)

\(^7\) *The Diaries of Johanna Schopenhauer*, translated by R. Michaelis-Jena and W. Merson, 1988, p.138. Similar sentiments were expressed by Sophie von la Roche, see *Sophie in London*, translated by C. Williams in 1933.


We have seen the interior of Masefield's shop in Image 2. This trade card, like that of Abraham Price and James Wheeley (Images 3 and 7) also depicts a well-stocked shop, where smartly dressed assistants attend to fashionable ladies and gentlemen, who in turn deliberate over the large choice of wallpapers for sale. London's luxury goods retailers were adept at courting customers, and some adopted strategies similar to Wedgewood and Boulton in opening exhibition style showrooms to display their goods and in claiming an exclusive reputation in order to entice customers. Both John Middleton at his Colour Manufactory and Paper Hanging Warehouse in St Martin's Lane and the Eckhardts in Old Bond St advertised their 'fitted up' exhibition showrooms. The Eckhardts, like Wedgewood, stressed their royal patronage (in this case that of the Princess Royal) on opening their showrooms in May 1793. Here the public could admire their Patent Silver Damask varnished Linen and Paper 'fitted up in a variety of forms, where the Effect [of their hung wallpapers] may at once be seen, and which from the Novelty of their Manufactory, they think necessary'. Further

---

12 Berry, 'Polite Consumption', p.383.
exclusivity was suggested, and excitement generated, by the issuing of tickets to 'the nobility and gentry' to view the rooms.\textsuperscript{14}

As the number of wallpaper manufacturers increased (Appendix Three) so did the opportunities to buy wallpaper. Thomas Gray, poet and friend of Horace Walpole wrote in 1761 how he had been 'rumageing Mr Bromwich's and several other shops' in search of particular gothic style wallpaper.\textsuperscript{15} From the 1760s onwards it became fashionable to describe shops as 'warehouses' to convey the idea of large choice of stock on offer\textsuperscript{16} and some luxury goods manufacturers sold their goods from shops attached to the manufactory and also from a fashionable warehouse elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17}

Wallpaper manufacturer Robert Pickering for example sold his stock of 10,000 'modern elegant prints' in 1794 from his house and offices 'desirably situate at 61 Cheapside' and also from a large warehouse attached to his manufactory at Garlick Hill.\textsuperscript{18}

Those wallpaper manufactures who had established premises on the outskirts of London required a fashionable and convenient central location from which to sell their wallpapers and conduct their wholesale business dealings. Offices and a shop were therefore established in London's luxury shopping districts in the West End, several for example settling in New and Old Bond Street and the surrounding area. James Woodmason was one, who sold his wallpapers for exportation from his existing wholesale stationery warehouse at No 5 Leadenhall Street in the City, and also from his 'substantial house with convenient shop' at 68 Pall Mall, before moving premises to 21 Old Bond Street in the 1780s.\textsuperscript{19} These prestigious locations also enabled shoppers to identify wholesale wallpaper manufacturers via what we would now term 'a high street presence' and a 'flagship store'.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} Sugden, Wallpaper, p.77.
\textsuperscript{16} Berry, 'Polite Consumption', p 383.
\textsuperscript{17} Berg, Luxury, p. 187.
\textsuperscript{18} Whitehall Evening Post, 2 January 1794.
\textsuperscript{19} For Woodmason see; Gazetted, 9 April 1787; World 26 Aug 1788. Other examples of manufacturers with separate west end shops include Cooke, East and Co and John Lane in Old Bond St, London Gazette, 2 May 1797; N.A: PROB 11/1363/1, Will of John Lane, 1 September 1801; George Bowen in New Bond St, an extension of the fashionable Old Bond St shopping area. Morning Post, 3 June 1806 and Hinchliffe and Co who also had 'a counting house and warehouse' in Panton Square. W.A: M:Acc 560, Box 2, Deed of Co-partnership, 30 March 1814. .
\end{flushright}
Clé Lesger writing on urban retail location in the eighteenth century describes the benefit of situating luxury goods shops in one geographical area, in that it allows the consumer the opportunity and pleasure of comparing price, quality and choice when buying what he terms luxury 'comparison goods'.20 A further advantage for retailers was the prestige associated with the location amongst other luxury goods shops, and the chance of an unplanned sale from shoppers enticed by the carefully arranged window displays. Craske and Kirkham see the eighteenth century as the period when shops developed definable retail identities.21 Indeed, with wallpapers, the second half of the century saw the growth of separate 'paper hangings' shops, dealing solely in the sale of wallpaper and the provision of paper hanging services. The term 'paper hanger' appears more frequently in trade directories from this period on, describing a range of status levels from prestigious west end premises to smaller shops elsewhere. As noted in Chapter Three, the fashionable London shops were often co-owned by partners involved in the manufacture of wallpaper, but who operated the retail arm of the business under a different company name.

For certain provincial consumers, notions of status were attached to the purchase of luxury goods direct from London rather than sourced through provincial shops.22 George Moore, a successful merchant from Peel on the Isle of Man bought wallpapers for his Billiard Room directly from London wallpaper manufacturers Moore and Gough, in Aldgate.23 The letter books of the London manufacturing firm Duppa and Co of Oxford St and paper hanging and decorating firm Trollope and Sons in Parliament St include several requests for samples to be sent of the latest in current trends. Lord Anson of Shugborough wrote to Trollope in August 1803:


22 For this application amongst the minor aristocracy, see J. Stobart, 'Gentlemen and Shopkeepers; Supplying the Country House in Eighteenth Century England', Economic History Review, 64, 3 (2011), pp. 885-904.

23 Moore chose to buy muslin, other fabrics and soap from Dublin, but speciality seeds and wallpapers from London. M.M: BH 4926 C, Folder M, Tradesmen’s Accounts, 1760-1786.
I wish to know if you have met with any new patterns since I saw you......since I came out of Town I have seen patterns of borders made from French patterns and thought them new and pretty. I am told Lord Gwydwr has furnished some of his rooms at his house at Whitehall with some Borders of that sort...for tho' I like the pattern I chose and fixed upon, I am afraid it has been much in use and will not look so new as I could wish.24

As we have seen in Chapter One, wallpapers were also available to buy through stationers, cabinet maker’s and upholsterer’s shops as well as from the shops of manufacturers and paper hangers. Many of these were ready to buy 'off the peg' wallpapers and here it is important to re-assert that although a made to order service was available for more expensive wallpapers, already printed wallpapers formed the bulk of the trade for many shops in both London and the regions.25

In provincial towns, wallpapers could be bought from such shops as early as the mid eighteenth century. Christine Ferdinand’s study of the role of newspaper advertising in selling luxury goods to newly affluent middle classes describes how unfamiliar goods were actively promoted and tested in more isolated regions. As early as 1745 for example, Baldwin, an Isle of Wight stationer, advertised the sale of 'stationery of every variety, Sterrop's True Spectacles...all manner of Musical Instruments, Violins, German and common Flutes ...also the most curious painted Paper for Rooms.'26 In the 1740s, wallpapers were also available to buy from stationers and uphololders in larger provincial towns such as Derby and Newcastle, and in the fashionable city of York, John Yates was already engaged in a competitive price war with fellow uphololders for the custom of polite society. 'Gentlemen and Ladies' were advised that; 'such as is usually
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24 Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 246-7.
25 Amanda Vickery is correct in stating that wallpapers were printed to order, which is based on her study of the Trollope Letter Book. This firm dealt with more wealthy customers and therefore skews the evidence towards a made to order service. See A. Vickery, Behind Closed Doors; At Home in Georgian England (New York, 2009), p. 169.
sold in this Town for 6d a Yard we sell for 4d a Yard; such as they sell for Three-pence...we sell for Two-pence halfpenny.\textsuperscript{27}

Shopping for new consumer luxuries such as tableware, cutlery, dress and furnishing fabrics also became a new genteel leisure activity in the growing and modernising provincial towns. This was made more inviting by an improved urban landscape and the provision of better facilities including paved streets and street lighting.\textsuperscript{28}

Wallpapers were available to buy alongside other luxury commodities in new industrial towns as well as genteel towns such as Bath and Stamford. Furthermore, its status as a fashionable luxury consumer good meant that some shopkeepers also sold wallpapers alongside other fashionable but non-related goods\textsuperscript{29} in the hope of a chance sale. Ormston and Lamb in Newcastle, for example, advertised 'a bale of paper hangings' to the list of their 'great variety of Mercery and Linen Drapery goods' in 1775, and James Wilkinson, shopkeeper near the Bull and Gate, in still rural Kentish Town also sold paper hangings amongst his haberdashery wares in the 1790s.\textsuperscript{30}

Even in smaller industrial towns such as Wolverhampton, where the population was increasingly made up of labouring classes, pockets of better-quality shops existed. Here middling class residents and visitors could buy luxury goods for the home from upholstresses such as James Eykyn who stocked over 450 wallpapers along with yards of furnishing textiles, mahogany furniture, Dutch tiles and a quantity of glass and china ware.\textsuperscript{31} Similarly, in smaller towns, lower numbers of shops served a wide social spectrum of local consumers. Here merchandise was varied, from essentials such as soap and candles, to some luxury goods including glassware and wallpapers, albeit of a limited choice.\textsuperscript{32} By the nature of these local shops and the size of the communities that they served, we can assume that the wallpapers for sale were of a quality and price similar to the rest of the stock and therefore not of a prestige range.

\textsuperscript{27} See Sam Fox, bookseller in Derby Mercury 1 May 1740 & Robert Akenhead, bookseller in Newcastle Courant, 2 August 1740; York Courant, 14 September 1748.
\textsuperscript{29} M. Ponsonby, Stories from Home (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 35.
\textsuperscript{30} Newcastle Courant, 24 June 1775; L.M.A: MS 11936/ 373/586146, 1792.
\textsuperscript{31} Ponsonby, Stories, pp. 106-7.
\textsuperscript{32} Berry, 'Polite Consumption', p. 378; Berg, Luxury, p. 123.
By 1830, both the London and regional trade had benefitted from the increased consumption of wallpapers among the growing middle classes. (See Chapters Five and Six). The advertisement of J. Poole, a Taunton stationer in 1820 is typical in offering over 4,000 regionally and London-made wallpapers and borders for sale at his warehouse in Fore St. A cut throat competition between retailers drove the market in many consumer goods including wallpapers, particularly in regional towns where it was played out to a great extent in the regional press. Hannah Barker concludes that provincial newspaper advertising was a more effective tool for regional rather than metropolitan retailers as its coverage provided an opportunity to entice customers from far afield.

Those living in or visiting many regional towns such as Liverpool, by 1830 had several shops to choose wallpaper from. The Liverpool Mercury on 21 March 1828 for example, featured three advertisements on its front page from competing Liverpool manufacturers, James Dodd, his brother W.D. Dodd and C. Seaton, each of whom announced the fitting up of their new 'show screens' and displays. Denigration of rivals was part of this sales technique and here also each maintained that they offered better quality, better deals and lower prices than the others as well as the speediest service to the widest catchment area in the counties outside Liverpool.

Helen Berry identifies a shift in shopping culture in the late eighteenth century onwards, as shopkeepers realised that more profit could be made through high volumes of sales, based on fixed prices paid for by cash, than by the old system of long drawn out periods of credit. Berry's 'browse/bargain model' describes how eighteenth-century shoppers chose goods, came to a polite agreement with the shopkeeper on price, and paid on credit - the wealth of the customer often dictating the length of credit a shopkeeper was prepared to extend. In the 1760s and 1770s Thomas Bromwich had been able to afford to wait for two years for the payment of
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33 Taunton Courier, 9 August 1820.
35 Berry, 'Polite Consumption', p. 392.
36 Ibid., pp. 390-1.
some of his bills from his wealthy and creditworthy customers.\(^{37}\) By the end of the century, a large market had emerged amongst the less wealthy, whose credit was less assured. Manufacturers were able to turn over large quantities of stock quickly by selling wallpapers for 'ready money only' and with 'no abatement' (at a fixed price), in order to meet this demand.

Consumers of luxury goods benefitted from this new ethos of faster paced selling in that it provided more opportunities to buy goods quickly and for reduced prices. Attending auctions and bulk sales in ware-rooms hired by merchants provided an entertaining urban leisure pursuit for the middle classes and urban gentry and an opportunity to pick up a bargain.\(^{38}\) Retailers who had a glut of unsold rolls of wallpaper could recoup losses in this way. John Roderick, auctioneer in Birmingham for example offered 40,000 yards of wallpaper and 55,000 yards of borders which he had bought for cash in London, for a quick sale through his auction house in 1826.\(^{39}\) Others held temporary one-off sales such as that advertised by E. Smith of Cheltenham in 1814 where he offered 1,400 pieces of wallpaper all to be sold off in small lots in a three day only sale.\(^{40}\)

There were further opportunities for consumers to buy wallpapers below standard prices. Shopkeepers openly advertised sales of wallpapers which they had bought at rock bottom prices at the bankruptcy, closing down and retirement sales of their competitors. These they sold on at below normal price whilst still making a profit.\(^{41}\) James Dodd of Bold St, Liverpool, for example, announced in the *Liverpool Mercury* in 1828 that having bought up a bankrupt stock of current fashionable wallpapers, he could now offer them for sale at half the going rate.\(^{42}\) For the less discerning and fashion conscious, and for those on a budget, it was possible to buy out of date stock from upholsters, stationers and wallpaper manufacturers' shops. W. Suffield, stationer

\(^{37}\) See for example Invoice to John Radcliffe of Hitchin Priory sent in 1773 and settled in 1775, H.R.O: DE/R/F210/11; Lord Leigh of Stoneleigh's final settlement in 1765, two years after the date of invoice. S.B.T: DR/18/5/4402 Stoneleigh/Bromwich, 1763.


\(^{39}\) *Birmingham Gazette*, 13 March 1826.

\(^{40}\) *Cheltenham Chronicle*, 13 August 1812.

\(^{41}\) For example see *Bath Chronicle*, 17 November 1791; *Birmingham Gazette*, 31 August 1829.

\(^{42}\) *Liverpool Mercury*, 18 July 1828; N.A: B3/1363, Bankruptcy of William Dodd, 1824.
in Bull St Birmingham and W. A. Hooper in Bath for example both advertised out of date stock for sale at 'considerably under the original cost' to make way for the arrival of new wallpapers. 43

Manufacturer T.M. Kingdon and Co in Exeter targeted these groups directly:

N.B. About Five Hundred Pieces of BED-CHAMBER PAPER HANGINGS of last year’s Patterns, are to be Sold at Reduced Prices, and are well worth the attention of Builders, and Persons who are furnishing Lodging Houses. 44

For those with little spare money to buy luxuries for the home, it was still possible by the early nineteenth century to acquire small quantities of wallpaper which were sold by upholders and auctioneers as off-cuts and remains of rolls and sets of wallpapers. 45

In previous decades, customers were billed for any unused off-cuts, but with the increased use of wallpapers among a wider group of less wealthy customers this was less practical for shopkeepers.

For those fitting up a house on a budget, second hand shops provided used luxury goods sold cheaply. The second hand goods market operated on several levels, reflecting the quality of what was available. 46 Higher end shops sold antiques and second hand prestige French and Chinese export wallpapers to the more affluent. Below this however, was a trade in cheap, used and remaindered goods, including wallpaper. One could visit premises such as that of the anonymous auctioneer in Hull, who placed the following advertisement in 1834 to silk mercers, china and cut glass dealers, pawnbrokers, carpet manufacturers and paper hangers:

...Tradesmen and Manufacturers, who may have discovered on taking Stock, an Accumulation of Goods - which from being unfashionable, soiled or in short lengths, they are unable readily to dispose of in their regular Trade - to forward such goods to him for the purpose of being disposed of by AUCTION. 47
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43 *Birmingham Gazette*, 19 December 1825; *Bath Chronicle*, 9 September 1813.
44 *Trewman’s Exeter Flying Post*, 20 March 1823.
45 See for example *Bath Chronicle*, 24 May 1770; *Birmingham Gazette*, 18 April 1825.
46 Ponsonby, *Stories*, p. 86; *True Briton*, 21 June 1797; *The Observer*, 10 August 1800.
47 *Bath Chronicle*, 14 March 1793; *Birmingham Gazette*, 11 April 1814; *York Herald*, 1 February 1834.
It is not difficult to imagine the excitement generated by a shopping trip to London or provincial urban centre for the upper and middling class consumer in this period. Newly paved and lit streets provided the arena for a dazzling and ever changing display of affordable and available consumer goods, in new styles, colours and materials which many consumers had not seen before. In this environment, consumers chose the necessities, accessories and luxury goods with which to furnish and decorate their homes. Through the long eighteenth century, we can see that the opportunity to buy wallpaper in these places increased in terms of the number and variety of shops, and also their geographical spread. Besides standard shops however, there were other possibilities to buy domestic items, as fast paced bulk selling, discounting and sales by opportunistic retailers of remaindered goods like wallpaper put the purchase of these objects within the reach of a greater number of less wealthy consumers.

**Choosing Wallpaper**

For those shopping for wallpaper, new opportunities were opened up. It was possible to ornament and transform the previously plain painted walls and panelling of their rooms with the two dimensional patterns and multi-colours of distemper printed wallpapers or with the new textures of flock wallpapers and those embellished with glittering mica or gold. In this, wallpaper provided a fitting and harmonious backdrop to other fashionable furnishings, drapery and ornaments. The enthusiasm for and anticipation of such purchases across all consumer goods in this period was driven by a new ethos of acquisitiveness. Beyond this, however, luxury goods were invested with other meanings besides desirability for the consumer, including the capacity to communicate a range of recognisable, shared social values. The following section therefore explores the motivations behind the choice of wallpapers in this period.

Historians of consumption in the eighteenth century broadly agree that one of the main drivers behind the desirability of consumer goods in this period was fashion. Wallpaper styles adapted to the changing rhythms of current fashions. Broadly speaking these movements can be summarised as a fashion for Chinese, chinoiserie
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and flocked textile designs, popular from mid-century to the 1770s giving way, but not
disappearing altogether, to arabesque and neo-classical designs and finally to Regency
classicism. Floral motifs and textile imitations remained current throughout this
period, adjusting designs accordingly to each of these themes.

Underlying fashion, lay the appeal to the senses, novelty and imitation.\textsuperscript{50} The
contrivance of flocked paper hangings imitating cut velvets and damasks were
regarded as ingenious, as were papers imitating stucco, marble and wainscot and
exotic 'mock India papers' imitating expensive Chinese wallpapers imported by the
East India Company. Bromwich and Leigh's invoice to Lord Leigh of Stoneleigh Abbey
in 1763-4 includes provision for over 28 rooms including blue, yellow and green flocks,
stucco papers for closets, painted papers to match chintz fabrics, plain painted
schemes with papier-mâché borders and Chinese wallpapers.\textsuperscript{51}

Lord Leigh's invoice represents the height of fashion at the time, and is illustrative of
similar orders placed by others with Bromwich and other prestigious suppliers
including Thomas Chippendale.\textsuperscript{52} John Styles has stressed that, whilst novelty and
fashion were of immediate importance when purchasing new consumer goods in the
eighteenth century, there was an underlying need on the part of consumers to be able
to recognise a use, meaning or familiarity with these products and designs before they
could be accepted as 'new and fashionable'.\textsuperscript{53} Flock, stucco and chinoiserie wallpapers
all represented clever ways of replicating already established wall treatments that
were identified with imported luxuries and associated with elite status.\textsuperscript{54} This
connection and acceptance was further re-enforced by a language or 'network' of
shared designs used on other luxury goods on the market at the same time.\textsuperscript{55}

Furthermore, whilst for the upper classes, wallpaper was a cheaper alternative to the
textile hangings, wood panelling or plasterwork wall treatments which it imitated, it

\textsuperscript{50} Berg, \textit{Luxury}, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{51} S.B.T: DR/18/5/4402 Stoneleigh/Bromwich, 1763.
\textsuperscript{52} For example, Invoice to Lord Howard from Isherwood and Bradley, E.R.O: D/DBy A44/12, Audley End
Household Accounts, 1786; Wells-Cole appends a useful list of orders to Chippendale in \textit{Historic Paper
Hangings from Temple Newsam and other Houses} (Leeds, 1983), pp. 45-46.
\textsuperscript{53}Product Innovation', p. 126.
\textsuperscript{54} Stobart explores this theme fully through the wider shopping patterns of the Leigh family in
'Gentlemen and Shopkeepers'.
\textsuperscript{55}Berg, \textit{Luxury}, p. 251.
was still a relatively expensive purchase. (Lord Leigh’s bill for the above, for example, cost £356 7s ½d). Its physical extent meant a large degree of disruption on installation. Rough masonry or planked walls, which had formerly been covered with textile hangings, plus wood panelled walls, required huge swathes of canvas to be stretched taut and closely nailed over them to provide a flat surface on which to hang wallpaper. Once on the wall, it could prove a costly and inconvenient mistake if badly executed or if the pattern was not well received. Here the skills of the upholsterer (‘upholder’) were necessary, not only to carry out the work correctly, but to advise unknowing customers on what was regarded tasteful and current and to ensure that as Craske puts it, they did not waste money on ‘some recherché gaff’.

Thomas Bromwich’s name often occurs alongside that of other eminent tradesmen associated with the building and decoration of the country house such as Robert Adam, Thomas Chippendale and ‘Capability’ Brown. This association helped in the acceptance of wallpaper as a fashionable yet cheaper decorative choice. Reliance on and patronage of eminent wallpaper manufacturers contributed in part to the elevated reputation enjoyed by the London wallpaper trade throughout the period of this thesis. This reputation also provided re-assurance when buying such a large and visually obvious addition to the home. This applied to both middling and upper classes proportionately, whether buying from a west end shop or a provincial stationer, who also claimed to offer London wallpaper stock.

Rooms were decorated at various levels of expense, depending on a hierarchy of their importance. Isaac Ware writing in 1756 advocated, ‘For a noble hall, nothing is so well as stucco; for a parlour, wainscot seems properest, and for the apartment of a lady, hangings’. Ware was writing about elite homes, but this same hierarchical principle was followed by classes further down the scale, with the cost of particular types of decoration varying accordingly. Fashion was not the only consideration in the choice of these wall treatments, however, and other factors influenced hierarchical choice. This was apparent in newly built urban areas, and particularly in London, where

56 S.B.T: DR/18/5/4402 Stoneleigh/Bromwich, 1763.
58 For example at Audley End House, Essex, Harewood in Yorkshire and Burghley House, Lincolnshire.
speculative builders built terraces in a new style of housing. This consisted of a kitchen and services on a lower ground floor, and a front and back parlour on the ground floor. The first floor often comprised a dining room at the front and bedroom and closet at the back. The second floor was given over to two or more bedrooms and closets and over these were situated the garrets in which the servants usually slept.  

Notwithstanding minor differences in size and ornamental details dictated by price, this style became a standard for both the urban middling class and gentry.

The new architectural style came to embody a new set of aspirations for its occupants. We have seen in Chapter One how builders used wallpapers as a cheaper alternative to panelling in fitting out new houses. Further benefits were also evident in the association of wallpapers with cleanliness, and as a means to lighten and refresh the look of a room. The ubiquitous eighteenth-century adjective 'neat' was applied to wallpaper as with many consumer goods, to imply good taste, restraint and refinement, but this term was also used to encompass a new concern for hygiene, tidiness and kemptness. Manufacturers such as Crease and Co, Great Newport Street and a host of imitators even took advantage of this to produce a range of 'washable' wallpapers. By the end of the eighteenth century, floor to ceiling panelling was regarded as sombre and unhygienic in the new ethos of light and informal interiors. New houses were increasingly built with panelling to dado level only or without it. In older homes of both the middling classes and gentry, existing panelling was covered with stretched canvas by upholsters and paper hangers and wallpapered over, or in some cases removed completely.

These houses also offered a range of room types based on a hierarchy of status including best parlours, guest bedrooms, family parlours, libraries, studies, back bedrooms and closets. Attic or garret sleeping arrangements for servants provided a new level of privacy for the owners of the house, family rooms reflected a new ethos

---

61 Vickery, At Home, pp. 177-181. Gazetteer, 18 September 1787 and St James’ Chronicle, 17 April 1790 for example include advertisements for shops selling 'neat and elegant patterns' and 'variety of patterns and neatness of execution'.
62 Klein, 'Politeness and Interpretation', p. 887.
63 Salisbury and Winchester Journal, 13 April 1818; Bath Chronicle, 22 May 1817.
64 See for example, Manx Museum: AP.138.1, Estimate of Necessary Repairs in the Governors House, September 1793; Duppa, Daybook; E. Entwisle, A Literary History of Wallpaper (London, 1963), p. 60.
of domesticity, whilst rooms for entertaining were identified to reflect a sophisticated urban lifestyle and a culture of polite sociability.\textsuperscript{65} We must consider that within this template there was of course room for personal choice as to how these spaces were used. Yet what was common to both old and new built homes of the middling classes and upper classes in the metropolis and provinces in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, was that multi-functional rooms became less common, rooms began to acquire a defined identity and specific purpose, with meals for example no longer taken in any room but only in those designated for eating.

Decoration of these spaces therefore reflected their use and status through the choice of appropriate wallpaper, furnishings and ornaments. Manufacturers of luxury domestic goods responded to this with increasing product variation. For the consumer this represented even more choice across the same items.\textsuperscript{66} Leading wallpaper manufacturers responded to this gap in the market by the early nineteenth century, in creating wallpapers that were increasingly marketed for use in specific rooms. The advertisement of J. Harrison's Commercial Sale Rooms in New St, Birmingham in 1825 is typical in advertising its sale of 2,500 pieces of French and English paper hangings, 'of the newest and most approved patterns, appropriate for dining, drawing rooms, parlours, sitting rooms, bedrooms, halls etc.'\textsuperscript{67}

Within each of these room brackets were even more choices based on price. Wallpapers were offered at prices per yard or piece (roll), on a sliding scale depending on the materials used, level of embellishment and labour required, plus their intended room use. The advertisement of C & W Thompson, dealer in paper hangings in Sheffield, best illustrates this hierarchy: simple distemper printed bedroom papers were typically the cheapest and these were offered from 2d per yard upward. Above this Thompson offered more complicated distemper patterns of mock flock, chintzes, damasks from 3½d upward. Above this were 'satins' made with more costly 'satin white' pigment and at the top, 'best flocks' and 'best gold' at 1s 4d, involving additional

\textsuperscript{65} It is worth noting that the term 'attic' did not always refer to servants rooms, as particularly in large houses, these rooms were often used to accommodate guests.


\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Birmingham Gazette}, 12 September 1825.
materials and application processes to produce. A range of prices were offered within all these categories themselves, the most expensive papers being a combination of 'best flock and gold' at 2s 3d per yard.68

In her study of the Trollope and Sons letter book, Amanda Vickery has described the sense of propriety and convention governing the choice of wallpaper for particular rooms within the home.69 This builds on Lorna Weatherill’s identification of how increases in consumer spending among the middle class in both urban and rural areas in the eighteenth century was channelled more towards 'front stage' rooms for the reception of visitors rather than private spaces. This in turn allowed classes beyond the elite to express their social mores and values through their domestic setting.70

The dining room was a formal space for entertaining and expressing status and as such contained the best furniture, tableware and linen.71 Relatively more would be spent on wallpaper as a fitting backdrop, with formal patterns and richer decoration, a more likely setting for C & W Thompson's 'best flock' and 'best gold' papers. In 1774, the wife of lawyer Lloyd Kenyon wrote to her mother about the decor of the townhouse they had newly moved into at 18 Lincoln's Inn Fields. Her account describes the large dining room on the first floor, with marble hearth and 'handsome steel grate,' which was to be hung with a new wallpaper - 'the paper is to be a blue, small patterned flock: I will send you a bit of it' she wrote. Other more private rooms in the house, including two bedrooms, however, were to retain their existing flock wallpapers. One was to be converted to a fashionable but private breakfast room, and of this she stated:

The back room has at present a bed in it, which is to be removed on Wednesday morning, and the room to have the old blue flock wallpaper we found in it, blue moreen curtains, chairs...a book-case - will not that be a nice breakfast room?72

68 Sheffield Independent, 9 May 1829.
69 Vickery, At Home, pp. 176-177.
Similarly, the Reverend Mr Webber in Kirkham, Lancashire when buying wallpapers from Gillows in 1823, chose papers of 5s 6d per yard for his wife's bedroom and 7s and 10s 6d respectively for the lobby and his study, both spaces where his parishioners would have been received.\textsuperscript{73}

Rooms that were both social and private spaces within the home such as the drawing room and parlour were also decorated to reflect status, but in a lighter, more comfortable and informal way. These rooms were decorated and equipped with the necessary tools of polite sociability and here the new fashionable hot drinks of tea, coffee and chocolate would be offered. The ritual of visiting and taking tea allowed for the display of genteel manners, respectability, social status and ownership. This was conveyed through the fashionable accessories of the tea table, including porcelain or china cups and saucers, and silver or ceramic teapots. In addition hospitality, comfort and domesticity were suggested through the use of curtains, upholstered furniture, carpets and wallpaper to replace cold plaster walls.

Wallpaper choices for this room often conveyed polite restraint and for this small, discreet and plainer patterns were chosen such as that shown in the satirical print below:

\textsuperscript{73} W.A: 344/142, Gillows Estimate Book, ff. 311.
Plain painted paper hangings with decorative borders were also thought fitting and are often seen in paintings of family portraits and conversation pieces. Duppa and Co for example provided such a scheme twice for the Coffee Room of Lord Lyndoch’s Albermarle St residence in the early nineteenth century. Image 9 shows this type of scheme in situ. Conversation pieces such as this represented individuals in a social

74 N.A.L: 86. AA. 13, Duppa and Co Memobook, 1 December 1815.
environment surrounded by the material artefacts of daily life and often expressed their cultural interests, knowledge and accomplishments.\textsuperscript{75}

Although possessions may have varied in quantity and value according to wealth, this culture of polite sociability expressed through the decoration and equipping of domestic spaces was understood and practised across several levels of the middle and upper classes.\textsuperscript{76} The image below shows fragments of a wallpaper from a townhouse in Diss. Whilst it is poorly executed and represents a cheap wallpaper, its depiction of the objects associated with tea drinking indicates that that the owner understood the symbolic implications of this genteel social ritual.

![Image 39](image39.png)

Image 39. Block printed and stencilled design of tea drinking accessories on a pink ground, c. late eighteenth, early nineteenth century. From a town house in Diss, Norfolk. Photograph: Michael Pollard/Wallpaper History Society. I am grateful to Christine Woods for this image.

Choices of wallpaper were also based on a desire to display the values of taste, simplicity and improvement. By the third quarter of the eighteenth century onwards, rationality and restraint were expressed through the neo-classical tenets of harmony, symmetry and simplicity, and as a reaction to what was seen as the indulgence and

\textsuperscript{75} Klein, ‘Politeness and Interpretation’, p. 877.

\textsuperscript{76} Berg, Luxury, p. 241.
excess of rococo and Chinese fashions. Styles influenced by Greco-roman art and architecture experienced on the Grand Tour were suggestive of a knowing, cultured and enlightened consumer, even if they were not wealthy enough to experience the Grand Tour in person. Middleton offered a typical range of wallpapers of this style; curious running pattern some in the arabesque, some in Etruscan Style, to be hung in compartments formed by panels, Pilasters and Antique Figures with curious landscapes and their devices...after the Vatican ornament by Raphael....and some of rare stones such as marbles granites etc...which with others of plain grounds, surrounded with rich borders, form an elegant Neatness, and serve as a good relief to Pictures.  

Neo-classical influences were evident in architecture and consumer goods across a broad social spectrum in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. McKendrick has shown how Wedgewood exploited this idiom to sell 'consumer classicism' to the wider market of the middle classes. Similarly with wallpapers, simpler and cheaper versions were available by distilling down motifs taken from this neo-classical repertoire: pillars and vertical ornament were translated into stripes and vertical bows, and classical devices were alluded to via stylised details such as scrolls and acanthus leaves. See Images 39 and 40. Colours were often subdued, such as buffs, greys and black and white.

---

77 Whitehall Evening Post, 22 April 1790.
79 McKendrick, Consumer Society, p. 114.

Wallpapers imitating stone, including porphyry and marble or representing pillars and arches of both classical and gothic architecture were frequently displayed in entrance halls and staircases and these patterns were copied and simplified for the entrance halls of more modest homes. Image 42 below is an example of this and can be compared with simpler design in Image 34.

Image 42. Gothic arch wallpaper block printed in brown and white on a brown ground, first quarter nineteenth century. Compare this paper with the more simple version of the same style in Image 34 above. From the staircase of a private house in Gloucester.

Enlightenment ideals of improvement, rationality and scientific reason also permeated the choices for domestic decoration. Culturally, these ideals were manifested by the urban middle classes and gentry through embracing activities such as attendance at scientific lecturers, membership of societies and patronage of subscription libraries. London itself was the home of a respected and growing scientific instrument trade making microscopes and mathematical instruments for architects, surveyors and other
growing middle class professions. Within the home, these ideals of progress and reason were reflected in the choice of ornament and patterns reflecting microscopic imagery were translated into simple patterned wallpapers such as those illustrated here:

Image 43. Orange white and black 'amoeba' design on grey ground, c. 1795. From the rear room, ground floor of 47 Manchester Street, Marylebone. English Heritage Architectural Study Collection: 88082029.

Similarly, geometric designs based on repeating and interlinking squares, circles and other symmetrical motifs, were also popular such as the image below from Lacock Abbey, Wiltshire.

Image 45. Multi-coloured geometric design on white ground, c 1810. The paper is stamped on the reverse 'oopers and Boyle', likely to be leading firm Williams Coopers and Boyle of Smithfield. See Chapter Six. From the Cloister Bedroom, Lacock Abbey, National Trust. Photograph: Sandiford and Mapes.
These designs had dual associations, echoing both Byzantine and neo-classical architectural ornament and also mathematical and geometric principles of balance and proportion. In both cases the consumer could express a familiarity with the qualities of erudition and improvement through their home decor. At the same time these new scientifically themed decorative designs were also embraced by manufacturers of domestic goods as these simple patterns were easy to produce. Creation of the pattern was also made easier by the use of new instruments as design templates, and here tools such as 'Letherbridges Improved Caleidoscope' were directly marketed to carpet, calico and wallpaper manufacturers for this purpose.81

Enlightened and rational ideas about aesthetics embodied in the culture of classicism were being challenged, but not supplanted from the 1770s by the aesthetic ideals of the picturesque movement. William Gilpin's practical guide, Observations...Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty (1782) provided an antidote to the Grand Tour by promoting an appreciation of the native landscape and the cultural pleasures of scenic touring at home. As part of the wider Romantic Movement, writers and artists helped encourage a passion for both wild and bucolic pastoral landscapes, an interest in botany and an appreciation of the garden.82 This aesthetic was also manifest in the decorative arts, including wallpaper which already had a tradition of replicating natural subjects such as flowers and leaves. Floral subjects had long been thought appropriate for bedroom papers as they tended to be restful, light and pretty, and thus suggestive of more relaxed and feminine domestic spaces.83 By the end of the eighteenth century natural subjects rather than stylised pattern were thought suitable subjects for a variety of rooms. These extended from simple natural motifs to complex rural scenes, which from 1800s onwards were sometimes even accompanied by a painted sky ceiling.84 See Image 46 below:

81 Morning Chronicle, 11 June 1818.
83 As evidenced in samples found in situ and in collections such as the V&A.
The pages of the order books of both Duppa and Trollope are full of such naturalistic references including 'ivy leaf greens, convolvulus blue, acorn blue, olive thistle, cowslip feather, honeysuckle, geranium' and 'sweet william' and 'rose border'.[85] Endless interchangeable variations based on a trellis with trailing flower and leaf motif were produced by manufacturers in response to these sensibilities: Thomas Jefferson Hogg described the reaction of his friend the romantic poet, Percy Byshe Shelley, on finding lodgings in London in 1811: 'there were trellises, vine leaves, with their tendrils and huge clusters of grapes, green and purple. This was delightful, he went close up to the wall and touched it: We must stay here, stay forever'.[86] The wallpaper illustrated below is an example of this type of paper:

---

[85] Duppa, Daybook, Vickery, At Home, p.175.
As noted in Chapter Four, wallpapers like other consumer goods in this period were a composite of eclectic design elements, which were pared down and adapted to new uses. Trellis and stripe backgrounds were easily interchangeable with both neo-classical scrolls, ribbons and stylised motifs as well as rustic leaf and flower designs. A customer order to Duppa and Co from Mrs Hillhouse in New Bond Street in 1813 illustrates these compound designs. Here neo-classical blended with picturesque with 'Oak foliage greens, Ivy on grey, Grape leafage, Diamond trellis Olympian, New Trellis

---

green etc on Olympia, Stone trellis greens on grey.'

For the manufacturer this provided the opportunity to produce an endless variety of multi-functional, unchallenging and perennially appropriate standard wallpapers to a wide customer base. For the consumer it represented less an aesthetic appreciation of particular design forms and more a token connection, sometimes unwittingly, to the values underpinning these styles. Image 23 for example, shows the combination of naturalistic/rustic themed wallpaper with a neo-classical border.

The customer’s ability to recognise taste and quality was also expressed via a pre-occupation with price. The word 'cheap' was frequently used in advertisements during this period, often alongside 'variety', as a means to attract customers in an increasingly competitive marketplace. Aside from its basic commercial connotations however, 'cheap' also stood for 'reasonably priced' and 'good value'. Paying the correct price for an item, particularly one involving the application of taste was important to both middle and upper classes. An understanding and appreciation of the value of particular consumer goods betrayed a familiarity with them and an ability to secure a good price marked one out as an informed shopper.

Customers, including the elite, often shopped around when buying wallpaper. Selecting purchases and then agreeing price and credit terms was an accepted part of 'genteel' shopping. As markets expanded and faster paced selling became more prevalent by the end of the eighteenth century, so these more involved types of transaction were less viable for shopkeepers. In the highly competitive regional market for wallpapers in the 1820s, for example, advertisements continue to mention price, with headline phrases such as 'TASTE AND ECONOMY', 'CHEAP WALLPAPERS' and 'CHEAPER THAN EVER!!', yet the terms of the transaction were firm: in the case of C &W Thompson of Sheffield, abrupt: 'Terms.-Money. No Discount'. Yet all did still stress the quality and variety of their stock and many were still couched in deferential

88 Duppa, Memo Book, 11 August 1813.
89 Berg, Luxury, p. 267.
91 Birmingham Gazette, 4 July 1825 & 14 September 1829; Sheffield Independent, 9 May 1829.
terms, thanking the public for their attention, as a continuation of a shared polite dialogue that married manners with commerce.\textsuperscript{92}

Vickery describes how 'iron convention' governed the choice of wallpaper patterns and colours for each room in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{93} Indeed as we have seen, specific patterns and styles were marketed as appropriate for different rooms within the house then and into the nineteenth century. General rules also applied in matching room size to pattern size and complexity, in order that the decor should not overpower. Whilst examples exist of personal taste overriding these conventions,\textsuperscript{94} choices were broadly made with these in mind. The availability of a wide range of multi-valent standard wallpapers blurred these lines however, and choices were in effect much more nuanced. Wallpapers chosen for one man's best parlour were also bought for another man's closet. The most important criterion here was the matching of price to the hierarchy rooms, from reception rooms down to private spaces and those of servants and lodgers. Regardless of personal levels of expenditure, it was more important that this criterion was acknowledged.

**Wallpaper as a Unifying Luxury Goods Item**

The values underpinning the choice of wallpaper in the home - fashion, status, taste, propriety and improvement - were also manifest in public as well as private spaces. By the 1800s wallpaper had become associated with these values and was recognised as a requisite to polite living. In the sale of houses for example it was automatically associated with the requirements of a genteel lifestyle. Provision of paper hangings in rooms was highlighted in advertisements alongside such other indicators of gentility as new sashed windows and separate rooms for eating, entertaining and for servants. One such advertisement emphasised the respectability of the property within, 'most of the apartments [are] hung with paper hangings' whilst 'the Situation is only a Thousand Yards from the Parish Church, and commands a most pleasing Prospect...and

\textsuperscript{92}Barker, *Business of Women*, pp. 82-83. Stobart, 'Selling (Through) Politeness', p. 316.
\textsuperscript{93} *At Home*, p.176.
\textsuperscript{94} For example, small motif pattern used in the large Howard Dressing Room, Audley End House, P. Mapes, *Report on the Wallpaper in the Howard Dressing Room, Audley End House*, prepared for English Heritage (September 2014); large pattern flock in situ in attic rooms at Clandon Park, Surrey.
is a most desirable Country Residences for a small genteel Family'. Further down the scale, builders were criticised for using cheap decorations such as wallpapers as an incentive to buyers when selling poor quality housing.

Langford characterises the emphasis on manners and respect shown by eighteenth-century shopkeepers to their customers as 'commercial politeness'. Informal codes of appropriate behaviour and a shared language of politeness governed the use of these public spaces, making it possible for consumers from the middling classes, gentry and nobility to mix. This was evident in places to buy wallpaper as many sold a wide price range of wallpapers suitable from 'the Cottage to the Palace'. J. Harrison in New Street, Birmingham was one such, who served the 'Nobility, Gentry, Innkeepers, Tradesmen, Farmers and all classes' with ranges of wallpapers from 2½d to 42d per yard.

Identification of wallpaper with these values also led them to be used as decoration within shops themselves. Here they could suggest not only fashion and status, but also domesticity and hospitality. William Paul, advertising his paper hanging and furniture warehouse in Fountain Street, Manchester in 1810, was keen to stress the suitability of his wallpapers for the use of private families and in shop interiors. The floral wallpaper shown in Image 48 dating from c 1800 was found in the interior of a shop in Melton Mowbray and conveys more of a sense of domesticity, and by extension trustworthiness and inclusivity to shoppers in this formerly small provincial town.

---

95 Leeds Mercury, 11 July 1818; see also Newcastle Courant, 30 May 1767; World, 13 May 1789.
99 Birmingham Gazette, 26 March 1827.
100 Manchester Mercury, 20 November 1810.
Langford's 'commercial politeness' was also practised by innkeepers and coffee house owners, and here too wallpaper was used as a part of these social spaces. As in the domestic sphere, the cost and quality of wallpapers used in these social spaces therefore was diverse. The architect James Burton for example, described his fashionable St Leonard’s Hotel in Tonbridge Wells as 'for the reception of Noblemen’s families', and chose his wallpapers from the upmarket firm of Cowtan and Sons in 1828. Inns catering for a less prestigious market could buy cheaper wallpapers from Examples from such locations can be found in both the V&A and English Heritage collections. Wells-Cole, *Historic Paper Hangings*, p. 44. Inns and coffee houses were also supplied, see for example Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 28. The V&A and English Heritage Collections both have fragments of wallpapers used in inns.
auctioneers such as John Roderick in Temple Street, Birmingham who in 1829 offered bulk sales of old wallpaper stock at discounted rates to 'those about to stencil, builders and innkeepers. Images 49 and 50 are examples of the range of wallpaper qualities available for inns and hotel interiors. Regardless of quality, however, in each case, wallpaper was used to convey a sense of politeness through association with status, comfort and propriety and therefore accessibility to those who shared these values and codes of behaviour.


103 Birmingham Gazette, 14 September 1829.
Shared cultural activities and leisure pursuits involving the arts, sciences and learning were enjoyed in theatres and public buildings holding lectures and meetings of clubs and societies. Inside these buildings wallpapers were chosen as appropriate decor to express modernity, taste and polite restraint, particularly via the use of neo-classical or gothic-influenced designs.104 Wallpapers were also deemed appropriate decor for places of business and public life.105 An example of this typical transformation in the public townscape is given in an account of the preparations for the 1822 Preston Guild

104 Diary or Woodfall’s Register, 13 September 1790; Morning Post, 4 June 1794; Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 97 & 280.
105 See for example, Duppa, Memobook, 16 April 1807; Vickery, At Home, p.169.
Merchant and describes how ‘The Town and Guild Halls underwent a thorough repair. The walls of the former were painted in a tasteful manner, and those of the latter were hung with a handsome gothic patterned paper.’106 As both gentry and middling classes occupied these spaces, their style cannot be identified in terms of one particular social group but reflected a cultural consensus shared by all who used them.

Increasing wealth amongst the middling classes blurred the lines between this broad group and the elite classes, yet integration was possible less through wealth and more through shared codes of civility, refinement and taste.107 Materially, these overarching values were also applied to consumer goods in both public and private spaces. There was a perceptible difference between prestige wallpapers intended for an aristocratic salon with their complexity of composition and elegance of execution, and cheap, crudely carved block prints produced by the unskilled using second hand blocks. In between however, lay the majority of available wallpapers in a vast range of interchangeable styles that were appropriate to all those sharing these 'polite' values. For all those buying from the major London manufacturers, regardless of social status, were assured of the same quality of product, as these firms practised quality control. (See p. 219). We can presume that this also applied to some regional manufacturers who advertised their wallpapers on the basis that they were as good quality as those of the London trade.

Beverly Lemire has described how clothing styles worn by the middling and upper classes became more homogenised in this period, as a reaction to earlier upper class sartorial excess and as a result of the middling classes’ increased access to and familiarisation with the concept of luxury goods.108 This development also applied to the broad band of 'middling' wallpapers which enjoyed a multi-valent status across these social groups. The simple patterned wallpapers used in nurseries and servants quarters of elite homes were also used in middle class homes, as well as in smaller but

more formal spaces such as closets and lobbies of the more wealthy. In middle class homes this same interchangability across room hierarchies applied. For example, in 1807, Duppa and Co supplied Mr Butler of Queen Anne's Street West with the same trellis pattern for the 'gentleman's room' on the ground floor, a closet on the first floor and an attic bedroom.

As the cost of wallpaper was dependant not just on its price per yard but also the quantity bought and the labour costs to hang it, it was therefore possible for two customers of differing income levels to afford the same paper to hang in different sized rooms. Thus both Robert Harper of Russell Place and Mrs Ladbrooke of Russell Square both chose the same wallpaper to furnish drawing rooms in 1808, but the former spent £28 on the scheme and the latter spent £45. These small patterned wallpapers, which manufacturers modified slightly each season, also made it possible for consumers to remain within a broad current fashion bracket for several years.

Adam Smith suggested that dress fashions changed annually and assumed that furniture was changed twice per decade. Vickery also argues that wallpaper was a cheap way of quickly brightening up homes and preparing lodgings for new tenants, and that it was frequently replaced. Indeed builders and landlords were sold bulk purchase discounted wallpapers, or cheaper wallpapers 'in the plainest way' for tenants. Yet laminates of wallpaper layers representing several decades of changing decor found in the homes of both the elite and middling classes indicate that for many, wallpaper schemes were left on the wall for ten or twenty years before being papered over with a new scheme. Aside from the cost of the wallpaper, labour to hang it

---

109 See V&A: E.1862-1885-1946, Cowtan and Sons Ltd Order Book, 1824-1840s for examples of wallpapers supplied to the elite for their servants. Also Image 18, Audley End, Essex, middle range trellis pattern and 19, daisy pattern used in servants quarters at Welgelegen Pavillion, Haarlem and in formal lobby at Strawberry Hill, Twickenham.

110 Duppa Memobook, 16 April 1807.

111 Duppa Memobook, 10th May 1808 & 18 May 1808.


113 Vickery, At Home, p. 168.

114 Manchester Guardian, 18 June 1831; Duppa, Memobook, 6 January 1817; Trollope, Letterbook, ff.23.

115 For example V&A: E524, 525-1956, Laminate of wallpapers from St Nicholas' Rectory, Middlesex dating from 1730-1900; Mapes, Howard Dressing Room; P. Mapes, Report on the Wallpapers in the Cockloft, Apethorpe Hall, prepared for English Heritage (July, 2013). For some amongst the elite, Chinese wallpapers were regarded as heirloom purchases. For a comprehensive listing of extant examples see F. Wappenschmidt, Chinesische Tapeten für Europa; Von Rollbild zur Bildtapete (1989).
would have to be paid for. Changing wallpaper schemes was also disruptive and messy, and depending on the wall substrate could involve stripping off old wallpaper, re-tensioning a canvas support, and the extra expense of new lining paper. It is important to note therefore, that not all landlords and homeowners made wallpaper purchases with such impermanence in mind.

For some, wallpaper schemes represented an investment. Despite the availability of new consumer goods, not all homes were always completely fashionable but contained a mix of treasured older furnishings and new acquisitions. Metropolitan and regional retailers offered services for repairing and re-matching sections of wallpaper that had become accidentally damaged. Although like other luxury goods, new wallpaper patterns were bought each year, this was not always by the same people. Hence the minor modifications made by manufacturers to designs were important, as too great a seasonal difference would alienate customers who had bought last year’s patterns. Furthermore, consumers who bought older stock cheaper would still have the same decor for several years as those who had bought it when new.

Samples in the Cowtan order book indicate that some styles remained best sellers for several years, whilst leading manufactures of the closely allied calico printing trade also revisited design details that had been popular over a decade previously. Safe and unchallenging, multi-purpose designs formed the basis of this broad bracket of wallpapers which served to promote inclusivity rather than alienate. This also helps to explain the difficulty faced by curators and historians in the precise dating of these wallpapers and also in ascertaining the status and value ascribed to them by their purchasers.

The ability to purchase wallpapers did not automatically mean that customers knew what to buy. Those who were not affluent enough to afford the services of a prestigious upholsterer to direct interior decoration projects, relied increasingly upon the services of shopkeepers selling these goods. As with other consumer goods in this

---

period, the retailer held considerable power in influencing the sales of particular products. In Stobart's words, eighteenth-century shopkeepers 'played on the idea of taste and discernment as a means of social differentiation, portraying themselves as central to the acquisition of goods and personal attributes that could mark out the individual as polite and respectable.' In less genteel shops, guidance was still available via the categorisation of wallpapers for individual rooms specified by manufacturers at source.

The letter books of both Duppa and Co and Trollope and Sons indicate that many of their customers welcomed assistance, requesting appropriate patterns to be chosen for them and merely specifying the room to be papered and the price they wished to pay. The Reverend Mr Ferries in Battle was matter of fact in his request for patterns for halls and staircases for his parsonage, stating in 1799; 'I care nothing about fashion, if they are neat and clean'. Mrs Maudsley of Portland Place likewise asked for any type of wallpaper for an attic room provided that it did not exceed 3d per yard. Similarly, in 1804, Colonel Smith M.P. of Chelmsford requested some 'pretty' pattern samples to be sent to him as long as the letter did not weigh more than one ounce, or the postage would have to be paid for.

In some cases customers did not quite understand what they were buying, often requesting estimates without providing essential information about quantity required. In one case James Duppa had to explain to a customer that the fashionable and relatively more expensive 'satin papers' were not satin fabric, but wallpaper made to resemble it. Delegation of aesthetic choice is evident on the part of a significant number of these firms' customers from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In the light of the wide choice of patterns and prices available, this is suggestive less of an aesthetic appreciation of wallpaper as a considered and anticipated luxury goods purchase and more a desire to buy what was deemed appropriate within a given price bracket. In this we can see that, whilst still a non-

119 Berry, 'Polite Consumption', pp. 375-394; Styles, 'Manufacturing, Consumption and Design', p. 542.
120 Stobart, 'Selling (Through) Politeness', p. 324.
121 Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 107, 165, 266.
122 Duppa, Letterbook, December 1818.
essential purchase, for some middling classes and gentry wallpaper had lost an element of its luxury goods status and had become more of a commodity.

**The Social Spread of Wallpapers**

How far down the social scale did the use of wallpapers spread? It is difficult to look at this in terms of income. To answer this it is useful to remind ourselves that wallpaper was fundamentally a non-essential, luxury good. Even genteel customers sometimes struggled to pay for their wallpapers. John Jeffries writing to Trollope in March 1801 for example, explained that he was unable to pay due to the fact that he had 'met with two or three unpleasant circumstances in the money way', similarly, the Misses Bailey, in April 1802 declared themselves 'quite ashamed' at their inability to settle their bill. The pages of Duppa and Co's memo book also yield similar apologies.

In exploring the extent of the use of wallpapers during the period of this thesis, it is helpful to examine them in the light of their role as a luxury goods item associated with politeness. Here Klein's work on defining the parameters and applications of this term in eighteenth-century British society is useful: he argues that society was not divided horizontally between polite and non-polite, but distinguished by a 'wide access of a range of persons to activities and competencies that contemporaries considered 'polite". Whilst politeness roughly correlated with wealth and status, increased prosperity, commercialisation and consumption blurred the lines between those who could from time to time experience polite behaviour or consumption. In this he cites the case of an apprentice stocking maker who acquired a 'genteel suit of clothes' or the Mayfair coachman whose possessions included a volume of the Spectator. It was possible therefore to 'dip into' just one or many spheres of politeness through the acquisition of dress and consumer goods as well as through knowledge and cultural practices.

---

123 Trollope, Letterbook, ff 183 & 221.
124 Klein, 'Politeness and Interpretation', p. 869.
125 Ibid, pp.882-884 & p.897. Klein also cites the work of T. Hitchcock, P. King and P Sharpe in *Chronicling Poverty; the voices and strategies of the English poor 1640-1840* (Basingstoke, 1997), pp. 155-91 in exploring the spread of non-essential domestic and personal possessions lower down the economic scale. J. Harley's study of pauper inventories in the eighteenth century also demonstrates that by the end of that period many paupers were able to own at least one or two 'non-essential'
Why then should those with little disposable income to spend on non-essential luxury goods wish to spend it on a fixture such as wallpaper, rather than on a portable or bequeathable status item such as clothing, furniture or a watch for example? John Crowley has shown how through the availability of new consumer goods in the eighteenth century, the concept of 'comfort' became a social as well as physical norm that 'transcended both the aristocratic imperatives of luxury and the necessities of poverty'.\textsuperscript{126} Furthermore Horrell, Humphries and Sneath have also demonstrated that amongst poorer classes the ownership of consumer goods was dictated by an ability to acquire them, but also motivated by an understanding of the fashion, status and respectability associated with these goods. In some cases, acquisition of quality items rather than quantity was also a factor.\textsuperscript{127}

Those living in humbler homes then, also shared with the more affluent a desire for cleanliness and comfort. Traditional practices of whitewashing and painting were still undertaken in poorer households as a means to these ends.\textsuperscript{128} In addition, we have seen in Chapter Six how by the 1800s, stencilled schemes became increasingly popular and were recognised by the government as contributing to the comfort and cleanliness of the poor. Furthermore, by the 1790s it was also possible to buy a range of cheap plain coloured papers that were dyed in the paper maker's vat in shades of blue, 'blossom' (possibly pink?) and purple. These were used for wrapping goods such as needles, but as the patterns were not printed, the papers were not subject to the wallpaper tax and were thus also used to decorate walls in poorer households.\textsuperscript{129}

Even with these alternatives there was still a market for wallpapers further down the scale. An advertisement aimed at the less well to do in the \textit{Bath Chronicle} on 24 May 1770, dispensed with any of the customary flattering terms towards its customers and advertising puff concerning its stock and notified 'the public in general' that sales

\textsuperscript{126} J.E. Crowley, \textit{The Invention of Comfort} (Baltimore, 2001), p. 292.
\textsuperscript{128} Ponsonby, \textit{Stories}, p. 105; Ayres, \textit{Interiors}, p. 139.
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Seventeenth Parliament}, 1792, H.C.P.P., p. 73; \textit{Fourteenth Report into Excise}, H.C.P.P., p.123. Both Duppa and Trollope supplied these papers to their more affluent customers for use in servants' halls. Duppa, Daybook, 27 September 1797; Trollope, Letterbook, ff. 28.
would be held twice a week for new and second hand furniture that was 'warrented clean'. An uninspiring postscript offered 'good paper hangings at 1½d per yard', considerably lower than the price in most advertisements at this time.\textsuperscript{130} Aside from the market in illegal non-taxed wallpapers operated by retailers (See Chapter Six), other ways were found to create wallpapers by printing over re-cycled old wallpapers and newspapers. There was also a market for stolen wallpapers amongst those who chose not to question their provenance.

Proceedings of the Old Bailey record several cases of theft of rolls of wallpaper, either from the homes of individuals or from employers. Beaver's \textit{Memorials of Old Chelsea} includes reference to the recollections of an employee of the Cheyney Lane wallpaper manufactory in Chelsea who described a secret passageway in the building which his fellow workers were accustomed to use to secrete stolen wallpapers.\textsuperscript{131} Yet whilst wallpapers had in some cases become 'commodified' for the middle and upper classes, the responsiveness of poorer consumers to the use of wallpapers rather than other methods of available decoration suggests these goods were perceived as expressions of fashion and personal taste, and associated with affluence and status. Historiographies of wallpaper have seen the use of wallpapers in the second half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century as the domain of the middle classes and upward, however, the desirability of wallpaper as a domestic luxury appears to have had wider purchase appeal than previously thought.

\textbf{Conclusion}

In looking at the different ways in which wallpaper could be bought in this period, it is clear that there were more options available to consumers in terms of price and places to buy and in terms of geographical spread than previous narratives have suggested. The broad range of styles, qualities and prices of wallpapers on offer made it possible for a variety of income groups to experience wallpapers, not just in their own homes or lodgings, but also in public spaces from cheap inns to expensive hotels and places of

\textsuperscript{130} This type of cheap warehouse sale should not be confused with sales of second hand furniture identified by Ponsonby as antique or heirloom pieces. Ponsonby, \textit{Stories}, p. 86 & 94-5. It is not common to see figures below 2d per yard in contemporary advertisements.

\textsuperscript{131} See for example, O.B.P: 17 January 1770; 21 May 1817; 6 July 1814; A. Beaver, \textit{Memorials of Old Chelsea} (London, 1892), p. 200.
public entertainment. Wallpaper as a commodity was associated with the various values represented by the concept of 'politeness' as defined by Langford, Klein et al, and this resulted in it being viewed as a necessity to this end. Furthermore, the vast range of interchangeable styles affordable to a broad middling class meant that the same wallpaper could carry different significance and express different meanings across homes of varying status.

Wallpaper was relatively more difficult and less desirable than other luxury and semi-luxury goods for poorer classes to acquire. This is not only because it was a taxable commodity which ultimately affected its price, but also its ephemeral nature meant that it had less long term value than other portable and durable domestic goods like textiles, furniture and other home wares. Nonetheless, humbler classes sought ways to acquire or replicate it, as regardless of the income of the consumer, it represented the same values of refinement, domestic pride, and status. For the middle classes, wallpaper had become a required accessory via which these values could be expressed, and for poorer classes it represented an aspiration to these values. Class distinctions within society were still clearly marked and taste and quality of execution would have distinguished a cheap crudely printed pattern from one bought from a shop in London's west end. Nonetheless by the end of the period under study, wallpapers had become a much more inclusive commodity than previously recognised, for those who broadly shared these same social and personal values.
Conclusion

I began this study with the aim of gaining a fuller understanding of the use of wallpapers in the long eighteenth century by examining them within the context of contemporary processes of industrialisation, commercialisation, urbanisation and cultural practices. Existing wallpaper historiographies have acknowledged the expansion of the trade in wallpapers to include the middle classes over the course of this period. The reasons for and implications of this development however, had not been fully explored. In order to examine the growth of the wallpaper trade in this period it was useful to explore similarities with other luxury and semi luxury goods trades that expanded their markets to the middle classes at the same time. Taking these wider contexts into account revealed how the wallpaper trade, like other domestic goods trades responded to widening market opportunities through product innovation, resulting in the availability of a wide diversity of wallpapers. As with printed textiles, pottery, glassware and other consumer goods, the wallpaper trade had both an expensive and cheaper version for every style and fashion depending upon pattern and labour involved. Variety also came from material used, where every component had a cheaper imitation, from 'mock' flocks, 'mock' satins, metal powders for gold and silver leaf and cheaper substitutes of fashionable colours. Thus, like other consumer goods of the period, wallpaper came to have appeal across a variety of social classes, including that of its largest market, the middling classes.

Although studies of consumption amongst the middling classes have been popular in recent decades, Berg has identified a gap in our understanding of how the wide range of consumer goods in this period were invented, produced, distributed and consumed.¹ The two-fold aim of this thesis has been to illuminate these wider issues of consumption in the long eighteenth century via a detailed case study of one particular trade and to add to the historiography of wallpaper itself in order to further our understanding of the material properties of wallpapers. Examination of how this trade grew and developed has shown that by the end of the period in question choice

had expanded from a range of styles imitative of imported textiles and Chinese wallpapers for the elite to a vast range of styles and qualities affordable by a broad group of middling classes. Marketing strategies included selling papers intended for specific use in different rooms and styles were copied from any current design of consumer goods, often mixing unconnected but fashionable styles together in order to give a paper more sales appeal. Within this choice, a range of qualities was also available from quality controlled wallpapers produced by prestigious London firms to poorly executed, simple prints produced by builders and unskilled tradesmen.

There are some contrasts with products of other luxury and semi luxury goods trades however, and these had a bearing upon the affordability of wallpaper. The 'value added' tax on wallpaper had implications for its market price, plus wallpaper was not a one-off purchase but could often incur further expense in labour to install. It also had a finite value as a commodity as it was widely viewed as a permanent fixture, that (with the exception of some prestige wallpapers) was not easily re-sold or bequeathed. Despite this, the use of wallpaper was extensive. The fact that people chose to buy it in a market where there were many other domestic items on which they could spend money indicates the cultural importance of possessing associated fashionable goods and also the significant role of wallpapers in creating what was identified by the middling classes as an appropriate domestic environment.

The value of this thesis lies in the connections made between the specific history of wallpaper and wider historical debates on how consumer goods were manufactured, marketed and consumed in this period. Analysis of the wallpaper trade has necessitated a multi-disciplinary approach across business, marketing, urban and consumer histories, also contributing to each of these disciplines in turn. By looking at the trade in its entirety it has shown how circuits of production and consumption intersected each other. This offers an alternative view to supply led models of economic history or demand led cultural histories that ignore issues of production and commercial environments. The detailed study of one trade allows a more nuanced approach to colour and flesh out these two discourses and argues that the market grew as a result of a more complex interplay of both supply and demand.
This case study has also furthered our understanding of how businesses were run in the long eighteenth century. Where business histories of this period often concentrate on an element of business practice, this thesis extends the discipline further by linking close examination of business practices and structures with detailed attention to the actual products, the technologies needed to produce them and their aesthetic qualities. Again this allows us a fuller understanding of how businesses operated at this time and the implications for the type, quality and availability of the goods that they produced.

This study has also shown that the wallpaper trade like other consumer trades in this period used product diversification and the division of labour to increase its market share to include consumers of different incomes. It also strengthens the argument that we need to look more closely at the contribution made by product innovation rather than technological innovation in extending markets during this period of proto-industrialisation of certain trades. It has also demonstrated that unlike many metropolitan manufacturing trades that were leaving the capital over the course of the period in question to set up more cheaply elsewhere, the bulk of wallpaper production chose to remain in London. This highlights the importance of a reliable network of commissioned regional retailers to metropolitan wholesalers and manufacturers of consumer goods at this time. Furthermore, the importance of the wallpaper trade's association with London as a centre for luxury goods production and reputation for high quality wallpapers was crucial to the extension of their much larger middle class market as well as their export trade. Their longstanding reputation as suppliers to a wealthy elite also helped in this, indicating that the use of elitist connections, prestige ranges and association with a 'quality brand' was a more widespread marketing practice in this period than has previously been thought.

---


Similarly, the skilful manipulation of the popular market for patterned goods was not just the prerogative of high profile entrepreneurs like the Peel family or Matthew Boulton. The use of market research and seasonal modification of best-selling lines was also practised in the wallpaper trade, as was selling loss-leaders and the undercutting of rivals, which implies that these practices were much more a feature of the eighteenth-century commercial scene than is suggested by histories based on a handful of high profile manufacturers whose business archives survive. As Julian Hoppit has argued, we need to move attention away from these famous success stories and toward a study of the smaller, more pedestrian business enterprises. Here their successes and failures will help us to more fully assess the economic and commercial climate of the eighteenth century.5

In this we can set straight some of the myths surrounding the romanticisation of the trade which had become part of the historiography of wallpaper.6 Examination of the background of some of those involved in the trade and also of their business networks reveals that the trade was not led by small producer artisan-craftsmen, but rather run by successful businessmen who were often involved in cognate trades and who chose to take advantage of this burgeoning market. These businessmen were further supported by financial investment and business expertise brought in by family members and the wider business community. Organisation of labour and capital into proto-factories, deskilling of the production process and the simplification of designs was a strategy pursued continually from as early as the 1760s in order to extend markets, and this enabled a small group of manufacturers to gain control of a large proportion of the market by the end of the eighteenth century onwards.

Dominance of the market by large firms conforms to the model suggested by Schwarz for the development of many trades over the course of this period. Yet while Schwarz argues this made it more difficult for the smaller tradesman to operate, this study indicates a more complex situation. The reprographic nature of wallpaper printing made it possible for unskilled traders to set up in business producing wallpapers once they had acquired already carved printing blocks as the means of production. In an

---

economic climate characterised by commercial booms and busts,\textsuperscript{7} this could often be as a result of sales of bankrupt stock. The number of tradesmen producing wallpaper therefore increased. As purchasing power rose over the period it became possible for more consumers to acquire wallpapers either, through the competitive pricing policies of the market leaders or via the output of these unskilled producers.

This case study has also identified some valuable caveats when using certain historical data sources. The case study of a small trade has made it possible to exploit the potential of nominal record linkage, and this has revealed the problematic nature of gathering data from trade directories. The inaccuracies and omissions inherent in these sources were established by Norton some time ago.\textsuperscript{8} This study however, has highlighted the often large and misleading discrepancies between different directory listings and has shown the necessity of using additional nominal record sources to build a more comprehensive picture when assessing the extent of a particular trade or profession. In addition, problems associated with the nomenclature used to describe specific tradesmen in this period have also been identified. Here masters, manufacturers, journeymen and entrepreneurs are often all grouped under the same occupational title (in this case for example 'paper-stainer' and 'paper hanger') and this can complicate assessments of the size of enterprises.

Similar problems also arise in the use of insurance policy registers as sources to assess the size and extent of businesses. Findings here have shown that surviving insurance sources may sometimes only represent part policies or policies on secondary premises and can result in inaccurate conclusions. In the use of contemporary trade guides such as \textit{Kearsley's Table of Trades} (1786) for example, broad bracketed figures for start up costs are often used. This study has demonstrated the need for a fuller understanding of the nature of a particular trade before data from these wide bands for trade entry can be meaningfully used by historians. Here such information has use for economic and business methodologies in helping inform threshold levels and trade structures

\textsuperscript{7} Hoppit, \textit{Risk and Failure}, p. 107.
and practices, but it also has implications for social, cultural and consumer histories in helping us to understand the availability of consumer goods and their possible quality.

The intrinsic differences between wallpaper and other consumer goods has been highlighted here, namely its expediency as a cheap wallcovering that emerged at a time of building booms and huge urban growth. As such, it served as a business tool for builders, landlords and manufacturers who took advantage of its cheaper practical applications, range of prices and fashionable status. In this respect, the impact of urbanisation on the success of the wallpaper trade in the long eighteenth century should not, as before, be understated. By extension, the findings of this thesis also have further applications for our understanding of the material and cultural lives of those in the provinces. The easy access to London manufactured wallpapers via the metropolitan trade's extensive regional retail contacts indicates the potential for the availability of similar consumer choices in and outside London.

Furthermore, the emergence of a regional wallpaper manufacturing trade in towns with established distribution networks indicates the level of demand for this decorative product in provincial homes. The development of this trade also tells us much about regional business practices in the long eighteenth century. Analysis of newspaper advertisements from these firms indicates an astute ability to manipulate the prestige of the London trade, by acknowledging and claiming allegiance to it to further their own sales. This allegiance was also easily transferable to wallpapers from France when fashion demanded. Cut throat competition between rival wallpaper retailers for their regional consumers also suggests that a forceful dynamism characterised the commercial environments of these growing regional towns.

Analysis of the trade within a wider socio-economic context has revealed that as the purchasing power of the middling classes in particular increased in this period, so did the opportunities to buy consumer goods. A vibrant market place emerged alongside high status and standard shops where knock-down sales, old stock, second-hand and discount-for-bulk auctions enabled consumers to buy manufactured products such as wallpaper more easily than ever before. Convoluted excise regulations also facilitated a significant black market in wallpaper itself, thus further extending its use. This, and
incidents of thefts of wallpaper, indicate that many people used more informal methods to acquire wallpapers. This issue opens up new areas for future research beyond the scope of this thesis, concerning the motives of poorer consumers in the acquisition of decorative domestic goods such as wallpaper, and their perceptions of fashion, status and quality.

The visual impact of wallpaper cannot be understated, and its transformation of the domestic interior where walls had previously been plainly painted helps explain some of the motivations behind demand. For the purpose of this study however, it has also been useful to examine contemporary attitudes to wallpaper through the lens of eighteenth-century 'polite culture'. Cultural meanings were ascribed to the use and choice of wallpaper that stood for, amongst other values, respectability, civility, erudition, hospitality and comfort. The wide range of wallpaper styles and prices available meant that these meanings were transferable across a broad range of social classes and possession of wallpaper implied a shared understanding of these. As with some other consumer goods in this period, a more homogenised market for wallpapers emerged. What had begun as a luxury item for the elite in the 1730s and 40s was now more extensively identified as an accepted and 'appropriate' backdrop, in both the domestic and public environment. By the end of the period, the success of the trade had driven forward the commodification of wallpaper as a decorative consumer good. The period itself therefore encompasses a highly significant developmental and transitional stage, before the full mechanisation and mass production of wallpaper in the nineteenth century.

What then, are the implications of these findings for the historian concerned with material culture? We know that our museum and heritage collections are largely biased towards examples of best quality and design. We lack in situ and archive examples of the many poorly made, poor quality, simple wallpapers produced at this time by those who were on the periphery of the trade in terms of both training and legality. Here we can expect these types of wallpaper to have been more widespread than the surviving material culture suggests. Of the existing examples we find, we can offer suggestions that they could be the work of a small group of London manufacturers, not simply because these are the only names we know, but because
they held such a large share of the market. In this we can expect to see prestige ranges plus a huge variety of similar simple designs, some interchangeable, yet all of a quality that befitted a leading firm with a reputation to maintain.

Whilst some manufacturers may have specialised in certain production techniques, in the main, the majority of the designs produced by firms in the trade can be expected to be of a similar style. They can also be expected to use the same designs and motifs as other consumer goods of the time. Here it is possible to find disparate examples of the same paper, which may well represent a best-selling line. For this reason, we must also not expect to be able to date papers exactly to within less than a decade upon design alone. Furthermore in dating papers, we must bear in mind that for some, wallpaper was an investment which they chose to retain on their walls for many years.

Across the country we are just as likely to find a London made wallpaper in a regional town house or country parsonage as we are in a London home, due to the extensive retail connections of the London firms. Similarly, wallpapers in regional houses may also be attributable to a local manufacturer, particularly from the 1800s onward. The same fashionable styles were certainly available in both London and regionally made wallpapers, although it is beyond the scope of this thesis to establish if a distinct regional taste differed from a metropolitan one within the range of choices available.

By the end of the period we can also expect a regionally manufactured wallpaper to be of the same standard of quality as that of its London counterpart. Furthermore, across England as a whole, we must acknowledge that French and Irish wallpapers (the latter particularly in the West) enjoyed much greater popularity than previously thought. These issues should all be borne in mind when we re-examine extant examples or seek to explain newly discovered ones. Above all else however, in our desire to understand more fully the past material lives of others, we must resist the temptation to be too dogmatic and acknowledge the part played by personal choice in the decoration of the home.
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Appendix One: The Block Printing Process.

Block printed wallpapers were made as follows: Until the adoption of continuous lengths of machine made paper for wallpapers in the early decades of the nineteenth century, wallpapers were printed on hand-made sheets of paper, adhered together along each bottom edge to form a continuous printable length or 'piece'. This was to measure 12 yards for tax purposes, and the paper was required to be First Class, although within this there was still a range of qualities of strength and smoothness of finish that would affect final appearance of the wallpaper.

The piece was then given a background layer of colour or 'ground' which was brushed on all over. Distemper paint (chalk, glue size and coloured pigment) was most often used to print wallpapers although more expensive and slower drying varnish based colours were also used, see Flocking below. Dossie's *The Handmaid to the Arts* contains a comprehensive list of the pigments used in the eighteenth century. Pigments would be bought from a colourman, and prepared by sieving and grinding in a colour mill to produce a fine consistency of paint. The better quality a pigment and its preparation, the more expensive and smoother the finish of the wallpaper.

The pattern was bought from a 'pattern drawer' who often designed for other trades such as textiles as well, or it was copied in-house from other designed products on the market at the time. The most skilled element of making wallpaper involved the translation of each component part of the pattern into carved wooden printing blocks. Each individual colour in the pattern was represented by a separate block bearing an element of the design and which all together built up the whole pattern. The printer charged his block with colour by pressing it onto a piece of stretched leather or textile onto which paint had been brushed, rather like an ink stamp pad. This stood next to the printing table and the responsibility for keeping the stretched leather charged with the required paint was held by an assistant, usually a boy, termed a 'tear boy'. S.D. Chapman and S. Chassagne suggest that this originates from the French tireur, in *European Textile Printers in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1981), p. 15, and therefore associated with tiroir or 'drawer'.

---

of small brass pins located in the corners of the blocks. Each piece would be hung up to
dry between each colour printing. Multi-coloured, detailed patterns required several
blocks to be cut and several printings, and so were more expensive in terms of
materials and labour.
Appendix Two: Taxed Wallpaper Output, 1730-1829

Table 5: National Yearly Output of Wallpaper for England, 1730-1829.

![Graph showing national yearly output of wallpaper for England, 1730-1829.]


Ashton and Chalklin have both studied building and construction cycles across Britain as a whole in the eighteenth century in some detail.\(^\text{10}\) An increase in house building would have automatically had an effect on ancillary trades such as the glazing and ironmongery trades and would have contributed to a growing demand within these sectors. Ashton includes useful statistical tables of imports and output of construction materials at this time including that of wallpaper, to chart national building booms across the period. His figures for the increase in the output of wallpaper which extend

to 1787 and are based on the revenue earned from the excise tax on wallpaper, have been incorporated into the table.

Appendix Three: Number of Firms in the London Wallpaper Trade, 1752-1833.

Table 6: Number of Firms in the London Wallpaper Trade, 1752-1833.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade/Year</th>
<th>Number of Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800s</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810s</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: London Trade Directories, 1750-1824; N.A: EXT 1/299/3, Memorial of the Principal Exporters and Manufacturers of Paper Hangings to the Lords Commissioners

Notes: These figures can be used as broad outlines only to show the increase in number of firms producing wallpaper over the period under study. The problem of inaccuracies, omissions and the unreliability of data taken from trade directories is well understood.\(^\text{11}\) This survey of several directories also revealed differences in the numbers of tradesmen listed in the same decade. For example, Boyles *Directory* (1794) lists 28 firms whilst Lowndes’ *Directory* (1796) suggests the figure of 15. In each circumstance the larger number has been used.

**Appendix Four: Division of Market Share Amongst the London Manufacturers in 1833.**

These figures are a detailed breakdown of the market shares expressed in Figure 2, Chapter Six. They are taken from the returns specifying the amount of duty paid by individual firms on stained paper produced in the tax year ending 5 January 1833.

**Eight Firms:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tax paid (£)</th>
<th>No. of rolls</th>
<th>Market share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Cooper &amp; Co</td>
<td>West Smithfield</td>
<td>5722</td>
<td>65394</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightfoot and Stutley</td>
<td>Adam St West</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>46583</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, William</td>
<td>Curtain Rd</td>
<td>3218</td>
<td>36777</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchliffe, Nathaniel</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>35600</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner and Williams</td>
<td>Elizabeth St, Bermondsey</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>31257</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubert, J.L.</td>
<td>Noble St</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>23143</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squire, John</td>
<td>St Mary Axe</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>17474</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 firms: Approx. 2% market share each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tax paid (£)</th>
<th>No. of rolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott, S.F.</td>
<td>Belgrave Place</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>11120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick, John</td>
<td>North Mews</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>10697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Lewis</td>
<td>High Holborn</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>9749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen, Henry &amp; Co</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>9611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, John</td>
<td>Goswell St</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>9234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collean, William</td>
<td>Cross St</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>8503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Moss</td>
<td>Old Kent Rd</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>8251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, W. &amp; T.</td>
<td>Charlotte St</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>7646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, R.E. &amp; J.</td>
<td>Tottenham Mews</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>7543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollams, John</td>
<td>Marylebone Lane</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>6983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16 firms: Approx. 1% market share each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tax paid (£)</th>
<th>No. of rolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kipps, Henry</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>6549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annes, Joseph</td>
<td>Stoner St</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>5851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolly, Jeffrey</td>
<td>New Cavendish St</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>5611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockett, John</td>
<td>Bath Pl, New Rd, Old St</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>5131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corren, William</td>
<td>Bath Pl, Hampstead Rd</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>4514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, James</td>
<td>Turville St</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>4274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinman, John</td>
<td>Westminster Bridge Rd</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham &amp; Chapronieer</td>
<td>City Rd</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Mary</td>
<td>Old St Rd</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Tax paid (£)</td>
<td>No. of rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull, William</td>
<td>Brokers Row</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>3349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan, John</td>
<td>Hackney Rd</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, James</td>
<td>Walworth Rd</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Morris</td>
<td>Wells Mews</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, Thos</td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindley, Robert</td>
<td>Featherstone St</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duppa, Slodden &amp; Co</td>
<td>Regent St</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 firms: < 1% market share each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tax paid (£)</th>
<th>No. of rolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chater, Richard</td>
<td>Featherstone St</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence and Barwise</td>
<td>Blackman St, Borough</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarman, William</td>
<td>Knightsbridge Green</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isherwood, Nicholas</td>
<td>Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubitt, W. &amp; L.</td>
<td>Gray’s Inn Lane</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard, Charles</td>
<td>Widam St (?)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry, Henry</td>
<td>Hackney Rd</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crease, Harold</td>
<td>Grt Russell St</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodson, John</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, J.W.</td>
<td>Westminster Bridge Rd</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malls, William</td>
<td>Northfleet</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Mark</td>
<td>Commercial Rd</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burford, T. &amp; J.B.</td>
<td>Seven Star Alley</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, A. H.</td>
<td>Grt Queen St</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, James</td>
<td>Whitecross St, Borough</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollams, William</td>
<td>Regents Park</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>House No</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, J.M.</td>
<td>Walworth Rd</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Thos</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempsey, John</td>
<td>Clarence St</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson, James</td>
<td>Doddington Grove</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renshaw, E.G.</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, James</td>
<td>New Bond St</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nind, John</td>
<td>Kingsland Rd</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prickett, J.G.</td>
<td>Grafton St</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollams, William</td>
<td>Oxford St</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, James</td>
<td>Eltham Place</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hover, William</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, John</td>
<td>Goswell St</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwood, William</td>
<td>Kingsland Rd</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blatchlee, Gabriel</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morant, George</td>
<td>Shepherd St</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platt, Samuel</td>
<td>Ogle St</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegg, William</td>
<td>Mile End Rd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes, Charles</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, James</td>
<td>Hackney Rd</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsher, Timothy</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough, William</td>
<td>Hoxton Sq</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trollope, J. A. &amp; G.</td>
<td>Parliament Street</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton, William</td>
<td>Cromer St</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page, Thos</td>
<td>Church St, Hackney</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Thos</td>
<td>Princes Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel, George</td>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platt, Samuel</td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer, Elisha</td>
<td>Drury Lane</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson, Catherine</td>
<td>King's Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguissse, Matthew</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, James</td>
<td>Knightsbridge Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Charles</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent, Thos</td>
<td>North St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is important to note here that the 1833 Government excise figures for numbers engaged in 'printing, painting and staining' of paper included ornamental painters and those who may have painted plain colours onto papered walls. Trollope's *Letterbook* for example indicates that they carried out this kind of work but did not print wallpaper themselves. The Duppa and Co archive indicates that this firm carried out both types of taxable work. Trade directories and newspaper advertisements from this period indicate an increase in the number of tradesmen, including plumbers and glaziers who also offered their services as paper hangers and who may have undertaken such taxable work. This indicates an increase in the popularity of wallpapers and painted decoration in general (See Chapter Seven), yet it can confuse the figures for the division of the market share.
Appendix Five: Output of Regional Manufacturers for the Tax Year 1832-33.

Table 7: *Names and locations of regional wallpaper manufacturers and their respective taxable outputs from returns produced in the tax year ending 5 January 1833.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tax paid (£)</th>
<th>No. of rolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Webb</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Anstice</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Tempany</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.M. Kingdon</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gould</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Westoby</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hardy</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sidnum [Sedman]</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>16617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Hudson</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Morton</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kershaw</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hargrave</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hargrave</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Seaton</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfred Troutbeck</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dodd</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Dodd</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Seaton</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>16171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Galloway</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>4709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Musk [Mush]</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>10434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Goodlad and Co</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td>27886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Morton</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Baker</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kibblewhite</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Manley [Morley]</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>5051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9777</strong></td>
<td><strong>111737</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Cross referencing with trade directory and newspaper sources indicates that some names may have been misspelt in the Report. The suggested name is included in brackets after the Report version. It is not clear therefore, how precisely the figures...
have been recorded without further numerical sources to substantiate them.
### Appendix Six: Bankruptcy and Insolvency in the London Wallpaper Trade, 1750-1830.

Table 8: *Figures of Bankrupts and Petitioning Debtors, 1750-1830.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Number of Insolvents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750s</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760s</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810s</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820s incl. 1830</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The London Gazette, 1750 -1830.*
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