This article charts Sir Edward Lovett Pearce’s complex connections from country estates in Norfolk, courtly circles in Surrey and fashionable enclaves in Mayfair to the newly-built streets of Dublin’s North City. Drawing together the fruits of existing scholarship and new lines of enquiry, it explores the myriad connections which Pearce established on both sides of the Irish Sea, and their consequence in terms of the spread of architectural ideas between the two kingdoms – Ireland and Great Britain – in the early Georgian period. In so doing it fleshes out our understanding of the English context to Pearce’s architectural practice.

Sir Edward Lovett Pearce (c.1690s–1733) was an architect of first-rate ability. His design for the Parliament House at College Green in Dublin (1728) was a pioneering exercise in Neo-Palladian public architecture and one of the finest European buildings of its day (Fig. 1) – so much so that it was later insinuated that it ‘must have been, like all good things in Ireland, of English origin.’

Despite such international consequence, until relatively recently Pearce has been a ‘sketchy and insubstantial figure’ in Irish scholarship, and he remains so in the broader discourse on British Palladianism. According to Howard Colvin, his connections were

Fig. 1. The Parliament House, Dublin’ (Views of the Most Remarkable Public Buildings, Monuments and Other Edifices in the City of Dublin, Robert Pool and John Cash, del., Dublin, 1780).
chiefly with Ireland and his English practice was limited. Direct connections between this Irish Palladian and his counterparts in England have proved elusive. Yet Pearce’s family was English and, thanks to relatives, he enjoyed connections with eminent members of English architectural circles. Of these, his link to the architect Sir John Vanbrugh, his father’s first cousin, is of the first importance, as were his family’s connections Court. Throughout the 1720s Pearce made regular visits to England, where he developed his professional networks and standing and benefited from exposure to the latest architectural exemplars. While little of his work was realised, Pearce was involved in several significant commissions in England.

According to Edward McParland ‘There is something Minerva like about Edward Lovett Pearce, springing fully-formed from the brow of Zeus,’ while to Maurice Craig ‘he was an unsatisfactory animal, a surprisingly young architect with one major building, and little else, to his credit, who died young.’ The quest for the elusive Pearce has preoccupied Irish scholars for more than half a century, and, though much work has been done to recover him from obscurity, much about his early life and career remains shadowy. Neither the place and date of his birth, nor the date of his marriage to his cousin Anne Pearce are known. We do not know where or with whom he trained. The close family connection, and the presence of drawings by Pearce in the ‘Vanbrugh Album’, formerly in the Library at Elton Hall (Cambridgeshire), and now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, suggests a possible professional link with Vanbrugh, though the album, which also includes drawings by Richard Castle, Nicholas Hawksmoor, William Talman and various anonymous draughtsmen, was assembled some time after World War II. The lack of any documented connection with the English champion of Neo-Palladianism, Richard Boyle, third Earl of Burlington, whose work Pearce’s resembles, is extremely puzzling.

**FAMILY CONNECTIONS**

The Pearces were originally from Glynde in Sussex but settled in Middlesex in the late-sixteenth century. Edward Lovett Pearce’s grandfather, Edward Pearce (c.1620–1683), of Parson’s Green in the parish of Fulham, had served as an East India Company agent at Surat in Western India in the 1640s. He travelled to Bussora, Persia – Basra in modern-day Iraq – to open a ‘factory’ which traded in indigo, pearls, spices, and Arab ponies. Having made his fortune, he returned to England where he married Mary, daughter of Sir Dudley and Lucy (née Croft) Carleton, in about 1657. The following decade he purchased an estate at Whittingham, near Norwich in Norfolk, which became the family’s primary English seat and an important focus for subsequent generations. Their son, Major-General Edward Pearce (c.1658–1715) was brought up at Whittingham, and was educated by a Mr Mazey in Norwich before going up to Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, in 1675. On his father’s death in 1683 the second Edward Pearce inherited the Whittingham estate (Fig. 2). He became an officer in the British army, serving on the Irish establishment for much of his career, and in c.1690 he married Frances Lovett, daughter of a Dublin-based merchant, Christopher Lovett. It is not clear if the Lovett-Pearces resided permanently in Ireland from this point. Certainly Major-General Pearce was abroad a great deal, serving as a field officer on the Peninsula during the War of Spanish Succession (1701–1714). The exact date and place of birth of his son, Edward Lovett Pearce, is unknown, but it is entirely possible that he was born, and perhaps even educated, in England, where his mother also had strong family ties.

It was through the marriage of Edward Lovett Pearce’s grandfather, Edward Pearce, and Mary Carleton that the Pearce-Vanbrugh connection came about. Mary’s sister, Elizabeth Carleton, married Giles Vanbrugh, making their son John (1664–1726) first cousin to Edward Pearce, father of the architect.
Edward Lovett Pearce. These family ties were maintained by subsequent generations. In his will, proved in 1683, Edward Pearce made reference to an indenture of trust for the Whittingham estate; its trustees – William Vanbrugh of London, merchant, and John Ferrers and Bishop Croft – were all related to one another. In the same year, John Vanbrugh was in India, working for the East India Company at Surat, where his uncle, Edward Pearce, had previously been governor. In May 1719 Edward’s widow Mary Pearce, then resident at Lower Close in Norwich, received a visit from Sir John Vanbrugh’s three sisters Betty, Robin, and Victoria, on which occasion he paid their travelling expenses.

Pearce’s maternal relations, the Lovetts of Liscombe Park, Soulbury in Buckinghamshire, also moved in high circles. Although his grandfather Christopher Lovett had settled in Dublin some time after 1660, working as a linen merchant at Blind Quay (now Lower Exchange Street), close contact was maintained with their English relations. Pearce’s uncle Colonel John Lovett, an active...
solider and MP who also had a hand in designing Eddystone Lighthouse at Plymouth Sound in 1708, lived at Kilruddery, Co. Wicklow in the early 1700s, though described as being ‘of Liscombe and Corse.’ He married Lady Mary Verney, daughter of Viscount Fermanagh of Middle Claydon (Buckinghamshire), where the Lovett and Pearce families, were frequent visitors; General Edward Pearce in particular was ‘often staying at Claydon.’21 The Lovett seat at nearby Liscombe Park had been in the family since the thirteenth century, and, though it was in the possession of his cousin during his lifetime, Col. John maintained close ties to this estate, which his son Robert Lovett eventually inherited.22 The house, which was built in the second half of the sixteenth century, was described by Lady Verney c. 1703 as ‘the ancient seat of my husband’s family, being only about twelve miles from my father’s … very old, very gloomy … but has a venerable appearance.’23 Although it was much altered in the following two centuries, the essential plan of a quadrangular building enclosing a regular large courtyard survives; one side comprises a fourteenth-century chapel, where services were still held in the eighteenth century.24 Through his Lovett relations Pearce was connected with several architecturally minded families in Ireland and Britain, namely the Cootes, the Tighes, the Medhops and the Molesworths; Colonel John Lovett, as a solider-turned-architect, would have served as a role-model to his young nephew, and certainly kept abreast of developments in his military career.25 He died, however, in 1710, followed by Pearce’s father, Major-General Edward Pearce in 1715, when it is believed Edward Lovett Pearce was still in his teens. Who then was the guiding hand in advancement in his military and later architectural career?

There is a decided military colouring to Pearce’s early architectural patrons and associates, particularly those in England, while several others seem to spring from family ties. One common thread is Pearce’s uncle Lieutenant-General Thomas Pearce (1669–1739). Like his older brother, Thomas served for most of his career in the Irish military establishment. He was elected to the Irish Parliament, first for Coleraine (1703–13) and then for Limerick City (1727–39); appointed Mayor of Limerick in 1727, he served as Governor of Limerick in 1729 and between 1732 and 1738. He was a governor of the Royal Hospital at Kilmainham, Dublin, in 1725 and was sworn in as an Irish privy councillor in 1737. Yet Thomas Pearce was very much an Englishman. He married Mary Hewes, daughter of William Hewes of Wrexham in North Wales.26 He sat as a Member of Parliament for Ludgershall in Wiltshire from 1710 to 1713, where he was classed as a ‘Tory on the Hanover list,’ brought in on the coat-tails of another Tory general, John Richmond Webb. Lieutenant-General Pearce resided at Chelsea during this period, before going out to Portugal as deputy commander-in-chief of the forces.27 It is not clear if the Pearces maintained a London residence after this time. Thomas Pearce appears to have been stationed at the garrison town of Limerick from 1715 as military governor, though his regiment was in Gibraltar in 1717, and it is unlikely that his wife and young family would have accompanied him to Limerick, where the situation was volatile.28 Thomas Pearce also maintained strong connections in Norfolk, the county of his birth, and inherited his mother’s share in the Whitlingham estate in 1728, which he ultimately passed to his daughter Anne in 1739.

Though a distinguished, and active, field officer, Lieutenant-General Pearce was something of a renegade. In 1713 an official complaint was made about him for having deployed his troops after the cessation of hostilities, but he was later excused on the grounds that he had not received his orders in time, and was not punished on his return to England.29 In October 1713 the Treasury was told that he had been arrested ‘for bills drawn by him … for money he took up in Portugal,’ and the paymaster of the forces was obliged to settle his account, yet in
the following February Pearce, then a major-general, returned to Whitehall, where he ‘had the honour to kiss Her Majesty’s Hand and was very graciously received.’ According to Hayton, he survived the Hanoverian succession, and in 1724 was even granted an addition of 6s. 8 3/4d. per day as a Major-General on the Irish establishment, ‘as he has distinguished himself by his vigilance and care.’ Thomas Pearce, it would seem had powerful connections.

Pearce had been a supporter of the Duke of Ormonde, from whose patronage he benefited, and he regarded the Duke’s dismissal as viceroy in 1707 as a ‘personal affliction.’ His other great military patron, the Duke of Argyll, was a powerful ally. Argyll, to whom, Dalton suggests, ‘George I owed his undisputed ascension to the British Crown,’ commanded great influence in the military and at Court. Like the Duke of Ormonde, Argyll nurtured the careers of several officers on the Irish establishment, including Thomas Pearce, Richard Molesworth and Jean Ligonier. The Duke also had significant architectural connections. He was related to Colen Campbell, who included ‘A New Design of my own invention’ for the Duke of Argyle in Volume I of *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715). He was a great promoter of the Scot James Gibbs, who dedicated his *Book of Architecture* to Argyll in 1728, while Campbell’s protégé Roger Morris carried out several commissions for his patron and friend the Duke of Argyll, notably at Combe Bank in Kent c.1728, whose detailing is remarkably similar to later Pearcean designs. Argyll also patronised Sir John Vanbrugh who made an unexecuted design, preserved in the album from Elton Hall, for Inveraray Castle in c.1720.

**NORFOLK NETWORKS**

According to Lady Verney, ‘two of the Irish soldier friends introduced by Colonel Lovett … Edward and Thomas Pearce’, who were principally identified with military affairs in Ireland, ‘were really connected with Whitlingham, Norfolk.’ Edward Lovett Pearce also maintained close connections to the family estate outside Norwich. He had inherited his father’s interest in the Whitlingham estate when still a minor, and his uncle Thomas Pearce, who was granted arms for Whitlingham at this time, may have acted as a trustee for his nephew’s interests. Thomas Pearce also held a financial stake in the lands about Whitlingham under the terms of his father’s will, and received his mother’s share in 1728. In the 1720s Edward Lovett Pearce and his uncle, who would also become his father-in-law, were both involved in the management of the estate. A survey of part of the estate showing the ‘Upper Dyal Hill’ and ‘Lower Dyal Hill,’ preserved in the Elton Hall album (Fig. 2), was taken in 1726 at Pearce’s direction, and sent to him in Dublin. The accompanying letter from the Pearces’ agent John Jermyn also references an account sent to ‘the General.’ It is not clear if the manor house was occupied by the family during this period. A newspaper report of 1718 notes that, though the land belonging to Whitlingham had been let out, the house, which contained ‘an handsome hall or parlour six good chambers and other conveniences fit for a gentleman’ was ‘still to be disposed of with all the garden ground courtyard [and] stable.’

Edward Lovett Pearce was certainly in Norfolk in the mid-1720s, when he carried out a number of architectural commissions for local families. In about 1725 he collaborated with his distant relative the amateur architect John Buxton (1685–1731) on a design for the front of Buxton’s house at Shadwell, near Rushford. Shadwell Lodge, as it was originally known, was intended as a retreat from the Buxtons’ ancestral seat, Channons Hall at Timbenham, demolished in 1786. It was set amongst the rolling hills of the Norfolk countryside, about 25 miles south-west of Norwich and the Pearce’s estate at Whitlingham. The house, which was built in 1727–9, was altered greatly in the nineteenth century, but a surviving watercolour of the original Lodge...
shows it to have been of a similar conservative nature to Buxton’s other architectural projects, Earsham and Bixley Hall: a compact square block of three storeys, with a hipped roof and faced in red brick.\(^4\) The emphatic use of quoins at the corners, which accentuate the block-like character of the building, as well as the arrangement of the string-course at Shadwell, bear comparison to elements of Pearce’s later works.

John Buxton held few public offices and seems to have taken little interest in the political affairs of the county.\(^4\) He was, however, a major in the Norfolk militia, treasurer of Norwich Castle prison and deputy lieutenant there in 1731. It seems likely that it was through this military connection, as well as that of kinship, that he was acquainted with Lieutenant-General Thomas Pearce and his nephew Captain Edward Lovett Pearce.\(^4\) The Buxtons also had a long-standing connection with Cambridge, in particular with Gonville and Caius College, of which Major-General Pearce was a graduate.\(^4\) John Buxton, like Edward Lovett Pearce, was of an antiquarian bent. He was also a committed bibliophile and Italian scholar, a language which he encouraged his son Robert to learn when at Cambridge; though he did not possess many Italian books, he recommended reading ‘Serlio’s Architecture’ and Vasari’s works.\(^4\) Buxton, like the Norfolk antiquarian and amateur architect Sir Andrew Fountaine, subscribed to a range of publications, including Kent’s Designs of Inigo Jones in 1727. He was also acquainted with Sir Robert Walpole, another Norfolk connoisseur, on whom he called when in London in 1717, and in August of that year he dined with the Prime Minister’s son Horace in London and at Bath.\(^4\) Buxton, who by the 1720s had gained a reputation as an architectural virtuoso, kept abreast of local developments, and also took an

---

Fig. 3. Plan of Heydon Hall, Norfolk showing proposed alterations by Edward Lovett Pearce. (Vanbrugh Album, Elton Hall V&A E.2124:83–1992. © Victoria and Albert Museum, London)
interest in Edward’s burgeoning career. In July 1728, noting Pearce’s presence ‘last week in ye county,’ Buxton noted that Pearce was beginning to ‘be taken notice of as an architect & ... will soon make a figure in that profession and he follows it con studio, con dilligenza and con amore.’

During this period Pearce surveyed Heydon Hall, the seat of another prominent Norfolk family, the Earles. A proposal for alterations to the Elizabethan house, in Pearce’s hand, is in the Elton Hall album (Fig. 3). The drawing, which John Cornforth suggested was made prior to Augustine Earle’s succession to the property in October 1728, proposed alterations to the entrance hall and the insertion of a grand open-well staircase approached through a typically Pearcean columnar screen. The drawing style is sketchy, particularly the curved quadrant to the garden-front, and the accompanying notes suggest this was a conceptual drawing, perhaps intended for someone else to execute. No alterations are known to have taken place at this time, though the Norfolk-born architect Mathew Brettingham the Elder did carry out work here in the 1740s. Pearce’s introduction to the Earles certainly is likely to have come by way of his maternal uncle Colonel John Lovett, who in 1704 described Lieutenant General Earle as ‘a particular friend of mine,’ while Augustine Earle also served in Major-General Edward Pearce’s regiment.

A man of some influence in the county and in administrative circles in London, Augustine Earle later served as one of his Majesty’s Commissioners of Excise. He was also a man of scholarly and antiquarian taste, who, along with Erasmus Earle and Peter Le Neve, Norroy King at Arms, was one of the first Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Apart from their shared patronage of Pearce, no documented link between Buxton and

Fig. 4. Houghton Hall, Norfolk, Colen Campbell/James Gibbs, 1722–1729. (© Melanie Hayes)
Earle has yet been discovered, though it seems safe to speculate that these Norfolk virtuosi moved in similar circles. The Earles of Heydon were certainly connected, through marriage, to the Fountaines of Salle, and thereby to the amateur architect Sir Andrew Fountaine and his circle. In the 1720s Fountaine was much occupied with alterations to his seat, Narford Hall, where he had built a new library wing, now much altered, to house his large collection of antiquarian and architectural books, manuscripts and prints. An early proponent of the Palladian style, Fountaine is believed to have acted as a mentor to Lord Burlington in the early stages of his interest in architecture, while he was also connected through the Leicester House set, to Henry Herbert (the architect Earl of Pembroke), and his associates Colen Campbell and Roger Morris, all of whom are believed to have assisted him at Narford.

Two members of this circle, Campbell and Herbert, were involved in yet another, even more prominent, Norfolk project during this period, working at nearby Houghton Hall in the north-west of the county. Houghton was one of the finest and most influential architectural projects of the 1720s and in the vanguard of the Neo-Palladian movement. Here Walpole, the de facto Prime Minister of Britain, employed some of the country’s leading architectural practitioners, James Gibbs, Colen Campbell, Thomas Ripley, and William Kent, in creating this grandiose edifice. Lord Herbert also designed a water tower for Robert Walpole c.1729/30. Many elements of their work here resonate in Pearce’s later domestic buildings, in particular the detailing of the façades and pavilions, as well as Kent’s celebrated interior schemes. By the summer of 1728, when Pearce was certainly in England and specifically in Norfolk, in search of materials for the Dublin Parliament House and, as McParland notes, ‘keeping abreast with latest developments abroad,’ Houghton was nearing completion. The main block (Fig. 4), including Gibbs’s domes, had been built by then, and all but the last of the cupolas gilded (completed in 1729), while internally Kent’s work on the main rooms was gathering pace.

On 8 June 1728 a Norfolk newspaper reported that Sir Andrew Fountaine was to direct ‘the building of a palace at Richmond.’ Fountaine was a favourite of Queen Caroline’s, acting as her vice-chamberlain and tutor to her son the Duke of Cumberland. As has been plausibly suggested, Fountaine was ideally placed to provide Pearce with the royal introduction for the Richmond palace commission, and could well have acted as a mentor to Pearce. Certainly, through his web of Norfolk connections, the interlaced threads of his architectural commissions, his kinship and military ties, we can place Pearce in the thick of the county’s vibrant architectural milieu in the middle years of the 1720s, and in the way of first-class buildings, an experience which clearly impacted on his later domestic output.

SURREY, INHERITANCE AND EXEMPLARS
The work of Sir John Vanbrugh also had a significance impact on Pearce’s architectural development, though no firm documented link between the two architects that might confirm the tradition that Vanbrugh trained Pearce has as yet been discovered. This is puzzling; Vanbrugh left fairly detailed accounts of his professional practice, while Pearce was not shy about architectural name-dropping; in a memorandum on the Parliament House, for example, he drew on the lineage of Vitruvius and Palladio but made no mention of his celebrated kinsman. Close family ties, the Vanbrughian strain evident in aspects of Pearce’s work, the fact that Pearce ‘inherited’ Vanbrugh’s architectural drawings, and other gossamer threads of evidence, do, however, help to fill out our sketchy picture of this important familial, and probably professional, connection.

The Vanbrughs, like the Pearces, were military men and moved in similar military circles. Though
Sir John Vanbrugh’s active career as a soldier was short-lived, he remained interested in military affairs, and was close to prominent officers like the Duke of Marlborough. His two younger brothers Captain Charles Vanbrugh (1680–1740) and Captain Philip Vanbrugh (1682–1753) were successful naval officers. Philip had won renown during the War of Spanish Succession, in particular at the battle of Vigo in 1702, where Thomas Pearce had also commanded a force. That Thomas Pearce and John Vanbrugh were in contact is clear from a grant of arms and crest made to ‘Thomas Pearce of Whitlingham, Norfolk,’ in 1715 by the recently knighted Vanbrugh, in his capacity as Clarenceux King of Arms.62

In 1721–23 the newly-married Captain Charles Vanbrugh took a house at Queen Square in Westminster (now Queen Anne’s Gate), to which his brother John paid regular visits from his nearby house in Whitehall. It is interesting, though perhaps coincidental, that this house and the other original examples in Queen Square which date from c.1704 are articulated at the party walls in the row of houses with a blind-panel device, similar to that employed by Pearce for his façade design at Nos. 11 and 12 Henrietta Street, Dublin of c.1730. (Fig. 5) In both cases this blocked-up brick panel served as a balancing device on the external elevation, visually alleviating the solid mass of brick at a point in the plan that would not permit an opening. The Queen’s Square houses, one of which was home to a member
of the Vanbrugh family, and the pair of Dublin houses appear to be unique in using this device. It is also noteworthy that, when Captain Vanbrugh was living in Queen’s Square, his cousin Captain Edward Lovett Pearce, then a half-pay officer in the Irish forces, would also have been in London, en route to the Continent and his Grand Tour of 1723. We know that on 28 March 1726, just two days after Sir John Vanbrugh’s death, Pearce was granted military leave to go to England for three months. This evidence, combined with his acquisition of Vanbrugh’s architectural drawings, has prompted McParland’s plausible conclusion that Pearce, as an architecturally-minded cousin, may have been charged with closing up Vanbrugh’s office, a task that surely must have been carried out in consultation with the architect’s brothers who were beneficiaries of his will.63

One commission which Pearce appears to have been inherited from Vanbrugh was Ashley Park in Surrey (demolished 1925), where he is believed to have made additions to the late-Elizabethan manor house of the ‘peripatetic soldier and courtier,’ Richard Boyle, second Viscount Shannon (c.1675–1740), an Irish peer of English birth. An undated plan in the Elton Hall album proposes an extension to the north-wing of the old H-plan house, comprising a new office and servants’ range with a connecting corridor to a kitchen and laundry block. (Fig. 6) Stylistically, however, this attribution is problematic. The drawing, according to John Harris, ‘might be Pearce after Vanbrugh, or by a draughtsman copying their designs,’ while the house itself was ‘encased and re-fenestrated in a style ‘unmistakably’ that of either Sir John Vanbrugh or Pearce working in his style.’64 Certainly, Vanbrugh comes to mind in the ‘ordnance manner’ of semi-circular bowed ends and the arcuated massing on the east-front, reminiscent of Vanbrugh’s own house at nearby Esher (later Claremont), while Pearce’s hand is also evident in the Burlingtonian Palladianism of the long gallery.
Harris’s suggestion that Pearce continued the work begun by Vanbrugh is strengthened by the involvement of Vanbrugh’s clerk ‘Arthur,’ whom Pearce referred to in the notes accompanying his plan. Shannon bought Ashley Park in 1718, by which time Vanbrugh had sold his house at Esher to the Earl of Clare, though he remained in the area, carrying out work there c.1714–20, when he added substantial wings to the house and constructed the fortress-like Belvedere on the adjoining hillside.

Ashley Park was let to William Pulteney between 1724 and 1725 and the alterations are thought to postdate this period. Pearce, who, as we have seen, was in England between April and June 1726, and again in the summer of 1728,65 may well have supplied plans (and direction) for Ashley Park remotely, once the survey work had been undertaken. We can therefore tentatively place Pearce in Surrey at some point in the mid-1720s, in the vicinity not only of Vanbrugh’s Claremont, but also of other important domestic buildings of the period. Colen Campbell’s Mereworth Castle, Kent, an adapted form of Palladio’s Villa Rotunda, built in 1723, was fifty miles to the south-east, Roger Morris’s Combe Bank, c.1726 was about thirty-five miles to the west, while the Venetian architect Giacomo Leoni’s Clandon Park, c.1720s was less than ten miles away. Elements of Clandon, a brick-faced Palladian mansion built for Thomas 2nd Lord Onslow who had a loose connection to Pearce’s kinsman John Molesworth – bear more than a passing resemblance to the new front for Marmaduke Coghill’s house at Drumcondra, Dublin, which Pearce designed c.1727. (Fig. 7)

The Vanbrughian link aside, Pearce was also connected to Lord Shannon who served on the Irish military establishment and who, like Thomas Pearce, had enjoyed the patronage of the Duke of Ormonde, distinguishing himself at the storming of Vigo in 1702. Shannon entered the House of Commons for Arundel in 1708, sitting successively for Hythe
and East Grinstead from 1710, at the same time as Thomas Pearce was returned for Ludgershall. Following the Hanoverian succession, both officers were transferred to the Irish establishment, where they prospered. Shannon was appointed Lieutenant General of Staff in 1716 and Commander-in-Chief in 1720. He was part of the younger branch of the illustrious Boyle family, cousin to Lords Burlington and Orrery, and he moved in the same exalted circles. In 1702 he married Mary Sackville, widow of Lionel Boyle, third Viscount Orrery and the natural daughter of Richard, Earl of Dorset. Despite the opinion of Eustace Budgell, that ‘this noble Lord’s education has been chiefly in a Camp, [and] I have never heard, that he has a more than ordinary Share of Learning’, he was a member of the culturally prominent ‘set of wits,’ the Kit Kat Club, along with his father-in-law the Earl of Dorset, his kinsman Lord Burlington, and Sir John Vanbrugh. And, while there is little evidence of his subscribing to architectural publications, he not only extended his patronage to Vanbrugh and/or Pearce at Ashley Park, but also engaged the services of Leoni to design his Arlington Street house in the late 1730s. Viscount Shannon, therefore is among the chief contenders to have served as the conduit between Edward Lovett Pearce and the Burlington circle in England.
BURLINGTON STREET MODELS

No. 30 Old Burlington Street in London, originally designed by Lord Burlington and Colen Campbell for Algernon Coote, sixth Earl of Mountrath, c. 1721, holds a significant place in Irish architectural history, for it provides the model for No. 9 Henrietta Street, Dublin, a house built in c. 1730 for Thomas Carter, Master of the Rolls. (Fig. 8) The Henrietta Street design is attributed to Edward Lovett Pearce, and, though evidence is circumstantial, it offers the most tangible link between Pearce and Burlington’s circle.68 Both Pearce and Thomas Carter were elected to the Irish House of Commons in 1727/8, where they were affiliated to similar political factions and moved in the same social circles. They were also related: Carter’s wife Mary (née Claxton) was Pearce’s paternal cousin, and Carter in turn was connected to Lord Burlington through his relation Henry Boyle of Castlemartyr, Co. Cork.69 Pearce’s uncle by marriage was, moreover, Thomas Coote of Cootehill, Co. Cavan, a cousin of Algernon Coote, Lord Mountrath, for whom No. 30 Old Burlington Street was designed.70 [Worth mentioning Bellamont Forest house here? I notice, by the way, that it has recently been sold.] Pearce certainly worked on other houses in Henrietta Street, for which drawings exist. Add to this the existence of an unsigned sketch of a basement plan of No. 30 Burlington Street among

Fig. 9. No. 9 Henrietta Street Dublin, c. 1730, Edward Lovett Pearce (attrib.). (© Marcus Lynam)
Pearce’s drawings in the Elton Hall album, and the evidence mounts up.

Less clear, however, is how this plan came into Pearce’s possession. As neither Lord Burlington’s nor Colen Campbell’s nuanced design for Coote’s intended house were engraved, the architect of No. 9 Henrietta Street must have had first-hand knowledge either of the built fabric or of the paper designs. Closer examination shows that the basement plan in the Elton Hall album, corresponds almost exactly (save from the annotations) to the ground floor of Campbell’s penultimate plan for Lord Mountrath’s house, not of the basement floor of the London house. (Fig. 9) Campbell’s ground plan was altered in execution, to include a more grandiose staircase and alternative room plans. The façade of the Henrietta Street house, moreover, departs from the London model as built in the treatment of the attic level. It would appear, therefore, that the author of the basement plan, and indeed of the Henrietta Street house, was more familiar with the paper designs of this model than the built structure.71 As the Elton Hall basement plan does not appear to be in Pearce’s hand, it seems likely that an intermediary was employed in recording Campbell’s design.72

Colen Campbell died in 1729, and in the last years of his life gave over much of his work to his assistant, Roger Morris. In 1728 we find Morris at No. 30 Old Burlington Street, working on the interiors. Around the same time he appears to have been employed in some capacity by Pearce’s one-time patron Lord Shannon at Ashley Park.73 That these two Palladian architects were acquainted is beyond doubt. Two years later in 1730/1 Pearce was back in London, where he is documented as having been the arbiter in a dispute between Viscount Shannon and Roger Morris over work at Ashley Park.74 And, though the trail runs cold there, we have at least one possible conduit in the spread of architectural influence.

At nearby North Audley Street, on the fashionable Grosvenor Estate, Pearce has been credited with the design of a sophisticated town residence for the French born Huguenot, Colonel Jean Ligonier. No. 12 North Audley Street was built in the closing years of the 1720s by the master-craftsman Edward Shepherd, who was also responsible for the adjoining block of houses. The richly elaborated and spatially complex interiors behind what is a fairly conventional façade are too sophisticated for Shepherd alone, and on stylistic and circumstantial grounds are more characteristic of Pearce’s work.75 The drama and spatial-excitement of the movement between swelling and contracting volumes, the variation of shapes, from the oval stair compartment to the octagonal room, and the domed and vaulted gallery at the rear complete with ‘Pantheon coffering’, all speak of a firm grounding in antique sources and evoke the ‘thermal’ architectural language of Pearce’s House of Lords in Dublin. The rigorous proportional control and finesse of detail, not to mention the tripartite arrangement of the gallery, bear comparison not only to the House of Lords, but are also to a grotto which Pearce designed on the Allen estate at Stillorgan in Dublin – though, as the surviving plan makes clear, this contained seven compartments. It is notable that both the Parliament House in Dublin and No. 12 North Audley Street in London predate similar explorations inspired by Roman thermae by Lord Burlington and William Kent: the York Assembly rooms (c.1730) and the ‘Pantheon Scheme’ for the proposed British Houses of Parliament in London (1733).76 (Fig. 10)

Pearce was certainly connected to General Ligonier, one of the greatest soldiers of his day and chief adviser in military matters to King George II.77 Ligonier was a close friend of Viscount Shannon, and, like Shannon and the Pearces, had served on the Irish establishment and fought in the Spanish wars. Similarly, both Thomas Pearce and Ligonier enjoyed the patronage of the Duke of Argyll.78 In Dublin, Ligonier moved in the same ‘Castle circle’ as Edward Lovett Pearce, and the Lord Lieutenant, the Duke of Dorset, and his sons John and Lord
George Sackville.79 Ligonier maintained an Irish establishment at Phoenix Park in Dublin, where he was Chief Ranger from 1734 to 1750, while in the previous decade he appears to have commissioned a plan for a ‘new Entended House to be Built … about 6 miles from Dublin’ from Pearce, whose estimated charges survive in the Elton Hall album, although the house was seemingly never built.80

Doubts over the attribution of the North Audley Street house have been raised, primarily on account of Pearce’s supposed absence from England during this period. Francis Sheppard noted in 1980 that Pearce ‘appears to have lived permanently in Ireland from 1726 until his death in 1733 and there is no indication that he visited England during that time.’81 We now know, however, that Pearce was in Norfolk in the summer of 1728, and, as McParland points out, given that his purpose was to source materials for the Parliament House, it is unlikely that he failed to visit London.82 The fact that Pearce seems to have imported British craftsmen, as well as materials, for the Parliament House project – namely Thomas Gilbert and Job Ensor, who are believed to have been involved at St Paul’s Cathedral – strengthens the probability that Pearce also visited London.83

In 1719 Ligonier leased a modest town house at No. 10 Old Burlington Street, almost directly opposite No. 30, and remained there until 1730, when he moved to his new house at North Audley Street.84 It is entirely likely therefore that he would have sought plans for the elaborate interiors at least two years earlier in 1728, when still in residence at Old Burlington Street.85 We know that Pearce was in London again in 1730/1731, arbitrating in the

Fig. 10. Basement plan of Lord Mountrath’s house at No 30 Burlington Street, London, c.1721. (Vanbrugh Album, Elton Hall V&A E.2124:100–1992 © Victoria and Albert Museum, London).
Ashley Park dispute, while the recent discovery of official correspondence firmly places him in London in December 1730, where he was lobbying for the position of Surveyor General.\(^86\) It would appear, then, that Pearce was in England at the beginning and end of the construction period of No. 12 North Audley Street, making it probable that he provided the designs remotely and left the execution to Shepherd. The contemporary practice of supplying architectural drawings by post or courier is referred to by the architect Thomas Hewett, who in 1725 describes sending plans for perusal by his patrons in London ‘in a little box,’\(^87\) while in Norfolk Pearce himself seems to have followed this practice, providing plans for someone else to execute. A letter from Mary Pendarves (later Mrs. Delany) to her sister in 1731 implies he did likewise elsewhere: ‘You must send to Capt Pierce for a plan to build a house, and then I am sure it will be pretty and convenient.’\(^88\).

The concept of the interlocking plan at Nos. 11 and 12 North Audley Street seems to have come from Shepherd, who utilised this unusual plan-type at nearby Brook Street in 1725, and again later in order to gain a larger footprint and more spacious rooms in one house, at the expense of its neighbour. This plan could be adapted to the requirements of a prospective customer as occasion demanded, as later happened at North Audley Street. A sketch plan for two unidentified terraced houses of uneven areas, in the Elton Hall album, appears to explore a similar

---

Fig. 11. The Gallery at No. 12 North Audley Street, London. (Conway Library, The Courtauld Institute of Art, London. Image 1962: © Country Life)
idea, and strengthens the probability that Pearce worked closely with Shepherd in formulating the interior schemes at North Audley Street.89

Edward Shepherd was one of the most important and prolific builder-developers in London’s West End, and by the mid-1720s had graduated to the title of ‘architect.’ His house at No. 72 Brook Street placed Pearce’s collaborator in a hub of architectural activity in the closing years of the 1720s, living a few doors down from Colen Campbell, and directly opposite the houses of two prominent Irish patrons, Viscount Mountjoy and Sir Gustavus Hume. Hume is a particularly important figure in this narrative, as the patron credited with bringing the Dresden architect Richard Castle to Ireland in the late 1720s, where he worked with Pearce in the drawing office of the new Parliament House in Dublin, and went on to establish a prolific Irish practice. Hume – who held the sought-after position of Groom of the royal Bedchamber from 1715 until the King’s death in 1727 – is likely to have first encountered Richard Castle in London, and it was there that Pearce and Castle struck up their professional relationship.90

**A ROYAL COMMISSION AT RICHMOND**

This brings us to a project of great significance, but one which, like the architect himself, has resisted elucidation. A set of designs by Pearce, but in Richard Castle’s hand, for a proposed royal palace or lodge at Richmond in Surrey are preserved in the Elton Hall album. They are believed to have been made about 1727/8, shortly after Richmond lodge was settled on Queen Caroline, but were never realised.91 As a formal exercise these drawings not only offer evidence of collaboration between Pearce and Richard Castle, but stylistically they demonstrate the influence of contemporary British architecture on both architects. Here the combined sources of Vanbrugh, Campbell and Gibbs are readily apparent. Vanbrugh is brought to mind in the cellular treatment of the transverse corridors, similar to Pearce’s plan for the Parliament House, and in the handling of the first floor gallery space.92 Echoes of Colen Campbell, and through him, or perhaps Vitruvius Britannicus, those of Inigo Jones’s Whitehall are also felt in the Richmond Lodge façade, while there is some similarity between the composition of the elevation and that of Campbell’s east-front at Houghton (Fig. 11). The detailing in the Richmond drawings, however, is more robust than Campbell’s restrained manner. The vigorous, almost Mannerist, handling of the ground storey on the Richmond elevation, the emphatic projecting keystones, the grotesque masks and the heavily rusticated surrounds, recur in a number of projects associated with Pearce in Ireland, both at Henrietta Street in Dublin and at the Archbishop’s palace at Cashel, Co. Tipperary (1732). These motifs are reminiscent of the Baroque tendencies in James Gibbs’s eclectic style, and, though it could be argued that Pearce was looking directly to antique sources by way of Palladio, it is significant that Gibbs’s St-Martin-in-the-Fields was being completed at this time, while his illustrated Book of Architecture was published in 1728. Gibbs’s involvement in the detailing of Houghton Hall is perhaps even more thought-provoking.93

Formalism aside, economic concerns also played their part in the Richmond palace design. In his memorandum which accompanied the drawings, Pearce tells us that the plans were ‘confined to the Conveniency and proper use without Magnificence, Ornament or great expense…’94 Its scale, however, ‘although not great … is of an extent something more than common for a Private Person.’ He does not go into the particulars of the costs involved, as he was ‘unacquainted with particular rates now in England’, which is rather telling in terms of his hands-on involvement, or lack thereof, with building works in Britain. The accompanying text also indicates that the proposed scheme was solicited, ‘the following plans,’ Pearce writes, ‘being
Who then, provided the royal connection necessary to gain such a prestigious commission?

One possible line of enquiry takes us to Orleans House at nearby Twickenham, a Thames-side brick villa of about 1710, built for the former Secretary of State of Scotland James Johnston (1655–1737) and his wife Lucy. Johnston, a Scottish diplomat who had served as envoi extraordinaire to Prussia in the 1690s was said to keep ‘a very great rank, and frequently has Mr. Walpool [sic] and the greatest courtiers with him at his country house near London.’ He was a close confident of King George I, and both he and his wife were favourites of Queen Caroline, and had entertained these royal visitors in the splendid setting of the Octagon Room, which was added by James Gibbs and the Ticinese stuccatori, Giuseppe Artari and Giovanni Bagutti, about 1720. (Fig. 13) George I visited Orleans House in 1724, while Queen Caroline dined there with Mrs Johnston in 1729. Mrs Johnston was born Lucy Claxton, and was Edward Lovett Pearce’s first cousin. Her sister Mary Claxton, as we have seen, was the wife of Thomas Carter, Pearce’s patron at Henrietta Street in Dublin, and both women were more distant cousins of Sir John Vanbrugh. Pearce’s close family links to the Johnstons is of the utmost interest considering both their intimate connection to Queen Caroline and the proximity of their house to Richmond Park, where Pearce’s proposed design for a royal palace was to be built. That the Johnstons maintained close ties with Lucy’s Irish relatives is made clear.
Fig. 13. Plan of the ground floor of Richmond Lodge, Surrey, by Edward Lovett Pearce (des.), engraved by Richard Castle (Vanbrugh Album, Elton Hall V&A E.2123-1992. © Victoria and Albert Museum, London)

Fig. 14. Elevation of Richmond Lodge, Surrey, by Edward Lovett Pearce, engraved by Richard Castle. (Vanbrugh Album, Elton Hall V&A E.2123-7-1992 © Victoria and Albert Museum, London)
Fig. 15 Plan for the Octagon Room, Orleans House, Engraving by E. Kirkhall after James Gibbs. c.1720. (© London Borough of Richmond upon Thames)

Fig. 16 ‘A Room for Mr Creighton’, Plan and elevation of an hexagonal gazebo to be built at Crom Castle Co. Fermanagh, by Edward Lovett Pearce, c.1728. (Vanbrugh Album, Elton Hall V&A E.2124:110–1992. © Victoria and Albert Museum, London)
from her husband’s will of 1734, wherein James Johnston named his wife’s brother-in-law Thomas Carter as a trustee and guardian of his son James, and, even more significantly, Lieutenant-General Thomas Pearce as his principal executor, a role only likely given to one’s closest acquaintance.88 Carter, who made regular trips to England, visited Richmond in 1731, where he waited on the King.99 It is more than plausible that Edward Lovett Pearce would also have visited his cousin at Orleans House during his visits to London, where he would not only have encountered the splendour of Gibbs’s Octagon Room – and indeed Morris’s nearby Marble Hill House, then under construction – but may also have gained the introduction to the exalted circles necessary for the Richmond Palace scheme. A drawing for a hexagonal gazebo, not dissimilar to Gibbs’s design, among Pearce’s papers lends weight to this suggestion. (Fig. 14)

This puzzle, like much else about Edward Lovett Pearce’s architectural development, remains unsolved. What is clear, however, is the impact upon Pearce of the English context, in particular the importance of family and high-ranking political, military, and architectural connections. The significance of the Richmond scheme, not only for his early career in Britain and Ireland, but also for the genesis of his working relationship with Richard Castle, calls for further exploration, in the hope that it might yield greater insights into how the commission came about.
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