In the late 1940s, one of the leading architectural historians of the 20th century, Mr John Summerson, believed that he had found evidence that, between 1725 and 1727, John Wood had been living in Oxford Street, London.\textsuperscript{1} Summerson shared this new information with fellow researcher Walter Ison and also drew his attention to the similarity between Wood’s design for the North side of Queen Square, Bath, and the group of houses with a pedimented centre, which were built by architect-builder Edward Shepherd in early 1728 and originally stood towards the left-hand end of the north side of London’s Grosvenor Square.\textsuperscript{2} This analogy seemed to indicate a probable link between the John Wood residing in Oxford Street and John Wood, architect of Bath.

Summerson’s discovery that by 1725 the Bath architect appeared to have been living in London, amidst all the ambitious building projects under construction in Cavendish Square and Grosvenor Square, was particularly significant because it emerged at a time when very little was known of John Wood’s upbringing and early career before the summer of 1725, when he asked for a plan of Bath to be sent to him at Bramham Park in Yorkshire.\textsuperscript{3} Evidence that he could well have been involved in building work in London was an idea that would gradually result in a change of focus, away from Yorkshire (where the young John Wood was thought to have grown up under the watchful eye of Lord Bingley) and towards Bingley’s aristocratic circle of acquaintances and the Cavendish-Harley Estate in Marylebone. By 1948, Ison was clearly beginning to consider Wood’s early years in a new light, acknowledging in the Preface of \textit{The Georgian Buildings of Bath}, that

\begin{quote}
... The darkness surrounding the early stages of John Wood’s career has been lightened by Mr John Summerson, F.S.A., ARIBA, to whom I am grateful for allowing me to profit from his research ...\textsuperscript{4}
\end{quote}

Neither Summerson nor Ison chose to speculate in any detail about the import of this promising new development. Nor does any further research seem to have been carried out at the time. One reason may have been that in 1948 there was a more pressing John Wood mystery to solve. Serious doubts were being raised relating to the year of his birth. Whilst Mowbray Green’s estimate that he had been born in about 1704 had been generally accepted for almost half a century, there were now historians with good reason to question this. Among them was John Summerson himself – and also Mr Sturge Cotterell, the Bath antiquarian and a highly respected
authority on John Wood. Both of them believed that he had been born before 1704 – and Sturge Cotterell had been bold enough to suggest a birthdate as early as 1695.5 With London coming more into the picture as his possible ‘stamping ground’, the year of his birth was vital to establish. For any researcher hoping to discover whether or when the Bath architect could have completed any kind of apprenticeship, his date of birth would be a crucial consideration. A John Wood born as early as 1695 and apprenticed for seven years at the age of 12 could have been granted his freedom by 1714, whereas one born in 1704 was unlikely to have completed his apprenticeship before 1723.

In 1954, the bicentenary of Wood’s death, Ison discovered (probably amongst the Reverend Shickle’s transcriptions of Bath’s parish registers) that a John Wood, son of George, had been baptised at the Church of St James, Bath on the 26 August 1704.6

The original entry in the St James’ register has since been examined in more detail and found to be less convincing than Ison and Summerson initially thought.7 Yet for those historians who have subsequently expressed no doubts that John Wood the Elder was baptised in Bath in 1704, it does establish a definite timescale. By 1716, he might have been old enough to start a 7-year apprenticeship (except apparently in London)8 and could have gained his freedom by 1723. It is a set span of time to bear in mind when considering some of the details that were yet to be revealed regarding the early career of someone known as John Wood, joiner of St Anne Westminster, and more recently claimed to have been the same man as John Wood, architect of Bath.

It was not until the late 1970s that evidence first began to appear about a John Wood who, between 1722 and 1730, had leased a number of building plots in Marylebone. During those same years Lord Bingley of Bramham Park, Yorkshire, and a group of fellow Tory peers, including Lord Harley, Earl of Oxford and James Brydges, Duke of Chandos, would have been planning and developing the Cavendish-Harley Estate – in the same location, just north of Oxford Street.

In 1976, Charles E. Brownell, an American architectural historian studying at the University of Columbia, completed his Ph.D. dissertation entitled ‘The Two John Woods, 18th Century Architects of Bath’.9 Brownell believed that John Wood the Elder had been working in the north of England for some time before his confirmed visit to Bramham Park in the summer of 1725; that between 1722 and 1733 he had rebuilt Capesthorne Hall in Cheshire;10 that it was Lord Bingley who brought John Wood to London to work on the Cavendish-Harley building development; and that

... Appearing in London, on 1st March 1723 Wood leased a site on Oxford Street to build a house of twenty-six foot frontage, and thereafter undertook at least seven more similar houses on the estate up to 1730 ...11

Brownell’s doctoral dissertation included detailed and reliable source references to support this new evidence and he obviously believed that the John Wood who was leasing plots of land in the 1720s in order to build houses in the Oxford Street area was, without question, John Wood, later architect of Bath.12

Tim Mowl and Brian Earnshaw acknowledged Brownell’s inspirational research paper and seemed similarly persuaded that the two Johns (Wood) were one and the same person. Their ground-breaking biography John Wood: Architect of Obsession was published in 1988 and began with a chapter boldly entitled ‘The Enigma Years of a ‘Joyner’ from Westminster’.13 The evidence discussed in this opening chapter has since been regarded as a reliable benchmark for subsequent research into the ‘mystery’ years in the early career of Bath’s renowned architect, and there does
not appear to have been any published challenge to the now well-established opinion that the John Wood whose name appeared regularly in the Marylebone Lease Records during the 1720s was, without question, John Wood, architect of Bath. As can often happen with the passing of time, convincing documented evidence may be seen eventually as valid proof and speculative ideas accepted as fact. Yet, remembering the importance of the year of John Wood’s birth – and the fact that, if proved, this would impose a definite time span on subsequent events in his early life – there appeared to be niggling inconsistencies in these early conclusions regarding John Wood, joiner of Westminster, that needed to be addressed.

Citing reliable source evidence, Mowl and Earnshaw clearly accepted the theory that John Wood had been baptised at St James’ Church, Bath in August 1704 and had attended the local Blue Coat School. What followed was more speculative. Their first supposition was that he could have left school to take up an apprenticeship in Bath in 1716. Then came the thought that ‘his later cool detachment from the citizenry [of Bath] and his obvious ambition suggests that he served the apprenticeship in London’. If this second hypothesis was right, it would almost certainly have called for an adjustment to the aforementioned timescale, since apprenticeships in London were reported to have begun at the age of 15 and lasted for seven years. For someone born in 1704 this would have meant an apprenticeship no earlier than 1719 and continuing until 1726.

Chronologically, this did not seem to dovetail with the suggestion that, at the age of eighteen, John Wood of Bath would have been sufficiently qualified to be referred to officially as a joiner of the parish of St Anne’s, Westminster. Neither did it seem likely that he might also have been adequately set up by then to take out a lease for a plot of land near Oxford Street; nor that, even three years after arriving in Bath in May 1727, he was still paying rent for sites 7, 8 and 9 in Edward Street and Margaret Street.

Part of John Rocque’s Map of London 1746

1 Cavendish Square 2 Oxford Street 3 Margaret Street 4 Edward Street [Ogle Street] 5 *Riding House 6 *Adam and Eve Court – *named in Chancery Bill (mentioned later)
Since the man leasing land in 1723 was already described as a joiner, it was clearly possible that he was a different John Wood – someone old enough to have completed his apprenticeship. And because he was regularly leasing land for building houses between 1722 and 1730, it looked very likely, as Mowl and Earnshaw suggested, that he was working with a consortium of craftsmen with complementary skills. They would acquire a lease on a piece of land, pool their labour to build a house on it, thus cutting cost, and then sell the property at a good profit.\(^{22}\)

Yet, to embark on such a coordinated project would surely have required more training, experience, maturity and financial security than a young man, originally from Bath and newly arrived in London, was likely to have possessed. The following quotation refers specifically to Master carpenters, but it provides a clear indication of the wide range of skills and qualities of organisation and management needed to achieve success in the kind of work undertaken by the joiner John Wood.

*… Master carpenters were effectively building contractors, responsible for not just the construction but sometimes also the design of buildings and supply of building materials. Some master carpenters managed to accumulate considerable wealth. In some cases, they owned the houses they built and let them out as tenements …* \(^{23}\)

This description could equally have applied to a joiner ‘whose work required a nicer hand, a greater taste in ornament … and that he should be acquainted with geometry and mensuration’. \(^{24}\)

Looked at as an independent piece of research, the validity of the evidence relating to John Wood, joiner of St Anne’s, Westminster, cannot be questioned. Far more open to scepticism is the theory that this same John Wood, joiner, had been born in Bath in 1704; and that he appeared in London at the age of eighteen, ready and able to lease a piece of land and build a house on it.

Even though John Wood of Bath has often been described as a precocious young man, fired with ambition, it was difficult to accept this oversimplified interpretation of the evidence without further investigation. Unlikely as it might seem, it was just possible that, in the early 1720s, there existed another John Wood, already an experienced London joiner, who happened to be leasing land and building houses in the same area at the very time that several Tory peers (including Lord Bingley, the Duke of Chandos and Edward Harley, Earl of Oxford) were overseeing their ambitious Cavendish-Harley building development. The most effective way to challenge the long-established assumption that the joiner leasing building plots in and near Oxford Street had been John Wood of Bath would be to discover an alternative joiner of St Anne’s, Westminster, who was also named John Wood.

Since surnames in England first existed there have always been a remarkable number of people called John Wood in almost every county in England. To narrow down this particular search, however, any possible alternatives would need to be described as joiners or carpenters, linked to the parish of St Anne and known to be working in the Oxford Street area from the early 1720s onwards. There were eventually two possibles to consider.

John Woods, described as ‘carpenter and joiner of St Anne, Westminster’, left a Will, probate dated July 1740, in which he named a wife, Dorothy.\(^{25}\) Marriage allegiance and bond records were found for a John Woods, widower, who married Dorothy Hughes in 1733.

Significantly, in all three documents he was named as John Woods, not Wood – and his signature on both marriage records includes an ’s’ at the end.
Although the spelling of names on documents is known to be erratic, it seems unlikely that someone recorded with the surname Wood throughout the Harley papers in the 1720s, should later be known as, and consistently sign his name, John Woods.

A more promising discovery looked to be a John Wood, ‘carpenter and joyner of the parish of St Mary le Bone in the County of Middlesex’, who gave evidence as the plaintiff in a Chancery Bill dated 1733. The defendant was Ann White, widow of Edward White, a ‘pavior’ (paver) who had died in 1729, and the case centred around various complicated issues undoubtedly arising from a lack of understanding and trust, combined with an accusation of unfair dealing – all of which had stemmed from the system of workmen cutting financial outlay by pooling and levelling up on costs of labour and materials.

There was no conclusive evidence in the witness statements to prove that the plaintiff was the joiner of St Anne Westminster who had been leasing land in and near Oxford Street between 1722 and 1730, but there was confirmation that the work was carried out within the parishes of St Marylebone and St Giles-in-the-Fields and that arrangements between the joiner and the paver for the pooling of costs dated back to 1724, ending with a similar agreement just before Edward White’s death in 1729. So here was conclusive evidence of a joiner named John Wood who looked to have been part of a consortium of workmen similar to that envisaged by Mowl and Earnshaw for their enigmatic John Wood, joiner.

In her statement, the defendant, Ann White, referred to two specific locations. By an agreement dated the 4th of April 1729, Edward White ‘was to do such paver’s work as shall be directed to be done for the said John Wood near the Riding House ………. the said John Wood to pay for the same in the Joyners and Carpenters work to be performed for a house the said Edward White intends to build in Adam and Eve Court …’ [See Rocque’s Map of London].

The fact that both Riding House and Adam and Eve Court were sited in the same area as Cavendish Square, Margaret Street and Edward Street was persuasive evidence that this was the John Wood who was known to have leased land in or north of Oxford Street from 1722 onwards.

Moreover, the document included proof that he was not John Wood of Bath, because his signature, although written in similar well-formed, Copperplate roundhand script ….

…. did not match that of John Wood the Elder, architect.

Yet there was still one further query to answer. The Chancery Bill confirmed him to be ‘… of the parish of St Mary le Bone in the County of Middlesex, Carpenter and Joyner …’ whereas the John Wood leasing land in the Oxford Street area has been described as ‘ … of St Anne, Westminster in the County of Middlesex, Joyner’. 
In fact, the parishes of St Marylebone and St Anne were both in Westminster – St Marylebone being north of Oxford Street and St Anne lying to the south, in the district of Soho. By comparing John Wood’s signature on the Chancery Bill with two signatures on other original documents, it was possible to discover more about him – and it seems that at different times between 1717 and 1738 he had personal links with both parishes.

Sixteen years before he added his signature to the Chancery Bill, the same John Wood signed as witness on a marriage record. Two signatures are rarely identical – but close similarities in the way letters are formed, where and how letters are joined, the spaces where the pen has been lifted from the paper, the slant of the letters, the alignment or slope of the signature as a whole, and characteristic flourishes (as seen here in the capitals ‘J’ and ‘W’ and the plain final ‘d’ followed by a ‘squiggle’ and line at the end) are all indicative of a reliable match.

Witnes signature on marriage record of Jean Parquot and Esther Dubois
April 1717

Two months later John Wood married Judith Parquot. Judith was Jean Parquot’s daughter from a previous marriage.

The marriage took place at the church of St Mary Marylebone on the 30 June 1717, but the entry in the parish register confirms that John Wood was of the parish of ‘St Ann’ and Judith Parquot of the parish of St James, both in Westminster.

John Wood and his wife Judith had three sons – John (1) 1719; John (2) 1720; James 1721. They were all baptised at the church of St Anne, Soho, Westminster.

No burial for Judith Wood has been found, but in 1728 John Wood, widower, married Elizabeth Proby of the parish of St George the Martyr, Holborn, and signed the marriage bond.

John Wood’s signature
Marriage Bond (1728)
2nd marriage to Elizabeth Proby

John Wood, widower, is described as ‘of the parish of St Marylebone, Co. Middlesex, Citizen and Joyner, London’
Between 1729 and 1738 John and Elizabeth Wood had three daughters and one son. They were all baptised at the church of St Mary Marylebone.

The matching signatures and additional key details included in three original documents meant that events in the life of John Wood after he became a qualified joiner of Westminster were not merely speculative possibilities, but could be established beyond doubt. As well as providing the crucial information that this same John Wood, joiner, had personal links with two parishes in Westminster (St. Anne and St. Marylebone), the proof that he married his first wife in June 1717 confirmed that he would have completed his apprenticeship as a joiner by then, since serving apprentices were not allowed to marry. Working back chronologically, this in turn sets yet another definite timeline. John Wood, joiner of Westminster, would probably have been apprenticed before 1710 and therefore born before 1695.

The following transcriptions of a baptism for a John Wood in the parish of St Anne’s, Soho, Westminster in October 1694, followed by an apprenticeship record dated August 1709, could well be the evidence needed to put speculative thinking beyond all reasonable doubt.

Name: John Wood  
Baptism Date: 18 Oct 1694  
Baptism Place: Saint Anne Soho, Westminster  
Father: John Wood  
Mother: Eliz.  
Source: ancestry.co.uk

Unfortunately, evidence found in original source material is not always initially so clear or conclusive. Two more pieces of information, possibly relating to this same John Wood, looked promising, but further investigation was needed to confirm that they too could have had some connection with the John Wood who had signed the Chancery Bill.

Included in a list in the Harley Papers, under the heading ‘House adjoining the Slaughter House’ was a payment dated 6 June 1729 ‘To John Wood for sashes’. On the same page, payments were also recorded to a Joel Johnson and Francis Thredgold, both of whom had been mentioned several times in John Wood’s evidence in the Wood v White Chancery Bill (1733). This may not prove conclusively that the man paid for making the sashes was the John Wood who gave evidence to the Court of Chancery, but it is certainly persuasive circumstantial evidence.

References to a John Wood, joiner, were also found in the Middlesex Deeds Registry. In 1733 he was listed as mortgagee of William Bignell, at No. 29 Compton Street, Soho, and records for 1732–1735 confirmed that in that same period he was also mortgagee of John Whetton, who had built the former Nos. 19–25.

Map showing St Anne’s Church, Soho, and the site of the Compton Street Development from a map in John Strype’s Survey of London

29 Compton Street 📍
In the 1720s and 1730s a partial rebuilding of Compton Street took place. No. 29 was built in 1728. The building was carried out under a sub-lease for less than forty-one years held by William Bignell, a Soho glazier. Bignell was also associated with the rebuilding about that time of five houses in Compton Street situated to the east of No. 29 and continuing around the south-east corner. John Whetton, a bricklayer, was responsible for building the house backing onto the north wall of No. 29 and three more houses adjoining it to the west in that same north-facing row.

But there was no real proof that John Wood, mortgagee, was the same man as the joiner who had been leasing land and building houses in and north of Oxford Street until 1730. The circumstantial evidence was persuasive, since it was already known that, following their marriage in June 1717, John Wood and his wife Judith had three sons baptised at St. Anne’s Church, Soho. It is clear from the map that the Compton Street redevelopment, begun in the 1720s, was only a very short walk from the church. The connection already looked plausible and the discovery of an additional incidental clue seemed to substantiate the likelihood of a link.

Describing Compton Street in 1720 in his Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, John Strype noted that ‘Compton street .......... is broad, and the Houses well built, but of no great Account for its Inhabitants, which are chiefly French’. Among the rate payers at that time, perhaps a third had French-seeming names.

The maiden name of John Wood’s first wife was Parquot and she belonged to a French Huguenot family. It was only a small piece of the puzzle, in itself insignificant, yet it immediately slotted so neatly into place with what was already known about the joiner John Wood. Somehow it seemed to corroborate the idea that the John Wood acting as mortgagee to a glazier and bricklayer in Compton Street by 1733 might also have been the John Wood who had been building houses in the Oxford Street area in the 1720s. And, though pure speculation, it was easy to imagine that during his first marriage he had lived in or very near Compton Street, perhaps close to his wife’s family, before marrying again in 1728.

Two final fragments of indirect evidence seemed to cast further doubts on the theory that John Wood of Bath had spent his formative years from the age of eighteen working as a joiner on the Cavendish-Harley estate in Marylebone.

Included in the Harley papers and dated 1735, are two payments to a John Wood who had made ‘a press for the Cambridge seal’. This was presumably the wooden press for a civic letter seal, and could well have been a task for a skilled and experience joiner with ‘... a nicer hand, and a greater taste in ornament ...’. It seems unlikely to have been a commission undertaken by John Wood the architect in 1735, when he was settled and well-established in his career in Bath.

There is also written proof that John Wood himself had a poor opinion of one joiner in particular who became an architect. Describing Bath’s Guildhall in his Essay, Wood included the disparaging comment:

... At the opposite end [the south] there is a Heap of Ornamental Work well put together under the Direction of one William Killigrew, a Joiner who laid his Apron aside about the Year 1719; and I can only say this much of them, that they incumber rather than adorn an handsome old Edifice ...

It might be argued that Wood, had he actually been the joiner who had leased land and built houses in London (as has long been supposed), was by then sufficiently arrogant to believe himself to have risen above such criticism. Yet that such a harsh comment could have been written by someone who had himself started life in the joinery trade is difficult to imagine.
Conclusion:

The existence of an alternative John Wood, carpenter and joiner, who by some unlikely coincidence was leasing land and building houses in Westminster from 1722 until 1730, might never have come to light without the discovery of the Chancery Bill. His signature on that document immediately ruled out any theory that he could have been John Wood of Bath. Furthermore, by matching his signature to those on two other documents it was possible to build up a very clear picture of the life and career of this second John Wood.

1717 Witness signature  1728 Marriage Bond (2nd marriage)  1733 Chancery Bill

The convincing evidence presented here strongly suggests that the John Wood who leased a plot of land in Westminster in 1722 was not John Wood of Bath, but a joiner of Westminster with the same name – very likely a trained apprentice by 1717 and therefore born before 1695. Even so, we know from John Wood of Bath himself and other sources that he worked in London in 1725 and so it seems probable that at some time earlier a much younger John Wood found himself alongside his namesake in what must have been an inspiring hurly-burly of planning, surveying, designing and building, much of it centred on the Cavendish-Harley Estate and overseen by Lord Bingley and his fellow Tory peers. That there is no contemporary reference to the coincidence of names is intriguing, but perhaps explained by how common a name it was and the different social classes from which they came.

Exact details of how the aspiring architect spent his formative years before coming to London remain uncertain. The comment in a letter written by the Duke of Chandos in 1728 that Wood had been ‘bred up’ by Lord Bingley\(^{39}\) seems to imply an association that had begun some years before Wood’s known visit to Yorkshire in the summer of 1725. There is also a hint in the expression ‘bred up’ that during that time Bingley may have acted as master and mentor of his young protégé. That much seems plausible. The problem to solve is how and when Lord Bingley of Yorkshire could have come across John Wood of Bath in the first place. It is difficult to know where to look for the answer. Payments in Bingley’s bank account at Hoare’s Bank have already been carefully scrutinised.

When Brownell introduced his theory that John Wood of Bath had appeared in London in the early 1720s and was busy buying land and building houses in and around Oxford Street until 1730, one area of research he referred to briefly in his dissertation was Lord Bingley’s bank account. Believing that the joiner and architect were both the same person, he included evidence of payments made between 1722 and 1724\(^{40}\) to prove that Wood’s association with Bingley could be traced back to a time several years before the summer of 1725, when the aspiring architect was known to have asked for a plan of Bath to be sent to him in Yorkshire.\(^{41}\) As it now seems probable that the two men named John Wood were not the same person, this evidence, although it remains important, needs to be looked at in a different context. There have been several attempts by researchers to find some kind of pattern or meaning to the very few relevant references found amongst the copious lists of entries kept at Hoare’s Bank. But although there are payments recorded to a John Wood in November 1719, July 1722 and July 1724, and three more to a Mr
Wood in June and July 1725, exactly who was being paid, and what work they might have carried out, or where, is ambiguous.

It will now be even more difficult to come to any valid conclusions about these payments, because there is no way of deciding whether they were meant for one John Wood (and if so which) or possibly two. Some of them could have been for joiner's work on Lord Bingley's property in London, others for a survey of the gardens at Bramham Park. It is tempting to speculate that payments to a John Wood from 1719 until 1724 were for joiner's work in London; that those to a Mr. Wood in June and July 1725 coincided with the fact that in the summer of that year John Wood of Bath was definitely in Yorkshire; that the change from John Wood to Mr. Wood between 1724 and 1725 might signify that the payments were to two different people – the joiner and the aspiring architect. But that interpretation would remove any possible evidence that John Wood (architect) had been at Bramham, before 1725. Nor was the worry of name repetition at an end quite yet.

The existence of two men called John Wood already seemed to have resulted in a case of mistaken identity. The discovery amongst the account holders at Hoare's Bank of yet another Mr John Wood threatened to cause further confusion. Thankfully, with clearly unrelated withdrawals amounting to thousands of pounds listed from 1716 until 1720, it looked highly improbable that this wealthy unknown gentleman could have had any relevant connection with either the joiner or the would-be architect. Even so, his appearance within the context of this particular piece of research was a timely reminder of the bewildering prevalence of the name John Wood.

It has become increasingly clear that the inconclusive entries in Bingley’s bank account are not going to answer the crucial question of how or when John Wood of Bath might have come to the notice of Lord Bingley of Bramham Park. A possible clue to that intriguing puzzle may perhaps be discovered elsewhere.
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