Two-Fold Design: The Oval Gate-leg Table as Household Commodity in Seventeenth-Century New York
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When folded up and pushed to the edge of a room, this small table seems like an unassuming version of a larger, familiar form. Since its creation for a late seventeenth-century New York household, this trestle-base, oval gate-leg table flexibly served the daily activities its owners (Figure 1 and Figure 2). Henry Francis du Pont purchased the item from an unknown source, most likely contemporaneous with purchases of other seventeenth-century and William and Mary style furnishings in the late 1920s. Like many other objects from the early seventeenth century, it puzzles experts. Furniture scholar, Benno M. Forman, noted in the 1970s that this object has many “distinctive quirks”: a solid, medial stretcher exhibiting Northern European technique; turnings similar to Boston styles; a trestle foot that might denote its categorization as a New York table. Its two gates are made with maple balusters, oak upper stretchers, and soft maple pivot spindles; the trestle base is butternut, but the upper trestle is made of cherry and attached to cherry top. In the absence of documented provenance, it is the presence of these materials and “distinctive quirks” that provide meaningful insights about the table’s style and previous uses. It is a cultural artifact that merged many distinctive materials and influences when New York’s history was in a state of transition.
Figure 2. Display of Tappahannock Room, featuring Gate-leg trestle table 1958.0527. Winterthur Museum. Photo by author, 2014.

The table’s color and overall aesthetic were equally important to the artisan and the consumer. In determining that this table was made for a New York household, it is helpful to identify the wood types available to New York makers. The table’s top and base incorporate four types of wood into a unified form: cherry, maple, butternut and oak. Cherry, maple, and butternut are all native and local woods documented in New York’s furniture industry, although red gum is a more typical choice in New York gate-leg tables. The table-top’s center board and two falling leaves are constructed from five cherry boards. One leaf made from a single board has warped about one inch in height over time, due to its tangential cut from the log. The maker may have constructed the other leaf and center from narrower cherry boards to mitigate this type of distortion. The artisan’s choice to make the center board from two glued boards was practical but still unusual, as the center board was the focal point (and most stationary) aspect of the table when folded and uncovered.³

The cherry top has many visible layers of red paint, a finish that mimics the fashionable preference seventeenth-century New Yorkers assigned to walnut chairs, tables, and case furniture (Figure 3). Abraham DeLanoy’s inventory, made in 1702, records the value of walnut as a primary wood. His probate inventory listed “2 Round Tables & Chist 0/12/0” and “one black walnut table 1/10/0.” DeLanoy’s black walnut table was more prized than his two round tables, regardless of their comparative sizes. Similarly, Hellig de Key’s inventory in 1709 lists a group of “2 Tables: 0/15/6 and 0/3/5;” one “black walnut Cubbord 1/6/6” has a higher value than the tables. The fashion for walnut in European royal courts spread from Italy to Northern Europe, and only diminished slightly after the trade of tropical woods such as mahogany, ebony and rosewood increased during the late seventeenth century. The mixture of woods in this table reduced its price. The use of paint masked this mixture in the dimly lit interiors of most New York houses in the late seventeenth century and featured the silhouettes of turned elements and the cyma curve of the trestle feet. The design negotiated the complex genealogies of European regional styles into a single American-made piece.⁴

Thus, this early American table exhibits a confluence of design sources and construction techniques rooted in English and Dutch traditions present in seventeenth-century New York and New England. Robert F. Trent has observed that seventeenth-century furniture construction in New England sometimes mirrored avant-garde English urban joinery, urban turning, and provincial joinery of high quality. Similarly, Peter M. Kenny, formerly the Ruth Bigelow Wriston Curator of American Decorative Arts and Administrator of the American Wing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, has traced patterns of construction from seventeenth-century New York furnishings. In a comprehensive study, Kenny compared thirty small oval Baroque tables of New York and rural New York origins (including areas of the Hudson River Valley and Long Island) to show the surviving range of table styles available to the American market between 1660 and 1730. Kenny argued that this group of tables is “structurally and ornamentally unconventional—in comparison to their New England counterparts—and redolent of a bold baroque design ethos. These tables present a . . . peculiar interpretive challenge as by-products of Anglo-Dutch cultural fermentation in late seventeenth-century New York.” His comparison of oval tables, with falling leaves and with draw-bar supports alike, recorded differences in joined and turned gate-leg construction. These tables tend to be made from mahogany, native cherry, walnut, or maple. Kenny quotes Forman’s observation that early New York style “[chairs] could come directly from Holland, or from Boston which had been influenced by England, which had been influenced by Holland,” adding that the same problem exists for New York oval tables with falling leaves. This oval gate-leg table exhibits hybrid international influences that appear in both Boston and New York: its use of materials appear to be from New York; the table’s design borrows from Boston examples that reference English traditions; and the table’s construction could be achieved by a number of skilled artisans in either region.[5]

The table’s oval shape, turned joinery and hinged leaves follow William and Mary style, an inclusive term that describes seventeenth-century innovations in English, Dutch and American craftsmanship. At its leaves, the table uses four wrought-iron butterfly hinges to secure two tongue-and-groove joints, a William and Mary period invention that was replaced by the rule joint in the 1730s. These types of hinges frequently appear on New York tables with pivot legs and draw bars, and this table’s hinges. The rosehead nails appear to be in excellent condition, and consistent with the presumed period of construction (Figure 4). Mortise-and-tenon joints secured with large wooden pins unite the frame and base. On the two gates, pintles allow two of the thinner-turned gate posts to pivot. Four pins attach the table’s cherry top to the frame. Skilled joiners and turners in either urban or rural American workshops could have completed all of these steps. Because this table’s design never included a drawer, it did not require dovetail joinery introduced by London-trained cabinetmakers in Boston workshops by the 1690s and perhaps earlier, as some of these artisans arrived in Boston by 1641. The table may not have demonstrated a cabinetmaker’s knowledge of dovetails, but its skilled construction and turnings embraced the William and Mary period’s modish designs with its oval top and precise joinery.[5]
Compared with other small tables from this period, this gate-leg table is uncommon due to its trestle base. As a New York interpretation of European designs, Winterthur’s trestle-base table with turned gates reveals more influences from English than Dutch designers. Trestle-base tables with flat gates are derived from English sources, while tables with draw-bar supports and other William and Mary design elements can find precedents in both English and Dutch designs. A contemporary maple New York table in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art exhibits a wider trestle base, flat gates, turned balusters, and simplified trestle feet (Figure 5). The gate-leg table...
at Winterthur is more compact overall, making it easier to move and store. However, the choice of a trestle base adds weight to the piece; that weight improves stability but decreases portability. The Winterthur table’s creator prioritized the craftsmanship, balance and stability available in English trestle design. At its height of popularity, this portable table may have belonged to a set of small trestle-base gate-leg tables created to accompany large dining tables. Today, this table is a rare and distinct hybrid of English design elements and sophisticated seventeenth-century American craftsmanship.7

The process of designing and constructing the trestle-base gate-leg table linked nearby New England settlements and the larger Atlantic World. In the 1660s, New England’s population of approximately 33,600 dwarfed New York’s small yet diverse population of 5,000. Probate inventories from New York and Boston reveal that tables were common furnishings in rural and urban households between 1660 and 1730. Early New York residents ranged from Dutch West India Company employees to British, French, Germanic, Scandinavian, Irish, Iberian and Slavic immigrants, some of whom grappled with the political change from New Netherland to New York in 1664. As a result, historical information that would contextualize the table’s scale, materials, design origins, inventive nature, placement and uses within a given household cannot be determined from probate inventories alone. The table reflects the diverse ethnic and commercial connections of the city’s population.

Recovering the design influences expressed in the table is difficult because documentary sources rarely described objects in precise terms. The table’s characteristic trestle-base, for example, is absent from inventories because an appraiser would describe the table as “small” before using the more detail-oriented modifier “trestle.”

The term “gate-leg” is a nineteenth-century phrase that replaced older conventions such as pivot leg, fly leg, or table with fly. Similarly, the table’s leaves could be signified as drop-leaf, sides, flaps, or table with folding or falling leaves. Probate inventories c.1660-1700 rarely assign a style or function to tables, probably because they had so many useful functions. An exception might be Richard Wharton’s room-by-room inventory from Boston, which recorded values for “[In the Dining Room] 1 old Spanish Table and 1 old Carpett 0/10/0, 1 Dutch Table 0/10/0, 1 Folding Table 2/0/0 … [In the Parlor] 1 old Chair 2 old Tables 2 Carpetts 0/15/0.” The references to tables that had associations with different ethnic groups supports the notion that New York and Boston woodwork communities were influenced by local markets and European trade. Wharton could have obtained his Spanish Table in Europe or the Spanish Caribbean almost as easily as he could have ordered a locally-made “Folding Table.”

The shifting nomenclature associated with these tables and the constellation of objects that accompanied them testifies to users knowledge of international conventions. In Boston, a survey of 1650-1690 inventories in hall and parlor houses reflected provincial room arrangements that had their origins in French court-styles and Restoration London’s urban furnishing practices; these patterns appeared in Massachusetts towns by 1670. Trent argued that from this perspective, the William and Mary style seemed like “less of a watershed” moment, especially for urban artisans who were already used to following innovative design trends. Gate-leg “oval tables” in the 1669 inventories of Antipas Boyce and Edmund Downes of Boston suggest the arrival of early Baroque forms prior to the appearance of dovetailed case furniture and new seating furniture in the 1680s. Although international trade was ingrained in early New York culture, the oval gate-leg table was likely part of a customized order fulfilled by a local artisan who took full advantage of his familiarity with New York’s and Europe’s diverse design resources and market-place.8

Probate inventories also offer other clues about household items, even though appraisers’ terms are often limited to noting scale, form, value, and general style. Linking objects to patterns visible in this evidence depends upon comparisons. To determine whether the Winterthur gate-leg table was perceived as “small” in seventeenth-century terms for example, Kenny compared its scale with a currently un-located table with turned gate legs and low flat stretchers illustrated in Lockwood’s Colonial Furniture (1913). Wallace Nutting cited Lockwood’s table as “much smaller than the usual gate-leg table.” As a domestic commodity, the Winterthur table’s height at 26.5 inches was slightly shorter than a standardized table height of approximately 29-30 inches. Upon closer study, however, the tips of the trestle feet feather out to a fine edge. Tracing the red paint layers on the table’s base, the feet appear to have been cut down by at least ½ to ¾ inches, suggesting that the table was not much shorter than most other tables. Within the even narrower constraints of terms commonly used, estate appraisers might have identified the Winterthur table as an oval table, a round table, a small table, or perhaps most accurately an old oval table. The 1696 inventory of Humphry Hull’s “New Yorke” residence listed “an old ovill Table 0/9/0.” Although potentially similar form to the Winterthur table, the terms “old” and “ovill” distinguish the table from Hull’s other possessions including “a Table 0/8/0,” and “3 Turkeywork Chairs & a old table 0/18/0.” “Old” may denote an old-fashioned style, but could also reference a worn out table or, alternatively, a beloved heirloom.9

The appraisers’ terminology may not reveal what the “typical” or “common” gate-leg table’s scale or design qualities were, but the inventories illuminate the perceived value of household items used alongside these tables. The gate-leg table borrowed European architecture’s baroque oval to introduce concepts of informal dining to the center of domestic spaces in early America. Tables with hinged leaves required minimal time to set up or break
down in rooms with multiple functions. They also offered a durable setting for conscious, fashionable display. Although it would have been covered with a cloth, this table most often functioned as a small dining table. In a constellation of objects that connote the table as a dining space, the oval table’s design served as a setting for equalized, seated conversation. In 1688, Elizabeth Grevenraedt had “Chairs whole and brooke 1/0/0” that may have accommodated her “1 Small Square oake table and 1 octangle oake, 0/19/0.” The inventory of Helligon de Key listed two types: “6 Chaires totaling 1/13/6... 5 leather chaires for 1/15/5.” Another expensive material was turkeywork, an older but still fashionable upholstery style in New York around 1700. Although both of these inventories are from Dutch residents of New York, the English dining room at Belton in 1688 contained a dining room with “two oval tables, two Armd cane chairs, fifteen single cane chairs, one child’s chaire, two side board tables, one pendulum clock with an inlaid case.” When preparing for dining in the English country house, the tables were taken from the room’s edges, opened, and covered with cloths before the chairs were drawn up and the sideboards laden with glass and plate. The oval dining table, with folding or ‘falling’ leaves, became common in fashionable English houses around the middle of the seventeenth century, mostly due to the compactness and the ease with which they could be moved and stored.10

While tables provided a stable setting for earthenware, pewter, iron and china dishes used during meals, households also used them in various ways between mealtimes. Damage on Winterthur’s table reveal that it sustained wear without a tablecloth. John Hoyt’s four brass candlesticks might be found on the table as he read “2 books 1 comentari on the revalation the other ye Christians watchfulnos 0/10/0” and “6 old books 0/8/0.” Candlesticks or still hot cooking pots might have caused this table’s circular burn marks, perhaps sustained while the table’s owners were reading. At least six inventories mention books and a range of expensive Bibles, all of which were assuredly heavy enough to require a wooden surface’s support. Elizabeth Grevenraedt owned 1 great bibell 1/4/0, 1 New bibel laid with Silver 0/15/0 and 4 small printed boockes 0/4/0 in 1687; that same year John de Lannay owned a French Bible in folio with several French books for 0/16/0; Philip Galpin owned “Three Bibles and other books 0/15/0.” With no light source listed in the inventory, Galpin may have set his table and “three chaers” next to a window to take advantage of daylight.11

The correlation between textiles, seating furniture, and tables evident from these inventories can be traced to the English rituals represented in the painting Grace Before a Meal, c. 1725, alternatively titled Saying Grace, by Flemish-born English drapery painter Joseph van Aken (Figure 6). Five relatives gather around a small gate-leg
table, lit by natural light. A tankard is on the floor, and two of the five people are without seating. The table is dressed with a crisp, folded-and-pressed white tablecloth. Earthenware plates and a mirror over the fireplace further illustrate items listed in American probate inventories. In this scene, there may not be room for elaborate place settings, but the settings are appropriate for this small meal. The table will surely be used between mealtimes for a series of household tasks, potentially related to the family’s apparent religious piety, or moved again to allow for better access to the cooking hearth or light. Van Aken’s table may not be turned, but its overall form is similar in scale and use to the Winterthur table. The painting supports Kenny’s suggestion that “the smaller tables may have been used for tea or light meals, or as service stations alongside grander, oval-topped dining tables; the larger ones could seat four and may have served as the principal dining table in some households.” In both England and America, the sitters’ clothing would have been more expensive than wooden furnishings at any scale. However, the table is still large enough to be this household’s principal dining table, with room to serve five people using individual pewter plates. Although the oval gate-leg table’s design origins are diverse, its role in the daily rituals of British American families was best understood by examining van Aken’s painting of an English family at mealtimes.12

Two additional examples of William and Mary style gate-leg tables at Winterthur suggest how gate-leg tables functioned in elite seventeenth-century Anglo American households (Figure 7). A circular maple table from New England has a carpet covering. The carpet masks the table top and the upper portions of the legs. As with the van Aken painting, the table serves as an armature for the coverings and the sociability that took place on it. The table’s details are obscured: the center leaf is much narrower than the oval version that is the subject of this study, but is made of a single board; two legs with vase-and-block turnings terminate in trestle feet; the symmetrical turnings are thinner than the ones on the oval gate-leg table; and the round table reveals more wear than the oval gate-leg table. Like the round table, the oval gate-leg table is more worn on its gate-leg turnings than its baluster posts. One gate-leg even has a cylindrical metal replacement between the pivot leg’s turned elements, potentially added as a nineteenth-century repair. In contrast, the oval gate-leg table has very few marks and no cracks on its maple baluster posts. These differences signify various owners’ choices and habits of use over long periods of time.13

Figure 7. Display of Oyster Bay Room featuring two tables, Winterthur Museum. Photo by author, 2014.
Nearby is an even smaller maple and oak table, painted black and situated in a doorway. Displayed together, these two tables highlight a trend in selected New York and Boston inventories: men and women tended to own multiple tables if they owned any at all. Seating in the seventeenth century was an expansive category that included chairs and joined chests that also functioned as storage. Even without seating for all family members, as depicted by van Aken, tables of differing sizes and shapes were the workbenches of domestic production and hospitality. The presence of multiple tables highlights the oval gate-leg table’s associations with flexible uses and meanings. Depending on its household composition, activities, and available light, these tables were designed for daily or seasonal domestic work. Along the perimeter of the oval gate-leg table and underneath the joined center boards, there are several circular dents, probably left by the clamp of a “sewing bird,” a device used to hold cloth while stitching. Many similar dents appear on other tables made in New York and Boston (Figure 8). In either Boston or New York, women could have made these marks while sewing at an uncovered gate-leg table. Whether supporting domestic industry or leisure, the small table’s role in daily activities suggest that a seventeenth-century New Yorker had several motivations to own multiple tables.

Winterthur’s trestle-base, oval gate-leg table signifies a sense of order and flexibility in an otherwise hectic household. A table that could fold up to save space changed how its owners conceptualized and organized domestic life. With two tables, users gained the ability to start an activity on one table and then physically set it aside. In a house where space was limited and unspecialized, the table’s ability to support different tasks and accessories invited a controlled sense of work and leisure. It created an opportunity for its owner to schedule tasks, activities and meals at a moment’s notice. This table’s small scale and flexibility allowed for personalization and conversation that went unnoticed next to specialized, larger tables. Currently displayed in the Tappahannock Room at Winterthur, the table seems insignificant adjacent to a large high chest nearby (Figure 2). The table’s museum-quality condition and survival is a testament to its mutability: its early users may have found it efficient and functional; others appreciated it as decorative and stylish. For his museum at Winterthur, Henry Francis du Pont collected what he thought was evocative of America’s artisanal past; and today’s visitors can now interpret this table’s many meanings for themselves.
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5 Roderic H. Blackburn and Ruth Piwonka, Remembrance of patria : Dutch arts and culture in colonial America, 1609-1776; with an essay on paintings by Mary Black and additional contributions by Charlotte Wilcoxen, Joyce Volk, and Nancy Kelley. New York : Produced by the Publishing Center for Cultural Resources for the Albany Institute of History and Art (1988), 74; Kenny, “Tables,” 120; Safford, American, 121.


9 Kenny, “Tables,” 129; Hull, Mic. 1581; For the purpose of this paper, objects quoted in probate inventories have monetary values in pounds / shilling / pence. For example, the an “old oville Table” with the value of nine shillings is written as “old ovill Table 0/9/0,” etc.

10 Johnston, William and Mary, 72; Brock Jobe and Myrna Kaye, New England Furniture: The Colonial Era: Selections from the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, 269; Grevenraedt, Col. 61, Box 28. Contains category of “Household Stuffe;” Johnston, William and Mary, 72. See for a discussion on chairs, including cane chairs and Turkey work upholstery since 1650; De Key, Helligon. Col. 61; Kenny, “Tables,” 117. In England, the gate-leg was less fashionable than the draw or drawing table, with a leaf at either end that was housed under the main top and could be pulled or drawn out as an extension, attached with lopers underneath. Without necessitating a swinging gate, the draw table would offer increased leg-room; Adam Bowett, English Furniture 1660-1714, From Charles II to Queen Anne. Woodbridge, England and Italy: Antique Collectors’ Club (2002), 106.
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13 Winterthur 1958.598, Table, maple, 1700-1720 New England. OH 26 3/8”, OW 32 ¼”, OD 33 1/8.” Circular top formed of narrow, stationary mid-section and two half-circular drop leaves; each leaf supported by a vase and block turned gate-leg with ball foot; two legs with vase-and-block turnings support central frame and terminate in trestle feet; double vase-and-block-turned central stretcher; Conversation and email on October 13-14, 2014 with Brock Jobe (professor of American Decorative Arts, Winterthur Museum), Mark Anderson (Senior Furniture Conservator, Winterthur Museum) and consultation with Stephanie Auffret (Associate Furniture Conservator, Winterthur Museum). Jobe documented his observations on the table’s condition: “The condition of the table is troubling; it appears too good to be true. The wooden pins that secure the top to the frame appear to be the first set of pins; there is no obvious evidence of other pins. However, the top, which is narrow to begin with, is made of two boards. This seems odd for period workmanship. The butterfly hinges are period in appearance, but they appear too perfect. There is no evidence of any other hinges. There is little wear to the vertical posts, especially the thicker end posts. The tips of the trestle feet are thin and feather out to a fine edge; the feet must have been cut down and perhaps were at least ½ to ¾ inch thicker (as is the case on the table illustrated in Lockwood)... It would be useful to x-ray this table in order to see the joints as well as any evidence of an earlier top on the table. It might be helpful to remove a couple of nails from one of the butterfly hinges and study them. Finish analysis and microscopic wood identification would provide further information. There are signs of age throughout the table; for example there is what looks to be an old repair at the upper turned collar of one of the pivot posts. The turning broke or split and was repaired with putty and a metal ring. This kind of repair doesn’t strike me as something done by someone who was creating a fake.”

14 Winterthur G1958.597, Table, maple, oak. 1700-1720, New England. OH 24 7/8”, OL (open) 27”, OW 29 ½”. Circular top formed of narrow, stationary mid-section and two half circular drop leaves; each leaf supported when open by a vase-ball-and-block-turned gate-leg with ball foot; two, long, slender legs with block and elongated vase turnings support central frame and terminate in trestle feet; vase-and-block-turned central stretcher; painted black; See Lauren Holly Brincat, *John Bowne’s Flushing: Material Life on a Dutch Frontier, 1645-1700* (Thesis). University of Delaware (2014), 180. As a direct contrast, Lauren Brincat’s study of Flushing, New York cites Simon de Ruine’s modest 1678 household that was “sparingly furnished with a chair (for the head of household), one small cupboard, and two old chests which probably also functioned as seating furniture…it appears that Ruine did not own a table. However, eating from a porringer, which could be held with one hand by the handle, did not require one;” Kenny, “Tables,” 117. A 1724 room-by-room inventory of Gertruy Van Cortlandt’s house in New York city describes an “oval table,” which would move up and down stairs. For additional references to portability within a Dutch home, see Martha Hollander, *An Entrance for the Eyes: Space and Meaning in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002; for an excellent description of early New York housing and architectural history, see Blackburn and Piwonka, *Patria*, 91.
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1. New York was founded in the 17th century. 2. The city is located in the mouth of the Hudson River. 3. Manhattan is also a district of business and finance. 4. People from all over the world came to live in New York in the 19th and 20th centuries. 5. The city is divided into East and West by the Fifth Avenue. 6. The statue of Liberty was presented to New Yorkers by the people of France. 7. Traffic on even-numbered streets is traveled east.