

GLOUCESTERSHIRE
HISTORICAL
STUDIES

1967



UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA-MURAL STUDIES

F O R E W O R D

The activities of the "Records Class" at Gloucester (the evening class organised by Bristol University Extra-Mural Department and the W.E.A., working on local historical research) are sufficiently well known to require no introduction or explanation. The present series of papers was prepared and compiled in the Gloucestershire Records Office in the winter of 1966-67, and I should like to thank everyone concerned with their production - the class members and their typists, and the staff of Bristol who have produced this booklet.

Our thanks are also due, of course, to the Gloucestershire County Council and the County Records Officer, Mr. I. E. Gray, for the privilege of holding the class in the Records Office.

BRIAN S. SMITH

THE BUILDING OF OLD FRAMPTON COURT

About 1651 John Clifford built a house which stood on the site now occupied by Frampton Court. A picture of this house painted in 1696 shows a modest brick-built structure.⁽¹⁾ There is a central entrance porch extending to the height of two storeys, with one room on each side on the ground and first floors lit by large windows. The attic is lit by three window gables. The two bay windows on the ground floor, and the three oval attic windows are unusual for this period and give the house an almost Victorian appearance. Bay windows about this period usually extended to the height of two storeys.

This little account book contains entries covering a period of twenty months from November 1650 to July 1652.⁽²⁾ At first sight it appeared to be a complete record of the building of this house. Since there was very little domestic building between 1649 and 1660 it promised to be interesting.⁽³⁾

An analysis of the entries, however, showed that most of them were of payments for unspecified work, and work on the farm. Although quantities of bricks, tiles and timber were bought there is no mention of glass. Stonecutters were paid for work "about the parlour chimney" yet there is no record of stone being quarried, bought or carried. Nevertheless, one can follow the progress of the building and get an insight into the activities of the people of the neighbourhood.

Thirty-five men, mentioned by name, and two women and several children were paid for various services, ranging from carrying bricks, tiles, timber, etc., to supplying beer and provisions, and working in the moat.

In November and December, 1650, John Clifford purchased some young fruit trees and employed a man to set them. T. Mann and J. Cowles spent thirty days fencing the orchard, for which they were paid £1. 7s. 4d. A stile was made and hedging and ditching was done. John Elliotts was paid 2/- for his "advice about the building"; £20 was paid for timber; and £4, on account, for bricks. In January there was payment of 2/6 to the mason and 2/- to the carpenter "in earnest".

Lime, sand and bricks were obtained in March and April; scaffold poles were made, and the tiler was paid 1/-. At the same time seed barley and white peas were bought and sown.

In May, window-bars and three ladders were made; lime and timber obtained; and quantities of various kinds of nails purchased - large last, lesser last, large stone, lesser stone, etc. It was, apparently, cheaper to buy nails in bulk. Twelve-penny nails were bought at elevenpence, eight-penny ones at sevenpence and so on. They were purveyed by a "naylewoman" - possibly an itinerant. The stonecutter was busy during this month and the barley was rolled.

More lime, sand and bricks were bought in June and the kitchen roof was "reared". The latter was a cause for celebration, for 19/3 was spent on beer and provisions for this occasion. The following month there was a bigger celebration on the occasion of the houserearing. A trumpeter received 2/- for his services then, £3. 17s. 6d. was spent on provisions, and three barrels of malt were brewed.

In the same month, July, £12 was paid for 16,000 tiles. These were obtained from the Forest of Dean and brought by water at a cost of £2. 11s. Od. It is not clear whether all the tiles used in the building came from the Forest as there is mention of Cornish tiles. These may, however, have been a particular variety of tile. A "Barnstable oven" was bought at this time. This was a baked-clay, dome-shaped oven, which was used to line a brick oven. Until quite recently they were made at Barnstable and Truro where they had been in constant production since the Middle Ages.

Work on the house continued steadily through August and September. The stairs were made into the brewhouse and chamber, and mantles made in the parlour, hall and chamber. The cellars and buttery were cleaned. Timber, tiles, boards, lime, hair, and bricks were obtained. Seed barley and wheat were also bought.

The next three months saw much activity. A pump was made (£2. 6s. 8d. including materials), the house was coloured (Thomas and John Smith, 13 days work, £1. 3s. Od. plus 6/- for redding), and a road made about the "porchcourt". Pear, apple, plum and cherry trees were bought, the garden was dug and a hedge set. £2 was paid for ironwork and 8/- for a table for the study. During this time, the campaign against the Scots culminated in the Battle of Worcester, and ripples from this reached Frampton. On September 6th, John Clifford made a payment of 2/8 to Mary Becket for quartering two foot-soldiers for one night, and in November paid 1/6 for "conveying the Scott's prisoners to Bristoll". He also contributed 5/7½ towards the Militia and 5/7½ towards raising horses.

Throughout the ensuing five months work on the building continued concurrently with work on the farm. The cellar was paved and flags were laid. Panelling (£1), thirty-one yards of wainscot (£1. 11s. Od.) and various household appurtenances were purchased. In June, 1652, nine men and one woman were very busy working in the moat - cleaning it, presumably. It is interesting to note that in this one instance the woman received the man's rate for the job - one shilling a day. The final entries are for hair, (24 bushels, 11/-) for making plaster.

It is not possible to draw any conclusions from this little book, as many of the entries are vague, and it is not always clear whether a payment was made solely for the commodity or if the cost of carriage and/or labour was included. Of the many payments made for unspecified work, some are to Thomas Longden who made the bedstead and the study table, so it is possible

that these sums were for other pieces of furniture. Thomas and John Smith did much work on the house, but also received payments for so many days' work that was not specified. It may have been work on the house but one cannot be sure, so it is impossible to calculate precisely what the building cost. However, here is an analysis of the entries which shows the cost of some of the materials and some of the labour. The total expenditure was £298. 17s. 2d.

Bricks	£18. 18s. 0d.	plus £2. 1s. 0d. for carriage. (54,000)
Hair	£2. 18s. 9d.	(121 bushels)
Lime	£20. 10s. 4d.	including carriage. (approx 277 barrels)
Nails	£ 7. 18s. 2d.	(41,809)
Sand	£ 2. 4s. 0d.	carriage only.
Tiles	£17. 3s. 5d.	including carriage. (16,620)
Timber	£52. 3s. 10d.	
Masons)	£ 2. 18s. 2d.	
Stonecutters)		
Sawyers	£ 9. 13s. 5d.	
Carpenters	£ 1. 1s. 0d.	
Work on garden	£ 1. 10s. 8d.	
Work on moat	£ 2. 11s. 0d.	
Fittings and labour on house (Pump, oven, etc.)	£20. 9s. 8½d.	
Unspecified work	£61. 5s. 5d.	
Farm (Stock, seeds, fruit trees, etc.)	£45. 15s. 1d.	

The remainder was spent on miscellaneous items such as contributions to the poor, provisions, etc.

Rates of pay were as follows:

Beating molehills	7d. per day.
Hedging and ditching	10d. per day.
Killing moles	2d. per mole.
Felling a tree	6d.
Sowing wheat	5/6d. per acre.
Colouring the house	1/4d. per day.
Stonework on chimney	2/- per day.
Haymaking (woman)	6d. per day.

Some of the prices may be of general interest. Lead cost 1½d. a

pound (279 lbs were used for guttering) - and the solder for it cost a shilling a pound. A bedstead cost 10/-, a basket 6d. and a wain rope 7/6.

I. Wyatt

References

- Glos. R.O., D149/Z1 Watercolour of Old Frampton Court, 1696.
Glos. R.O., D149/A2 Account book of John Clifford for building
Old Frampton Court, 1650-52.
M. W. Barley, The English Farmhouse and Cottage (1961)

CHEESE MAKING AND CHEESE CHAMBERS IN GLOUCESTERSHIRE

Cheese making has been carried out in Gloucestershire from the earliest times but appears to have developed into a farmhouse industry in the mid 17th century. The main areas of production were along the level heavy lands of the Severn Vale. Here the cultivation of land was difficult as it is today, and grass production was easier and very productive. These conditions led to the development of a dairy industry based on cheese making. Two types of cheeses were made - Double Gloucester and Single Gloucester.

Double Gloucester cheese was made from the mornings' milk with part of the evenings' milk or the cream of the evenings' milk. These cheeses were made from May till September and were from 15 - 25 lbs. each. They required a period of ripening and were sold at cheese fairs in July, Michaelmas and the Spring. The Single Gloucester cheeses were made from mornings' milk or from the skimmed evenings' milk and weighed 9 - 12 lbs. They were faster ripening and were used mainly for domestic consumption on the farm.

A very good description of the process of cheese making is given in Marshall's Rural Economy of Gloucestershire, (1783). Briefly the cows were milked at 5 a.m. and 4 p.m. by a team of hand milkers. The cattle at this time were Gloucesters, and a mixture of Shorthorns and Longhorns. Usually 20 - 25 cows were kept and one expected to get $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 cwts. of cheese per cow. The milk was set in shallow pans after evening milking and skimmed the following morning and this was then added to the mornings' milk. After setting the rennett was added. Rennett was made by the dairy maid from calves' stomachs which had been cured and pickled. This was an art in itself and greatly affected the cheese made. Following rennetting the whey was taken off and heated, then returned to the vat. This process was repeated until the curd had been properly formed. Then the whey was drained off and the curd salted and packed into the cheese moulds and pressed.

The earliest cheese presses were made of wood and the weight was obtained by a box fitted into the framework. This was raised and lowered by a series of rope pulleys. The weight was made up of washed coarse river gravel which could be added or removed from the box depending on the weight required. A good example of this type of cheese press can be seen in the Gloucester Folk Museum.

The cheeses were pressed and scalded for 2 days with the weight increasing as the curd hardened. The fresh cheeses were then kept in the dairy on shelves for 7 - 10 days. During this time the cheeses were turned daily and the development of a grey-blue mould on the surface was encouraged. It was most important that the rind developed correctly, as a good firm cover was essential to keep the moisture of the cheese and allow the ripening to continue.

After 10 days the cheeses were carried up to a cheese chamber where they were stored until ready for market. The cheese chambers were prepared for the cheeses by rubbing the floors and shelves with bean tops, potato halm, or some other succulent vegetation until the boards were black in colour. The cheeses were then placed in rows and turned twice weekly. The floors were scrubbed with fresh herbs every 2 weeks. This was done to encourage the development of a blue coat on the cheeses. It must have helped to maintain humidity and prevent the cheese rinds from drying out and cracking.

The cheeses were sold in earlier times at the Cheese Fairs at Berkeley, Bristol and Gloucester. Barton Fair was a very important one; Marshall states that even in his time there were 40 large waggon loads. However by the 1790's most of the cheeses were sold through factors, one of the most important being Ralph Bigland the historian and later Garter King of Arms. His cheese rooms at Frocester Court are still in existence and water power was used to turn the cheeses. The cheeses were then sold to shopkeepers in Bristol, London and some were exported to the Continent.

Cheese production in the Severn Vale went into decline in the late 19th century and with the opening of a liquid milk factory by Cadbury Bros. at Frampton-on-Severn in 1924 the decline was accelerated, finally finishing with the 1939 - 45 war. Now there are one or two farmers' wives who make sufficient for the family needs, but none are made commercially in Gloucestershire.

The material remains of this great industry can still be found on many farms in the Vale. Careful inspection of the farmhouses will reveal dairies, whey troughs, whey vats and the heating arrangements for them, the cheese stores and cheese chambers.

Some farm dairies are still intact and retain the shelves and slate troughs. Marshall, very aptly describes a typical dairy as a room set on the north side of the farmhouse, 18 feet by 15 feet. Usually entered from the outside by a door facing north, this door is usually double the outer one, being only shut at night and the inner made of lathes on a light frame-work to increase ventilation in the dairy. A perfect example can be seen at Michael Wood Farm, Lower Wick. The floor is made of sandstone slabs 2 feet by 2 feet imported from the Forest of Dean. Often the floor is sloped to a central stone gutter which leads to the outside to a stone drainage system. The walls and roof are plastered. The ceiling is usually 7' 6" to 8' high. An inner door leads to the farm house kitchen. Some of the walls are lined with wooden shelves and usually two fairly large slate troughs are placed against an outside wall. At Field Farm, Coaley, a lead pipe from the troughs took the whey direct to a trough in some pigsties 40 feet away.

Box-type cheese presses similar to those in the Folk Museum are still in place in the dairies at Lovetts Wood, Hillesley, and at Middle Farm Saintbury, whereas a different type of press made of a huge block of dressed

oolite stone is preserved at Leigh Farm, Leigh, and this type was common in that area.

The whey was heated in large copper basins similar to the more recent hot water coppers. At Blanchworth Farm, Berkeley, there are three of these in a specially built room, and they occur on many farms, usually in a small separate building or room adjoining the dairy. There are several cheese vats on farms but on the whole they are fairly scarce. A beautiful example of one of these is a 90 gallon vat still set on its original wooden stand at the Hurns Farm, Slimbridge. This vat has been in the family for 200 years and is graduated on the inside in gallons. The stand has a simple lever which can be lifted to tilt the vat to drain off the whey. Another good example, which was recently sold for scrap, was fitted in the dairy at Fernley Farm, Ozleworth. An iron vat is now used to store cattle feed at Corner Farm, Coaley. This was made in Gloucester.

At Blanchworth Farm there is a cheese rack in the cheese loft capable of holding 90 single Gloster cheeses. Whey troughs are to be found on several farms. These are large stone troughs 3 feet high and 4 feet square. They are now much in demand for decorative garden troughs but can still be seen in situ outside the dairy at Blanchworth Farm. The whey was stored in these troughs until it was required for pig feeding.

Often the cheese chamber is the only evidence of cheese making to be found at a farmhouse. The cheese chamber or loft was either a room or often the entire attic area of the farm house used as a cheese store. The room or rooms were made with good oak floors, the walls or roof were lined with plaster and painted white. Light and ventilation were provided by windows and vents set at floor level to keep the chambers cool.

Cheese chambers, like most other building features, developed over a period of time. There is documentary evidence that during the late medieval period the storing of cheeses in garrets of houses was common practice over large areas of the country.⁽¹⁾ However the idea persisted in Gloucestershire and became part of the farmhouse design in the Severn Vale.

A typical farmhouse was generally one room thick and usually 16 to 18 feet wide. When larger houses were required they were made by adding wings to become L, E or H Shaped. However large the house became it still retained its single span roof. In the north of the Vale timber-framed building continued until the early 19th century when it was superseded by brick. In the Berkeley Vale stone was the principal material until it also was superseded by brick in some areas. In the stone buildings the walls are 18" to 24" thick, and consist of dressed stone or rubble on the outside mortared together, but the interior is of loosely packed rubble.

The upper floors are carried on joists placed across beams. The beams are placed centrally and are very plain, often roughly dressed and with little or no decoration. The exception to this is rare, an example being

Court Farm, Lower Cam. Here the dairy roof consists of finely carved beams forming square panels over the entire room. The first floor boards form the ceiling.

The cheese chamber floor is often set into the walls 3 feet below the eaves. This gives the farm houses their characteristic appearance of a fair expanse of wall above the first floor windows, instead of the windows meeting the eaves as in most houses. This was probably done to give strength and support to the chamber floor and to make the chamber large enough to stand up in without the rafters getting in the way.

The position and type of ventilators varies considerably. An early version consisted of small rectangular openings 2 to 3 feet long and 1 foot wide set just below the eaves. These can be seen at Whitehouse Farm, Stinchcombe, and Baynham Court, Lower Wick. These developed into longer vents 4 feet long and 3 feet wide as at Wortley Farm House and Frogend, Coombe, Wotton-under-Edge. Another version which is fairly common around North Nibley and Coaley is that the vents with wooden louvre boards have replaced the dormer windows. Examples of these are Betworthy Farm, Coaley, Blanchworth Farm, Berkeley and Bassett Court, North Nibley. Finally the vents were placed in the end gables usually in pairs. These can be seen at Brookend Farm and Kingshill, Berkeley and many others.

The storing of cheeses in the attic caused another problem, namely the physical process of bringing the cheeses up to the chambers. This was overcome in several ways. Sometimes a door was built on the first floor so that the cheeses could be loaded direct into the store. The commonest method was to carry the cheeses up the main staircase. This is usually in the centre of the house and much wider than one would normally expect. A door on the first floor led to the second staircase, which was not so wide and ended in the chamber. On several farms an easier way was found by means of a trap door in the dairy ceiling, which often led through a further trap door in the landing direct into the chamber. This system can be seen at Court Farm, Almondsbury, and Mill Hill Farm, Forthampton.

There are several cheese chambers with what at first sight appear to be concrete floors.² This type of floor was common in the Cotswolds and was made by laying clay, straw and hazel twigs between the closely fitting timber joists and finishing this off with cement. Examples are Northway Farm, Ashchurch, and Norton Grounds Farm, near Broadway.

This system of storing cheeses was not always as efficient as one would expect from the numbers of chambers to be found. Thomas Rudge, writing in 1807,³ felt that the chambers were often responsible for poor cracked cheeses of inferior flavour, and suggests that many of the cheese rooms were poorly contrived when situated near the roof of a house. Here the cheeses were exposed to the hot rays of the sun. If this could not be helped then the windows should be as low as possible to the floor to allow cool air to pass over the cheeses.

The dating of cheese making in Gloucestershire is extremely difficult as a description of the dairy husbandry of the County does not appear to

have been written until 1783 by Marshall. However there is an Elizabethan description of cheese making in Somerset⁴ so one can surmise that it was being made in Gloucestershire at this time. An inventory of the goods of George Martin,⁵ Baynham Court dated 16th June, 1688 includes "Item in the upper loft two hundred cheeses. Item a cheese press." Apperley Hall, Deerhurst, is dated as a 16th century building.⁶ Its cheese room on the first floor is contemporary with the rest of the building. The chamber spans the building with a ventilator at floor level on one side and a window at the same level on the other, thus showing that it was never intended as a living room, and must always have been a cheese store. Another early farmhouse, Allcocks, with cheese rooms was described by Thomas Fulljames, in his survey of the Forthampton Estates in 1802.⁷ He states that the house was 'indifferent' with three rooms on a floor, a small dairy and underground cellars, four bedchambers over and a cheese room above. It has been dated as 16-17th century.⁸ New Hall Farm, Wickwar has a date 1691 over an outside door of the house. This has cheese chambers and the whole building appears to be of one date.

The majority of brick built farmhouses in the Berkeley Vale are of similar design and architecture. Some of these have dates. Actrees Farm, Berkeley Heath, has a later brick wing with cheese chambers dated 1791. Dayhouse Farm, Hill, is dated 1806 and Blisbury Farm, Bevington, 1772. A later brick built house with cheese chamber but of different architecture is Kitesnest, Berkeley Heath of 1830. Blanchworth Farm was originally a stone house with cheese loft; however in 1798 the dairy was added in brick with a large cheese room over. This was reached by an outside stone staircase, and a trap door high on the wall connected it with the existing loft. Many older farmhouses had dairies and cheese lofts added in brick and the type of bricks used make them contemporary with the late 18th century farmhouses. Examples are Oakhunger Farm, Berkeley, Worlds End Farm, Bevington, Rectory Farm, Slimbridge, and many others.

Many cheese lofts and dairies have notices displayed on the loft doors, over outside windows and over dairy doors. This was to claim exemption from the Window Tax which was first levied in 1696 and abolished in 1851. Kingshill Farm has 'Cheefe loft' painted on the loft door as at Apperley Hall, and displayed over the ventilator is a sign 'Cheese room'. At Lovettswood over the dairy door a small plaque 'Dairy' appears, and over a bedroom door at Comer House Farm, 'Cheese Room'.

The distribution of cheese chambers and cheese making is generally confined to the lowlands around the Severn, although there are farmhouses on the Cotswolds with cheese chambers such as Symonds Hall Farm, Wotton-under-Edge. The majority of cheese chambers stretch in a belt from the Bristol Avon up to the Berkeley and Gloucester Vales and on into the Vale of Evesham. Fulljames⁹ account of the Forthampton Estate mentions 9 farmhouses with cheese chambers. He also records 4 in the Hailes area and 3 on the Toddington Estate.

There are probably 350 farmhouses with cheese chambers in Gloucestershire, possibly 50 in North Wiltshire and very many first floor cheese rooms in Somerset. In Somerset it was usual for a first floor room to be used as a cheese store but not the attic or loft. There are examples in the Newent area and these may extend into South Herefordshire and Worcestershire.

V. C. Nielsen

References

1. F. W. Steer, Farm and Cottage Inventories of Mid Essex 1635-1749 (1950)
2. W. G. Davie and E. G. Dawber, Old Cottages and Farm Houses and other stone buildings in the Cotswold District (1905)
3. T. Rudge, Agriculture of Gloucestershire (1807)
4. K. D. Moddever, Farmhouse Cheese Making in Somerset (1966)
5. Gloucestershire Records Office, D149/F237
6. Ministry Lists of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest, (1946-1956)
7. Gloucestershire Records Office, D134/F11
8. Ministry List, op cit
9. Gloucestershire Records Office, D2153/Aul6

SOME CATHOLIC FAMILIES OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE IN THE 18th CENTURY

The position of Catholics in the County of Gloucestershire in the 18th century differs negligibly from that of other counties at the same period. The enforcing of the standing Acts of Parliament varied with the times or opinion of the local magistrates. There had been many Acts of Parliament incapacitating Catholics from taking any official position in the land owing to the Oath of Supremacy, the Acts of 1559, 1563, 1581, and 1606 were still in use, 12 pence for every non-attendance at the Anglican Service besides £20 per month, with £10 per month for each of their servants not attending church. They were not allowed to vote or to become M.P.s, and after 1675 were not allowed to take their seats in the House of Lords, they were not able to become schoolmasters or teachers of any kind, to practice at the Bar, become physicians, to keep arms, or own a horse worth more than £5. Priests were still made subject to life imprisonment and a reward of £100 was offered to any informer who had secured the conviction of a priest for saying Mass, this last penalty being abolished with the First Catholic Relief Act of 1778

Thus it came about that the only places of Catholic life centered around the houses of county gentry who still held to their faith and who had sufficient means to do so, this subjected all Catholics to a long strain of inactivity. One naturally finds a lot of intermarriage in these families and finds too families emigrating and dying out completely, owing to lack of money to keep up with the perpetual fines. In the Catholic Relief Act of 1791 Catholic chapels became legal on registration, but it was the Catholic Emancipation of 1829 which removed nearly all the obstacles and Catholics could once more play their part in the life of their country.

At intervals these people had been compelled to register their names and estates both to let the authorities know their wealth and to know where they were. The Compton Census of 1676 gives no names but gives the numbers at 128, presumably all adults. The Register of Dissenters (Papists) 1735, again numbers but no names, 255.

But the main source of our present research has been 'The Register Book of Papists in the County of Gloucestershire pursuant to the Statute of the 1st King George 1716 obliging papists to register their names and real estate and kept by the Clerk of the Peace' which is now in the County Record Office, and the list of "Papists and Reputed Papists", written in the back of the Quarter Session Book Vol. IV, also in the County Record Office. The former book gives the number as 51, all owners of property in Gloucestershire but not all resident, as more often they had estates of varying sizes in several counties acquired by intermarriage. The latter list gives 251 persons, mostly in the Forest of Dean area.

Two names in the list with property nearest to Gloucester were Mary Smith, widow of Samuel Smith, from whom she inherited property in Berkeley,

and Jane Hynson, widow of William Hynson, late of Badgeworth, both of Coopers Hill, Brockworth. Jane had property of a house called the Day House which I have discovered as being Coopers Hill House. Jane and Mary were probably related and possibly lived together but I have not found out if this was so.

The next family nearest to Gloucester is that of Sir Walter Compton whose family came into possession of the Manor of Hartpury during the reign of King Henry VIII. Sir Walter of the Register having no male heirs the estate came at a later date to the Gordon-Cannings - the Cannings of Foxcote, Warwickshire, whose ancestor Francis Canning registered estate and lands in Ebrington and Illmington, Gloucestershire. The family of Gordon-Cannings were great benefactors to the Catholic Church of St. Peters in Gloucester in the early 19th century. Their names are on the alter rails of the Lady Chapel and the needlework kneeler there is one that was worked by Mrs. Gordon-Canning, the mother of Mrs. Gwyn-Halford, at whose death the estate was sold and it became the County Farm Institute, so severing the long link between it and St. Peters Church.

Within a few miles of Hartpury is Deerhurst, where Mary Cassey of St. Martin in the Fields, London, registered the Manor of Whitfield, more or less the last of the estate held by the Casseys since John Cassey, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer died seized of the Manor of Deerhurst in the first year of the reign of Henry IV and whose well known brasses are in Deerhurst Church together with their dog Terri at their feet.

The Jerninghams of Cossey Norfolk, held the Manor of Fainswick, which had come down to them through Sir William Kingston, Constable of the Tower, to whom it was granted by King Henry VIII after the death of Thomas Cromwell who had obtained it from Viscount Lisle. At the time of the Registration it was in the hands of Sir Francis Jerningham of Cossey, his son John, registered as of Fainswick and doubtless lived at what is now known as the Lodge, the old house near Sheepscombe.

The family of Faston had settled in Horton, when the ancestral mansion of their estate at Appleton, Norfolk, which they had held from the 15th century, was destroyed by fire in 1708. They were related to many great families of the day, the Tichbournes, Lord Clifford, Lord Baltimore, and Lord Somerset of Fauntley Court, Gloucestershire, whose widow married John Faston who registered the estate of Horton. This centre of Catholic life laid the foundations for the Mission at Chipping Sodbury.

The last Abbot of Tewkesbury Abbey was, in 1541, made the first Bishop of Gloucester, and it was this same family that Joseph Wakeman of St. Giles in the Fields and Henry Wakeman his brother registered their estates of Ashton under Hill and Beckford. The former held life estate at Beckford, but dying in 1720 the estate came to another brother Benedict Wakeman. Their mother had been the daughter of Benedict Hall of High Meadow whose estates were registered at Newland and Rurdean. Anne Hind of Beckford was a sister of these Wakemans. William the last of the Wakemans of Beckford died in January 1836 aged 96 years. After his death the

remnants of the Catholic congregation with a few Catholics from Tewkesbury became the start of the Mission Church of St. Benedict at Kemerton.

There were two John Vaughans who registered their estates, one of Hunsome, owning the Manor of Ruardean which had belonged to the Abbey of Flaxley and had come to the Vaughans through the Baynhams.

John Vaughan of Courtfield Monmouth, had for his estate in Gloucestershire the Manor of Abenhall and property in Ruardean, English Bicknor and Lydbrook which is on the opposite bank of the Wye from Courtfield, the ancestral home of the Vaughans. Cardinal Herbert Vaughan who was born in Gloucester while his parents were on a visit to the city, lived at Courtfield with his brothers and sisters. John Vaughan of Ruardean's mother, Dame Joan Vaughan, was the daughter of Thomas Baynham of Clearwell and Mary, daughter of Sir William Winter of Lydney. She was imprisoned in Gloucester Castle for harbouring a priest, John Broughton, who was her chaplain and steward. When her friends petitioned the King, Charles I sent "to stay Execution upon the said Joan Vaughan until our further pleasure be declared". One supposes that she was fined, as in a statement of accounts of rents received on 14 November 1641 is a memorandum, "The Charge of her Gloucestershire troubles, was payed out of her Jewells and Plate, Pawned by herself for it".

Robert Brent of Lark Stoke and his five daughters, Margaret, Mary, Frances Brent, Elizabeth Conquest and Anne Lytcott registered an estate at Illmington, Gloucestershire, inherited possibly through the Canning family to whom they were related. He had been a Magistrate in the reign of King James II but in 1689 a reward of £200 was offered for his apprehension, while his wife Catherine was actually imprisoned. She died in 1706 and was buried at St. Pancras, London. A daughter Catherine married into the Bartlett family of Hill End, Worcestershire, who had property in Gloucestershire, and this family of Bartlett also married into the Vaughan family.

At Lydney an estate was registered by Thomas Nevill, who married the widow of Sir Charles Winter, Dame Frances Winter, the last of that interesting family of Lydney, one of the most fascinating families of the county. Another important Catholic family was the Webbs of Hatherop, of whom more details are given below.

Our interest in the Webb family stemmed from the fact that they were responsible for founding the first Catholic Mission in Gloucester after the Reformation. Miss Mary Webb, daughter of Sir John Webb, 5th Bart. and his wife Mary (Salvin) died at Clifton, Bristol, on September 30th, 1787, leaving £1000 for this purpose.

The Webb papers held at the Gloucestershire Record Office deal principally with their estate at Hatherop, though their largest estate was at Great Canford in Dorset. They also owned estates at Branston, Northampton, Cdstock, Wilts, in Lincolnshire, Sussex and Yorkshire and many

other places including five houses in London.

A very rough pedigree included in the Webb papers shows them to be descended from a William Webb of Salisbury in the reign of Henry VIII. He was married to Catherine daughter of John Barrow Esq. By marriage, his son, John, seems to have obtained the Manor of Odstock, Wilts. and his other son, William Paines Place, Motcombe, Dorset. Both John and William's sons, also John and William, according to the pedigree became Knights.

In the early part of James I's reign Sir John Webb purchased Great Canford, Dorset for £14,000. He married first a daughter of Falconer of Oxfordshire by whom he had no issue. His second wife was Catherine, daughter of Sir John Tresham, Knight, of Rushton, Northants by whom he had three sons, Sir John Webb created a baronet, in 1644 for services to the Royal Cause in the Civil War, Major General Webb died of wounds received at the battle of Newbury 1643, and Thomas, died without issue.

Sir John Webb, Bart, married Mary daughter of Sir John Caryll of Hastings; she died in 1661 and Sir John in 1680. Their son, Sir John Webb, 2nd Bart, of Odstock obtained the Manor of Hathrop upon his marriage to Mary, sister and sole heiress of John and William Blomer of Hathrop.

The Manor of Hathrop had been purchased by John Blomer, yeoman of Hathrop in 1552. He belonged to an ancient Westmoreland family settled about this time at Cowley in the County. William Blomer purchased the Manor of Eastleach Turville in 1595 and was Lord of the Manor of Hathrop in 1608. His grandchildren, John and William died unmarried in 1685 and 1686 aged 56 and 53 years respectively, leaving Mary in sole possession. She first married Richard Draycott of Fainsley, Staffs. Her son and daughter of this marriage died without issue, so that Sir John Webb her son by her second marriage succeeded to this Manor and estate. Lady Mary Webb died on March 29th, 1709, aged 74. In the Compton Census of 1676 nine Catholics are listed at Hathrop.

The 3rd baronet married Barbara, one of the daughters and co-heiresses of John, Lord Bellasyse of Worlaby, second son of Lord Viscount Fauconberg, named in the Titus Oates revelations and committed to the Tower in 1672 but afterwards released. Barbara was one of four daughters by his third wife Lady Anne Powlett, daughter of the Marquess of Winchester.

Sir John's estates at Hatherop are given in great detail in the Register of Papists Estates. He was entitled to graze 600 sheep on Hatherop Common free of tythe and 660 tythable on Common and Common fields, which must have been a great boon when wool was such a valuable commodity. This Sir John Webb and his lady must be the ones included in the list of Papists and reputed Papists at the end of the Quarter Sessions Order Book for 1714-1724. In the Register of Dissenters of 1735 there are fifty Catholics at Hatherop and "Mass at Mr. Webbs".

The principal claim to fame of the third baronet will undoubtedly be as father-in-law to the ill-fated James Radcliffe, Earl of Derwentwater, who lost his head on Tower Hill, after the 1715 Jacobite Rebellion. The Earl married Sir John Webb's daughter, Anne Maria on July 10th, 1712, and they resided at Hatherop for two years after their marriage. His son John Webb,

married Mabella youngest daughter of Sir Henry Joseph Tichbourne, Bart. Their marriage settlement of 1723 is included in the Webb papers. There is also a marriage settlement of John Webb and the Hon. Mrs. Elizabeth Roper, March 24th, 1729. She was the daughter of Henry Lord Teynham, dec. and granddaughter of Philip, late Viscount Strangford. John Webb pre-deceased his father without issue, and his brother Sir Thomas became 4th baronet after his father died in France in 1745. In his will, which was proved in 1763, he asks to be buried privately at a cost of not more than £20, and settles his estates on his eldest son who became the fifth baronet and the father of "our" Miss Mary Webb. He married Miss Mary Salvin eldest daughter of Thomas Salvin of Easingwold, Yorkshire, (one of the heiresses of the ancient Barony of Mauley). Sir John's will leaves most of his property to his granddaughter, Lady Barbara Ashley. His only daughter to marry and have issue was Barbara Webb who married Anthony, 5th Earl of Shaftesbury on July 17th, 1786. Their only daughter married the Hon. William Francis Spencer Ponsonby, 3rd son of the 3rd Earl of Bessborough created Baron de Mauley 1838, his wife's right through her Mother. Her ladyship died June 5th, 1844. A deed to raise money for the erection of a Manor House under the marriage settlement of Baron de Mauley and Lady Barbara Ashley Cooper is included in the papers.

It may be of interest that Mass is still said each month in St. Peter's Church, Gloucester for Mary Webb and throughout the year for other members of the Webb family.

H. Crisp

V. Ferry

References

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Glos. R.C., Q/SO 4 | Quarter Sessions order book, 1714-24. |
| Glos. R.O., Q/RNc 1 | Register of Papists' estates, 1717-19. |
| Glos. R.O., D540 | Webb family archives, particularly pedigree, wills and marriage settlements (D540/F2-5) |

THE ACCOUNTS OF THE OVERSEERS OF THE POOR, COLN ST. DENNIS
1776 - 1812

This survey of the overseers' accounts of Coln St. Dennis from 1776-1812 formed part of a general study of the village, and it was not anticipated that anything exceptional would be found. In fact the accounts follow the general pattern of poor law relief in country areas. However it may be that a detailed study of one Gloucestershire parish is of interest, especially if compared with the larger examination of vagrancy in the county, and the work on the poor in Mitcheldean undertaken by members of earlier classes.

Coln St. Dennis is an agricultural parish in the North Cotswolds, seven miles from Cirencester, and three from Northleach. According to Atkyns, the population at the beginning of the eighteenth century was 60, with 16 houses. Rudder gives the number of inhabitants in 1779 as 112, with 28 houses, and the Census of 1831 numbers 176 inhabitants, 37 houses, and 39 families. Of these, 20 families were employed in agriculture; 5 occupied land and employed one or more labourers, but none occupied land which they worked themselves with the help of the family, and there were 22 labourers. Eleven men were occupied in trade or handicraft, 2 (including the clergy) were professional, 2 were non-agricultural labourers, 21 were male servants, and 3 "others". This may be compared with the Enclosure Award of 1798, where there are 4 large landowners (including the rector), 8 occupiers of small-holdings ranging from 10 - 80 acres, while 12 other persons (including 3 widows) are listed as owners or occupiers of houses and cottages with adjoining gardens and closes.

When we turn to the overseers' papers, it will be seen that a high proportion of this small population received poor relief in some form or another, and that a considerable number had permanent relief; also that the number of paupers and the money spent rose sharply as the period went on. There was no poor-house or school in the village, and all relief was "out-door". In 1776 the total expenditure was £28. This rose gradually to £70 in 1788, £134 in 1795, £209 in 1799, and in 1801 it reached the staggering total of £392. For the next few years it gradually declined, and in 1809 it was £165, 1811 was £162, and 1812 was £170. This rise in expenditure was common throughout the country, and resulted in part from the notorious Speenhamland system of 1795 which regulated relief to the price of bread.

The first charge noted in the annual accounts is for the weekly pensions, which increased in number and amount during the period. In 1776 there were 3 pensioners getting 6d. or 1/- a week. These had risen to 10 persons in 1785, 15 in 1795, 18 in 1797, and 20 in 1812. By this time the majority of the pensions had been stepped up from 1/- to 3/- a week, and in some cases 4/- or 5/-. The rate also varied, a number of weeks being greater than others - presumably with the season.

Another regular item was for house rents: thus William Agg was regularly paid the rents of Shepherd Morris, and Sarah Agg (a poor relation?) of £2 and £2. 9. 0. a year. Five persons had rent paid for them at the beginning of the period, 11 by 1794, and some, like George Arnold (a cripple who had payment for a "brass for his arm") had part rent in certain years. There were also bills for repairs to houses, such as "Mr. Coal for thatching Finchin's and Mills houses 6/-" in 1793.

Those who fell ill had a great deal of help from the parish. A number of different Doctors were called (we have the names of seven!) and some of their bills have survived in the miscellaneous papers. For example:-

"Dr. Child.

Journey	2/6
12 Fever bolus's	3/-
a fever mixture	2/6
journey	2/6
mixture repeated	2/6
mixture repeated	2/6
mixture repeated	2/6
the bolus's repeated	3/-
a bark mixture	2/6
the mixture	2/6
Total	£1. 9. 0."

There were also payments of 5/- to a Mrs. Sly "for medicine" and the parish paid regularly for attendance, soap, food and wine. Perhaps the most interesting is for 1788, headed:-

Account of expenses of Wm. Eiles wife and child in the small pox

Feb 4th, To bread	8. 6.
To 11½lb of cheese at 5d. per lb.	4. 9½.
To 2lb bacon	1. 4.
To 24lb. mutton at 4½d. a lb.	9. 0.
¾ peck of flour	1. 3¾.
¼ peck of flour	6.
1 lb. shuger	10.
2½ lbs. "	1. 8.
tea	1. 8.
wine	1. 3.
brandy	1. 6.
oil and thread	5½.
oate meal	11¾.
salt	1¾.
currens	3½.
salts and manna	4½.
mixt bear	4. 0.
6 gallons ale	8. 0.
wood	2. 0.
candle	8.

milk	6.
nutmeg	6.
Paid the nurse for nursing Wm. Eiles wife and child	£1. 15. 0.
lime and whitewashing the house	2.
Drs. bill for same	17.

Cash payments were made to victims of accidents or indisposition, and in old age or infirmity. So Joseph Butlin was paid 1/6 a week for 11 weeks in 1795 "for waiting on his mother", and in the next year he had 52 weeks at 2/- for the same purpose. We wonder whether he was the same Joseph Butlin who appears as overseer in other years.

Apart from illnesses, the parish also helped to pay for births among the poor. Thus "Mary William for waiting on Eiles wife when she lay in - 5/-" is an example for 1796. Some of these births were of course of illegitimate children, and from some of the bastardy papers we find the father ordered to pay a share. In 1810 R. Hobbs had to pay £2. 1. 6. towards the lying-in, and 1/9 a week. This presumably accounts for the receipt of £3. 15. from Hobbs entered in 1812, and the same year gives a similar payment from Wm. Bloss. As these bastardy orders were made in 1804, and this is the first mention of payment, it looks as if the overseers for that year were doing some checking up.

Payments for the marriages of paupers were probably made not out of charity, but in an effort to put the responsibility on someone else's shoulders. After payments from 1776 for Mary Nash "when she was ill", we read in 1779:

"Francis Richards for Marrying Mary Nash £4. 4. 0."

In 1786 the parish got rid of Mary Finchin (the Finchin family figure regularly through all the accounts) by marrying her to Richard Sutton, who had no settlement in Coln St. Dennis:-

"Taking Mary Finchin to Cirencester, her examination and oath.	2/6
A warrant to take Richard Sutton & expenses, taking him to Cirencester	
swearing him to his parish, his oath and expenses	8/4
The marriage of Richard Sutton & Marry Finchin	£2/2/6
Taking him to Bibury, his oath, order and expenses	7/-
Taking them to Brize Norton	8/-
The boarding of Richard Sutton and Joseph Butlin 1 week at	
Mr. Elcombe's	£2/16/-
Joseph Butlin being 8 days with Richard Sutton	16/-"

Funerals were a more frequent charge on the parish than marriages or births. Thus the Robins family buried several children on the parish, and in 1793 there are the accounts for the burials of Joseph Robins and his wife. He was a blacksmith. The cost was usually about the same:-

Coffin	10/-
shroud	5/6
laying out and affidavit	2/6
carrying to church	4/-
bread cheese and beer	4/2

There is only one instance where an inventory was taken after a pauper had died. This is in 1788 when William Hall's home contained:-

"One chest	One round tea table
Two boxes	One bed
One iron bed	Three tubs
Five whole bottom chairs	One round table
One square table	Three putur (pewter) dishes
Nine putur plates	One warming pan
One coppard (cupboard)	One shelf and dresser
One iron pott	a paire of hand irons
a paire of tonges	a fire shovel
a bellows	one box
one tea cuttle (kettle)	three candlesticks
one iron grate"	

Clothes for the poor form the most numerous and perhaps the most interesting items in the books; shirts, breeches, coats for the men and boys, gowns, handkerchiefs, aprons and hats for the women, shoes and bedding for both. A certain Betty Lovesey appears every year, and by the end of the period we feel we know her well. She seems to have done quite well out of the parish, for apart from her weekly pension, she had one or more pairs of shoes each year (as well as shoe repairs), gowns, shifts, stocking, petticoats, bedcase, sheets, blankets, and stays are perennial items. Her new shoes were usually about 5/-, and her mending was also paid by the parish - 1790 "pd. new topping Betty Lovesey's gownd 3/9. Mending Betty Lovesey's stays 4/6." She received relief for 46 years, but she was obviously active (witness the shoes!) for she was also given cards for spinning.

Clothes were also supplied to boys on being apprenticed, or girls going into service. In 1788 "A pair of shoes for Farmer Tomb's servant girl allowed by the parish at Easter. 4/2" seems an example of the parish paying for things which should properly have come out of decent wages - out of a disastrous policy which the Speenhanland system opened up throughout the country. On the other hand two boys were apprenticed to proper trades (one to a blacksmith, and one to a hatter) and we hope that these were genuine arrangements for training, and not, as often happened, a device for ridding the parish of the upkeep of children, and at the same time providing cheap labour.

"Firing for the poor" averaged £2 a year. This was usually for wood, but in 1807 coal is mentioned and appears several years later.

Payment towards shelter, food, clothes and fires may have been good enough for temporary misfortune, but must have been demoralising over a long term. In 1795 the overseers adopted a new, and more constructive expedient in spinning work. There had been a payment of 7/6 in 1783 to the "spinning master", but it was not until 12 years later - perhaps because of additional distress through the French war - that spinning work appears as a major item. In 1795 they bought "ropes to the scales to weigh the wool" and "paid John Spencer as spinning house to weigh the wool 7/-" They also paid for

"lodging the wool at Northleach 4/6" The next year Mr. Collier was paid £7. 0. 7½d. for spinning work - the first of a series of increasing payments to Messrs. Coxeter & Collier of Witney - some of the actual bills have been preserved among the miscellaneous papers. In 1798 the wool cost £25. 1. 3., £36 the following year, and £42 in 1800; thereafter the amounts drop sharply. It was only £3 in 1808, and does not re-appear in the books under review. John Spencer's bills (sometimes Sarah Spencer) of about 9/- annually have also survived, and show that the wool was weighed every three weeks. At the same time various women were given money for cards.

Nothing is given in the accounts to show what became of the work when finished. The 1807 "Return relative to the Maintenance of the Poor" gives the same amount as the Overseer's book for the purchase of material, and it also returns nothing under the heading "money earned by the labour of the poor", so presumably the workers must have disposed of it themselves.

From Elizabethan and Stuart times the problem of poverty had been treated parochially. Each parish was responsible for its own poor, and a great deal of time and energy was expended by parish officers to see that relief was given only to those who had legal settlement. Those who could not prove this were moved to their last place of settlement, and the poor wretches were shunted back and forth across the country, often separated from the other members of their family by the chance working of the settlement laws.

Behind the bare records of removals and settlements, we can sometimes trace a tragic human story. The record of expenses for the removal of Dinna Selby from Bibury back to Coln St. Dennis can be supplemented by the bastardy papers, which show she was pregnant at the time - no doubt the reason why she had left the village. There are many settlement and removal expenses given, and these are sometimes enlivened by the original bills.

"1797.	Chaise to Gloucester & Back	£1. 6. 0.
	2 Turnpicks	2. 0.
	Paid postboy	3. 0.
	Horse & Groom Glos.	
	2 Breakfasts	1. 8.
	3 dinners	6. 0.
	liquor	3. 6. "

These bills are connected with the extraordinary case of Robert and Hannah Swinford, whose settlement involved the parish of Coln St. Dennis in a protracted dispute with the parish of Shipton Sollers. The story can be traced from a bill for £12. 0. 8. from Messrs. Fitt & Daubeney, solicitors, of Cirencester in 1796.

"To attending and advising with respect to a notice of appeal being given by the parish officers of Shipton Sollers touching the removal of Swinford and touching instructions to defend the appeal 6/8.

Mr. Lewis at Northleach attending Mr. Poole and the Pauper at least two hours taking his evidence and reducing the same to writing 6/8

Writing to Mr. Poole desiring he would send the Pauper to Gloucester to attend the sessions 3/4

Journey to Gloucester to attend hearing of the appeal when order was quashed. Appeal heard Wednesday.

Chaise hire etc.	£2. 2. 0.
Paid Robert Swinford 4 days	8/-
Pd. Wm. Swinford 3 days	6/-
Their expenses	7/-
Paid to take them home	2/6
Attending and examining Samuel Forter as to Swinford's Settlement	6/8
His journey and expenses	6/-
Examining the two Swinfords	6/8
Paid their expenses and loss of time	13/-
Faid old Swinford	£1. 1. 0.

Attending Mr. Poole with respect to putting the Paupers in a house in another parish so that they might be again moved to Shipton Sollers when he promised to prevail on Mr. Millington to put them in a house at Coln Rogers."

We wonder whether Coln St. Dennis got away with this apparent piece of sharp practice; perhaps it was only just that an entry in the books shows a payment of £2. 10. 0. towards the expenses of the overseers of Shipton Sollers in this case. There may have been a special reason why Coln St. Dennis went to such lengths to rid themselves of the Swinfords. In other cases they appear to have accepted responsibility for poor persons living in other parishes. Thus for several years Widow Curtis was sent money in London.

The condition of the poor as here shown was no doubt similar throughout the county, and the country as a whole, but we must remember that in small parishes in rural areas, where the poor were still part of the village community and were relieved in their own homes, their lot must have been much more tolerable than in larger areas where they were sent to the dreaded work-houses, soon to be multiplied and perpetuated under the 1834 Poor Law.

K. M. Munn

References

Glos. R.O., P97 Coln St. Dennis parish records, especially vestry minutes and overseers' accounts (P97/VE 2/2,3,5,7), settlement papers (P97/OV 3/1-5, OV4, OV5), and census return (P97/OV 7/1).

A SEVERNSIDE MERCHANT

Lying for many years in an old box in a workshop in Old Town, Wotton-under-Edge was a little leather covered book - "The DAILY JOURNAL or the Gentleman's, Merchant's and Tradesman's complete ANNUAL ACCOMPT BOOK For the Pocket or Desk For the Year of our Lord 1783." An attempt had been made to destroy it and the entries to June 2nd. are missing as are those from October 12th to the end of the year. I acquired it from my father and it has been in my possession ever since.

The writing is small but not difficult to read and it soon becomes evident that the diarist lived very near the banks of the Severn and not far from the parish church at Newnham-on-Severn. The family was of some importance locally as the entry for June 26th records the confirmation of "my sister Anne" among many others on the occasion of a visitation by the Bishop of Gloster who with the Member of Parliament for the district and many other guests "came to our house and walked about the Garden".

Each day's entry faithfully records the day's weather; the names of the numerous visitors calling for business or making social calls who all "Drank Tea at our house"; and social calls on friends; the receipt of letters with the names of their writers and the dispatch of replies and other correspondence; details of the family business transactions; and on Sunday the text for the morning sermon and a very short comment on it.

The diarist did not write his name, or if he did the page has been lost, but with the help of Mr. Irvine Gray of the County Records Office and Canon Mansfield, Vicar of Newnham-on-Severn, I have identified the diarist as Richard, second son of John and Elizabeth Mintle, baptized January 7th, 1767. Among their children were John, Anne, James, Thomas and Mary, all of whose names are mentioned as those of brothers and sisters by the diarist.

The family business was that of shipping agents. They had contacts in many places - Bewdley, Bristol, Gloucester, Helston, Limerick, Liverpool, London, Worcester, Upton-on-Severn, Dunkirk to mention a few. For instance, on June 2nd, 1783, the diarist's brother John was at Dunkirk and in a letter dated June 3rd he states that he has purchased a brigg on Mr. J. Boughton's and his own joint account with the intention of taking in a cargo of wheat for Bristol and that he intended coming home in the vessel himself towards the end of the month. He eventually arrived in Kingsroad on July 3rd after a passage of 11 days.

During this period Richard had been occupied at home - going to Gloucester one morning to fetch a forgotten licence in order that the sloop might land a cargo at Beachley, putting 9 or 10 casks of liquor in to a cellar at Ruddle, writing to and answering letters from a Mr. Harrison of London and Mr. T. Gazely also of London among many others. He had to obtain a Brandy licence for Mr. Clark (of the Ship, one of the inns at Newnham).

Another day was spent discharging junk (old or inferior cable or rope) out of the sloop which was purchased by Mr. Kinch of Nailsworth who being in Newnham that day settled for it. The next day was partly occupied by putting into Mr. Shaw's warehouse five casks of Tobacco. This day's entry records that "my father, brother Thomas & self were at the feast with several others" - was this to celebrate the launching of a brigg by Messrs. Swayne & Co.? The next day the sloop was loaded with 22½ tons of Thomas Hales' coal and on the evening tide she went to Amstells. Richard's father had been at Gloucester all that day returning about 10 p.m. Next day she (the sloop) went on the morning's tide to the Tumps, then away to Gatcombe with a letter for Capt. Flaisted who was expected there.

Part of Friday June 27th was occupied in "tying up sticks in number 200 dozen to be sent to London" and these with ¼ pipes of brandy were on board Mr. Adams's ship when he set off on the morning of July 1st for Bristol. The next morning, immediately after breakfast, Mr. J. Boughton and Richard set off for Bristol, first riding to Brimspill where with other passengers they went on board Mr. Adam's sloop. Leaving between 9 & 10 they arrived at Hot Wells between 6 & 7 in the evening and immediately went to call on the ladies but were unable to find them. They had travelled there the previous day, first "crossing the water" and continuing their journey by road.

This visit to Bristol which lasted from Wednesday until Saturday combined business with pleasure. The brandy was delivered; the sticks were put on board Captain Priest's ship for London and consigned to Messrs. Davidson; a letter was written to Mr. Kinch of Nailsworth returning his bill which could not be accepted (the one in payment for the junk?); Captain Proctor and Captain Clarkson had to be contacted together with Messrs. Castle & Co., who paid a bill value £140/15/-, and Mr. Cabe who paid one value £140/-/-. After a visit to his brother's brigg the next morning Richard set off about 8 o'clock by coach, dining at Newport (Glos) and arriving home about 6 o'clock.

During the next week or so Mr. Thos. Wintle (uncle) and John (brother) paid two more visits to Bristol the second time being accompanied by John's father. Richard meanwhile paid a visit to Mr. Joe Swayne who "paid me for the things I bought for him at Bristol". Wednesday July 9th was a very hot day particularly in the evening, and "This day we began mowing".

On July 14th "We finished our hay mow this evening". By now Richard seemed to have made other plans for the sale of "a quantity of tobacco". A letter was sent to Owner Noah Pearce, Worcester where he intended sending it next day for sale and his brother John wrote to Mr. Smart Gloster to get a certificate to accompany it. Early on the morning of July 15th the 6 casks of Tobacco were put on board a trow for Gloster. Later Mr. Joe Swaine's brigg attempted to go to Amstells but there was not sufficient water to take her over the sands. However in the evening this was accomplished. A journey was made next day to Gloster to meet the tobacco only to find that it had already been forwarded by wherry to Worcester. "I paid freight for the Tobacco to Gloster & my expenses 13/6".

Richard's own words can best describe his next business trip the object of which was to sell the Tobacco.

July 22nd. Tuesday

Wind about S W blow fresh much hard rain. I called at Mr. Matthew's. About four o'clock this afternoon I set off for Gloster (on my way up into Worcestershire) where I arrived a little before seven o'clock. Rather wet it having rained most of the way. I called at Evans & Hazel and was at Mr. Smart's. Then returned to the Lower George where I stopped all night.

July 23rd.

Wind to the Westward, blowing at times a little fresh. Weather very fine. I left Gloster this morning about 8 o'clock and proceeded for Worcester in the Shrewsbury Wherry we stopped at Ashlard also at the mouth of the Avon near Tewkesbury & at Upton at wch. place we dined. I called at Mr. Wm. Skey's to whom I sold two puncheons of Brandy. We did not leave Upton till near 4 o'clock and arrived at Worcester about eight after rather a tedious sail tho' we passed many places wch. gave me some pleasure. Immediately on my arrival I went to Mr. Pearce's where I stopped all night.

July 24th.

Wind in the same quarter as the preceeding day. Light breese, weather very fine. Not being able to do any business in Worcester I was under the necessity of taking horse after dinner and proceeded to Bewdley where I arrived about 8 in the evening and stopped with my horse at the Black Boy Inn. In going from Worcester thither I passed over two Canals the first about 3 miles from Worcester wch. is navigable to Droitwich, the other about 10 miles from so called Stour wch. as the other emptieth itself into the Severn the last mentioned navigation has a communication with the Duke of Bridgewater's that runs thro' the county of Lancaster etc. How exceedingly convenient for trade.

July 25th.

Wind and weather nearly as the proceeding day. How seasonable. Blessed be God. After breakfast I waited upon Mr. Sam'l Skey to whom I sold a Cask of Gin. He also provided a person who bought of me the Tobacco I had for sale at Worcester: as soon as I had agreed for price I left Bewdley and returned to Worcester after drinking tea with Mrs. Pearce I went to Miss Morgan's Post Office where I had the pleasure of seeing Mrs. Widow Jones with whom I made some little stop, I afterwards called upon Miss Linton my sister Ann's old governess. I then returned to Mrs. Pearce's where I slept.

He received £159. 10. 6. for the tobacco and slowly made his way back home, calling on friends and business acquaintances in Worcester, Upton and Gloucester, and arrived early in the morning on 30 July. Twice again that

day he went out, once with Captain Plaisted to load a cargo of coals in his sloop at Purton Passage and again to watch the floating of the brigg 'Good Intent' which had run aground. This impression of constant business activity and ceaseless social events can be seen in every entry in the diary.

M. A. R. Falser

References

Diary of Richard Wintle of Newnham-on-Severn, 1783 in the possession of Miss Falser of Cirencester. Typescript copy in Glos. R.O., D 1559.

THE FRAMPTON VOLUNTEERS

On April 30th, 1798, a resolution was passed by the residents of Frampton-on-Severn, headed by their squire, Nathaniel Winchcombe, (who later changed his name to Clifford) to form a Corps of Loyal Volunteers to fight in defence of their country up to a radius of 8 miles from Frampton "but not more". This resolution is one of the collection of documents belonging to the archives of the Clifford family in the Gloucestershire Records Office. Why these parishioners came to form a Volunteer Corps and how they went about it provides an interesting light on the defence arrangements of the time, more particularly because this Corps was a small one, lacking the urgency and resources of those formed on the South Coast and in London, where the threat of invasion was more likely.

The resolution of April 30th 1798 stated that the Corps expected the Government to supply muskets and bayonets, while they themselves would supply uniforms and whatever else they needed. Attached to it is a list of the 110 names of the Volunteers, mainly Winchcombe's tenants, not all of whom came from Frampton itself; the remainder came from Eastington, Stonehouse, Whitminster and Arlingham. There were 48 farmers, 8 clothiers, 6 tailors, 5 butchers, 3 shopkeepers, 3 innkeepers, 3 cordwainers, 2 pig-killers, 2 wheelwrights, 2 surgeons, 2 schoolmasters, 2 clerks, 2 maltsters, 2 cabinet-makers, 2 gardeners, 2 chandlers, 2 carpenters and one each of the following: miller, chapman, carrier, glazier, builder, pig-dealer, farmer's son, bricklayer, accountant, cooper and mercer.

The next day, Winchcombe eagerly wrote to the Earl of Berkeley reporting the proposal to start a Corps "for the preservation of internal tranquillity and the maintenance of a proper policing in a very populous country within 8 miles". On May 4th Berkeley replied telling him to go ahead and simply apply to the Secretary of War for equipment. The tone of the letter implies that setting up of a Corps was straightforward and easy.

Local rivalry was soon forthcoming, for in a letter to the Earl of Berkeley on May 20th, Winchcombe anxiously pressed him to help speed up the commissions, so that they would get them gazetted at the same time as those of the Stroud Volunteers. "I will frankly confess to your Lordship that I shall be sorry to have the intended Corps disappointed or mortified, which must be the case if they are not soon to have the opportunity to show the pains they have taken to qualify themselves for military duty". But such pleading did not succeed and their officers were not gazetted until after their rivals. A full list of the commissions was printed in the Gloucester Journal for June 18th 1798. These commissions clearly illustrate points in the 1794 and 1798 Parliamentary Acts about Volunteer officers not being able to assume commissions in the regular army and the Corps not being under military discipline.

Sometimes there were delays in obtaining commissions and then the Volunteer Corps found need to have a regular agent in London to press their claims. W. Tustin who lived in Fludyer St., Whitehall acted as agent for

both the Frampton and Stroud Corps and was invaluable when tackling the problems of equipment or pay.

On July 18th 1798, when the Corps strength had reached 120, the Articles of their Association were drawn up. Nathaniel Winchcombe was listed as Captain, Henry Hicks, a clothier, as 1st Lieutenant, William Fryer, a farmer, as 2nd Lieutenant, Edward Gardner, a malster, as Ensign, the local vicar as Chaplain and Treasurer, J. Earle, as surgeon and Dr. Marshall as Adjutant. As allowed by the Government, they drew up disciplinary rules, which imposed fines for drunkenness, swearing, inattention, failing to turn up, and not looking after their equipment. The fines varied according to the rank of the offender and severity of the misdemeanor. Swearing was fined 5/- for officers, 2/6 for non-commissioned officers and 1/- for the rest. Failing to answer the call to active service was £50 for officers, £30 for non-commissioned officers and £20 for the rest. The fine money was to be used to buy drums and fifes and to clothe the drummer.

While negotiations about the supply of arms were in progress, the all important question of designing and purchasing uniforms was proceeding. The Order Book of the Corps lists the uniform as a round hat with cockade and scarlet feather, scarlet jacket faced with blue, lined and edged with white, blue turnbacks; white waistcoat and breeches, gilt buttons with "F.V." surmounted by a crown, white cotton stockings, black velvet hose and half gaiters made of black cloth. Late in 1798 the deliveries were made from London despite the drunkenness of a carrier who lost the sashes.

Naturally the arming of the Corps was of major importance and considerable correspondence was involved in securing their supplies from the Ordnance Office. On June 4th 1798, Winchcombe first wrote to Tustin for his help and on June 7th Tustin replied telling Winchcombe that Lord Berkeley had asked the Board of Ordnance to issue 60 firelocks and that he would send them in 10 - 14 days time. A week later he wrote again saying that no ammunition would be granted until the Corps was "perfectly disciplined to use it". However the Frampton Corps finally received their arms on June 22nd. An explanation as to why equipment for only 60 men was sent was given in a letter by Lord Berkeley, which said that the number available for Gloucestershire was limited, but that 60 would do until the Corps was up to its 100 mark. The shortage was a problem to Winchcombe and he succeeded in acquiring 20 muskets from the Royal Gloucester Infantry on August 4th. Four days later the pikes were issued to the sergeants and drums and fifes to those concerned.

The first time the guns were fired was 6 rounds to celebrate Nelson's victory on October 24th, 1798. On November 5th Winchcombe asking for a cartridge allowance for a 100 men to be sent immediately promised "I shall take care that it shall not be wantonly or improperly expended". The outstanding arms and ammunition were despatched from the Tower and received in December 1798. The ammunition consisted of 2,000 blanks, 600 musket balls and 200 flints. This allowance shows just how much practice was

permitted in a year: namely 20 blanks and 6 shots per man. It is recorded that on May 29th 1799 they fired these 6 rounds and on June 11th a letter arrived from the Ordnance Office saying that these had had their annual allowance until December 1799. Just what would have happened in the event of an invasion is obscure! The possibility of local rioting seemed a good enough excuse to prompt Winchcombe into writing to the Board of Ordnance on June 21st to explain their shortage and therefore inability to check local rioting if it did occur. "No man can be more unwilling than I am to make an improper application so that I feel greatly mortified at the appearance of having done so." He went on to say that he had bought a lot of powder at his own expense long before the Government had made an allowance. Furthermore their Colour's Presentation ceremony was to be held in a fortnight and they had to fire several rounds then. After that there was bound to be an inspection which would require a considerable amount. The result was that their annual allowance was forwarded immediately. Unfortunately rain prevented a celebration round being fired at the Colour's ceremony, but on October 16th they fired 13 rounds "extremely well" when the Captain of the Hereford Volunteers inspected them.

The formation of the Corps' band was considered one of the necessities of military activity. The uniform of the 19 men involved was exactly the same as the rest of the Corps except that their jackets were blue with scarlet facings lined and edged with white, with scarlet turnbacks. John Pearce was appointed bandmaster and he made a report recommending that no time should be lost in the purchasing of instruments "I have it on the best authority that Mr. Cramer manufactures the best Wind Instruments in Europe. Cramer and Milhouses' Clarionets are said to be superior to all others." He stresses that bassoons and clarionets would be usable for concerts and at church and that they would need 4 Clarionets, 2 French Horns, 2 Bassoons and 1 double or base drum. Captain Winchcombe duly noted in the Order Book that he himself had bought some of the instruments and that they must remain his personal property. When the band was completed it contained all the instruments requested by Pearce together with a triangle, 2 octave flutes and the regulation drums and fifes. The base and regulation drums, with the Colours and some swords are in the Regimental Museum, Westgate St., Gloucester, today.

All was not well as far as band practices went, for Pearce and seven others agitated for the dismissal of the horn player, W. Hooper. Hooper was quick to reply saying "I consider myself extremely ill-used by Mr. Pearce.....a person who is ready at any time to substantiate the same, told me Mr. Pearce went to Arlingham on Sunday last and Assembled the performers in a Public House and spent 4d or 5d in their Company and before he left he prevailed upon them to sign a paper he had prepared.....Mr. Wiles (the basson player) told me in the prescence of Mr. Earle that he did not know it was to dismiss me." It seems that Hooper may have been the victim of a trick and he concludes his letter saying that he will not play in the band if Pearce stays in it. As Pearce had already said the same with regard to Hooper, Winchcombe had to act and a Mr. Rider was appointed to replace Hooper, although he in turn was dismissed for failure to attend practices.

Equipped with uniforms, arms, ammunition and a band the Frampton Corps was now ready to design and purchase a banner and to attend to the all important ceremony of the Colour's Presentation. On June 3rd 1799, as the Corps had asked for a Colour, Winchcombe went to London to buy it and agreed that "the expence should not exceed 20 gns". In fact it cost 14 gns. which Winchcombe himself ultimately paid.

Winchcombe's next problem was to find an officer to inspect the Corps on the great day and a Lady to present the Colours. Consequently he wrote to Major Snell of Guiting Grange, Northleach, who accepted the invitation, provided it did not clash with the Assizes, the Sessions or the Oxford races. Writing nearer the date to Lady Mill of Arlingham, Winchcombe informed her of the date of "our Gala" and comments as requested on her proposed speech, saying that he promises "no person shall ever know the honor you have done me by permitting me to see your intended address and much less that you have condescended to ask my opinion of it". However their combined efforts amounted to very little when compared with the magnificent address given by the Countess of Berkeley to the Stroud Volunteers. Winchcombe then wrote to the Stroud Volunteers to "keep the ground" during the ceremony. The Stroud Commanding Officer feared that drunkenness might "tend to confusion", but Winchcombe replied that they should come in uniform but without arms and left them to judge the danger of drunkenness.

Winchcombe described the great day of August 22nd at much length in the Order Book, noting that the marquee and booths were fully stocked for the ladies' and Corps' refreshment. The Frampton Corps was on parade at 10 a.m. promptly and were followed by the Longtree, Bisley and Whitstone Gentlemen and Yeomen Cavalry and the Loyal Stroud Volunteers. The ladies and gentlemen crowded into Mrs. Phillipps' drawing room just before 11 a.m. and with rain falling at noon, Lady Mill and Major and Mrs. Snell arrived. Then the Frampton Corps was formed up in a semi-circle near the steps of the house and the Colours were presented. Lady Mill expressed pleasure in performing the Presentation and trusted that the Corps would live up to its duties and realize the importance of the trust placed in it. The Chaplain then consecrated the Colours, the Corps saluted them and Captain Winchcombe addressed the crowd "My Friends and Fellow Soldiers, Unaccustomed as I am to speak in public....." he went on to praise his Corps for its conduct and drew attention to their motto "Pro Deo, Rege, et Carissimus" and to the "excellent constitution of our country, so admirably calculated to secure the happiness of all persons, who can be happy under any Government".

Unfortunately the rain prevented the planned "manoeuvres", so that the order to dismiss was followed by a rush to the refreshments and the officers sat down to an excellent dinner (Ordinary) with "plenty of good liquors". Winchcombe ends his account in the Order Book by saying "the expences of the day (except the Ordinary) were born solely by me".

Great though the day was, it was soon to be overshadowed by the Stroud ceremony of the Colours at which 800 Volunteers were present and a crowd of

20,000 with them to hear the truly magnificent speech from the Countess of Berkeley.

The intricacies of the various statutes affecting the pay of Volunteers under certain conditions were not easy to follow and this can be seen from the correspondence between Winchcombe and Tustin. On October 5th, 1798, Tustin wrote to him to remind him to forward a signed request for sergeants' and drummers' pay which he would then forward to the War Secretary. The sums involved were:- Sergeant 1s 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ d per day for 145 days - £11 6s 6 $\frac{3}{4}$; drummer, 1s 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d per day for 145 days - £8 6s 1 $\frac{3}{4}$. Although Winchcombe sent off the certificates, Tustin wrote again on October 22nd warning him that there would be no pay without certificates. In spite of the fact that he did finally receive them, no money was forthcoming because they had both overlooked the Government order of April 30th 1798, which said that pay would be dependent on a Corps' willingness to serve in its Military District. On December 2nd Tustin wrote that the War Office refused to pay up until the Corps would agree to serve.

Captain Winchcombe took care to see that his men claimed their exemption from the Militia, when he warned them of the absolute necessity for regular attendance in order to qualify. In due course he attended the Deputy Lieutenants' meeting in Gloucester and claimed exemption for his men. The claim for exemption from Hair Powder Tax caused some confusion among Volunteer Corps throughout the country with the result that an Act for exemption from Hair Powder Tax was passed indemnifying all those who had omitted to take out the necessary certificates.

In 1803 instructions were issued for the tightening up of inspections of Corps. The copy in the Clifford archives says that the River Severn District is to have one of 24 Inspecting Field Officers to be appointed in England. His function is to inspect the Corps drill and exercises once every 2 months and to report to the General Officer on the numbers present, absentees, state of clothing, horses and equipment and their arms and ammunition security. Each month he is to send the Muster returns to the Assistant Adjutant - General of the district and to the Lord-Lieutenant. His pay is given as 15s per day with forage for 3 horses and he is to hold the temporary rank of Lieutenant Colonel. The instructions then go on to give precise details as to the nature of the size of the Corps, its composition and details of payment.

The need to improve the drill of all Volunteer Corps is shown by the Frampton Corps' possession of a booklet entitled "General Orders and Observations on the Movements and Field Exercises for Infantry". Among many points it draws attention to are these "The ordered times of march and length of step to be scrupulously observed, and no others to be taught or practised". Words of execution, such as March, Halt, etc., are to be pronounced short, loud and clear and by no means lengthened out or given in a drawling tone of voice, they may be repeated more than once, if not instantly acted upon". The Commander of a line when giving these commands can make a "motion of the hat or sword" which will "greatly aid him".

By now Winchcombe had changed his name to Clifford and had been appointed Inspector of the Whitstone Hundred. It is in this capacity that his papers contain a collection of letters dated 1803-4 giving lists of horses, carts and waggons available for transport purposes. The list from the parish of Stonehouse says that their horses and waggons can be ready at an hour's notice and that each waggon has a bushel of oats tied on in a strong sack. Clifford was also responsible for putting into effect the War Office circular of 1803 calling for volunteers not in the Volunteer Corps to sign on as special constables because of invasion danger. The replies he received contained the names of 500 people, the largest group of which, 16, came from Frampton. The final mention of the Volunteers in the Clifford Archives is in 1806 when a call for new volunteers is made and they are asked to sign on in the chancel immediately after Divine service.

Other Volunteer Corps in Gloucestershire have a similar history to that of the Frampton Corps, which suggests that Frampton was typical of an inland corps in general and they provide an interesting illustration of how the various Acts and War Office instructions on the Volunteer system called forth and utilized the patriotic feelings of 18th Century countrymen. Self-interest shows through this patriotism both in the securing of exemption of service in the Militia and in the gratification of their social pride in parading before their fellow-parishioners. England has utilized the volunteer principle throughout many centuries of her history and the people of Frampton had probably not forgotten the famous march of the London Train Bands down the tobacco-covered hillside to save Roundhead Gloucester in the Civil War. Similarly Winston Churchill, in championing the Home Guard, was perhaps reviving Pitt's championship of the Volunteer Corps of his day.

J. R. S. Whiting

References

Glos. R.O., D149/X19-29

Order book, articles of association, correspondence and other records of the Frampton-on-Severn Volunteers, 1798-1806.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON AND THE EARL OF
REDESDALE. 1837 - 1851

Among the family papers deposited in the Gloucestershire Record Office by Lord Redesdale is part of a correspondence between the 1st Earl of Redesdale and the Duke of Wellington, lasting from January 1837 to July 1851. There are 40 letters from Wellington, and 7 drafts or copies of letters from Redesdale. At this time Wellington was a leading member of the Tory party, and Redesdale was acting, without any official title, as the party's first Whip in the House of Lords. These letters are therefore interesting for what they reveal of the early stages in the development of party organisation, in the modern sense, within Parliament; they also show the different attitudes of two politicians to various political questions of the time. Obviously, the correspondence is of limited value - most of Redesdale's contribution to it is absent, and much of the business involved in party management must have been done by word of mouth, letters being necessary only when one of the men was out of London. Nevertheless, some impression can be gained of the methods of party organisation, and of Wellington's attitude to them.

Wellington's first letter in the series expressed his gratitude for "the Service that you consent to render to us", (presumably referring to Redesdale's new duties as "Whip") and a number of years later he again mentioned this with appreciation: "I..... have exercised an influence in that House, due to your kind Assistance, which has not been exercised in Modern Times by any Individual". Yet Wellington was in some ways an unlikely figure to preside over these early exercises in party discipline. As the greatest soldier of his time, and the victor of Waterloo, he held a unique position in British politics, and although he had for a time been leader of the Tories, his letters show his belief that "I ought never..... to consider myself a Party Man". One early letter in fact flatly stated: "There is nobody who dislikes so much as I do, and who probably knows so little of Party Management," and he went on, in a somewhat illogical tirade, to attribute the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Act and all the Tory reverses of the 1830's to the growth of this practice. However, he seems to have become more willing, as time went on, to accept the need for organisation.

The main period of activity in party management seems to have been the opening of a session, when policy had to be planned, and attendance encouraged. (The importance of this may be unduly emphasised by the fact that more letters were exchanged at this point, since the preparation for a session necessarily took place during the vacation, when both men would be in the country). It was usual for Wellington to prepare a circular letter urging attendance, to be sent to the Tory peers before the session. He would begin on this some six weeks before the opening, composing and signing a draft, and arranging for copies to be made. Redesdale's part was to supply the list of recipients. The earlier letters refer to all this in some detail, but as time went on, less comment was needed, and in 1845, for

example, Wellington merely said he would write the "usual circular letter".

In general, Wellington's letters make little reference to the need for a good attendance of Tory peers. Even in January 1846, when the critical repeal of the Corn Laws was to be introduced, although he mentioned the desirability of a full attendance at the beginning of the session, he added that he did not want anyone to be "put to real personal inconvenience by coming to the day exactly". One reason for this lack of a sense of urgency was probably the existence of proxy voting in the House of Lords at this time. In December 1839, for instance, Wellington, commenting that he was anxious to stay at home at the beginning of the session, believed that "we may trust to London and its neighbourhood and Proxies to do all that we shall probably require". There are references to blank proxies sent by Wellington to Redesdale, in bulk, or singly for particular individuals; on one occasion Redesdale was asked to supply one.

A regular practice at the opening of a session was the holding of dinners at Wellington's London house. This was an occasion for the discussion of party policy, and in August 1841 Wellington, who did not as yet know the exact date for the opening, was determined not to hold the dinner more than one day before this, for fear that their discussions on "the course we should take in the two Houses..... must get out". Two dinners were usually held, because of the numbers involved, and the leading Party members (including Redesdale) would attend both. Not all the Tory peers were invited. 50 or so came to each dinner, as against some 200 who received the circular letters. At first Redesdale provided a list of those to be invited, with a supplementary list for filling up any places left vacant through refusals, but in later years, as the procedure became more familiar, Wellington seems to have decided on the guests unaided. In December 1845, for instance, he mentioned that he would "invite the usual Party to dinner".

The dinners were apparently begun in January 1840, and the early ones were a source of some annoyance to Wellington, who protested in 1840, "I am very troublesome. But I cannot help it....A Man cannot make his Room hold 60 or 70 at dinner, when it can hold only 50", although he acknowledged that those who were left out resented their exclusion. The note of irritation recurred in 1841. He refused to invite peers who were abroad, for fear they should accept out of willingness to have an excuse to return home; and dismissed the idea of a side-table, as "none of these great Lords" would like to sit at one. "A Man must cut his Coat according to his Cloth" was his terse comment on the problem of numbers, and he concluded "I must do as I usually do; the best I can". After these initial difficulties, however, the pre-session dinners seem to have become part of the accepted pattern of party management.

When the Tories came into power, after a number of years in opposition, in 1841, a new preoccupation was added to the customary pre-session arrangements. Peers had to be chosen to propose and second the Address to the Queen moved in the Lords in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Redesdale was usually consulted over this and asked to suggest names; in September 1844, for instance, he was asked to "consider who the Peers are to whom I

might apply". Wellington might also suggest names himself, and in January 1844 he discussed at length the nice problem of which of two peers should act as mover, one being senior by virtue of his Irish earldom but junior by the barony which entitled him to a place in the Lords. Again, as time went on, less consultation seems to have been found necessary.

Once a session was under way, fewer letters were exchanged, but some idea of Redesdale's duties at these periods can be gained. The first problem that arose in a session was the possibility of an Opposition amendment to the Address to the Queen. In December 1839, when the Tories were the Opposition, Wellington hoped that the Address would be innocuous enough not to need an amendment, adding "But I cannot answer for them". Conversely, in January 1846, when the Tories were in power, he hoped to "prevail upon our friend in the House of Commons" not to move an amendment.

There are several references to impending Parliamentary business. In October 1837 Wellington briefly discussed the beginning of the session: a discussion on the Civil List was probable, and although there were unlikely to be "questions" early in the session, "we must be in readiness". Few Bills are mentioned. In January 1838, the Tory peers were anxious for a private meeting to discuss a Bill which was about to receive its second reading in the Lords, and Wellington readily agreed to this - "I can understand the Lords wanting to have a meeting" - without, apparently, having intended to call one on his own initiative. In July 1840, Wellington was unwell, and agreed to Redesdale's suggestion that, because of this, the third reading of the Irish Corporation Bill should be postponed. In August 1843, it was Redesdale he consulted about whether an unspecified Bill had had its first reading, and whether he ought to attend the second reading. Tory peers who wished to introduce Bills or needed information for use in debates would on occasion apply to Wellington. In February 1842 Redesdale was asked to make arrangements concerning a motion which Lord Mounteagle wished to introduce, and to let Wellington know what was arranged. On another occasion, in 1843, he was asked to find out precisely what information Lord Clanricarde needed to enable him to answer questions in the Lords, so that Wellington could supply him with it. Redesdale might sometimes have to inform the Tory peers of forthcoming events - in February 1845, an address was to be presented to the Queen at Buckingham Palace, and he was requested to notify the peers of the time of presentation, "which I beg you to do without loss of time." This letter, incidentally, also refers to Redesdale's counterpart: "the Lord who communicates with the Lords in Opposition".

From time to time in the correspondence specific political issues of the day are discussed, usually on Redesdale's initiative. In September 1840, the problem had arisen of where the Queen's new husband, Prince Albert, should sit at meetings of the Privy Council. An announcement in the Gazette had made public the Queen's intention that he should sit on her right, taking precedence over her royal uncles, to which he had, strictly speaking, no legal right. Redesdale was disturbed by this action; he felt that she was behaving in an arbitrary manner, declaring that if her uncles pressed their rights and "Her Majesty turns them out because she does not choose to obey

the law of the land, I fear the consequences." Wellington's attitude was calmer : the Queen was within her rights in choosing where the Prince should sit, and she must be obeyed, although he felt that the public announcement was a mistake, and was inclined to attribute some blame to the Whig Prime Minister, Lord Melbourne.

A more important political question appears in August 1843, by which time the Tories were the governing party. Redesdale wrote to express his fear that the Cabinet might decide to adopt a system under which Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland would be paid by the state. He felt that such a policy would conflict with the oath, sworn at this time by M.P.'s on admission to Parliament, to allow no "foreign prelate" to have jurisdiction in the country; and that, even if an Act were to release members from this oath, he could not support such a proposal. Consequently, he warned Wellington that, were the measure introduced, he would have to give up his party duties, although this would be "very painful for me". To conceal his breach with the Government, he suggested that the excuse could be made that his new duties as a master of foxhounds made it necessary for him to spend more time in the country! Wellington's reply was, again, calmer in tone. He agreed with Redesdale's views, commenting that he himself had been "at one time bit by their (the reformers') Mania", but had changed his mind, because of the existing laws. However, he thought the Cabinet was unlikely to take such drastic action. In January 1845 Redesdale reminded him of the problem, but his reply was, again, that it was not likely to be raised - and in fact it was not.

The greatest political crisis of the 1840's was Peel's repeal, in the face of an Irish potato famine, of the laws restricting the import of foreign corn, an act which involved a complete reversal of declared Tory policy. There is a group of letters in the correspondence which discuss this question, in December 1845, soon after it arose, and while it was not yet certain whether the Tory government would itself introduce repeal, or resign and leave the problem to a Whig government. Redesdale set out his views in a long letter. He was flatly opposed to repeal, declaring, "I will not be a party to my own ruin and that of those with whom I live"; among other dangers he feared the competition from Russian and Hungarian corn, as railway development linked these areas with the ports of Northern Europe. He believed that the Government should maintain its previous policy, adding that "the people like a firm Government. They like consistency". He saw no danger of famine in England, and thought that the Irish situation could be eased by a larger amount of outdoor relief under the Poor Law, aided by an extra government grant. "We can beat the (Anti-Corn Law) league, the Times, and the Whigs if the Government will lead us to the charge."

Wellington's attitude was more flexible. He declared himself anxious to preserve the Corn Laws, but he was ready to agree to repeal if it should prove politically necessary, although he felt that the seriousness of the Irish famine had been exaggerated. He referred to his efforts to avoid a split in the Cabinet: "I have done everything in my Power to keep together the ... administration. Moved thereto by my sense of Duty to the Queen and

by strong feeling for the safety of the Publick Interest on various Points". His stress throughout was on the need to find the best policy for the preservation of good order and Peace", and when, after Peel's resignation, the Whig leader failed to form a government, Wellington was prepared to give Peel his full support over repeal, since the only alternative seemed to be a government led by the Whig back-bencher and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League, Cobden. "God send us a good deliverance!" he wrote.

The repeal of the Corn Laws led to a serious split in the Tory party, and Peel's resignation. With the party again in opposition, and Wellington himself ageing, the correspondence with Redesdale seems to have ceased, but there was one further interchange of letters in 1851, when Redesdale was a candidate for the post of Chairman of Committees in the Lords. He wished Wellington to propose him for this as "a public mark of your favour and regard" reminding him that in 1841 Wellington had offered him a further elevation in the peerage as an acknowledgement of his services, and Peel had refused it. Wellington, however, would not agree to the request, as he felt that Redesdale's candidature would embarrass the Government and might lead to their resignation, and he persisted in his refusal even when Redesdale assured him that the Government would not object-a typical instance of his readiness to ignore party advantage. In the event, Redesdale was unanimously elected.

The correspondence between Wellington and Redesdale thus gives some insight into the development of the modern party system in the earlier nineteenth century. It shows that a more carefully organised type of party was emerging, with the use of such methods as the pre-session dinners; while on the other hand there was little stress on party discipline over such matters as attendance.

R. Manning

References

Glos. R.O., D 2002/C 39

Letters from the Duke of Wellington, with some draft or copy letters from Redesdale, 1837 - 51.