

Transactions
of the
Shropshire Archaeological Society
with which is incorporated the Shropshire Parish Register Society

VOLUME LIX
Part II
1971/1972
Issued June 1976

TRANSACTIONS OF THE SHROPSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME LIX

1971-72

PART II

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Editorial	78
Domesday Society in Shropshire, by T. A. GWYNNE	91
The Ludlow Poll-Tax Return of 1667, by M. A. FARADAY	104
The Burial Place of Abraham Darby I, by WINIFRED E. HUTTON	124
The Diary of a Country Gentleman : Sir Baldwin Leighton, Bt. (1805-71), by VINCENT J. WALSH	127
Farmers' Revolt : the North Shropshire By-Election of 1876, by JULIAN R. McQUISTON	170
Obituary : Alexander Thomas Gaydon (1929-74)	181
Reviews	183

THE SHROPSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
(WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED THE SHROPSHIRE PARISH REGISTER SOCIETY)

EDITORIAL

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE *TRANSACTIONS*

- 1 Papers should be typed on A4 paper in double spacing with a left-hand margin of 3.5 cms.
- 2 Footnotes should be numbered consecutively and typed separately from the text.
- 3 Plans and illustrations for a paper must be submitted at the same time as its text ; indelible numberings should not be put on them as figures and plates are numbered consecutively through a volume. An accompanying note should set out (a) the order in which they are to be arranged and (b) such captions as are to be printed as underlines.
- 4 Contributors will receive galley proofs but not page proofs. Corrections should be made in ink in accordance with *Hart's Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press, Oxford* (1967) ; they must be limited to the rectifying of typographical errors. If insertions of new matter or corrections other than typographical are requested, the contributor will be asked to bear the expense. Corrected proofs must be returned to the Hon. Editor, not the printer.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETINGS, 1971, 1972

In 1971 the Annual General Meeting was held on 11 June at the Wakeman School, Shrewsbury, the chair being taken by the President, Sir Offley Wakeman, Bt., C.B.E. After the formal business Mr. G. S. G. Toms gave a lecture on 'Archaeological Destruction in Shrewsbury and Shropshire'.

In 1972 the Annual General Meeting was held on 28 June at College Hill House, Shrewsbury, the chair being taken by the President, Sir Offley Wakeman, Bt., C.B.E. After the formal business, which included the amendment of Rules 3 and 8, Mr. J. B. Lawson gave a lecture on 'Eighteenth-century Shrewsbury'.

EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING, 1972

An Extraordinary General Meeting, summoned to amend Rule 10, was held on 7 December at Attingham Park, the chair being taken by the President, Dr. Graham Webster. After the amendment of Rule 10 Dr. Webster gave a presidential address on 'Wroxeter'.

EXCURSIONS, 1971, 1972

In 1971 excursions were made to Barrow Church, Much Wenlock Guildhall, Coalbrookdale Museum, and Benthall Hall (led by Mr. T. S. Cole ; May), to the Avoncroft Museum and Hartlebury (led by Mr. D. T. W. Price ; July), and to the Wroxeter excavations (led by Dr. A. W. J. Houghton ; August).

In 1972 excursions were made to Condover Court, Baxter's House, Buildwas Abbey, and Whitton Court (led by Mrs. M. Moran ; May), to Wroxeter, Harley, Marshbrook, and Affcot (led by Mr. G. S. G. Toms ; July), and to the Lord Hill Exhibition in the Shirehall (introduced by Mrs. M. C. Paget) followed by visits to Prees Hall and Hawkstone Hall (with notes, no leader) (Oct.).

COUNCIL MEETINGS, 1971, 1972

Council and Officers—1971 : Mr. D. T. W. Price appointed deputy Hon. Editor and Mr. J. E. Pilgrim resigned from the council (Apr.), Mrs. C. A. Peele appointed Excursions Secretary (May), Mr. H. Beaumont resigned as Hon. Secretary to be succeeded by Mr. G. S. G. Toms and Mr. D. Stewart resigned from the council (Sept.), Mr. Beaumont was co-opted to the council (Sept.). 1972 : Mr. G. C. Baugh was co-opted to the council and Sir Offley Wakeman's wish to resign the presidency was communicated to the council (Jan.), Miss Lily F. Chitty, O.B.E., was invited to become President (Mar.), Miss Chitty having expressed her regret at being unable to undertake the presidency, Dr. Graham Webster's willingness to be nominated was communicated to the council (May), Mr. D. J. Pannett was co-opted to the council (May), Mr. G. C. Baugh was appointed Hon. Editor on the resignation of the Revd. D. T. W. Price and Mr. N. Cossons was co-opted to the council (July), the Revd. D. T. W. Price resigned from the council (Sept.).

Membership—1971 : 21 new members and 5 associate members were elected and Messrs. A. T. Gaydon and H. Beaumont were elected honorary members. 1972 : 36 new members and 3 associate members were elected ; the associate members' subscription was raised to 50p. a year.

Transactions and News Letter—1971 : Miss C. E. Purser was given permission to reprint Mr. J. W. Tonkin's article (*Trans.* lviii. 140-52) on the White House, Aston Munslow (Apr.), the price of the *News Letter* to non-members was raised to 25p. an issue (Sept.), it was resolved that articles on Shropshire history and archaeology in other journals should be summarized in the *News Letter* (Nov.), the Hon. Editor was authorized to look for cheaper printing of the *Transactions* and the policy of annual publication was abandoned in favour of publication as often as finances permitted (Nov.), the amendment of Rule 10 was put on the agenda of the 1972 Annual General Meeting (Nov.). 1972 : the Hon. Editor reported a low estimate for printing *Transactions*, lix (1), and it was resolved to revert to annual publication as soon as possible (Jan.), enough issues of *Transactions*, lviii (3), were secured from members (who might be credited with a year's subscription) to allow full distribution of that under-printed part to institutional members (Mar.-May), exchange of publications with Glasgow Archaeological Society was continued (May), it was resolved that 450 copies of *Transactions*, lix (1), be printed (Nov.).

Excavations—1971 : a report was received on Mr. John Paget's excavation of the 12th-century chapel at Malins Lee (Apr.), it was learned that the Department of the Environment had granted £200 towards the cost of Mr. W. E. Jenks's excavation behind Boots' shop on Pride Hill (Nov.), the council resolved to try to co-ordinate archaeological work in the county (Nov.). 1972 : it was decided to request the Council for British Archaeology to urge archaeologists intending to excavate in the county to contact the Society first (Jan.), £25 was granted towards the cost of using a J.C.B. on the Lyth Hill site being excavated by Mr. W. E. Jenks (Jan.), the Society joined the Council for British Archaeology insurance scheme to cover third-party liability and volunteer field workers (July).

Miscellaneous—1971 : £50 was donated to the newly formed preservation society RESCUE (May), in response to a request by the Council for British Archaeology the Hon. Secretary was authorized to appoint a subcommittee to compile a list of Shropshire archaeological sites worthy of permanent preservation (May), it was decided that the Rachel Layton Bequest (Parish Register Fund) could be merged into the Society's general funds (Sept.). 1972 : Mr. W. E. Jenks reported on a conference on archaeological fieldwork which he had attended in Sept. 1971 as the Society's representative (Jan.), lectures and excursions subcommittees were formed

(May), it was decided to subscribe £5 a year to RESCUE (May), local correspondents were appointed to inform the council of archaeological and historical activities in outlying parts of the county (Jan.-Mar.), reports were received on action taken by the Department of the Environment towards the preservation of surviving mediaeval structures behind Boots' shop on Pride Hill (July), on evidence given at the inquiry into the route of the M54 through Shropshire and Staffordshire (July), and on the Department of the Environment's excavation of the site of the B.B.C.'s television mast on the Wrekin (Sept.), a discussion of rescue archaeology in Shropshire emphasized the problems affecting the future of Shrewsbury's archaeological remains, those consequent on motorway and trunk-road development, the need for a county archaeological officer, and the necessity of liaising on these matters with the Council for British Archaeology, RESCUE, the Department of the Environment, and local authorities and societies (Sept.).

AMENDMENTS TO RULES

At the 1972 Annual General Meeting Rules 3 and 8 were amended to read as follows :

- 3 Candidates for membership may apply directly to the Hon. Membership Secretary, who shall be empowered to accept membership on behalf of the Council.
- 8 Candidates for membership under the age of 21 may apply for membership as Associate Members. The annual subscription for an Associate Member shall be 50 pence. Associate Members shall enjoy all the privileges of full membership except that they shall not be entitled to free issues of the *Transactions* or occasional publications of the Society. Associate Membership shall terminate at the end of the year in which the member has attained the age of 21.

At the Extraordinary General Meeting on 7 December 1972 Rule 10 was amended to read as follows :

- 10 Every member not in arrears of his annual subscription shall be entitled to one copy of the latest available *Transactions* to be published, and copies of other publications of the Society on such conditions as may be determined by the Council.

RULES ON 1 MAY 1975

1. The Society shall be called the 'Shropshire Archaeological Society (with which is incorporated the Shropshire Parish Register Society)'.
- 2 The objects of the Society shall be, in general, the promotion of archaeological and historical investigation in the County and the preservation of its antiquities ; in particular, the publication of the results of research and excavation, the recording of archaeological discoveries, the editing and printing of documents of local historical importance, and the transcription and printing of Parish Registers.
- 3 Candidates for membership may apply directly to the Hon. Membership Secretary, who shall be empowered to accept membership on behalf of the Council.
- 4 The Council shall have power to elect Honorary Members.
- 5 The subscription of each member shall be paid on election or on 1st January to the Honorary Membership Secretary, and shall be the annual sum of £2.10, except that members who joined the Society before 1950 shall have the option to continue to subscribe at the rate of £1.05 *per annum*. If any member's subscription shall be in arrears for two years, and he shall neglect to pay his subscription after being reminded by the Secretary, he shall be regarded as having ceased to be a member of the Society.

6 The management of the Society shall be vested in the Council, which shall consist of the following : the President, Officers, and not more than 20 elected members. The Officers of the Society shall be appointed by the Council and shall consist of Chairman, Secretary, Treasurer, Editor, Editor of the *News Letter*, Meetings and Excursions Secretary, and such other officers as the Council may deem necessary for the efficient management of the Society. The Officers of the Society shall act in an honorary capacity. The President and Vice-Presidents shall be elected at an Annual General Meeting ; they shall be elected for five years and shall be eligible for re-election. Members of the Council (other than officers) shall be elected at the Annual General Meeting. Members of the retiring Council shall be eligible for re-election and their names may be proposed without previous notice ; in the case of other candidates a proposal, signed by four members of the Society, must be sent in writing to the Honorary Secretary not less than fourteen days before the Annual General Meeting. The Council shall have power to co-opt not more than five additional members to serve on the Council for the year.

7 Five members in attendance at Council Meetings shall be deemed a quorum.

8 Candidates for membership under the age of 21 may apply for membership as Associate Members. The annual subscription for an Associate Member shall be 50 pence. Associate Members shall enjoy all the privileges of full membership except that they shall not be entitled to free issues of the *Transactions* or occasional publications of the Society. Associate Membership shall terminate at the end of the year in which the member has attained the age of 21.

9 The Council shall determine what number of each publication shall be printed.

10 Every member not in arrears of his annual subscription shall be entitled to one copy of the latest available *Transactions* to be published, and copies of other publications of the Society on such conditions as may be determined by the Council.

11 Contributors of papers shall be entitled to twelve free copies of off-prints of such articles as they may contribute.

12 No alteration shall be made in the Rules of the Society except at the Annual General Meeting or at an Extraordinary General Meeting called by the President and Council for that purpose. Any proposed alteration must be submitted to the Honorary Secretary in sufficient time to enable him to give members at least twenty-one days' notice of the Extraordinary General Meeting.

INSURANCE

The Society is insured under the Council for British Archaeology's National Archaeological Insurance Policy. This covers primarily legal liability for personal injury or property damage to third parties, and also personal accident insurance for members and/or volunteer workers if they should be injured while on excavation, recording, preservation, survey or observation work *on behalf of the Society*.

In order to ensure that the terms of the policy are complied with, each Director of Excavations, and any person proposing to undertake similar work under the aegis of the Society, **must** inform the Hon. Treasurer of the Society of the estimated number of man-days to be worked during each year from 1st April to 31st March following, and the actual number of man-days worked in the immediately preceding year. Notice must be given to the Hon. Treasurer of any major change in planned activity, and of new types of work, or fresh sites upon which work is to be done.

The Hon. Treasurer will be pleased to give further information about the cover and the exclusions. Any claims must be notified immediately to the Hon. Treasurer and to the underwriters.

PUBLICATIONS

Stocks of the Society's publications are available. Ten per cent is discounted to members from the prices shown below (which exclude postage). There are further discounts for large orders. Inquiries should be addressed to the Hon. Publications Secretary.

Transactions (paper-bound parts) : 1st-4th series, 37p. a part ; vols. xlvi-lv, £1 a part ; vols. lvi onwards (quarto), £1.50 a part.

Shropshire Parish Registers (paper-bound parts) : small parts, 50p. ; medium-sized parts, £1 ; large parts, £1.50. Bound vols. £3.

D. H. S. Cranage, *An Architectural Account of the Churches of Shropshire* (1894—1912) : 75p. and £1.50 a part.

Church Plate of the Archdeaconry of Salop, ed. S. A. Jeavons (1964) : £1.

P. A. Barker, *Medieval Pottery of Shropshire* (1970) : £1.50 post-free.

THE SHROPSHIRE NEWS LETTER (1957-74)

The *Shropshire News Letter* was edited and published from Shrewsbury Museum by J. L. Hobbs until 1964. The Society was associated with the publication from 1965 and was wholly responsible for it from 1967. Publication ceased in 1974 with issue no. 45. The *News Letter* contained summaries of current work in Shropshire history and archaeology ; it was also the vehicle for short articles, the more important of which have been listed in the *Transactions* (above, p. 5). Requests for back nos. should be addressed to Shrewsbury Public Library, Castle Gates, Shrewsbury, SY1 2AS (for nos. 1-31) and to the Hon. Publications Secretary (for nos. 32-45).

REPORT

The following report was received by the council in 1974 and is printed here in accordance with paragraph 18.

Report to the Council of the Shropshire Archaeological Society on the Society's property and on the local-history collection of the Shrewsbury Public Library.

1 This Report is divided into three parts dealing with (I) the history of the local-history collection (paragraphs 2-11), (II) the Society's property (paragraphs 12-13) and (III) Recommendations (paragraphs 14-18). Part II excludes mention of the Society's stock of back numbers of its own publications which are stored away from the Shrewsbury Public Library under the care of the Society's Hon. Publications Secretary. The Museum collections are mentioned only in so far as they impinge on the matters discussed in this Report. The Report is based mainly on the Society's minutes, but newspaper reports were also used and the Shrewsbury Public Library was visited.

I THE HISTORY OF THE LOCAL-HISTORY COLLECTION

2 The connexions between the Shropshire Archaeological Society and the Shrewsbury Public Library have always been close since the latter was founded in 1883-5 as the first rate-supported library in Shrewsbury.

3 Before the foundation of the Shrewsbury Public Library the Shropshire and North Wales Natural History and Antiquarian Society, founded in 1835, had long maintained a museum and library in the town. They were housed in Vaughan's Mansion which the Society had rented since its foundation. In 1877 the Society amalgamated with the newly founded (1876-7) Shropshire Archaeological Society.

The new Society resulting from the amalgamation was called the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society.

4 By 1879 the Society's museum and library were outgrowing their premises, and large and valuable donations had to be refused owing to lack of space. At the same time there was a feeling that the museum and library should be re-sited in a more prominent and central place in the town. H. W. Adnitt, the Society's Hon. Secretary, giving expression to this feeling, also drew attention to 'the great want of a Free Reference Library for the town'.

5 In 1882 it was known that the old buildings of Shrewsbury School would shortly be for sale at a price of £4,000—£5,000, and the Society was told that there existed 'rather a strong feeling' that a public free library should be opened in them. Accordingly the Society appointed a committee to confer with the borough council 'and to take such steps as were practicable to secure the buildings to the town and county'. A Joint Committee of the Society and the borough council issued an appeal for funds to purchase the buildings, and before the end of 1882 £3,025 had actually been collected and £200 more had been promised.

6 On 1st May 1883 a public meeting of the burgesses of Shrewsbury agreed almost unanimously to adopt the Public Libraries Act of 1855 and the amending Acts of 1866 and 1871. (A similar proposal had been unsuccessful in 1872.) In October 1883 the former school buildings were acquired; the governing body of Shrewsbury School had decreased the purchase price on condition that the Society's collections, which were to be housed in the buildings, were handed over to the care of the Mayor and Corporation in trust. The Joint Committee, which raised and paid £4,000 for the buildings, handed them over to the Shrewsbury corporation. After further funds had been raised to equip the building a reading room was opened on 2nd February 1885, and the library was formally opened on 9th April following. A lending library was opened in July. In the same year the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society's collections, including its exchange publications, were handed over to form the nucleus of the museum and reference library that were established elsewhere in the old school buildings. The reference library was opened to the public on 5th January 1886.

7 The conditions on which the Society placed its museum and library in the hands of the Corporation of Shrewsbury (Appendix A) were agreed at its Annual General Meeting. The museum's classification and arrangement was to be undertaken by Hon. Curators appointed by the Society's Council. The collection was vested in eight Trustees appointed by and for the Society; the Trustees had no right to remove the collection so long as it was properly cared for by the Corporation on the conditions laid down. The Society's books and manuscripts ('printed and written books') were placed in the Corporation's reference library on the same conditions.

8 In 1895 the Corporation's Free Library Committee wrote to the Society's Council to represent the unsatisfactory nature of the dual control thus established over the collection. On 29th March 1895, at a Special General Meeting, the Society resolved unanimously 'that the whole of the contents of the Museum, together with all printed and written books, the property of the Society now in the Reference Library, be transferred to the Corporation as absolute owners for the use of the public'.

9 The Council of the Society nevertheless continued to appoint Hon. Curators. In 1906, however, after the Free Library Committee had pointed out that the transfer of 1895 had rendered the appointment of Curators anomalous, the Council agreed that in future it would nominate the Hon. Curators who were to be appointed by the Free Library Committee.

10(a) By 1914 only two of the original eight Trustees (Prebendary T. Auden and H. W. Adnitt) survived. In that year the Council of the Society was alarmed by a suggestion made in the borough council that the building containing the Free Library and Museum should be converted to municipal offices. The proposal, which the Council of the Society 'would have had no choice but to oppose', was not

pursued. Nevertheless the Society's Council 'took the opportunity of filling up the number by appointing six new Trustees to watch over the interests of the Society in that relation'.

10(b) In 1932, 'the question of the ownership of the contents of the Museum having been discussed' at a meeting of the Society's Council, 'it appeared to be the general opinion that the collection is in the hands of the Corporation for public use, and that it is vested in Trustees appointed by the Society who would have power to act in the case of any failure on the part of the Corporation to carry out their obligations'. There then remained only three of the Trustees appointed in 1914. Five new Trustees were accordingly appointed. At present the only surviving Trustee is Miss Lily F. Chitty, O.B.E.

11 The Society, by its appointment of Trustees, has demonstrated its conviction that it has a residuary interest in the permanence and integrity of the collections it handed over in 1895. Even more importantly, however, it has continued to demonstrate its interest in the local-history collection by adding to, or helping to add to, the collection of books and manuscripts. A small number of examples must suffice to illustrate the variety of ways in which it has done so.

The Society's minutes for 1896 show that a former member, the late John Calcott, 'showed his appreciation of the objects aimed at in the work of the Society by a valuable legacy of scientific books to the Shrewsbury Free Library'.

In 1906 William Phillips's archaeological MSS. were bought for the Free Library, the Society and the Free Library Committee each paying half of the purchase price of £25.

In 1907 Mrs. Martin, of Westhope, Craven Arms, gave the Society a number of Shropshire deeds to be deposited in the Free Library, and in 1922 Mr. Swinnerton Dyer promised to hand over to the Society's Council Mrs. Martin's papers 'so that her work and memory may be perpetuated in the archives of the Reference Library'.

In 1924 the Society handed over to the Free Library some Shropshire deeds which had been presented to it, and later the same year some of Phillips's MSS. relating to the history of Shrewsbury were placed in the library.

In 1916 the Society ordered that exchange publications were to be sent directly to the library and made efforts to bring the various sets up to a complete state.

II THE SOCIETY'S PROPERTY

12 The variety of ways in which the Society has helped to augment the local-history collection adduced in the foregoing paragraph has blurred any dividing line that may have existed between the property of the Society and that of the Shrewsbury Public Library. Nevertheless there are items in the Library which demonstrably belong to the Society or are acknowledged to do so. A list was drawn up for the Council in 1945. More recently the Council was informed on the subject by Mr. M. F. Messenger, the Shrewsbury Borough Librarian and the Society's Hon. Librarian, in a report of 26th November 1973. These sources mention :

the exchange publications,

MS. and TS. transcripts of parish registers belonging to the Society since its amalgamation with the Shropshire Parish Register Society in 1923,

MSS. 373 and 664.

To these should be added the John Homes Smith Collection of Watercolours bequeathed to the Society by Gilbert Bakewell Stretton by his will dated 5th March 1931 and proved at London on 26th March 1949 (Appendix B).

13(a) The precise number of volumes of exchange publications is not known. Mr. Messenger's report estimated 2,500 volumes in about 60 series occupying 200 feet of shelving. An accurate inventory will be made before the end of March. These periodical publications—some national, some regional—form an extremely valuable source of information about the archaeology, local history, and to some extent the

natural history of many parts of Britain. The collection includes many publications available nowhere else in Shropshire. It is currently stored in three places. National periodicals and regional periodicals beginning with the letter 'A' are in a small office off the first-floor reading room ; periodicals 'A' to 'Scot' are in an adjacent small office off the same reading room ; periodicals 'Scot' to 'Z' are on shelves in a corridor near Room 9 in Rigg's Hall. In addition the *Montgomeryshire Collections*—and possibly some other series relating to neighbouring counties—are shelved in the main local-history room on the second floor.

13(b) The storage of the parish register transcripts on some 30 feet of shelving in the Library's local-studies department has been described in Mr. Messenger's report.

13(c) MSS. 373 and 664 are stored with the rest of the Library MSS. in the strong room.

13(d) The J. H. Smith Collection of Watercolours is kept in the Committee Room in Rigg's Hall.

III RECOMMENDATIONS

14 This report has been drawn up, and the following recommendations are made, against the background of the Local Government Act, 1972, which transferred library powers to county councils, but gave concurrent museum powers to county and to district councils. The Shrewsbury District Council apparently intends to exercise its museum powers. Some other recent decisions are germane to the subject matter of the present report.

On 7th January 1974 the Shrewsbury District Council accepted the report of its Policy and Resources Committee recommending that 'subject to the collection being retained permanently by the Salop County Council in the present library buildings, the local history collection be transferred to that Council with the library function'.

On 9th January 1974 the County Librarian drew attention to the existence of the vacant post of Librarian in charge of Local History within the County Library. According to the job description prepared by the County Librarian the 'main responsibility' of the holder of the post will be to 'organize, administer and develop the local history material within the county Library so that it may be used to the full. First claim upon his/her time will be the oversight of the central local history collection in the Shrewsbury library at Castle Gates . . .' In her accompanying letter the County Librarian notes that 'the person in charge of that collection [in the Shrewsbury library] will be a key factor in retaining the collection in its present form . . .'

On 7th December 1973 the Council of the Shropshire Archaeological Society elected the County Librarian to be the Society's Hon. Librarian with effect from 1st April 1974. The County Librarian subsequently agreed to serve the Society in that way.

15 The Society, conscious of having contributed much over the years to the local-history collection in the Shrewsbury Public Library and desiring to continue its contribution, has been anxious to see the collection's integrity and stability preserved through the present period of local-government change. It is therefore recommended that the Society should welcome the recent decisions and present policies of the Shrewsbury District Council and of the County Librarian as outlined above. It is further recommended that copies of this Report be sent to the Shrewsbury Borough Librarian and to the County Librarian.

16 It is recommended that seven new Trustees be appointed to act with Miss Chitty, at present the sole Trustee, to maintain the Society's residuary interest in the local-history collection and to consider, whenever it shall seem necessary or appropriate, any of the matters raised in this Report or related matters.

17 It is recommended that the Council communicate with the County Librarian about the exchange publications to the following effect :

- (a) The Society hopes that the County Librarian will be willing for the County Library staff to continue to receive and shelve additions to the collection of exchange periodicals.
- (b) The Society would not wish there to be unrestricted public access to the collection of exchange periodicals, but would be anxious for it to be made available to members of the Society and, on the judgement of a senior member of the library staff, to all other *bona fide* scholars and students on the following conditions :
 - (i) no volume may be taken away from the library premises by any individual borrower,
 - (ii) no volume may be sent out of Shropshire on inter-library loan, and
 - (iii) parts of the collection may from time to time be temporarily deposited in branches of the Shropshire County Library outside Shrewsbury for use by members of the Society and other *bona fide* scholars and students provided that permission has first been obtained from the Society's Hon. Secretary.
- (c) To facilitate the use of the exchange periodicals in the Library by members of the Society and other *bona fide* scholars and students the Society would like to see the whole collection (with the exception of such series as the librarian may wish to place in the main local-history reading room) shelved in one room. Ideally the room should be equipped with one or two reading desks. The Society hopes that this recommendation may be considered during any future rearrangement of rooms in the library.

18 It is recommended that this Report be printed in the *Transactions*.

29th January, 1974

G. C. BAUGH
J. B. LAWSON
B. S. TRINDER

APPENDIX A

1 The Corporation shall provide in the Old Grammar School Buildings for the display of the Collection, and bear the expense of lighting, warming, cleaning, and keeping in repair the rooms allotted for this purpose, and also bear the expense of the removal of the Collection.

2 Free Admission to be afforded to the public to view the Collection, at such time as shall be hereafter determined by the Managers appointed by the Corporation under the Free Libraries' Act.

3 The classification and arrangement of the Collection to be made by Honorary Curators appointed to the several departments of which it consists, by the Council of the Archaeological and Natural History Society for the time being, but should the Council neglect or refuse to appoint such Honorary Curators, the Corporation may take upon itself the duty of appointing competent persons to do the work.

4 The Corporation to appoint an Attendant or Custodian to be in charge of the Collection.

5 The Collection to be vested in the following Trustees, viz :—The Right Hon. the Earl of Bradford, Stanley Leighton, Esq., M.P., Rev. Canon Butler, Rev. W. A. Leighton, Rev. T. Auden, J. R. Humphreys, Esq., Mr. William Phillips, and Mr. Adnitt, appointed by and for the Archaeological and Natural History Society, but these Trustees shall not have power to remove the Collection under any pretence whatever, so long as it is properly cared for by the Corporation, and the herein-named Conditions are complied with.

6 Should the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society become insolvent, or be unable to carry out the objects for which it was established, or cease to exist, the whole Collection shall pass into the absolute possession of the Corporation, for the use of the public.

7 The Collections herein-named shall be understood to comprise all objects of Archaeology, Natural History and Art, together with the cases in which they are kept, contained in the Shrewsbury Museum, now at College Hill, except the printed and written Books, with the cases containing them. These printed and written Books shall, however, be handed over to the Corporation on similar conditions, provided a Library of Reference (i.e., Books not removable) be established in the same building by the Corporation, of which such Books shall then form a part.

APPENDIX B

Extract from the will (5th March 1931) of the late Gilbert Bakewell Stretton (died 27th October 1948) proved at London 26th March, 1949.

4 I GIVE AND BEQUEATH to the President and Chairman for the time being of the Shropshire Archaeological Society in trust for that Society whose present address is 28 Claremont Hill, Shrewsbury, (the receipt of the person who professes to be their Treasurer or other proper officer for the time being shall be a good and sufficient discharge therefor) free of all duties and charges whatsoever the following Drawings, namely :—

- (1) 219 Water Colour Drawings of Shropshire Churches by my Grandfather J. Homes Smith of Worcester.
- (2) 176 Water Colour Drawings of other Shropshire views and buildings by the same Artist.

COUNCIL AND OFFICERS ON 1 MAY 1975

President

GRAHAM A. WEBSTER, Esq., M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A., A.M.A.

Vice-Presidents

The Rt. Revd. the LORD BISHOP OF HEREFORD

The Rt. Revd. the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD

The Rt. Hon. the LORD HARLECH, P.C., K.C.M.G.

Capt. Sir OFFLEY WAKEMAN, Bt., C.B.E.

Sir JOHN A. LANGFORD HOLT, M.P.

Dame KATHLEEN M. KENYON, D.B.E., D.Litt., D.Lit., L.H.D.,
F.B.A., F.S.A.

Miss LILY F. CHITTY, O.B.E., M.A., F.S.A.

H. BEAUMONT, Esq., M.A.

The Revd. J. E. G. CARTLIDGE, F.R.Hist.S.

Elected Members

T. S. COLE, Esq.

N. COSSONS, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., F.M.A.

W. DAY, Esq.

S. G. HAY, Esq.

Dr. A. W. J. HOUGHTON, M.B., B.S.,

M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.S.A.

W. E. JENKS, Esq.

J. B. LAWSON, Esq.

J. F. A. MASON, Esq., M.A., D.Phil.,
F.S.A.

D. J. PANNETT, Esq., B.A.

Co-opted Member

R. E. JAMES, Esq.

Chairman

M. C. de C. PEELE, Esq.

Hon. Secretary

G. S. G. TOMS, Esq., M.A., 29 Mount Street, Shrewsbury, SY3 8QH

Hon. Treasurer

N. MUTTON, Esq., B.Sc. (Econ.), Ph.D., 12 Manor Close, Shifnal, TF11 9AJ

Hon. Editor

G. C. BAUGH, Esq., M.A., 28 Oak Street, Shrewsbury, SY3 7RQ

Hon. Editor of the News Sheet

B. S. TRINDER, Esq., B.A., 20 Garmston Road, Shrewsbury, SY2 6HE

Hon. Membership Secretary

Mrs. M. T. HALFORD, M.A., Shropshire Record Office, Shirehall, Shrewsbury,
SY2 6ND

Hon. Publications Secretary

Mrs. J. M. MILLER, A.T.C., Stonehouse, Picklescott, Church Stretton, SY6 6NR

Hon. Excursions and Meetings Secretary

Mrs. C. A. PEELE, 2 Lane End, Muckleton, Telford, TF6 6RQ

Hon. Librarian

Miss O. S. NEWMAN, F.L.A., Shropshire County Library, Column House, 7 London
Road, Shrewsbury, SY2 6NW

Hon. Auditor

J. DYKE, Esq., F.C.A., Dyke & Ruscoe, 21 St. Mary's Street, Shrewsbury, SY1 1EE

SHROPSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND PARISH REGISTER SOCIETY

Receipts and Payments Account for Year ended 31st December 1971

RECEIPTS	PAYMENTS
Balance, 1st January 1971, Lloyds Bank Ltd. ...	Printing and stationery ...
converted as ...	Postage, stationery, and office expenses ...
Subscriptions ...	Public liability insurance ...
Sales of <i>Transactions</i> , etc. ...	Insurance of book stock ...
Net proceeds of tours ...	Subscriptions ...
Net transfer from Deposit Account, Lloyds Bank Ltd. ...	Room hire and meetings expenses ...
Grant from Department of the Environment for excavation at Pride Hill (£200 less £30 payment on account) ...	Excavation expenses ...
	Conference expenses ...
	Donation to RESCUE ...
	Balance, 31st December, 1971, Lloyds Bank Ltd. ...
	<u>£1,442.13</u>

Deposit Account for Year ended 31st December 1971

RECEIPTS	PAYMENTS
Balance, 1st January 1971, Lloyds Bank Ltd. ...	Transfer to Current Account ...
converted as ...	Balance, 31st December 1971, Lloyds Bank Ltd. ...
Transfer from Current Account ...	
Interest ...	
	<u>£734.11</u>

(Signed) NORMAN MUTTON, Hon. Treasurer, 19th June 1972

Deposit Account for Year ended 31st December 1972

Note : The Society's funds on 31st December, 1972 included the following unexpended balances of grants from the Department of the Environment :

(1) on account of 1st Pride Hill excavation	.. £45.00
(2) on account of 2nd Pride Hill excavation	.. 153.94
	<hr/>
	£198.94

DOMESDAY SOCIETY IN SHROPSHIRE

By T. A. GWYNNE, M.A., M.Litt.

'THE Shropshire portion of the Domesday inquest hardly ranks among the most interesting in the great record'. Thus Professor James Tait began his Introduction to the Domesday Survey of Shropshire in Volume I of *Victoria History of Shropshire* (1908).¹ Even so he went on to note that Shropshire's border position lent a special interest to these data. More recently Mr. V. A. Saunders, writing in the *Domesday Geography of Midland England* (1954), has stated: 'The Domesday folios for Shropshire are of especial interest because they throw light on the unsettled condition of the Welsh borderland in the years immediately following the Norman Conquest'.² Those border conditions must figure largely in any picture of society in late-11th-century Shropshire, but it is hoped that there is more than that to be found in a fresh study of the Shropshire folios. Within certain limits it is possible to draw a fairly clear picture of the social classes recorded in the Domesday folios and of their relationships both to the land and to one another.³ The Domesday evidence relating to Shropshire has already been the subject of a considerable amount of investigation, but it is hoped there is still something to be added, albeit of no more than modest dimensions.⁴ In preparing this article I have considered all the evidence recorded in the Shropshire folios whether or not it refers to places within the modern shire, a practice which differs from that of the compilers of the Domesday Geography of England series.⁵

Not surprisingly the Shropshire folios record a number of Welshmen, sometimes entered as *Waleis*, sometimes as *Walenses*. Throughout all the Domesday folios relating to the Welsh Border region the term *Waleis* occurs on only seven occasions, all of them in the Shropshire folios.⁶ In the remaining entries for Shropshire the term *Walenses* is used. I reckon 67 Welshmen recorded in the Shropshire folios and, perhaps rather surprisingly in view of the remarkable difficulty in getting agreement on Domesday totals, that is also the total arrived at by Sir Henry Ellis, the Revd. R. W. Eyton, and Professor Tait.⁷ There are also references to unspecified numbers of Welshmen at Trewern (*Alreton*) and Whittington.⁸

While, numerically, recorded Welshmen can be regarded as of little significance,

¹*V.C.H. Salop*. i. 279.

²V. A. Saunders in H. C. Darby and I. B. Terrétt (eds.), *Domesday Geography of Midland Eng.* (1954), 57. All refs. are to be the 1st edn. although there is a 2nd (1971) edn.

³Much of this article is based on my unpublished M.A. thesis, 'Social Classes in the Welsh Border region in the Early Norman period' (1969), deposited in Nottingham Univ. Libr.

⁴In addition to the works cited in notes 1 and 2 the following are important: R. W. Eyton, *Antiquities of Shropshire* (1854-1860); J. C. Anderson, *Shropshire, its Early History and Antiquities* (1864); D. W. Sylvester, 'Rural Settlement in Domesday Shropshire', *Sociological Review*, xxv; W. J. Slack, 'The Shropshire Ploughmen of Domesday Book' *T.S.A.S.*, l. 31-5; D. W. Sylvester, *The Rural Landscape of the Welsh Borderlands* (1969); R. W. Finn, *The Norman Conquest and its effect on the economy, 1066-1086* (1971), chap. 4, pp. 152-68; Trevor Rowley, *The Shropshire Landscape* (1972).

⁵The wisdom of the practice of recasting the Domesday statistics in terms of modern shires has been doubted by Prof. F. Barlow in *History*, liii. 396-7.

⁶255a1, 258a1, 258a2, 259a2, 259b1. (The Record Commission edn. of *Domesday Book*, i (1783); references are to the folio, the column, and the *recto* or *verso* of a leaf.)

⁷The figures of Eyton and Tait are most easily consulted in *V.C.H. Salop*. i. 307; those of Ellis in *A General Introduction to Domesday Book, accompanied by Indexes* . . . ii (Record Commissioners, 1833).

⁸253b1. *Alreton* was identified with *Caus* in the text and discussion of Domesday in *V.C.H. Salop*. i. The indexes to vol. i (*ibid.* ii), however, give the correct identification—with Trewern (in Buttington, Mont.) established by Mr. J. B. Lawson.

their distribution is rather more interesting. The total Domesday population of Shropshire, Herefordshire, and Gloucestershire has been reckoned at 18,814;⁹ from the same shires we can count only 112 recorded Welshmen. It is of some importance to note that those represent men entered specifically as Welshmen and that other Welshmen may well have been entered under the more general classes of the rural population. Tait wrote of what was the probable fate of Welsh captives along the Border and drew attention to the large proportion of slaves in these shires.¹⁰ Indeed it is very likely that any Welsh captives, and certainly those of long standing, were entered as slaves. The interesting feature, however, is that Domesday Book was careful to record some inhabitants as Welshmen and we may presume that there was a reason for that.

In Shropshire a large concentration of Welshmen is recorded in the most severely devastated hundred, *Mersete*, and another smaller grouping in another badly ravaged area in *Rinlau*. Not only do those groupings of Welshmen coincide with general areas of devastation, but in six instances in *Mersete* Welshmen were recorded on land that had been waste when received by Norman landholders: at Oswestry, Whittington, Weston Rhyn, *Tibetune*, Molverley, and Weston Cotton.¹¹ A large number of Shropshire entries bear witness to the arable activities of Welshmen, and it seems possible that such Welshmen had taken the opportunity of acquiring lands across the Border in much the same way as did their Saxon counterparts. Whether it is still correct to regard Welshmen as exclusively pastoral in their occupations (as was once thought to be the case) is at least debatable.¹² We may also note a peculiar feature of isolation on the part of some of these recorded Welshmen, e.g. in 4 of the 6 above-mentioned entries for *Mersete* hundred, Welshmen and their ploughs were recorded separately from the main list of rural classes. In the Shropshire folios in general this feature is repeated in 6 more entries, making a total of 10 such entries in all. Further, in 8 instances Welshmen were recorded on lands which had no other Domesday inhabitants at all. Such a situation suggests Welsh settlers who had recently acquired land and who, as yet, were not integrated into local society. This situation is not repeated in Herefordshire where, for example, we find no Welshmen in the severely devastated north-west of the shire. Can we infer from this that the situation in Shropshire was more conducive to Welsh settlement than in Herefordshire, where recorded Welshmen did not spread beyond the still disputed areas of Ewyas and Archenfeld? Yet there too Welshmen and their ploughs are very often entered separately from the other inhabitants, as was sometimes the case in Gloucestershire.

Although it is quite clear that much recovery of waste in Shropshire had taken place in many areas where there were no recorded Welshmen, it may well be that in the case of Shropshire Welshmen had been recruited to make up manpower: 15 entries record that where Welshmen were found there could be more ploughs, thus suggesting a lack of manpower. That is sometimes stated (as at Oswestry) or can sometimes be calculated from the number of possible ploughs and the actual number recorded (as at Molverley). It would be interesting to be able to identify a

⁹Ellis, *op. cit.* 445, 454, 481.

¹⁰*V.C.H. Salop.* i. 279.

¹¹253b1, 254b2, 255a1.

¹²G. R. J. Jones, 'The Pattern of Settlement on the Welsh Border', *Agricultural History Review*, viii, 66-81.

particular landholder's interest in introducing Welsh labour but unfortunately that is not possible for the whole Border region. In Shropshire, however, 34 of the total of 67 Welshmen were entered on the estates of Rainald the Sheriff, especially on his holdings in the hundred of *Mersele*.

The Shropshire folios also provide some evidence of the agricultural role of Welshmen, e.g. at Trewern and Clun we have instances of some Welshmen being entered in association with ploughs, while the same entries also record other Welshmen with no connexion with plough ownership.¹³ At Trewern certain Welshmen laboured there and paid 16s., while at the same place 2 Welshmen were included in a list of villeins, bordars, a riding man, and *bovarii*, who amongst them had 3 ploughs. This could mean that while the 2 Welshmen on the lands of Roger's 5 *milites* took their part in the arable cultivation, those recorded on Roger's own estate, having no recorded connexion with the 4 ploughs recorded there, pursued other activities, perhaps of a more pastoral nature. A similar situation occurs at Clun where, on Picot's estate, we find 4 Welshmen paying 2s. 4d. and entered separately from those classes who share the 7 ploughs there. On the lands held of Picot by Walter, by another Picot, and by Gislold, we find 2 Welshmen who shared 2 ploughs with villeins and bordars. In the Shropshire folios 52 Welshmen are numbered in plough entries, while 15 are noted by renders alone. Such a number does not provide an impossibly large total for pastoral duties. Unfortunately at Great Ness and at Clun we find 6 and 4 Welshmen respectively entered without ploughs or a share in plough ownership.¹⁴ These are rather large block numbers for pastoral duties, but of course there may well have been other activities to occupy them at these two places.

The renders of Welshmen present a striking difference between Shropshire and Herefordshire. In Shropshire we find only one instance of a render in kind, at Kinnerley where a Welshman paid one falcon by way of ferm.¹⁵ The remaining 9 references to renders all record money renders. In Herefordshire we find a remarkable contrast: only at Eardisley do we find an exclusively money render.¹⁶ Produce renders very likely result from the nature of the Saxon occupation of the Welsh areas, and they reflect Welsh tribute renders that were taken over with the land by the Saxon conquerors. The money renders of Shropshire might well reflect a far more recent, but also far more complete, domination of these areas by Norman lords. It may be that the Norman subjugation of these areas was either so violent that it disrupted the Welsh organization itself, thus making it necessary to replace Welsh tribute with money renders, or so complete as to allow the Normans to ignore the old Welsh customs and impose what they wanted, namely money tribute. That the Normans had made some startlingly rapid progress is demonstrated by Rainald's control of the two Welsh commots of Cynllaith and Edeyrnion.¹⁷ In Herefordshire Welshmen were often recorded round castles in such circumstances as to suggest that they were men who traded across the Border but this feature is absent from entries recorded in the Shropshire folios.

We need not be surprised at the appearance of recorded Welshmen in this Border shire but we also find a number of Frenchmen recorded: 33 *Francigenae* and 3

¹³253b1, 258a2.

¹⁴253b2, 258a2.

¹⁵259a2.

¹⁶184b2.

¹⁷255a1.

Francigenae servientes appear in the Shropshire folios. Here again there is agreement with the counts of Ellis, Eyton, and Tait.¹⁸ For Shropshire, Herefordshire, Worcester-shire, and Gloucestershire I calculate a total of 102 Frenchmen.¹⁹ Such a number is fairly large in terms of their general appearance throughout Domesday England, although Hertfordshire and Leicestershire record larger numbers. Ellis counted 41 Frenchmen in Cheshire²⁰ so we may fairly conclude that Frenchmen were well represented in the Border region. Only Hertfordshire, Leicestershire, and Cheshire record shire totals greater than the 33 in Shropshire. Very few of them appear in the west of the shire; they are spread thinly over the central and eastern areas of the shire. Only a single Frenchman appears in a hundred contiguous to the Border: at Halston in *Mersete* hundred.²¹ There is a small concentration of them in the Shrewsbury area. All but two entries record Frenchmen with a share in plough ownership. The entry for Myddle in Baschurch hundred records no ploughs other than the one in demesne but we find 8 bordars, a priest and 2 Frenchmen there.²² There seems to have been land for 20 ploughs, so what we may have is a group of men waiting to take the opportunity of extending land under cultivation but who, as yet, had made little headway. On no occasion is a Frenchman entered separately from the rest of the inhabitants. Throughout the Border region there were often large numbers of ploughs in operation where we find Frenchmen recorded, e.g. 12 ploughs at Emstrey, 11 at Edgmond, 10 at Stoke upon Tern.²³ Only rarely was there just one plough in action. These features would suggest that Frenchmen came to Shropshire in search of flourishing estates, ready to benefit from the Conquest—to benefit, however, with the minimum of risk. Hence they remained well behind the extreme western limits of the Border region. The Shropshire folios contain 12 entries that record Frenchmen on land that had been waste when received by Norman landholders, and 22 that record Frenchmen on estates where there were lands for more ploughs—lands that in some cases could use large numbers of extra ploughs. Thus in Shropshire Frenchmen seem to be men who were eager to benefit from areas of intensive cultivation and by the scope for development offered by the region in general. We can perhaps picture men characterized by individual opportunism and, indeed, find them thinly spread over the shire and not in block groupings as was the case in Leicestershire.²⁴

In the Shropshire folios some 13 entries relate Frenchmen to Rainald the Sheriff but at least 8 other landholders held estates on which Frenchmen were recorded. Six Frenchmen were entered on ecclesiastical estates; it is perhaps a reflexion of the relative prosperity of those lands, which can be seen both in the intensity of cultivation taking place and in the recorded values. On only one occasion in Shropshire does a Frenchman appear on an estate round a castle—at Castle Holgate;²⁵ they may nevertheless have had a military function. Maitland noted that we could expect Frenchmen to have been capable of bearing arms²⁶ and it is possible to speculate on

¹⁸Ellis, *op. cit.* 481; *V.C.H. Salop.* i. 307.

¹⁹I have accepted the translation of *francigenae* as Frenchmen although it could be translated as freemen.

²⁰Ellis, *op. cit.* 430.

²¹254b2.

²²255a1, 255a2.

²³252b1, 253b2, 256b1.

²⁴*Domesday Geography of Midland Eng.* 334.

²⁵258b1.

²⁶F. W. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond* (1897), 46, n. 1.

their potential military functions along the Border. Frenchmen were recorded as playing a part in Border campaigns as early as 1052²⁷ and it is unlikely they would have no part in the defence of the Border of the late 11th century.

On only one occasion do Welshmen and Frenchmen appear in the same entry : at Halston 2 Welshmen and 1 Frenchman with two *homines* held 1½ plough on an estate of Rainald.²⁸ Otherwise in Shropshire (and this is the rule in Herefordshire too) the two groups seem mutually exclusive. Welshmen were to be found mostly in block groupings to the west ; Frenchmen were spread thinly over the central and eastern areas of the shire.

In Welshmen and Frenchmen we have perhaps representatives of the old and the new orders of Domesday society in the Welsh Border region. There were, however, other representatives of the old order. Riding men appear to be almost exclusively confined to this region, although it may be that the same class in the eastern counties was concealed under the more general designation of freemen or *servientes*.²⁹ There is also the possibility that the riding men of the Border region must be viewed alongside the sokemen of eastern England as survivors from much older systems of organization.³⁰ They are entered in Domesday Book as *radmanni* and *radchenestri*, and Dr. L. H. Nelson has demonstrated that *radmanni* seems to be a usage in the northern areas of the Border region while *radchenestri* is generally confined to the south of this region.³¹ I calculate 174 *radmanni* and 3 *radchenestri* from the Shropshire folios and this tallies with the figures presented by Tait.³² Ellis and Eyton both counted 167 *radmanni* and 3 *radchenestri*.³³ They were spread over most of the shire, but there were no riding men recorded in the hundred of *Mersete* and they appear only in the south-east of the hundred of *Baschurch*. They do not appear very frequently in *Leintwardine* hundred nor in *Rinlau*, but when they do appear in this Border hundred it is often in large concentrations. They do not seem to favour the extreme western districts of the Border region in general. The largest concentrations occurred at Lydbury North (8), Bourton (4), Lydham (6), Leegomery (4), and Wotherton (4).³⁴ In each case the vill had a fairly large recorded population and it is therefore possible to argue that concentrations of riding men mark centres of some importance, perhaps in terms of 11th-century communications within the region. Many large villis, however, recorded no riding men. Yet assuming such functions as Round suggested³⁵ we might well expect villis recording large numbers of them to be places of some importance. Since it is unlikely that any particular lord would have a monopoly of needs requiring riding service we should expect to find riding men distributed among a variety of landholders. To a limited degree this is true of Shropshire : at least 29 individual landholders can be identified in relation to the appearance of riding men upon their estates. In many cases, however, it is impossible to determine just who would be able to claim the riding service—tenants-in-chief or sub-tenants ? Even so,

²⁷ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, sub anno 1052.

²⁸ 254b2.

²⁹ P. Vinogradoff, *English Society in the Eleventh Century* (1908), 70.

³⁰ R. H. C. Davis, *The Calendar of Abbot Samson of Bury St. Edmunds and Related Documents* (Camden 3rd ser. lxxxiv), pp. xlv-xlvi.

³¹ L. H. Nelson, *op. cit.* 44-5, esp. Table 1.

³² *V.C.H. Salop.* i. 307.

³³ Ellis, *op. cit.* 481 ; *V.C.H. Salop.* i. 307.

³⁴ 252a2, 252b2, 253b1, 254b2, 259b1.

³⁵ *V.C.H. Worcs.* i. 250-1.

certain landholders held estates that recorded a total of riding men sufficiently large to be noticeable : Rainald's holdings account for 21, Robert fitz Corbet's for 15, and Roger fitz Corbet's for 9. That suggests that there is no reason to believe that riding men were unpopular tenants for Norman lords, although Dr. Nelson asserted just that and drew attention to the 9 per cent of the shire total of riding men who resided on the lands of a small group of Saxon landholders in the hundreds of *Ruesset*, *Witen-treu*, and *Condober*.³⁶ Such an argument would allow us to make the same claim for the estates of Rainald or Robert fitz Corbet. Furthermore, it is perhaps worth noting that the estates supposedly characterized by the appearance of riding men under Saxon lordship are all but equalled by the two nearby *Rinlau* manors of Lydbury North, in the hands of the Bishop of Hereford, which recorded 8 riding men and Lydham, in the hands of Earl Roger, which recorded 6 riding men. Thus it seems far more likely that the area in general rather than the landholders provides the answer to the numbers of riding men. Indeed those numbers themselves are not unduly large and groupings of 15 can easily be put together without any accompanying Saxon landholders. Finally we may note that the total of riding men for the 3 hundreds comes to 54 : 19 in *Condober*, 23 in *Witentreu*, and 12 in *Ruesset*. From such a total, 15 is hardly a sizable proportion on which to base any far-reaching generalizations.

Dr. Nelson also claimed that where Norman immigration was high the number of riding men was small. The Shropshire folios record 38 *Francigenae*, the second highest shire total from the Welsh Border region ; yet the same folios also record the highest shire total of riding men in the region. Cheshire had the highest total of *Francigenae* and—as far as tenants-in-chief were concerned—was totally in the hands of Norman landholders. Yet the same shire records the second highest shire total of riding men. Even within Shropshire itself it is difficult to accept Dr. Nelson's claim, for in the western districts *Francigenae* hardly ever appear ; yet riding men are not particularly well represented in those areas either.

Riding men clearly played their part in the agricultural activity of the shire : from a total of 98 entries for Shropshire 75 record riding men with a share in plough ownership, 10 record them with their own ploughs, and only 3 record them with no ploughs at all. The remaining 10 entries are difficult to interpret. From a total of 195 entries relating to the Border region, if we omit 22 entries as too difficult to interpret, we find only 7 entries which do not associate riding men with plough teams. That is significant for it suggests that, no matter how important their other duties may have been, their livelihood still came directly from the land. That in turn poses a question. If riding men could expect to be absent either on military or, more likely, messengerial duties, was sufficient provision made for their absence from the vill ? At Lydbury North, Little Rossall, Trewern, Coton (in Wem), Woore, Dorrington, Moston, and Rhiston we have 8 instances of what appear to be riding men entered with some dependent labour.³⁷ Eight entries, however, can hardly be regarded as significant from a total of 98 for the shire. Riding men, however, generally appear on estates with large numbers of inhabitants. Only on 6 occasions in Shropshire are they recorded as the sole inhabitants on an estate. In very general terms we may say

³⁶L. H. Nelson, *op. cit.* 49-50.

³⁷252a2, 253a1, 253b1, 257a2, 257b1, 259a2, 259b1.

that a sufficient labour force was available to allow for their absence on messengerial functions.

Two Shropshire entries provide details of renders made by riding men. At Priest Weston 7 riding men paid 20s., and at Clun 2 riding men paid 2 animals as rent.³⁸ The entry for Clun is one of the 2 entries for the Welsh Border region that record renders in kind from riding men, the other being at Leominster in Herefordshire. The Shropshire folios provide no evidence of the service required from riding men, although Dr. Nelson used the evidence regarding the 'better-class' burgesses of Shrewsbury to deduce similar duties for riding men.³⁹ Riding men, however, were not the only mounted men to frequent this region. I count 34 *milites* in the Shropshire folios, 22 entered as under-tenants and 12 simply as *milites*. Tait also counted a total of 34 *milites*.⁴⁰ Rather surprisingly perhaps, they do not appear near the castles of Oswestry, Montgomery, Castle Holgate, or Shrewsbury.⁴¹ This feature is repeated in Herefordshire. It may be that the defence of the Border was not envisaged as a static system based upon castles but as a system devised in depth. It is possible to discern two lines of settlements recording *milites* running from north to south within the shire. Dr. J. Beeler has drawn attention to the need for such a system: 'To protect the frontier against Welsh raids a few major castles were insufficient. Many local strong points were needed, to which the Norman settlers and their dependants could repair in times of danger; and these appeared in large numbers all along the border.'⁴² Can we therefore assume such strong points in Shropshire from the appearance of *milites*?

Shropshire *milites* often had a substantial number of plough beasts. On at least 8 occasions a ratio of 1 *miles* to 8 plough beasts is found⁴³ and some held even more, e.g. at Trewern 5 *milites* held 52 plough beasts. Sometimes the ratio was rather smaller. Sixteen Shropshire entries recorded ploughs on estates held by *milites* but at Acton Reynald we find a Richard holding from Rainald. There was sufficient land to occupy 5 ploughs, but only 1 plough was recorded. Two *milites* are the only recorded inhabitants and we might wonder who operated the single plough on this land, the value of which had dropped from £4 in 1066 to 10s. in 1086.⁴⁴ Could it be that these 2 *milites* had to carry out ploughing functions? Certain evidence from the Herefordshire folios also leads us to a similar conclusion regarding some *milites* entered in that shire. In Shropshire at Sambrook 3 ploughs were recorded but there were only 5 labourers. Nevertheless a 2 : 1 ratio of men to plough can still be achieved if we assume that the *miles* who held the estate took his part in the ploughing. That many knights were humble people, sometimes no better off than prosperous peasants, has been noted by Dr. Sally Harvey⁴⁵ and, mindful of this, we might find it easier to accept the idea of *milites* carrying out ploughing duties.

Ploughing, however, was the business of those classes who not only made up the

³⁸256a1, 258a2.

³⁹252a1; Nelson, *op. cit.* 48-49.

⁴⁰V.C.H. Salop. i. 307.

⁴¹253b1, 254a1, 258b1, 253a1, 252a2.

⁴²J. Beeler, *Warfare in England* (Cornell; New York, 1966), 208.

⁴³Onibury, 252a2; Corfham, 253b1; Caynham, 256b2; Sambrook, 257b2; Clun, 258a2; Sutton Maddock, 259a1; Leintwardine, 260a2; Upper and Lower Lye, 260a2.

⁴⁴255a2.

⁴⁵S. Harvey, 'The Knight and the Knight's Fee in England', *Past and Present*, no. 49 (Nov. 1970), 4. The whole article (pp. 3-34) provides valuable background to the study of *milites* in Domesday Eng.

bulk of the whole population of Domesday England but also the bulk of the Shropshire population in particular. It has long been recognized that the south-west recorded a high percentage of slaves in the shire population. This feature may be extended to include the Welsh Border region, although here it occurs to a lesser degree. The distribution of slaves was not uniform throughout Shropshire: more than 10 per cent of the population of the eastern hundred of Wrockwardine were classed as slaves while in the Border hundred of *Mersete* there was not a single slave recorded. Viewed in relation to the other Shropshire hundreds the 21.6 per cent in *Rinlau* may be deemed high, but in general the highest percentages of slaves are not found in the extreme west of the shire, as the Table shows. This feature is common to the whole Border region.

TABLE

Percentages of slaves and *bovarii* distributed in the Shropshire hundreds calculated from Domesday Book

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Slaves</i>	<i>Bovarii</i>	<i>Combined</i>
Baschurch	12.8	7.5	20.3
Condetret	30.1	2.0	32.1
Condovery	29.9	4.6	33.3
Culvestan	15.8	9.2	25.0
<i>Elnostruil</i>	36.6	5.1	36.7
Leintwardine	12.4	13.2	25.6
<i>Mersete</i> *	0	26.7	26.7
Hodnet	20.0	10.0	30.0
Overs	20.8	0	20.8
Patton	22.5	4.8	27.3
Wrockwardine	10.9	16.4	27.3
<i>Rinlau</i> *	21.6	0.7	22.3
Shrewsbury	16.7	0	16.7
<i>Ruesset</i> *	19.1	6.0	25.1
<i>Witentreu</i> *	16.2	7.5	23.7

*—Border hundreds

Significant recovery of waste had taken place in the hundred of Hodnet which recorded 20 per cent of its population as slaves, in Wrockwardine which recorded a 10.9 per cent slave population, in Patton which recorded a 22.5 per cent slave population, and in *Elnostruil* which recorded a 36.6 per cent slave population. Despite the relatively low figure for Wrockwardine it begins to look as if there may have been a clear connexion between the appearance of slaves and the recovery of

waste. Yet *Mersete*, which had no slaves recorded, nevertheless showed a gradual return to cultivation. *Rinlau* which appears to have had very little recorded waste had a slave percentage of 21.6 per cent, and that situation is repeated for *Ruesset* which recorded a 19 per cent slave population and *Witentreu* which recorded a 16 per cent slave population. This does not allow the acceptance of quite such a clear connexion between high percentages of slaves and the recovery of waste as at first seems to be the case.⁴⁶ *Mersete* hundred presents some peculiar circumstances: no slaves were recorded but a relatively high number of Welshmen (48) was recorded. There is, however, no opportunity of seeking from this a generalization for the whole shire since *Rinlau*, for example, records 8 Welshmen as well as the highest percentage of slaves in any Border hundred.

I reckon 388 *bovarii* from the Shropshire folios.⁴⁷ Apart from *Mersete* they are not found in large numbers in the western areas of the shire. No particular land holders can be associated with large numbers of *bovarii*. Only 4 *bovarii* were entered outside the Welsh Border region, all in the returns for Suffolk. Since they are more or less confined to this region there has inevitably been detailed consideration of their position in the agricultural economy in general and frontier life in particular.⁴⁸ In general there appears to have been a clear connexion between *bovarii* and demesne ploughs and an association between slaves and *bovarii* in relation to demesne ploughs. The most interesting feature is undoubtedly the relatively small percentages of both slaves and *bovarii* found along the westernmost limits of the shire (see the Table). In the case of slaves this may be explained by the reluctance of lords to settle men who would require their protection in times of disturbance. The case of the *bovarii* is rather more difficult since they enjoyed a greater degree of freedom than slaves. It may be there was less ploughing to be done along the exposed frontier.

Two thirds of the population of Domesday England were classed as villeins and bordars and, like the whole of the Welsh Border region, Domesday Shropshire was no exception to this general observation. Despite the large numbers recorded, the evidence from the Shropshire folios does not provide any unusual details. The appearance of half-villeins, as at Onibury and Stanton Lacy,⁴⁹ has been explained in various ways,⁵⁰ but perhaps the simplest answer lies in Professor Loyn's statement that, 'In the Gloucestershire and Shropshire sections of Domesday Book the villein holding was so much a recognized feature of the agrarian landscape that it is used as a unit of account'.⁵¹ The Shropshire folios throw no light on the duties and renders of villeins. Throughout the Welsh Border region the bordar class seems quite well off in terms of plough beasts, a feature remarked upon by Reginald Lennard.⁵² This, however, as in the case of villeins, may have reflected not larger holdings but heavier ploughing duties.⁵³ On occasion the region proved an unfavourable environment for bordars: at Cross Hill (entered as *Corselle*) there was a bordar who owned

⁴⁶L. H. Nelson, *op. cit.* 63-6, for a somewhat contrary view.

⁴⁷Ellis counted 385: Ellis, *op. cit.* 480. Eyton counted 384, Tait 397: *V.C.H. Salop.* i. 307.

⁴⁸e.g. J. H. Round in *V.C.H. Worcs.* i. 276; J. Tait, *Domesday Survey of Cheshire* (Chetham Soc. N.S. lxxv); Vinogradoff, *op. cit.* 464; Slack, *op. cit.*; *Domesday Geography of Midland Eng.* 125-6; R. Lennard *Rural England, 1086-1135* (1959), 360; M. M. Postan, *The Famulus* (*Economic History Review*, Suppl. no. 2), 6-13; L. H. Nelson, *op. cit.* 51-7.

⁴⁹252a2, 260b2.

⁵⁰*V.C.H. Salop.* i. 311, n.11.

⁵¹H. R. Loyn, *Anglo-Saxon Eng. and the Norman Conquest* (1962), 345.

⁵²R. Lennard, *op. cit.* 356.

⁵³E. Miller, *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely* (1951), 45-8.

nothing and at Bratton there were 5 bordars who owned nothing.⁵⁴ The hundred of *Mersele* provides the one exception to this picture of a land of villeins and bordars : those two classes account for only 30 per cent of its population.

Shropshire seems fairly rich in its variety of classes : we can find 50 priests, 15 cottars, 13 coliberts, 9 coscets, 9 reeves, 8 smiths, 2 of the 3 widows of Domesday Book, 1 of the 2 Domesday beekeepers (the other occurring in the Herefordshire folios), and 1 miller. Domesday Herefordshire, however, provided much greater variety and larger numbers. Some Shropshire estates accounted for quite a large number of these smaller classes ;⁵⁵ at Stanton Lacy, for example, with a total population of 134, we find 2 priests, 2 smiths, 4 coscets, 4 *servientes*, as well as 3 riding men. Again at Stokesay, with a total population of 47, we find a miller, a beekeeper and 9 female cottars. Villis with large populations that included a variety of tradesmen might well be viewed as rural centres of some sort. The Domesday scribe clearly thought it necessary on occasions to identify the craftsmen because some of the entries recording these specialists also include slaves and *ancillae* entered jointly with no desire to attempt to provide the numbers of each. At Stokesay, for example, the scribe entered a miller, a beekeeper and 9 female cottars but left 16 ' among the slaves and *ancillae* '.⁵⁶ Generally villis recording craftsmen are found to have sufficient manpower available to operate the recorded ploughs without the inclusion of these specialists.

Some 17 freemen were entered in the Shropshire folios generally rendering payments in money, for example at Grinshill and Edgbold.⁵⁷ In Gloucestershire and Herefordshire freemen sometimes made customary renders in kind but this does not occur in Shropshire. There were 6 *servientes* and 3 *francigenae servientes* in the shire : the 3 *francigenae servientes* at Lilleshall, 2 *servientes* at *Cerlitone*, 4 *servientes* at Stanton Lacy.⁵⁸ It seems possible that *servientes* may have carried out some similar, if less specific, functions to riding men. Vinogradoff suggested that they were the successors of dispossessed riding men.⁵⁹ If that were so, the entry for Stanton Lacy is most interesting for here, as well as 4 *servientes*, we find 3 riding men. Here we may well be looking at a process in its half-way stage. From the admittedly small number of instances available we can conclude that *servientes* tended to appear on flourishing estates. They appear on Shropshire estates which record both *bovarii* and riding men. The appearance of these two classes, more or less confined to the Border region, suggests that the villis in question had been subjected to such pressures as helped shape the social character of this Border area, and we now find *servientes* attracted to the same areas. The Shropshire folios recorded 7 *hospites*, 1 at Hatton, 4 at Colemere, and 2 at Leaton. To these we can add 2 men paying 4s. for the hire of their land at Leintwardine.⁶⁰ Three *hospites* were recorded in the Cheshire folios and 7 in those for Herefordshire. The class was confined to the Welsh Border region and Dr. Nelson has examined their circumstances fairly closely.⁶¹

⁵⁴257a2, 257b1.

⁵⁵260b1, 260b2.

⁵⁶260b2.

⁵⁷257b1, 260b1.

⁵⁸253a1, 255b2, 260b2.

⁵⁹Vinogradoff, *op. cit.* 89.

⁶⁰259a1, 259a2, 259b2, 260a2.

⁶¹L. H. Nelson, *op. cit.* 57-60.

Any attempt to sort out the feudal geography of Shropshire holdings is complicated by the extensive holdings of Earl Roger as tenant-in-chief. He kept in his own hands some 25 estates, generally widely scattered but with 12 or so in a fairly concentrated group round the castle of Montgomery. Apart from this concentration, another significant fact emerges: with the exception of the hundred of Overs, no hundred is without a manor held in demesne by Earl Roger. Some such as Baschurch and *Elnostruil* have as many as half a dozen, but often a hundred has only one. This suggests a deliberate attempt to maintain a centre of power in each hundred. A number of manors held by Earl Roger appear to have had hundreds pertaining to them.⁶² Such circumstances need to be discussed in a wider context than Shropshire, but associations between hundreds and manors are in general limited to the Welsh Border region and the western regions of England.⁶³ The whole question of whether they represent a pre-Conquest system or an innovation of the Normans is a most difficult one to answer and cannot be seen in isolation. It seems likely that the Shropshire circumstances will have to be viewed in relation to studies conducted in the east and north of England.⁶⁴ The Normans took care to establish a commotal basis for their power in their advance into Wales,⁶⁵ and it may be that a broadly similar process is detectable in the manors of Earl Roger within Shropshire. Earl Roger's system of administration was sufficiently clear for a study of it to be made by Dr. J. F. A. Mason, although he stressed the difficulty of finding evidence of actual administrative methods.⁶⁶ When we pass on to the distribution of estates granted out to under-tenants, a broad pattern is observable along the western areas of the shire. Most estates in the hands of Earl Roger were sub-let, according to area, to Rainald, to the fitz Corbet brothers, and to Picot. Rainald was clearly the dominant force in *Mersete*, the fitz Corbet brothers in *Ruessed* and *Witentreu*, and Picot in *Rinlau*. Further south we find Ralf de Mortemer holding numerous estates in Leintwardine. It is noteworthy that Rainald's holdings in *Mersete* were not generally sub-let whereas his estates elsewhere in the shire often were. Whereas his holdings did in fact extend beyond *Mersete* into Baschurch and appear fairly frequently throughout the shire, often in concentrated groups, the holdings of the fitz Corbets and Picot seem more or less limited to the immediate Border area. That is a feature of some significance, for we might have expected landholders with estates at risk along the exposed frontier would have some rather more settled holdings in relatively secure areas. Indeed the estates of Ralf de Mortemer, running, as it were, in a horizontal line through the southern area of the shire, demonstrate this feature. The general pattern along the western Border, however, seems to be one of areas of fairly exclusive landholding by 4 predominant barons who, in 3 cases, appear to have had few resources elsewhere in the shire. It seems clear that the Border lords were expected to rely on their own resources in the immediate vicinity of the frontier with very few estates placed conveniently in reserve. This relative isolation may well have made it necessary to come to some sort of terms with the inhabitants of the other side of the Border and

⁶²253a2.

⁶³H. Cam, *Liberties and Communities in Medieval Eng.: Collected Studies in Local Administration and Topography* (1963), chap. V, pp. 64-90.

⁶⁴R. H. C. Davis, *op. cit.*; the Northumbrian shires are currently being investigated along broadly similar lines.

⁶⁵J. G. Edwards, 'The Normans and the Welsh March', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* xlii. 155-77.

⁶⁶*T.S.A.S.* lvi. 244-57.

thus may partly account for the distribution of Welshmen in the shire. The pattern of holdings along the Border continues south into Herefordshire. Despite some variation, the Border lords of Herefordshire did not enjoy holdings further eastwards on which they could fall back in times of disturbance. No landholder makes any consistent appearance along a north-south line, hence any consistent Border policy was unlikely, and this may account for the varying degrees of penetration into Welsh territory undertaken by the Shropshire lords holding estates along the westernmost limits of the shire.

Finally, having made a broad survey of the society of the shire in general, let us look more closely at the areas immediately bordering upon Wales, i.e. the hundreds of *Mersete*, *Ruesset*, *Witentreu*, *Rinlau*, and *Leintwardine*, for there the pressures of a hostile frontier, as well as the opportunities for territorial aggrandisement would be most acutely felt and realized. It is there, if the frontier affected Shropshire society at all, that we might expect to detect the results. It is of course essential to remain mindful of the fluctuating nature of the frontier because the population of the immediate frontier area must have experienced a considerable ebb and flow of conquest.

The unusual circumstances of the hundred of *Mersete* have already been noted. No slaves were recorded but some recovery of waste had taken place. There were 48 Welshmen and there was only a single Frenchman. There is no clear mention of any *milites*. The bulk of the lands had been held by Saxon landholders in 1066 so it can hardly represent what might have been an area of almost Welsh territory. In *Ruesset* we find only 4 Welshmen but large numbers of slaves, villeins, and bordars. Those classes again figure prominently in the entries for *Witentreu* but both *bovarii* and riding men appear. There is only one Welshman. In the mountainous hundred of *Rinlau* the bulk of the population is yet again made up of slaves, villeins, and bordars. Nineteen riding men were recorded, 8 Welshmen, and 2 *bovarii*. This survey is completed by the hundred of *Leintwardine*, mostly inhabited by villeins and bordars. There also were slaves, *bovarii*, riding men and 3 *milites*. The conclusion seems inescapable: the bulk of the population of the Border areas of Shropshire consisted of villeins, bordars and to a lesser degree slaves. Whatever the effect of a hostile frontier may have been, it had done little to modify the basic structure of Domesday society. Perhaps the most significant feature is the appearance of only 3 *milites*. It looks as if Norman lords were content to leave their rural tenants to deal with any Border incidents as best they could. They were perhaps more interested in sporadic expeditions in search of new territories and tribute renders. Here we may note the interesting recurrence in the Welsh districts under Norman subjugation of the pattern of money renders already noted within Shropshire. Only once is a produce render from a Welsh district entered in the Shropshire folios, i.e. 8 cows from Edeyrnion rendered to Rainald.⁶⁷ It is worth noting that those cows were rendered a *Walensibus*, thus suggesting that there were other settlers there. Such foreign elements were perhaps responsible for the render of 60s. by way of ferm from Cynllaith. In the same way we find 33 *homines* recorded in the land of Yale.⁶⁸ Such *homines* might at first seem to be Welsh, but they might also be newly settled foreigners. Certainly the value of those lands had been increased from waste in 1066, and when Earl Hugh received it, to 40s. in 1086. Only one plough more could have been employed there

⁶⁷255a1.

⁶⁸254a2.

in 1086, while on lands in the Shropshire Border hundreds there was frequently room for more ploughs.

Our final conclusion may be that Shropshire society in general fitted into the general class structure of Domesday England, despite the proximity of a hostile frontier. The appearance of such classes as riding men, *bovarii*, and *hospites* possibly reflected frontier conditions but this society had no noticeably military structure. It now seems far more likely that the greatest future interest will lie in seeking evidence of more ancient systems of organization, perhaps through the establishment of bases of hundredal power. In this respect continued investigation into the Shropshire evidence would follow similar investigation into circumstances in the east and the north of England, in other words the riding men, the hundredal organization, and so on should be examined in relation to the sokemen of East Anglia and the ancient shire system of Northumbria, and eventually in an even wider context.

THE LUDLOW POLL-TAX RETURN OF 1667

By M. A. FARADAY

BETWEEN 1660 and 1700 governments tried several types of direct taxes in attempts to tap most kinds of wealth. The most important, the assessments, usually called land taxes, fell on income from land and, to a lesser extent, on income from public offices. The subsidies fell on both land and personal estates, but they were too conventional in their valuations to be very effective or very fair. The hearth taxes fell on householders. The poll taxes were attempts to tax all persons and all wealth except land, in an effort to lessen the state's increasing reliance on land taxes. The latter, however, became the normal method of financing the state because they were easier to levy and produced more revenue.

Normally commerce was taxed on its circulating capital through excises and customs duties. Those, however, were indirect taxes which could be passed on to the consumers of goods and services through increased prices. The consumers were to a great extent the very people being taxed at the same time on their landed incomes. As the main burden of supporting the state's normal activities had been borne by the landed classes since the middle of the 17th century, there was a strong incentive in emergencies (such as war or the need to pay off an army) to lay the extra burden on personal estates and on the rest of the people except the poor.

The poll tax of 1667 was authorised by an Act 'for raising moneys by a Poll and otherwise towards the maintenance of the present Warr'. Like many taxes it was a temporary expedient, in this case to finance the second Anglo-Dutch war.¹

The bill for the poll tax was proposed on 16 November 1666 by the committee of the House of Commons which had been considering the question of the king's supply. The main provisions were laid down within a few days,² though the House of Lords later persuaded the Commons not to double-charge nonconformists and to adopt some procedural changes. There was in fact a prolonged dispute with the Lords over various provisions which they disliked: the assessment of peers (thought to be a breach of privilege), charges on officers of the royal household, on government pensioners, and on servants' wages, and double charges on nonconformists and the foreign-born.³ Eventually the matter of peers' privileges was settled by the Lords' acceptance of the Commons' power to fix the rates chargeable on peers and the Commons' agreement to the Lords' empanelling of their own members to assess particular individuals.⁴ Unusually a new set of local commissioners to administer the raising of the tax was not appointed; the knights of the shires examined the lists of royal aid commissioners and merely added a small number of new names to them.⁵ The dispute with the Lords delayed the passing of the bill until the king sent word that he could wait no longer. The royal assent was given on 18 January 1666/7.⁶ The Speaker's address on the occasion summed up the motives behind the bill: 'The greatest part of the Taxes that have been raised these Six and Twenty Years were laid upon our Lands which made us desire to give them some Rest, we have

¹18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1.

²*Commons Jnl.* viii. 650.

³*Lords Jnl.* xii. 56.

⁴*Ibid.* 74-5.

⁵*Commons Jnl.* viii. 659.

⁶*Lords Jnl.* xii. 81.

therefore prepared a Poll Bill, whereby we have brought in all sorts of Persons, Professions and Personal Estates to give their Assistance to your Majesty and to ease the Land Tax—*multorum manibus grande levatur onus*.⁷

Ad hoc taxation to meet immediate needs posed considerable administrative problems, as the local machinery for assessing and collecting each successive tax had usually to be set up afresh. In 1667 some continuity was achieved by reappointing the royal aid commissioners; nevertheless the real problem was that the use of temporary expedients meant that the objects of taxation and the rules for assessing them changed from one year to another. Rapidly changing taxes, themselves caused in part by the lack of an effective fiscal bureaucracy, could not be imposed efficiently without that very bureaucracy; continuity, stability, and a well understood canon of fiscal principle and practice were necessary to absorb changes.

Like all graduated direct taxes the poll tax required a progressively high ratio of administrative effort to returns the lower down the social scale it extended. Since exemptions were specific, much unproductive work must have been expended on identifying them. In Ludlow the number of exempt persons may have been over 130.

Section 15 of the Poll Tax Act of 1667 required certificates to be returned to the commissioners, giving the names, qualities, degrees, and titles of every person living in a place together with valuations of their estates. In Ludlow that was not fully observed; normally only the householder's name was recorded, together with the numbers in his household. According to the Act every person was responsible for paying the tax assessed on him, excepting only minors whose liability was to be met by their parents. Nevertheless the reaction of the Lords to the charge on servants' wages suggests that they expected masters to have to pay it. Most people, including servants, were to be charged where they lived. Office holders on the other hand were to be charged on their official incomes where their duties were carried out.

Although poll taxes had been imposed in the late 14th century and—on aliens and recusants—subsequently, the first poll tax to resemble that of 1667 was levied in 1640 to help to pay off the army which had fought in Scotland.⁸ A similar tax was levied in 1660, again to pay off an army.⁹ The 1667 tax was more elaborate than those and was followed by others in 1678, 1689, 1690 and 1691.¹⁰ Thereafter the poll taxes were first simplified and then finally abandoned. The first six of the series each included a capitation charge, a scale charge on ranks, and rated charges on income.

The 1640 Act charged each rank of nobility according to a graduated scale, the highest charge, £100, being laid on dukes, the lowest, £40, on barons; baronets and knights of the Bath were charged £30 each, knights bachelor £20, and esquires £10. A lesser scale of charges was levied on the eldest sons of noblemen. Those scales were repeated in 1660, but were halved in 1667.¹¹ The 1667 rates were repeated in 1678, 1689, and 1690. In 1691 a single charge of £40 on each peer was substituted. The 1678 Act introduced a scaled charge on the younger sons of peers. In all poll taxes until 1690 widows were charged at one third of the rate appropriate

⁷Ibid. 80.

⁸16 Chas. I, c. 9.

⁹12 Chas. II, cc. 9, 10, 28.

¹⁰29 & 30 Chas. II, c. 1; 1 Wm. III and Mary II, c. 13; 2 Wm. III and Mary II, c. 2; 3 Wm. III and Mary II, c. 6.

¹¹12 Chas. II, c. 9, s. 1; 18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, s. 10.

to the ranks of their deceased husbands. There were also scaled charges on the various ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.¹²

In 1660 difficulties arose over the definition of an 'esquire'. The problem was met in 1667 and later by imposing a £1 charge on all gentlemen (or those reputed so to be) over 16 years of age or owning an estate of £300 a year.¹³ The provision was repeated until 1691 when a £16 charge on gentlemen with estates of £300 was substituted. In 1694 even that was abandoned.¹⁴

The poll tax proper (that is, the capitation charge) was apparently a small part of the 1640 poll tax. Only those not otherwise chargeable on their ranks, offices, or income were 'polled', and then all persons receiving parish relief and all children under 16 years of age were exempted. The tax was 6*d.* a head. That was repeated in 1660, although single persons (including widows) paid 12*d.*, presumably to put all households in the same position. The 1667 Act did not include that complication, but it did double the general capitation charge to 12*d.* That was no longer a residual charge but was levied on everyone (except the poor) whether charged under other provisions or not. The exemption was also removed from the children of ratepayers.¹⁵ As those changes coincided with substantial reductions in the charges on rank (apart from those on gentlemen) they represented a shift of the poll-tax burden onto the common people. The 1678 Act maintained the 12*d.* charge, but it exempted the children of day labourers, of farm servants, and of persons with estates of less than £50 a year and with four or more children. It is doubtful whether such refinements reduced the numbers of taxpayers by very many. The 1678 rules were repeated in 1689, but in 1690 all persons not paying local rates because of poverty were exempted. In 1691 that was redefined as applying only to householders and housekeepers; it was not a change of substance. Thereafter the rules were unchanged, although the capitation charge was quadrupled to 4*s.*, an increase necessitated, like that of the contemporary land tax, by the costs of the French wars.

The charge on servants' wages was first imposed in 1667. It gave particular offence to the House of Lords which approached the Poll-Tax Bill entirely selfishly, as befitted a body which consumed its time largely in debating real or imagined threats to its members' purses, privileges, or self-esteem. The Lords recorded their dislike of the charge on 22 December 1666,¹⁶ but they later agreed to remove it from the agenda for the conference with the Commons.¹⁷ The charge was of 12*d.* in the pound on wages of at least £1, excluding board wages.¹⁸ That was repeated in 1678 and, for the last time, on wages of £3 or more in 1689.

Rated charges on wealth or income varied considerably from one poll tax to another. On those not taxed by rank the 1640 Act imposed a graduated charge of £5 if they could 'dispend in lands or money' £100 a year, a charge of £2 on £50 a year, 5*s.* on £20 a year, 2*s.* on £10, and 1*s.* on £5. The notion of measuring taxable capacity by the ability to 'dispend' so much a year was taken from the rules for subsidies. It had provided an excuse for the substantial under-valuations which

¹²18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, ss. 12, 13.

¹³Ibid., ss. 10, 11.

¹⁴5 & 6 Wm. III and Mary II, c. 14.

¹⁵18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, ss. 6, 8; Poll Tax Explanatory Act, 1667 (18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 6); *Commons Jnl.* viii. 650.

¹⁶*Lords Jnl.* xii. 55.

¹⁷Ibid. 59.

¹⁸18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, s. 5.

occurred for these taxes and was never repeated in later poll taxes. The second poll-tax amendment Act of 1660 taxed real and personal estates at £2 for each £100 a year with a further charge of £5 for each £100 of personal estate, exempting only personal estates of under £5 a year. 'Personal estate' included almost every kind of income except that derived from land. Strictly it should have included the value of leases, but such evidence as there is suggests that it did not.¹⁹ Although the £5-a-year exemption level remained, there was no longer a graduated scale, so the lower incomes paid a higher rate than hitherto. In 1667 the subjects of the charges on income were elaborated. There were no longer any round-sum charges on the holders of particular offices, a feature of the two previous taxes, but there was to be a charge of 3s. in the pound on the profits of most public offices not already taxed under the monthly assessment rules. The latter bore only an extra shilling in the pound. Government pensions and annuities were taxed at 3s. in the pound, and the profits of lawyers and physicians at 2s. in the pound. A one-third deduction for expenses was allowed to be made from the profits of office and professional practices before the rate was applied. In addition to these rates there was a charge of one per cent on personal estates of £100 or more.²⁰

In 1678 the tax on offices was reduced to 2s. in the pound and all personal estate was made chargeable, though it is to be doubted how far this was achieved. In 1688 the tax on profits and pensions rose to 3s. in the pound, but that on personal estate fell to 10s. in the £100. These charges were substantially simplified in the 1690s.

The capitation charges accounted for more than half the tax collectable in Ludlow under the Poll Tax Act of 1667. The proportion would have been much higher but for the new charge on gentlemen. If, on the other hand, the 1660 rates had been continued, the proportion would have been about a third. The total poll-tax charge on the town may have been over a third greater than that for 1660.

In Ludlow, which, except for the presence of office-holders of the Council in the Marches, was probably a typical country town, 94 per cent of the charges were capitation charges under section 6 of the 1667 Act. They produced only 53 per cent of the total tax collected from Ludlow. Two per cent of the charges were under sections 10 and 12 (on rank) and produced 34 per cent of the tax. One per cent of the charges as under section 2 (on offices) and produced 10 per cent of the total tax.

Forty-two per cent of the tax was raised from households on which the only charges were under section 6; they comprised 86 per cent of all households. Forty-nine per cent of the tax was raised from households on which the only charges were under section 6 and section 5 (on servants' wages); they comprised 92 per cent of all households. Fifty-one per cent of the tax came from households, comprising 8 per cent of the whole, which were charged under sections 1 (personal estate), 2 (office-holders), 5, 6, 10, and 12.

The poll-tax return can yield some information about population size and social structure. The structure of two thirds of the households is shown in detail. In 292 households there were 870 people of whom 164 (19 per cent) were servants, apprentices, living-in journeymen, or visitors. Eighty-five households were taxed on one

¹⁹See *Herefs. Militia Assessments of 1663*, ed. M. A. Faraday (R. Hist. Soc., Camden 4th ser. x), 4.
²⁰18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, ss. 1-4.

person each. A further 85 contained no children. It is not certain how many of those 170 households consisted of persons whose children were exempted.

The other third of the households included about 460 persons, after allowance has been made for the charge on servants' wages. If the same proportions applied as in the former group, probably about 90 of the 460 would have been employees or visitors. On the other hand, in the first group there was an average of 2.4 assessed persons (other than servants, etc.) per household ; if that average applied in the second group, it would leave about 180 to be accounted for as servants, etc.

The return excludes both persons receiving alms and the children under 16 of persons too poor to pay rates. The 1672 hearth-tax return and exemption certificates, showing a total of 478 households,²¹ suggest that the number of exempt householders may have been about 70 in 1667. As most would have been elderly or widowed and certainly without servants, their average family size was probably very small. They accounted for perhaps no more than 100 persons in all. Examination of the parish register²² indicates that there were at least 30 children living whose parents alone were listed for the poll tax.

A tabulation of the population of Ludlow as shown by the poll-tax return, with certain necessary adjustments, enables an estimate to be made of the total population and the average household size. The latter is a rough measure of relative prosperity. The Council in the Marches accounted for the high proportion of the population in gentry and service-trade households. The number of children in the homes of leather-trade workers, the largest group, suggests that those trades still attracted young men with young families. Textiles may have been less prosperous, although it is likely that the most successful in those trades counted themselves gentlemen. A portent of the future may be seen in the size of building-trades households ; perhaps investment in building had already diminished. The general picture is that of a town with a still viable ' export ' trade but too dependent on the tenuous existence of the Council in the Marches.

Few of the 17th-century poll-tax assessments have survived and, of those for Shropshire, only that for Ludlow in 1667 remains in the Public Record Office.²³ A transcript of that return is given here, together with a copy of the two hearth-tax exemption certificates for 1672. The latter are included here for comparative purposes as they list the poorest householders, many of whom were also exempted from the 1667 poll tax. The published edition of the Shropshire hearth-tax return for 1672 is a transcription of the ' duplicate ' return which lists exemptions by hundreds, which is less useful.

The poll-tax return is contained in a rotulet of four membranes, the fourth of which has details on its dorse as well as its face. The membranes are in fairly good condition, although parts are faded and part of membrane 3 has been torn off leaving eight names incomplete.

Crown-copyright material in the Public Record Office is published by permission of the Controller of H.M. Stationery Office.

²¹P.R.O., E 179/342 (uncat.) ; *Shrops. Hearth-Tax Roll of 1672*, ed. W. Watkins-Pitchford (Shrops. Arch. Soc. 1949).

²²*Ludlow Par. Reg.* ii (Shrops. Par. Reg. Soc., Heref. xiv).

²³P.R.O., E. 179/255/37. The following transcript preserves the original spelling, but superior letters have not been printed as such.

The Population of Ludlow in 1667

<i>Description or Trades</i>	<i>Numbers of Households</i>	<i>Numbers of Persons</i>	<i>Average Household Size</i>	<i>Average Number of Children</i>
Gentry, Professional & Official classes	33	199†	6.0†	1.4*
Farmers	22	57†	2.6†	0.5*
Leather trades including dyers	60	202	3.4	1.0
Textiles and distribution	29	94	3.2	0.8
Food and drink trade	36	128	3.3	1.2
Woodworking and building	24	66	2.8	0.6
Other trades including inns	19	80	4.2	1.6
Labourers	48	81	2.3	0.8
Estimated exempt children		30		
Not specified	138	423†	3.1†	0.3*
Estimated exempt households	70	100	1.4	—
Town	479	1460†	3.0†	—

†—After deduction of estimated 23 servants' wages charges.

*—Calculated for the households where children enumerated.

The 1667 Poll Tax Return

The assessmt of Ludlow for raising money by a poll & otherwise towards maintenance of the present warr according to a late Act of Parliament.

CORVE STREET WARD	£	s.	d.
Mr Baylif Wilkes his daughter & mayd servant noe wages	0	3	0
John Tayler dyer his wife, 3 children, one soiorner one jorneman	0	7	0
Edward Turford glov' his wife & one granchilde	0	3	0
James Turford glov' his wife one child 2 apprentices.	0	5	0
William Lukenor dyer and his wife	0	2	0
John Marten weaver	0	1	0
Thomas Marten weaver his wife one child one Jorneman & one apprentice	0	5	0
Tho : Robinson labourer and his wife	0	2	0
Alice Earsley widdow one mansearvant noe wages one Mayd searvant wages 20s	0	4	0
John Heath glov'	0	1	0
Richard Pearce corviser his wife & 4 children one soiorner	0	7	0
John Wharton corrier	0	1	0

	£	s.	d.
Robert Webb yeman & his wife	0	2	0
Joseph Powys tanner & his wife	0	2	0
William Wilson laborer his wife & one child	0	3	0
John Hall feltmaker his wife & 2 children	0	4	0
Walter Lea yeman & his wife & 2 men servants one whereof hath wages 35s the other not any one mayd servant wages 20s	0	7	0
Thomas Lea yeman his wife & one child	0	3	0
Richard Langford yeman his wife 2 children one maid servant noe wages	0	5	0
William Hardinge malster his wife & sister	0	3	0
John Ward Carpinter his wife servant maid noe wages	0	3	0
Charles Vale baker his wife & 3 children	0	5	0
William Hayton weaver his wife & 2 children	0	4	0
Rich' Mound dyer his wife one child 2 apprentices one sojourner	0	6	0
Rowland Thornton vitaler & his wife	0	2	0
Thomas Ward Jun' feltmaker & his wife	0	2	0
John Chesheire Joynr his wife 2 apprentices one maid servant wages 20s	0	6	0
Edward Bond glasier his wife	0	2	0
Jonas Wellings blacksmith & his wife	0	2	0
Rich' Davis Ironmonger his wife 2 children one maideservt wages under 20s	0	5	0
John Lewis Taylor his wife & one apprentice	0	3	0
William Ithell Corviser his wife & one child	0	3	0
Henry Child Cowper his wife one child his mother & one apprentice	0	5	0
Thomas Davis glov' his wife & 2 children	0	4	0
Edmond Stanway dyer his wife & 3 children	0	5	0
William Hodges Joynr & his wife	0	2	0
John Acton glov' 4 children one Jorneman & one mayd servant wages 20s	0	8	0
Elizabeth Windle widdow one child	0	2	0
Richard Davis glov' & 2 Jornemen	0	3	0
Edward Powys yeman	0	1	0
Rich' Browne Tanner his wife & one child	0	3	0
George Madox labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Rowland Earsley Corviser & one apprentice	0	2	0
Rowland Earsley Tanner	0	1	0
Richard Earsley Tanner his wife 5 children one Jorneman one maide noe wages	0	9	0
Thomas Powys Tanner his wife 6 children one (prentice <i>erased</i>) one orphant one Servt maid wages 20s	0	11	0
John Botterell Tanner his wife & one child	0	3	0
Roger Powys Tanner his wife 1 child 1 apprentice 1 mayd Servt wages 20s	0	6	0
Edward Brampton dyer	0	1	0
Edward Bellamy laborer	0	1	0
Edward Heath laborer & his wife	0	2	0
John Phillipps laborer & his wife	0	2	0
Robert Hurston laborer	0	1	0
Richard Bough labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Margery Crosse Spinster	0	1	0

LUDLOW POLL TAX

III

	£	s.	d.
George Scott Tayler	0	1	0
John Martley his 2 daughters	0	2	0
George Baylies laborer	0	1	0
John Lloyd weaver	0	1	0
Thomas Davis labourer	0	1	0
Allen Carpinter	0	1	0
Edward Davis feltmaker	0	1	0
Thomas Rockley labourer	0	2	0
William Holmes victualer & his wife	0	1	0
William Unkles labourer	0	2	0
Daniell Dayos butcher & his wife	0	1	0
Caleb Waters feltmaker	0	1	0
Anne Giles Spenster	0	2	0
David Morgan laboure & his wife	0	2	0
John Bedford Tyler & his wife	0	2	0
Richard Vale baker & his wife	0	2	0
The wife of William Reynolds glov'	0	1	0

Summe totall is 10 13 0

Rest 10 11 4

Deducted out of this Somm is 8d

Rowland Earsley subcollector²⁴

Seal

Richard Wilkes } Comrs²⁵
John Pearce }
Richard Davies }

(2)

The Assessment of Ludlow for raysinge Moneys by a Poll & otherwise towards maintenance of the prsent Warre accordinge to an Act of parliament in that Behalfe provided

BROAD STREET WARD

John Bowdler Mercer his wife 2 children one apprentice, one Mayd	0	7	0
Servant wages 20s	0	1	0
Olive Seabourne Spinster			
John Perks Corviser, his wife, 1 child, 1 Journeyman, 1 Apprntice one	0	7	0
Mayd servant wages 20s			
Henry Bishoppe Mercer, his wife, 1 Child, 1 Apprentice, 1 Maid servant	0	5	0
noe wages	0	4	0
Edward James Butcher, his wife, 1 Child, 1 Aprentice	0	2	0
Rowland Griffith Butcher, & his wife	0	2	0
Ales Griffith widdow & one Child	0	4	0
Gabriell Cadman distiller of Hott waters, his wife, 1 Mayd Servt wages 20s.	0	4	0

²⁴18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, s. 17. Subcollectors could deduct as salary 2d. in the pound (interpreted here as to the nearest pound below).

²⁵Ibid., s. 15. The commissioners were the same as those named for the royal aid in 16 & 17 Chas. II, c. 1. They included Ric. Davis of Ludlow and the bailiffs of Ludlow *ex officio*.

	£	s.	d.
Thomas Poston Butcher, his wife, 1 Child, 1 Mayd Servant noe wages	0	4	0
William Lenne Gunsmith, his wife, 6 Children, 1 Man Servant, 1 Mayd Servant noe wages for eyther	0	10	0
Peeter Cole, his wife, 3 children	0	5	0
Margarett Whaigham widdow, 1 daughter, Grimes widd', 1 Mayd Servt noe wages	0	4	0
William Waringe Joyner, his wife, 1 Mayd Servt noe wages	0	3	0
Peeter Cole Cor'ser, his wife	0	2	0
Thomas Hinton Baker, his wife, 1 Child, 1 Apprentice, 1 Mayd Servt wages 20s	0	6	0
William Gardiner Ironmonger, his wife, 1 Child	0	3	0
William Holland Gent 21s, his wife, Mary Powell spinster, one Child, Two Mayds, wages 20s each of them	1	8	0
Thomas Lyster Gent	1	1	0
Rowland Higgins pursuivant, his wife, 5 Children, 1 Man Servant, one Mayd Servant, wages 20s, Penelope Lynne spinster	0	11	0
William Gregory Taylor, his wife, his Sonne, & one Apprentice	0	4	0
Henry Shepheard Gun Smyth & his wife	0	2	0
John Jones yom' & his wife	0	2	0
Edmond Jenckes Clothier & 2 Children	0	3	0
William Becke, his wife & one child	0	3	0
James Child junior & his wife	0	2	0
Richard Clee, his wife & daughter	0	3	0
Richard Wigley, Blacksmith, his wife, 2 children & one Apprentice	0	5	0
Nicholas Carre Dctr of phisicke, his wife, 3 children, 1 Man Servt, 2 Mayd Servts ye one hath wages 20s ye other none	5	9	0
Richard James Tyler his wife. & 4 Children	0	6	0
Elisha Rogers Carrier, his wife, 2 Children, 1 Mayd Servt wages 20s	0	6	0
John Winwood one of ye Clres of ye Signet, his wife, 3 Children, 1 Mayd Servt wages 20s	0	7	0
Edmond Dillow victualler, his wife, & daughter	0	3	0
James Collier Tyler, his wife	0	2	0
Robert Smyth Labourer, his wife, his Sonne in Law, his wife & 2 Children	0	6	0
Arthur Thomas Dyer, his wife, 2 Children, 1 Journeyman & one Apprentice	0	6	0
William Myvert yom' his wife, & 6 Children	0	8	0
David Davies Labourer, his wife & 3 Children	0	5	0
William Davies Miller, his wife, Dorothy Jones Spinster, 1 Man Servt wages 20s	0	5	0
John Gough Dyer, & his wife	0	2	0
George Castle victualler, his wife, 6 Children, & one Mayd Servt wages 20s	0	10	0
Francis Palmer, his wife	0	2	0
Richard Collier Mason, his wife, 1 Apprntice, 1 Mayd Servt noe wages	0	4	0
Richard Browne victualler & his wife	0	2	0
John Homford Ar 5£ : 1s, his wife, his Sonne, Mrs. Susanna Wigmor, Mrs. Jane Parry, Mrs. Ellinor Williams, Henry Browne, his servaunt wages 50s, Phillip Hancocke, his Servt wages 30s, one Man Servt			

LUDLOW POLL TAX

113

	£	s.	d.
more noe wages, 3 Mayd Servts more wages 30s a peece	5	18	0
William Bredoe yeman	0	1	0
Thomas Symonds yom', his wife & one Child	0	3	0
Anne Jenckes widdow & her daughter	0	2	0
David Powell Esqr & one Man Servt noe wages	5	2	0
Margery Williams widd', her daughter & 1 Mayd Servant wages undr 20s	0	3	0
Samuell Pretty yom'	0	1	0
Edward Stedman Gent 21s, his wife, 2 Men Servts noe wages, 1 Mayd Servt wages 24s	1	6	0
David Jones, distiller of Hott waters, his wife, one daughter, 1 Apprntice Mayd	0	4	0
Richard Maund Blacksmth, one Journeyman	0	2	0
Edward Coulbourne Butcher, his wife, one child	0	3	0
Robert Cole Sadler, 2 Children, 1 Mayd Servant wages under 20s	0	4	0
Thomas Hunton Gent for his wife, Sonne & daughter, 1 Maid Servt wages 26s & one Girle	0	6	0
Henry Winshippe Carpenter, his wife, & one William Adames	0	3	0
Thomas Phillipps Mason	0	1	0
Edward Hancockes Currier, his wife, 4 Children, & one prentice	0	7	0
Edward Lyke Butcher & his wife	0	2	0
Rose Ball widdow	0	1	0
Margarett Lawrence widd	0	1	0
Thomas Michell victualler, his wife, 2 Children, 1 Mayd Servt noe wages	0	5	0
John Phillipps Gent & one Mayd Servant	1	2	0
Katherine Tompson widd	0	1	0
Richard Scott Innekeeper, his wife, 1 daughter, 4 Men Servants, 2 Mayd servants neyther havinge wages	0	9	0
John Wicke Cor'ser, his wife & 3 Children	0	5	0
Richard Porter disteller of Hott waters his wife & 2 Children	0	4	0
Richard Cole Senior Sadler, his wife, 2 Children, & 1 Mayd Servant wages 20s	0	6	0
Moris Hemings Butcher, & one child	0	2	0
William Collier Mason	0	1	0
Thomas Moris Labourer	0	1	0
Richard Browne Butcher	0	1	0
John Streat Labourer	0	1	0
Mathew Rocke Labourer	0	1	0
John Brelsford Labourer	0	1	0
John Walker Senior Carpenter	0	1	0

Sume 34 7 0

David Jones Sub Collector
deducted according to ye Act for collecting of ye
above menconed sum of 34 7 0 five shillings &
eight pence

Richard Walker
John Pearce Comrs
Richard Davies

(3)

The Assessmt of the CASTLE WARDE in the Towne of Ludlow for raysing moneys by a Poll & otherwise towards ye maintenance of the present Warr, according to an Acte of Parliament

	£	s.	d.
The Earle of Norwich & Sr Sam. Jones p' Edward Stedman gen for their offices ²⁶	3	10	0
Georg Lee Esqr for his office p' Edward Stedman gen'	1	0	0
Rich : Gough for his Office	13	4	
John Wynnwood for his office	13	0	
Richard Bullocke for his office	13	4	
Hen : Hunton for his office	13	4	
Michaell Purefoy gen' for his office	13	4	
Walter Vaughan gen' for his office	13	4	
John Griffith Ar' for his office	1	0	0
Charles Chetwynd gen' for his office	13	4	
John Butts Ar for his office	1	0	0
Richard Wigmore Esqr for his office	0	13	4
Wm Mordant Arm' for his office	13	4	
Rich. Randall gen for his office	5	0	
Ralph Fenton Clre ²⁷	10	0	
Elinor James widow & 1 da :	2	0	
Wm Archer gen 21s & his family	1	6	0
Edm : King Barbar Chyrurgeon & his family	7	0	
Wm Palmer & his family	4	0	
Sam : Weaver & his family	3	0	
Mary the wife of Thomas Weaver Clre &c	4	0	
Tho : Hill Victualler & his family	3	0	
Wm Daniell Glover & his sister	2	0	
Charles Chettwynd gen' 21s & his family	1	12	0
John Evans Chandler & his family	6	0	
John Griffiths & his family	0	4	0
Jam : Davies & his family	0	9	0
Joane Crumpe widow	0	1	0
Edw : Barker & his family	0	5	0
John Matthews & his family	0	3	0
John Glover & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Smyth & his wife	0	2	0
Tym : Littleton Serjt at Law 12£ & his family ²⁸	12	15	0
Robt Berry Gent 21s and his family	1	11	0

²⁶Chas. Goring, Earl of Norwich (1615-71), clerk of the Council in the Marches of Wales : *Complete Peerage*, ix. 776 ; *Cal. S. P. Dom.* 1670, 297, 339-40, 367. Sam. Jones of Berwick, a member for Shrews. in the 1660 Convention, was knighted 2 Sept. 1660 and died 3 Jan. 1673 : *T.S.A.S.* 4th ser. xii. 214. Both charges were levied under 18 & 19 Chas. II, c. 1, s. 2.

²⁷Rector of Ludlow, c. 1658 until 1685 : *Ludlow Par. Reg.* i (Shrops. Par. Reg. Soc., Heref. xiii), p. xi.

²⁸Timothy Littleton, recorder of Ludlow (1653-75) and a member for Ludlow in the Convention and the Cavalier Parliament (1660-70) (*T.S.A.S.* 2nd ser. vii. 31 ; xi. 324), was also a commissioner or this tax. Under s. 10 of the 1667 Act he should have paid £15 as a serjeant at law.

	£	s.	d.
Wm Meredith & his family	0	3	0
Wm Atkins & his Wife	0	2	0
Robt Coxshall & his wife	0	2	0
John Brompton & his family	0	3	0
Anne Griffiths widow & her family	0	4	0
Wm Louke & his family	0	5	0
Hugh Proger & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Morris & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Davies gen' 21s & his family	1	8	0
Thomas Blackpeach & his family	0	7	0
Rich : Blackpeach & his family	0	4	0
Wm Carelesse & his Wife	0	2	0
Tho : Freeman	0	1	0
Dorothy Hynston vid	0	1	0
Wm Rowley & his family	0	6	0
Wm Morris sen'	0	1	0
Patience Crowther vid & her Family	0	4	0
The wife of John Crowther Ar' & 1 Childe	0	2	0
Philemon Unett & his family	0	4	0
Thom : Warde & his family	0	4	0
John Dedicott & his wife	0	2	0
John Colbach & his family ²⁰	0	12	0
Wm Thomas & his wife	0	2	0
Ben : Chyrme & his family	0	7	0
Rich : Gough & his family	0	3	0
Wm Preece & his family	0	5	0
John Riccards gen' 21s & his family	1	16	0
John Lynn gen' 21s & his family	1	6	0
Alice Bullocke vid & 1 Chylde	0	2	0
Edward Myles & his family	0	6	0
Georg Biddle & his wife	0	2	0
Richard Biddle & his wife	0	2	0
Jon. Penson Schoolmr	0	1	0
Wm Underwood & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Griffiths & his family	0	4	0
Robt Adney	0	1	0
Morgan Griffiths and his wife	0	2	0
Fran : Hassold & his wife	0	2	0
John Evans & his family	0	3	0
Wm Woodall & his family	0	6	0
Thomas Hassold & his wife	0	2	0
Hen : Stedman yeoma' & his family	0	4	0
Edw : Woodall & his family	0	3	0
Tho : Patchett & his family	0	3	0

²⁰Churchwarden 1666-7 : *Ludlow Par. Reg.* i. 436.

	£	s.	d.
Edw : Colbach & his family	0	4	0
Wm. Colbach & his family	0	5	0
Sam : Raynolds & his family	0	6	0
Rich. Cupper & his family	0	11	0
Athal : Phillips vid & her family	0	3	0
—— Prichard & his family ³⁰	0	3	0
—— Savery & his family ³¹	0	9	0
—— g & his family	0	6	0
—— rford vid & her family ³²	0	5	0
—— ynolds & his family ³³	0	8	0
—— ams & his wife	0	2	0
—— arvey yeoman	0	1	0
—— Palfrey & his wife	0	2	0
Mary Milner vid & her family	0	3	0
Lewis Wms for his office	0	3	4
Edward Roberts & his wife	0	2	0
Richard Waldron & his family	0	3	0
Rich : Colbach & his wife	0	2	0
Margarett Jones wid & her family	0	11	0

	(3 ^v)		
Thomas Coates & his family	0	11	0
Katherine Rawlins widow	0	1	0
Nicholas Payne & his family	0	10	0
Thomas Dewxall & his family	0	4	0
John Vernalls & his family	0	5	0
Tho Hunt & 1 daughter	0	2	0
Hen : Berrington & his Bror.	0	2	0
Rich : Bebb & his family	0	6	0
Eliz : Waldron	0	1	0
Griff : Edwards Barbar Chyrurgeon & his family	0	8	0
Rich : Bond & his Wife	0	2	0
John Walker iu' & his Wife	0	2	0
Richard Cole & his family	0	8	0
Richard Hitchcott & his family	0	6	0
Edward Caldwell & his family	0	4	0
Edw : Howgate & his Wife	0	2	0
Hugh Davies & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Ambler	0	1	0
David Roberts & his wife	0	2	0
Wm Wannerton & his Wife	0	2	0
Thomas Shorte & his wife	0	2	0

³⁰Perhaps Samuel Pritchard.³¹Perhaps Richard Savery.³²Perhaps Ann Harford.³³Perhaps John Reynolds.

LUDLOW POLL TAX

117

	£	s.	d.
Wm Addams & his Wife	0	2	0
Lewis Heighwey & his wife	0	2	0
Hen : Tong	0	1	0
Rich : Brimell	0	1	0
Hen : Ambler	0	1	0
Wm Meredith	0	1	0
Griff : Bellamy & his Wife	0	2	0
Elinor Roe vid & 1 da :	0	2	0
Thomas Gwilliam & his family	0	5	0
Wm Hooper	0	1	0
Jane the wife of John Matthews	0	1	0
The wife of Hen : Niccolls	0	1	0
The wife of John Vyner	0	1	0
The wife of David Price	0	1	0
The wife of Morgan Vaughan	0	1	0
The wife of Corporall Lewys	0	1	0
	54	7	4

seal. Wm. Woodall }
 seal. Philemon Unett } Sub Collectors
 deducted by vertue of the Act for the
 Collecting of the sume above written gs.

Richard Wilkes }
 John Pearce } Comrs
 Richard Davies }

(40)

The Assessment of Ludlow for rayseinge money by a poll and otherwise towards
 maintenance of the present warr according to the late Act of Parliament

	£	s.	d.
OULD STREET AND GOLFORDS WARD			
Evan Davies Sadler	0	1	0
	0	1	0
Robert Bond Tayler, his wife, 2 Children, 1 Apprentice, 1 mayde servant noe wages	0	6	0
John Clibery Corviser, his wife, 3 Children, 1 Apprentice	0	6	0
Richard Davies gen 21s his wife, 5 Children, one Servt mayde wages 20s	1	9	0
George Haughton mrcer 1 apprentice & his sister	0	3	0
Samuell Boudler gent 21s 1 Apprentice, 2 maide servants wages 20s apeece ³⁴	1	6	0
Mary Jones widdow	0	1	0
William Hinton Ironmongr his wife, 2 Children, 1 Apprentice ³⁵	0	5	0
William Crump Corviser and his wife	0	2	0
Charles Davies Corviser	0	1	0

³⁴Will proved 1669. He had been a shopkeeper in Ludlow for 15 years. See P.R.O., Prob. 11/329, f. 50.

³⁵Churchwarden 1666-7 : *Ludlow Par. Reg.* i. 436.

	£	s.	d.
Edward Brompton haberdasher his wife, & 2 Children	0	4	0
George Morgan Tayler, his wife, 4 Children one Apprentice and one maide servant wages 20s ³⁶	0	8	0
Thomas Clibery corviser his wife 2 mayde servants either of them wages under xxs	0	4	0
William Wigley Blacksmyth his wife, 4 Children one Servant maide noe wages	0	7	0
Thomas Palmer gunsmyth and his wife	0	2	0
William Tayler labourer and his wife	0	2	0
Richard King Barbor his wife and 2 Children	0	4	0
Richard Tayler Tayler his wife & 2 Children	0	4	0
Edward Hunt Corviser, his wife, 2 Children, 2 Apprentices	0	6	0
John Lewis Chaundler his wife and 1 Child	0	3	0
Meredith Nesse Inkeeper Jane Ball & Ann Ball Spinster	0	3	0
Richard Cam yeom' Ann Cam spinster	0	2	0
William Smyth victuler his wife and one Child	0	3	0
Henry Lewis Gunsmyth	0	1	0
Jenett Edwin widdow & her 3 Children	0	4	0
Daniell Leight victuler his wife, and 2 Children	0	4	0
Georg Wright nayler his wife, 2 Children, one Jornyman	0	5	0
John Chaundler Chaundler his wife & 2 Children	0	4	0
Ralph Sharret Baker his wife 3 Children and Apprentice one mayde Servant noe wages	0	7	0
Edward Cole Sadler his wife and 3 Children	0	5	0
James Jones feltmaker his wife, 2 children, 1 Jornyman	0	5	0
Jone Jones widdow	0	1	0
Giles Vaughan Inkeeper his wife, 1 Child, 1 maide Servt wages 20s. ³⁷	0	4	0
Richard Nash Corviser his wife, and Joane Nash widdow	0	3	0
William Hamonds Tayler & his wife	0	2	0
Margary Knight widdow	0	1	0
Edward Yorke Tayler and his wife	0	2	0
John Garner Corviser and his wife	0	2	0
Anne Dewce widdow	0	1	0
Thomas Griffiths victuler his wife & one Child	0	3	0
Richard Brecknock labourer his wife & one Child	0	3	0
Richard Gwynet Carpenter and his wife	0	2	0
Edward Edwards, Corviser & his wife (<i>Deleted</i>)	0	2	0
John Moore yeoman his wife & one manservant wages 20s	0	4	0
James Child senior mason his wife, 4 Children, 1 Apprentice	0	7	0
William Hasnet yeom' and his wife	0	2	0
Thomas Portor Corviser	0	1	0
Richard Bedoe Victuler his wife and one Child	0	3	0
Edward Betoe Tayler and his wife	0	2	0
John Whooper labourer & his wife	0	2	0

³⁶A charge under s. 5 seems to have been due but not levied.

³⁷A charge under s. 5 seems to have been due but not levied.

	£	s.	d.
Thomas Cooper labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Henry Dytcher labor' & his wife	0	2	0
Zackarias Evans Labor'	0	1	0
Roger Norgrove Senior Labourer	0	1	0
Roger Norgrove Junior Corviser & his wife	0	2	0
Evan Phillipps labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Evan Jones Labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Hugh Powell Labourer	0	1	0
John Harris Senior glovr his wife & 1 Child	0	3	0
William Mullard Labourer	0	1	0
Edward Jones Labourer	0	1	0
John Eales glover & his wife	0	2	0
John Walbadge yeom' & his wife	0	2	0
Thomas Bird husbandman his wife	0	2	0
Richard Davies Mason his wife, 2 Children	0	4	0
John Edwin corvisor & his wife	0	2	0
John Harris Jun' his wife 4 Children one Apprentice 1 Jorneyman	0	8	0
Humphrey Hall Glover his wife & one Child	0	3	0
John Still Sadletreemaker his wife & one Child	0	3	0
Thomas Evans victuler his wife one mayd Servt noe wages	0	3	0
William Wyer Joyner	0	1	0
Blaunch Hacklet widdow & 2 Children	0	3	0
Francis Client Inkeeper his wife 3 Child : 1 man Servt. 1 maide Servt. noe wages	0	7	0
John Franklin Glover his wife & one Child	0	3	0
John Bond Tayler his wife 1 Child 2 Apprentices	0	5	0
John Pearce gen Bayliff his wife 5 Children 1 Apprentice 1 man Servt. wages 2£ 1 maide Servant wages 20s	0	13	0
Thomas Halton glover his wife & Apprentice	0	3	0
Edward Yorke Tayler his wife	0	2	0
Edward Waties Tayler	0	1	0
William Davies Glover his wife & one Child	0	3	0
George Somes Butcher his wife 2 Children	0	4	0

(4r)

Thomas Shilton Maltster 2 Children 1 maide Servt wages 20s debts & money C£ xxis ³⁸	1	5	0
Hugh Davies Laborer	0	1	0
Thomas Harris glover his wife	0	2	0
Owen ap Evan labourer his wife	0	2	0
William Skyrme (labourer <i>overwritten</i>) Baker & his wife	0	2	0
Henry Fayres Labourer & his wife	0	2	0
William Deverell yeoman & his wife & mayd noe wages	0	3	0

³⁸A charge on personal estate under s. 1.

	£	s.	d.
Mary Gregory widdow & her daughter	0	2	0
Henry Jones Labourer	0	1	0
Thomas Hoskins Corviser his wife	0	2	0
John Wil——s labourer	0	1	0
Meredith Jones labor' his wife one Child	0	3	0
Jenkin Preese labourer & his wife	0	2	0
John Bent labourer & his wife	0	2	0
John Aston	0	1	0
Richard Wheyham tan'r his wife, one Child, one maide Servt	0	4	0
Richard Nethway Tayler & his wife	0	2	0
Richard Plumer yeom' his wife & one Child	0	3	0
Peeter Teskey Sadler & his wife	0	2	0
John Gilly Mason	0	1	0
Richard Gilly Mason	0	1	0
John Hall Glover his wife & 1 Child	0	3	0
Thomas Winston yeom' & his wife	0	2	0
Elizabeth Gardenr widdow	0	1	0
Thomas Davies Cooper his wife, one Child, one man Servt wages 40s one maide noe wages	0	7	0
Edward Shaw cler his wife 2 Children one maide Servant wages 20s ³⁹	0	6	0
Judith Harris Spinster	0	1	0
Anthony Larkin Lynendraper his wife one Aprentice Elizabeth Larkin Spinster	0	4	0
Margaret Bedoe widdow 3 Children one maide servant wages 20s	0	6	0
Mary Blunt widdow & one Child	0	2	0
John Harris Scrivnor his wife	0	2	0
Sarah Goodhall Spinster	0	1	0
Ann Hitchcot widow. 3 Children 2 manservts noe wages 2 maide servants 20s wages a peece	0	10	0
Hump Hall Senr Blacksmyth his wife : 1 Child	0	3	0
Edwa : Slade butcher his wife, & 4 Children	0	6	0
William Griffiths gent poll 1£ his wife & maide Servt wages 20s ⁴⁰	1	4	0
Evan Phillipps gent' p' poll	1	1	0
Thomas Vernall mercer his wife & Aprentice	0	3	0
Edward Robinson booksellr his wife 5 Children & one servant maide wages 20s	0	9	0
Rowland Williams gent' p' poll 20s, his wife, one daughter one apprentice & 2 maide Servts 20s a peece	1	8	0
Micheall Purefoy gen' p' poll 21s his wife 2 maide servts wages 20s apeece & one kinsman	1	7	0
Katherin Reade widdow 1 maide servt wages 20s	0	3	0
Nath : Braisier Curier his wife 1 Child	0	3	0
Rowland Weale Labourer	0	1	0
James Thomas Labourer	0	1	0

³⁹Assistant to the Reader, 1661-9 : *Ludlow Par. Reg.* ii, p. viii.

⁴⁰High bailiff 1662.

LUDLOW POLL TAX

121

Peeter Lloyd Laborer his wife	0	2	0
William James labourer	0	1	0
John Lloyd labourer	0	1	0
Silvanus Jones labourer	0	1	0
Samuel Clarke Tanner	0	1	0
John Rawlins yeoma' & his wife	0	2	0
Thomas Bodle yeoman	0	1	0
David Edwards Corviser	0	1	0
Jenkin Price labourer	0	1	0
Wm Bold Mason	0	1	0
John Bold Mason	0	1	0
Thomas Evans glover	0	1	0
Roland Eales glov'	0	1	0
Stephen Wms labourer & his wife	0	2	0
Griffith Davies Labourer	0	1	0

Sume is 27 17 0

Richard Wilkes	} Comrs
John Pearce	
Richard Davies	
Tho Shilton	} Colect'
George Houghton	

(endorsed : ex Salop Dupcts Salop Poll 1666)

The 1672 Hearth Tax Exemption Certificates

We the Minister of the Parish of the Towne and Parish of Ludlow in the County of Salop & the Churchwardens of the said parish do hereby certifie unto His Majesties Justices of the Peace for the said Towne That we do believe that the respective Houses wherein the Persons here undernamed do Inhabit are not of greater value than twenty shillings per Annum upon the full improved Rent ; And that neither the Person so inhabiting nor any other using the same Messuage hath useth or occupieth any Lands or Tenements of their own or others of the yearly value of twenty shillings per Annum ; Nor hath any lands tenements Goods or Chattels of the value of ten Pounds in their own Possession or in the possession of any other in trust for them ; And that the said Houses have not above two Chimneys, fire hearths and Stoves in them respectively. Witness our Hands this third day of February 1671.⁴¹

Jane Crumpe widd
Anne Lingen widdow
Elizabeth Hinton wid'
Mary Ambler

Mary Walker widd
John Gilson
the widd Harper
Anne Fox

George Fox
Mary Phillipps
John Smith
John Knott

⁴¹The rules for exemption differ from those for the poll tax and have the appearance of being more generous.

Elinor Underhill	Thomas Edwin	Francis Smith
Anthony Stead	William Gethyn	John Rea
Robert Edny	Samuell Browne	Elizabeth Norton
Issabel Browne	Thomas Freeman	Margery Gwilliam
Wm Underwood	Thomas Wem	Anne Rogers
Howell Williams	Jane Dunne widd	Mary Edwards
Sibell Underwood	Elinor Knight	Lewis Hayway
Alice Same widd	William Carelesse	Sam: Dodd
Rich : Watson	William Ambler	John Davies
John Wilcockes	Margarett Morgans wid	Mary Burford
Hugh Davies	John Onions	Elinor Nevill
Owen ap Evan	John Smith	Mary Dickason
John Brilsford	John Taylor	Richard Yeomans
Wm Meredith	Anne Abley	Mary Fox
Francis Lewis als Penn	John Underwood	Margarett Phaires
Alice Biddle widd	John Arthurs	Widdow Williams
Bridgett Renny widd	Widdow Onions	David Edwards
William Wates	Griffith Jones	Richard Rice
Elizabeth Biddle	Hugh Davies	Margarett Dixton
Anne Lewis		

We allow of this Certificate containing 70 names

John Reinolds	Ra : Fenton	Rector
Richard Wheigham	Edm : King	} Churchwardens
Wm Griffith	Rowland Earsley	
Sam Reynolds	C. Baldwin	

(Certificate repeated)

Morrice Edwards	Margery Renny	Edward Cowper
John Lane	Elizabeth Underwood	John Hughes
Edward Botwood	Humphrey Hall	Richard Pugh
Richard Mier	Howell Watkins	William Mallas
Alice Bould	widd Powell	John Bowen
Thomas Maurice	Evan Jones	Wm Offerley
Roger Norgrove	widdow Norgrove	Alice Edwards
John Price	Henry Ditcher	Anne Jones
Martha Rosse	Thomas Cooper	Anne Wale
Jane Kethyn	John Brabant	John Martley
John Williams	William Collins	Elizabeth Palmes
Margaret Ridges	Henry Winshopp	Mrs Lloyd
Dorothy Mason	Edward Godwin	Anne Powis
Susan Probert	John Underwood	widdow Heath
Wm Adams laburer	widdow Like	Thomas Davies labourer
John Morrice	Wm Underwood	Elizabeth Meredith
Richard Heath	Thomas Ward	Elizabeth Piers widdow
John Eales	Morrice Griffiths	Alice Shockley widdow
John Browne	Richard Griffiths	Joane Gilly widdow

LUDLOW POLL TAX

123

Edward Jones
Wm Mullart
Robert Mathewes
Phillipp Jones

Thomas Thomas
Wm Collier
Thomas Chandley
John Walker

Edward Waties
Jenkin Price
Zacharias Evans
Thomas Higgins

69 names. The full number of the two certificates is 139.

John Rainolds
Richard Wheigham
Wm Griffith
Sam Reynolds

Ra : Fenton
Edm King
Rowland Earsley

Rector
Churchwardens

C. Baldwyn

THE BURIAL PLACE OF ABRAHAM DARBY I

By WINIFRED E. HUTTON

WHEN Abraham Darby came to Coalbrookdale early in the 18th century he was an active Quaker and so became a member of the group of Friends which existed across the Severn at Broseley.¹ He was one of the signatories of the deed of purchase of land there (1706) which subsequently became the burial ground of the Broseley Friends,² and his infant daughter Esther was buried there in 1709.³ His name appears in lists of donations collected by the Broseley Monthly Meeting to help to relieve the distress of Friends who had suffered persecution, and the last such subscription is recorded in 1716.⁴ Nevertheless the journey from his home at Madeley Court—a ferry across the river followed by a steep climb up to Broseley Wood—must have become increasingly arduous towards the end of his life. We have the evidence of Hannah Rose that, as his health failed, a Meeting for Worship began to be held in a new house he was building in Coalbrookdale. She further records that, after his death at Madeley Court early in 1717, his body was taken to this new house before burial in the Quaker burial ground at Broseley. His widow, refused the use of the new house, moved to Bewdley (Worcs.) where she died and was buried a year later.⁵ Abraham Darby's parents must have been living near Coalbrookdale or Broseley, for their burials are recorded later on, as also is that of his son Edmund, who had lived at Albrighton near Shrewsbury.⁶

In a recent article Dr. R. A. Mott has set aside Hannah Rose's evidence, and has stated that Abraham Darby 'was buried at Bewdley as was his widow'.⁷ As authority for that he cites a Quaker register for Herefordshire, Worcestershire, and Wales in the library of Friends House in London, and the present writer, having examined the same register, confirms that those are indeed the facts there recorded. It is, however, extremely unlikely that one so actively concerned with the Broseley Meeting would have been buried elsewhere, and an examination of earlier records confirms that the entry in the register at Friends House is incorrect.

Friends have always kept careful records of their monthly business meetings and many of their early records survive. Clerks of the monthly meetings are required to keep records of births, marriages, and burials among their members. National registration of such events was introduced in 1837,⁸ and earlier non-parochial registers were subsequently deposited in Somerset House,⁹ whence they have recently been transferred to the Public Record Office. Before parting with their registers, however, Friends employed copyists to summarize them in tabular form, arranged alphabetically and grouping several meetings together in one summary. There are two such summaries relevant to Broseley Meeting. The summaries give references to the

¹Many people have helped the writer to search for the information in this article, and their help is here gratefully acknowledged.

²Heref. and Worc. R.O. (Worc.), ref. b898.2 BA 1204/21 (abstracts and copies of deeds relating to Salop. Monthly Meeting property 1670—1800).

³Heref. and Worc. R.O. (Worc.), ref. b898.2 BA 1204/17.

⁴Heref. and Worc. R.O. (Worc.), ref. 898.2 BA 1948/4 (Accts. of Broseley Monthly Meetings with constitution and minutes).

⁵Hannah Rose, 'Some Account of the Family of the Darby's' (Friends Ho. MSS., box W; original at Dudmaston *penes* Lady Labouchere; copy in S.P.L., BD 21 v.f.).

⁶Heref. and Worc. R.O. (Worc.), ref. b898.2 BA 1204/17.

⁷T.S.A.S. lviii. 154, 161-2.

⁸Under the Act for registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England, 1836, 6 & 7 Wm. IV, c. 86.

⁹Under the Non-Parochial Registers Act, 1840, 3 & 4 Vic. c. 92.

original source of each entry, and it is only by tracing the contemporary records so referred to that the puzzle about Abraham Darby's burial place can be solved.

The smaller of the two summaries is that of the Shropshire Monthly Meeting 1656-1838 (henceforth called the Worcester summary) now in the Worcestershire Record Office; it contains names from about eight individual meetings.¹⁰ In 1843 it was examined and certified correct by several Friends, among whom was William Gregory Norris of Newdale Meeting. Norris was responsible for the collection and preservation of many early documents relating to the Coalbrookdale Works,¹¹ and it is most unlikely that he would have overlooked an error in the record relating to Abraham Darby I. The Worcester summary states that Abraham Darby senior died in 1717 on the 5th day of the third month. The date is written in pencil but the script is similar to that on the rest of the page. The date and place of burial (8th day of third month at Broseley) are written in ink, but the place of burial is written by a different hand from that on the rest of the page.

The Worcester summary refers to book 702, page 2, and to book 707, page 12, as the sources of its information about Abraham Darby's death and burial. Both books are now in the Public Record Office. Book 707 is 'A register of the deaths and burials of Friends in Shropshire (First) 1659, to 1777'. Page 12 records simply that in 1717 'Abraham Darby, was buried the 8th day of the 3d month'.¹² Book 702 is entitled 'Broseley Meeting Burials'. It contains burials from 1701 to 1777. Since all the names are those of Broseley Friends, the places of burial are mentioned only in the cases of those few who were buried elsewhere. Page 2 records that 'Abraham Darby sen. was buried the 8th day of the 3d month 1717'.¹³ There can be no doubt from this important record that Abraham Darby was buried at Broseley. The book refers to many other Darbys and is probably the source of John Randall's list of members of the family¹⁴ and also of the information about the Darbys contained in the printed genealogy of the Wilson family.¹⁵

The larger summary is that of the General Meeting of Herefordshire, Worcestershire and Wales (henceforth called the Friends House summary) in the library of Friends House. As has been seen, it is the source relied on by Dr. Mott. It contains names from about 25 meetings including those of Broseley and Bewdley, so that confusion between the two place-names, when they were wrongly spelled or badly written, is very likely. There is no certification that its entries were examined and found correct. There are two entries for Abraham Darby I, from three sources. The first entry records that he was buried in 1717 on the 8th day of the third month. The date of death and the burial place are not given and the entry refers to books 702 and 707, which have already been discussed. The second entry records Abraham Darby's death in 1717 as on the 7th day (*sic*) of the third month; it gives his burial place as Bewdley, though no date of burial is recorded. Reference is made to book 666, p. 61.

Book 666, now in the Public Record Office, is 'A book of records from the 23d of the 5th mo[nth] . . . belonging to Budly . . .' begun by William Sankye. Marriages

¹⁰Heref. and Worc. R.O. (Worc.), ref. b898.2 BA 1204/17.

¹¹Now in Shrops. R.O. 516. and Friends Ho. Libr. (MS. vols. S 200-5).

¹²P.R.O., R.G. 6/1003 f. 10v. (modern foliation).

¹³P.R.O., R.G. 6/1327 f. 4v. (modern foliation).

¹⁴J. Randall, *Broseley and Its Surroundings* (Madeley, 1879), 220-1.

¹⁵J. Foster, *Pedigree of Wilson of High Wray* (privately printed, 1871).

are recorded in the front of the book from 1679—the year in which ‘ Truth [was] received at Beudly ’.¹⁶ At the back of the book is a record of burials in Bewdley Friends’ burial ground from 1683. Page 61 records, in an illiterate hand, that :¹⁷

Mary the widow of Abraham Darby deceased the 1st day of the second month 1718—and was interred at Bewdly the 3d. The 7th of 3d mo[nth] 1717 her husband A.D. deceased and was buried at Brosely.

It is the only reference to Abraham Darby in the list of Bewdley burials and clearly shows that he cannot have been buried there. There can be no doubt that it was responsible for the incorrect entry in the Friends House summary : an unfortunate, though understandable, error was made in summarizing the entry for inclusion in the Friends House summary.

Friends continued to meet in Coalbrookdale after the death of Abraham Darby I, and they built their own meeting house there, with an adjacent burial ground, in 1741. The group at Brosely, however, declined and the regular monthly business meetings there seem to have been discontinued after the 11th month 1741. Brosely and Coalbrookdale apparently became alternative names for the same meeting.¹⁸ Burials at Brosely, however, continued until late in the century¹⁹ and several infant children of Abraham Darby II were buried there. After about 1750, however, the family interments were at Coalbrookdale.

Mary, widow of Abraham Darby I, seems to be the only member of the Darby family to have been buried at Bewdley in the 18th century.

¹⁶P.R.O., R.G. 6/1581 f. 2 (modern foliation).

¹⁷Ibid. f. 14 (modern foliation).

¹⁸*V.G.H. Salop.* ii. 12 n. 3.

¹⁹e.g. that of Eliz. Dixon, widow, in 1794.

THE DIARY OF A COUNTRY GENTLEMAN : SIR BALDWIN LEIGHTON
BT. (1805-71)

By VINCENT J. WALSH, Ph.D.

THE recent availability of the diary of Sir Baldwin Leighton, Bt. (1805-71), has opened up a rich vein of insights into the affairs of both Shropshire and Britain generally. The nine hundred pages of manuscript in three volumes were begun in 1841 and the author maintained the effort until his death. The volumes are in the possession of Sir Baldwin's descendants, the Leightons of Loton Park, near Shrewsbury—along with the other private records and papers of the family. With the kind permission of Sir Michael Leighton, Bt., a copy of the seventh baronet's diary has been made accessible to the present writer.

Sir Baldwin was the son of General Sir Baldwin Leighton (1747—1828) and his second wife Margaretta Louisa Anne, daughter of Sir John Thomas Stanley, Bt., of Alderley Park, Cheshire. The Leighton family acquired its estates in Alberbury and Cardeston at the beginning of the sixteenth century ; before that, however, its representatives can be found at Court and as members of the House of Commons, and Edward Leighton was created a baronet on 2 March 1693.

Yet it can safely be asserted that none of the Leightons had a deeper, more thorough, or more widely respected involvement in public life than did Sir Baldwin Leighton in the middle of the nineteenth century.¹ He was chairman of Shropshire quarter sessions (1855-71) and previously chairman of Montgomeryshire quarter sessions from 1847.² In 1836, when the New Poor Law arrived in the region, he became the very active chairman of the Atcham Union, a post which he retained until his death. As owner of the Loton estate he was attuned to the problems of agriculture and kept in close touch with his tenantry. Through his early introduction to the problems of estate management he also became familiar with the housing and employment requirements of agricultural labourers. He was instrumental in 1838-40 in the establishment of a county pauper lunatic asylum and of a county police force.

In 1859 Leighton was returned to Parliament for South Shropshire. In the Commons he spoke on a wide range of domestic issues. He was the principal Conservative to push for the passage of the 1862 Night Poaching Prevention Act. In 1864, as the diary attests, he led a small group of Conservatives to abstain from a party vote against the ageing Palmerston's government on the issue of Schleswig-Holstein.³ Thus that government survived by a close margin (313-295) until the dissolution in the next year.⁴ In 1865 Leighton himself was defeated at the polls.

Despite his six years in the Commons, Leighton always retained the preoccupations of a country gentleman. Even during parliamentary sessions he travelled back to Shrewsbury to keep in close touch with quarter-sessions and poor-law matters. Thus defeat in 1865 brought little change in Sir Baldwin's interests and activities. Only at the opening of the year 1871 did Leighton consider retiring from public life,

¹Leighton's two sons later sat in Parliament and the elder eventually became chairman of the Atcham Poor Law Union.

²He had been vice-chairman of both benches before becoming chairman.

³Diary, July 1864 ; see below, p. 164.

⁴W. Baring Pemberton, *Lord Palmerston* (1954), 343 ; H.C.F. Bell, *Lord Palmerston* (2 vols., 1936) ii. 385.

believing that his health had begun to fail. He died, however, in mid-winter before he had time to arrange his retirement.

The diary ranges over many topics—his family, the personalities who directed Shropshire's political life, the magistracy, church affairs, problems of agriculture, the financial state of his fellow gentry, his travels, and the skeletons in the cupboards of local families. Many odd entries of course defy easy categorization.

The diary reveals an affectionate family man. Indeed his family, his conventional churchmanship, and his strong desire to play a useful part in public life were, as will later be shown, the main sustaining forces behind his many public involvements.

Sir Baldwin and his wife Mary, daughter of Thomas N. Parker of Sweeney Hall, near Oswestry, had six children, born between 1833 and 1841. Fanny, the eldest, was followed by Bella, Charlotte, Baldwin, Stanley, and finally Margaret. The diary begins, therefore, when the family is almost complete. Early entries about the children are brief and devoted to such occurrences as the usual childhood illnesses :

1842	The three eldest girls sickened of the measles. They however have
Sunday	had them very lightly, being kept in the nursery only [blank] days &
March	able to dine down stairs on the 13. The measles being very prevalent
6	in the neighbourhood & appearing a good sort & the time of the year
Measles	being favourable the children were taken into a cottage where the
	disease was. It however did not break out on them for 3 weeks after.

Next year, in 1843, the diarist recorded :

March	Took the 5 eldest children to Liverpool for the benefit of change of
7	air & in order to get rid of the hooping cough. They were all very
Liverpool	much pleased with what they saw, but unfortunately with the exception
	of Baldwin fell sick one after the other. We remained there a fortnight.

The governess was changed in 1844, as the children grew :

June 21	Miss De Lolme left Loton suddenly on account of her sister's illness.
	She had been Governess here for nearly 4 years, & considering her
	age only 17 when she came has done very well by the children. But
	we considered as they are now growing up it was necessary to have a
	lady of more experience, & accordingly we had engaged Miss Bancroft
	& Miss De Lolme was to have left us in a month.

A later governess, however, left under other circumstances :

1849	Miss Corney our Governess left, having been with us for two years.
May 11	She had several good points & got the children on very well in most of
	their studies. Her temper was not always good and latterly she was
	not able to have that controul over the children which the Governess
	ought to have. This in regard to [the] two elder was in some measure
	occasioned by the manner in which she spoke to them of her love
	affairs . . .

The children's education was a matter which regularly concerned the diarist, as his

interest in the governesses shows. Later of course, for the boys, there was more formal schooling too.

1846 Took Baldwin to school at Mr. Rowdens at East Sheen ; he bore the
August 13 parting from home very well & the next day when I took leave of
B. to School him at the school there was no crying.

By 1850 it was time for the 13-years-old Baldwin to go on to public school. His father again accompanied him, but perhaps the trip to the dentist was as important :

April 15 Took Baldwin to Eton. We left Loton at 4.30 [a.m.] arriving in
London at 1 in order to have time to see Mr. Waite the dentist.
B. B's eye tooth was growing behind the others as there was not room for
Eton it in the proper place. It was therefore necessary to take out [one] of
the double teeth & by means of a frame make room for the eye tooth ;
the front teeth of the lower jaw were also too crowded & Mr. W. made
a frame to force them back. In the evening we went by the S. West
rail to Eton where I entered Baldwin with Dr. Hawtry ; he is boarding
at Dr. Okes.

By the autumn of that year Leighton was studying the public schools more thoroughly before sending off his younger son. Although Leighton himself had gone to Rugby in the days before Arnold, the following entry suggests that he did not even consider Rugby for Stanley, then aged 13 :

[1850] As on enquiry the education at Harrow appeared to me very superior
Nov. to that taught at Eton I determined to send Stanley there if I could
get him in. Accordingly wrote to Dr. Vaughan to inquire whether he
could take him next Midsummer into his house. Received an answer
saying that owing to an accidental circumstance he could admit him
after Christmas but that if I could not send him then, there would be
very little chance of getting him in for 3 years, when of course he would
be too old, as there were so many applications. I therefore determined
he should go then, although I should have very much preferred if he
could have remained $\frac{1}{2}$ year longer at East Sheen considering it a
great point for a boy to be placed well on entering a public school.

My objections to Eton are that all the attention seems to be given to classics & making Latin verses while English Literature appears to be almost totally neglected. French notwithstanding Prince Albert's prizes does not fare much better while Mathematics, Algebra & Arithmetic, are extras. The discipline of the school also seems to me to want improving ; it is not an offence to be out of bounds, but it is to be caught out of bounds, very like the Spartan idea that thieving was not wrong but to be discovered was infamous. B. tells me the drawing Master Evans sometimes comes into his room among his pupils smoking a cigar & that the rooms where the boys draw smell often very strong of tobacco smoke ; this shows that Hawtrey pays no attention to the conduct of the extra Masters.

* * *

1851 Went with Stanley to Harrow ; dined with Dr. and Mrs. Vaughan.
[Jan.] I was much pleased with the Dr. who appears to make his old Master Arnold a model. The school which had only 40 boys when he became head Master now reckons 400 & . . . there are a vast number of applicants. Lord Hill entered Jeffrey Hill the same day that I went there ; his name had been down two years.

University soon followed public school for the young Leightons.

1854 To Oxford with B for his matriculation ; we had received a very
June 7 pressing invitation from Dr. Jelf a canon of X Church & accordingly took up our quarters at his house in Tom Quad. Next morning went to the Dean's house where we found about 35 other young men waiting ; also several fathers on a similar errand to mine, among others Boughey Wikestead & Wakeman (Rev.). The Noblemen & Gentlemen Commoners had not to undergo any examination but the Commoners were marched off to the hall where they were kept under examination for three hours.

The expenses of Matriculation for B. were

Fees to Vice Chancellor	7.3
Caution Money	21
Entrance Fee	21
Mathematical Lecture	8
Logic Lecture	3
	<hr/>
	60.3

Stanley went up to Balliol next year, and in 1858 Leighton accompanied Baldwyn on his first day at Lincoln's Inn. In January 1860 Leighton saw Stanley begin his studies at Lincoln's Inn, while he himself went off to the Commons. Baldwyn evidently did not continue his studies in the law, but Stanley did and eventually began work as a barrister in Shropshire and the counties of the Oxford Circuit.

1862 Salop Assizes. S. got his first Assize brief. Reg. v. Bailey for obtaining
March 20 money under false pretences. He was Junior. I went into the Gallery to hear him & so that he should not see me as I thought if he did it might make him nervous. He examined very well . . .

In all his concern for his sons' education, however, Sir Baldwin never lost interest in his daughters' development. Periodically their governess was changed to ensure that their instruction at Loton continued to advance. Occasionally when Leighton and his wife went to London, they took their daughters, and masters were hired to instruct them.

1848 Went up to London with Mary & 3 eldest girls leaving Margaret &
May 18 Miss Corney the Governess who went over to Sweeney. Lodging at Jermyn St. No 39, 8 G per week. Remained 5 weeks. 3 girls engaged with masters—drawing 3 mornings per week from 9 to 12—dancing (Madl Michaut) twice for 2 hours & piano twice Madl Dulcken. I trust they will profit by it . . .

The girls also accompanied their parents on journeys to Paris, the Rhine, and the West Country. The comment at the end of the above excerpt, however, suggests not only that Sir Baldwin was cost-conscious—as will be demonstrated more clearly later—but that he was not altogether sure what all these special tutors could do for his daughters. Yet Lady Leighton must have been able to reassure him, for she herself was an accomplished watercolour artist.

Fanny and Bella married during their father's lifetime. In 1858 Bella married Beriah Botfield⁶ whom Leighton approved of, though he was 51 and she was only 24. Botfield was M.P. for Ludlow and 'in point of fortune (if that was the only thing to be considered) Bella could not have done better as Botfield is by far the richest commoner in Shropshire.'⁸

But Leighton the father continued—in a more melancholy strain :

Bella will be the first of the family to quit the paternal roof & her marriage will occasion the the [*sic*] first vacancy in our family circle . . . Fan already seems much affected at the approaching departure of her sister, being only 1 year older than Bella these two sisters have always been thrown most together & I fear the day that takes Bella from Loton will be one of sorrow & weeping for Fanny.

In 1863 Bella was widowed, but in 1866 she married Alfred Seymour, Liberal M.P. for Totnes.⁷ In April 1862 Fan married a younger son of William L. Childe of Kinlet, the Revd. Edward G. Childe (later Baldwyn-Childe). Two years later, in 1864, Baldwyn married the Hon. Eleanor Leicester Warren, the third daughter of Lord de Tabley. It was, however, also the year in which Leighton lost his wife. Lady Leighton died of scarlet fever a fortnight after Loton Park had celebrated the return of Baldwyn and his bride Nelly from their wedding trip, and the diarist was obviously in great grief. Apart from recording his personal anguish, however, the diary also includes comments on the funeral in terms of interest to the social historian :

March 9	Charlotte expressed a wish to attend the funeral & as she had shewn
Wednesday	such attention to her dear Mother during her last illness I could not
	refuse although I think it is not desirable as a rule that Ladies should
Funeral	be present at these ceremonies. All my 6 children & Edward Childe
	therefore attended as mourners and perhaps it is very seldom that
	there are so many real sorrowing mourners at a funeral. Indeed with
	the exception of Botfield's those that I have attended during the last 12
	months have been very deficient in this respect.

Over the remaining period of his life the diarist carried on his social life, entertaining at Loton—the Shropshire Hunt Ball being the favourite occasion for parties in those years—visiting other houses in a rather established routine, and making a few journeys especially to London. Whatever the social occasion, Leighton was supported by his children. He remained active, too, in public affairs, especially quarter-sessions and poor-law work. But the warmth was gone, and for any reader of the whole diary there is a sense of anticlimax throughout those seven last years, busy though they were. Leighton himself occasionally adds to a commentary on some festivity

⁵*D.N.B.*

⁶Diary, 8 Sept. 1858.

⁷*Dod's Parliamentary Companion* (1865), 282.

he might be attending, a regret that his wife is missing. Although all his entries are factual with some reflexions, his words entered on 15 February 1866 are remarkably cryptic.

It will not tend to your happiness she said. It will not increase your happiness she repeated. On a further statement our conversation was brought to a close. Can it be true. I have enjoyed great happiness with one who alas is now gone from us.

The diary affords no explanation of these words. Had Leighton proposed marriage to a lady and, having been refused, felt unable to commit her name to the pages of his diary ?

Twenty-five years before, a guest at Loton had commented on his host and his family. Disraeli wrote to his sister Sarah :⁸

Carlton Club, July 7, 1841

Here I am again having been only 5 days out of Parliament : we had a sharp contest, but never for a moment doubtful. They did against me, and said against me, and wrote against me all they could find or invent but I licked them ; & the result is that we now know the worst. And I really think their assault in the long run did me good . . . After ' Chairing ', which was gorgeous & fatiguing, and after quaffing the ' Triumphal Cup ' at 40 different spots in Salop, . . . we went & stayed till Monday at Loton Park, Sir Baldwin Leighton's. One of the most charming old English Halls & filled with a family in their way as perfect. A complete old English gentleman, whom I first met out at Stamboul, a most agreeable wife, the finest Amateur Artist I know, and children lovelier than the dawn . . .

Despite the exuberant spirits which filled Disraeli at the moment of writing this letter, he wrote truly : there does seem to have been a genuinely warm and affectionate family life at Loton over the years, and Sir Baldwin found much solace in his children in his later years. He died visiting Bella at Norton Hall in Northamptonshire.

Along with his family life, Leighton's religious convictions were important to him. Though no doubt sincere, they were conventional enough and figure in the diary principally through his concern for the maintenance of sound ecclesiastical tradition in the face of the current wave of Puseyite fashions. In 1851 a new curate came to Alberbury, the parish church just beside the park gates, to serve the living on behalf of the non-resident vicar, R. W. Huntley.

March 2 Mr. Jenner our new Curate preached for the 1st time. He appears to be rather imbued with Puseyite doctrines & stated that he should in

⁸W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield* (1910-20), ii. 114. Leighton noted the Shrews. election and the candidates, including Disraeli : ' I had met him at Constantinople but had forgotten the circumstance. He as well as his father is an author . . . His age may be between 35 and 40 with a sallow complexion & black locks of which he possesses a goodly quantity. After the election he spent a few days at Loton. He appeared a clever man, and very ambitious, but struck me as devoid of principle except that of getting himself on in the world.' See diary, 28 June 1841.

- future when there was no sacrament read the prayer for the Church militant from the Communion table after the sermon in accordance with the oath he had taken on being ordained (to follow the rubric).
- 9 Mr. J. preached in his surplice & began his sermon at once without any previous prayer.

By 1853 Leighton had begun to move against Jenner.

- July 1 I had for a long time been annoyed at the Puseyite proceedings of our
[1854] Curate Mr. Jenner but in the hopes that the Vicar would take measures to procure another Clergyman in his place, I had taken no active steps in the Parish, Huntley's answers having constantly been, 'if you will keep quiet I will get rid of him of my own motion as it is not desirable a curate should be dismissed apparently from the representations of his parishioners'.

Huntley, however, failed to effect Jenner's departure in the year after that note, and Jenner heard of Leighton's antipathy :

On the 28 [January 1854] I received a letter from the curate informing me he was to remain at Alberbury & accusing me of trying to get him out of his curacy by saying he held papistical opinions. A correspondence took place between us & also with Huntley & as now I fear there seems but little probability of his quitting this place I have determined though with regret to discontinue attending the services at Church and shall read the morning service on Sundays to such of the family as do not go to Cardiston or Wollaston.

There are several later entries dealing with local ecclesiastical events⁹—Jenner's eventual departure in 1858 and the coming and going of vicars and curates in neighbouring parishes. Only once, however, does the diarist review a sermon's content and suggest thereby something of his own religious outlook and philosophy.

- 1841 'Straight is the way but narrow is the path that leads to salvation'
Jan 10 was the text. He explained that on either side was [a] precipice &
Sunday that by going to extremes on either side we might fall. That if with Calvin we asserted every thing was predestined & that man had no free will we should equally err as if we believed that nothing was predestined. That we must not think Goods [*sic*] works alone could save us while on the other hand we must nevertheless do all the good we can.

This zeal for good works found practical expression in the diarist's regular respect for being useful. His own desire to be useful comprehended a wide range of activities

⁹ On the lighter side, the pet dog had no 'papistical' opinions. 'Bijou having become quite deaf & very lame . . . he was shot this morning. He was given to the children by the keeper, who had shot their cat in the shrubbery when a puppy & had been our constant companion . . . He was a very pretty spaniel & the most intelligent dog I ever saw. The children had taught him a great number of tricks & had he been the property of a travelling showman would doubtless have been exhibited as The Wonderful Dog . . . At the period of the papal aggression he was taught to growl at the Pope & lie down & die for the Queen . . .': diary, 3 Nov. 1858.

and interests, and disappointments—such as his defeat at the polls in 1865—were tempered with the satisfaction of having rendered useful service.

Sir Baldwin frequently expressed his belief in the importance of being useful with reference sometimes to himself, sometimes to others. In 1865 some of the antagonism had disappeared from the relationship between Lord Hill and Leighton,¹⁰ and the two spoke about the forthcoming contest in North Shropshire.

June 3 Lord Hill is very much annoyed at thus being obliged to retire his son from the representation of the County & spoke to me about it at the Carlton in a very bitter spirit. He appears however quite to forget that Rowland was a very useless member seldom attending in the House & never taking any part in the business. It is these sort of members who in my opinion are a great injury to the landed interest & we have too many of the class on both sides the house.

In 1864 his elder son and heir, Baldwyn, seemed for the moment bound on a course his father opposed :

July B. determined to give up Sweeney & live in London. I am very
B. House sorry for it, as I was in hopes by residing in the country he would
in gradually learn some of the duties of a landed proprietor & try to
London make himself a useful man in the County, but by living in town both
 he & Nelly I fear will become useless Members of Society . . .

In 1865 Sir Thomas Winnington, M.P., was at Loton for several days.

Nov. 11 Winnington mentioned that in talking over the late elections with Childers a junior Lord of the Treasury [a Liberal], C said that he considered the House of Commons had sustained a loss by my not being elected. It is some satisfaction therefore to find my political opponents apart from party feeling believed that I was a useful member.

The first duties in which Sir Baldwin became involved were those connected with the management of the Loton Park estate. His father had raised him with a dual sense of preserving and improving—designing his entire rearing so that he might restore the prosperity of the family properties which had been somewhat neglected during the years of the general's bachelor cousins, Sir Charlton (1780-4) and Sir Robert (1784-1819). In November 1822 Baldwin's tutor, the Revd. James Field, wrote to the general, describing his pupil—then in his eighteenth year :¹¹

It is very rare to meet with any young man who keeps pace with him, from the *very solid* talents he possesses and the steady application he is, for the most part, willing to make of them . . . In all things, he is steady and decisive beyond his years, and when he dislikes any subject, any branch of study, he seems to be

¹⁰See below, p. 165.

¹¹*Extracts from Letters & Speeches, &c., of Sir Baldwin Leighton, Bt., M.P. for South Shropshire* (privately printed; Shrews. 1875), ed. Frances C. Childe (copy in S.P.L.), pp. 5-6. See also Loton Hall MSS., 'A Hist. of the Leighton Fam. of Loton in the County of Shropshire', chapter relating to the life of the 7th bt.; there is a TS. copy of this fam. hist. in S.P.L. (accession 3983) and another copy of the chapter on the 7th bt. in S.R.O. 783, parcel 194.

acting upon *some principle*, . . . and not like other boys upon mere disinclination to exertion.

Through the experience thus gained in his early twenties Sir Baldwin became well acquainted with the habits and problems of agricultural labourers, with the needs of farmers, and with the problems of estate management faced by his fellow land-owners. Of course it was excellent experience for his work in quarter sessions and as chairman of the Atcham Poor Law Union. He soon became a critical and respected agriculturist, and—like many of his class¹²—he had an appreciative interest in novelties and new inventions.

1841 To the Agricultural meeting at Liverpool with Mr. Parker [his
July 19 father-in-law] . . . There was a very large number of animals exhibited
Monday & also a great assortment of implements. One article shewn illustrates
in a remarkable manner the effects of commerce ; it was a manure
called Guano which was imported from some Island in the Pacific off
the coast of Peru. It was described as a very powerful manure being
the dung of sea-fowl but the price £25 pr ton is almost too high to
bring it into general use. It was stated the custom House Officers were
very much puzzled to know what duty to fix on it . . .
Bought Bearts patent machine for making draining tile.

In 1848, after a visit to Dudmaston, William Wolryche Whitmore's estate near Bridgnorth, he wrote :

Oct. 24 Wolryche Whitmore has a farm of nearly 1000 acres & is trying agricultural experiments on a very large scale. At present the hobby is pigs ; his plan is to have about 200 acres (he has 500 arable in hand) of roots such as potatoes turnips carrots & parsnips, these are to be boiled with barley meal & given to the pigs, & the profit to be derived he expects will amount to 20£ pr acre for the roots after paying for the barley meal. Mais-nous verrons.
He mentioned that in the time of Sir John Whitmore who died in 1762 the Dudmaston Estate was only 1200£ pr annum whereas now it is 4000£. Part of this increase, however, must be attributed to the enclosure of the Morfe.

It is no surprise to find Leighton in the following position :

1849 Meeting of the Salop Agricultural Association. I was President ;
Oct 9 there were very few animals exhibited in the Showyard & hardly any implements. After dinner Mr. Meire made a very violent speech & took occasion to find fault with Mr. Burd for a plan which he was proposing for having a corn instead of a money rent. After he had said his say, Mr. B got up to answer him which he did in a very temperate manner saying he should be happy to discuss the question with any one who would call on him but that it was not the place then to enter

¹²e.g. T. N. Parker (his father-in-law) and Wm. Wolryche Whitmore. For Parker see e.g. S.R.O. 1060/176-85 ; Holland Bros. (of Ledbury, Herefs.), *Antiquarian Books* (Catalogue no. 556), no. 325. According to family tradition some of Whitmore's characteristic traits may be discerned in the inventive protagonist of *The Grinding Mills* (1903), a novel by his great-niece Mary Whitmore Jones : inf. from Mr. A. Clutton-Brock, of Chastleton Ho. (Oxon.) per Dr. J. F. A. Mason. Leighton's use of the term 'hobby' is suggestive.

into the merits of his plan. Mr. Meire then got up again & I had a great deal of difficulty in preventing [him] from inflicting another long speech on the party. Wheat having fallen to 6/- the Shrewsbury measure or about 41/- to 42/- the Imperial Quarter & stock also being very low the farmers are complaining & as generally speaking they are men with very little capital the times are pressing very hard on them ; & no doubt if prices continue low rents must come down.

Pertinent too is the latter part of the following entry :

1850
Jan. 29 Boys planted out in the Lawn below the terrace on the East side 2 Spanish Chesnut trees which they had sown some years before in the garden. I trust they may live to see them grow into large trees. While we were planting them the bell was tolling for the funeral of John Wilde the late tenant of the Lower House. He succeeded his father in the farm about 32 years since, was a good neighbour and a kindhearted man but a very slovenly farmer.

Later in the year a wide-ranging conversation is recounted :

Oct. To Millichope [the Childe Pemberton estate near Munslow]. Met there Woolryche Whitmore [and] Cheney ; the former talked about free trade, but does not seem to think so well of the alteration of the corn laws as he did some time since. The truth whether the admission of foreign wheat be a benefit or not to the nation at large it appears quite certain the Landlords & farmers must suffer ; Whitmore who at one period was a most violent free trader now says that undoubtedly many landlords & farmer[s] must be ruined, *but* perhaps in 3 or 4 years things may get right again. I fear he is one of those who are now feeling the change of prices. Should the price of agricultural produce remain . . . low . . . there seems every probability of several of those squires who are in embarrassed circumstances being quite ruined. Childe of Kinlet it is reported has reduced his establishment & now only keeps a butler & a boy in the house ; he has had several farms in hand & no doubt has lost considerably by them, but from Whitmore's statement he appears to have been borrowing for several years so that like many others he must have been a very bad economist & allowed great extravagance to go on in his household & his farm. Some years since he told me his home farm which is very extensive had been a loss to him of 1000£ that year & he has now on hand 2 other farms, which I fear he will not cultivate to much profit. Powis [the Hon. Thomas Wentworth Powys] of Berwick [near Shrewsbury] is one of those landlords whose income will probably be destroyed by a reduction of rents, with an estate of 5 or 6000 it is supposed he has not above 7 or 800£ to spend, the rest going to pay the charges on the property so that if his rents are reduced 15 pr ct he will not only have nothing but will be unable to pay his interest.

Sir Edw. Smythe is also another squire who is supposed to be very embarrassed.

Several Landlords have had farms this year thrown on their hands.

Lord Forester has from 1,000 to 1,200 acres being either 3 or 4 farms & others have from one to two. The only farm [in] Watlesborough [where Leighton had farms] that was vacant I was able to let though the tenant is not everything I could wish. Many landlords have given back 10 pr ct, others have at once reduced the rent. I gave back at the last rent day 10 pr ct, but have now determined to alter the rent, & propose to reduce $\frac{1}{2}$ the rent from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 pr ct according to the quality of the farm & the other half to be a corn rent according to the average of the last 3 years. This will probably reduce my income from 5 to 600 per an. I have therefore at once determined to reduce my garden establishment & shall discharge one man leaving 3 & a woman & the head gardener to do the work. Although prices are not lower that [*sic*] in 1834 35, there seems a want of confidence among the farmers & more farms are thrown on the landlords' hands than at any former period while there are fewer applicants to take them.

* * *

1852 I received an address signed by 150 farmers thanking me for my
April exertions in trying to reduce the County expenditure . . .

The farmers' plight eased only slowly after 1853—which year presented a wet winter and summer. A new agricultural crisis however, was only just over a decade away. Cattle plague, beginning in Market Drayton, appeared in August 1865. The high sheriff called a meeting, and it was decided to divide the county according to the poor-law unions, each union appointing a subcommittee to deal with the disease.¹³ In this August entry¹⁴ Leighton adds

John Meire suggested a subscription to indemnify any farmer who might lose cattle from this complaint ; to my surprize even among his brother farmers this did not seem to find favor.

The idea continued to be canvassed :

Nov. 18 Meeting at Shrewsbury to discuss the formation of a Mutual Insurance Society against loss by the Cattle plague. The farmers however appear very careless in the matter [and] talk of the landlords helping them by paying a portion of the Insurance while at the same time few offer themselves to insure.

On 9 December Leighton, as chairman of quarter sessions, called the magistrates into special session to discuss the plague and the Privy Council's recent orders conferring on the justices in each petty-sessional division very stringent powers to prevent the movement of cattle, sheep, or pigs. They decided to prevent all such animals' movements between any hundreds of the county, orders for such limitation being issued in each division. By mid December, however, Leighton was finding fault with some magistrates :

Dec 22 In several divisions the Magistrates have been very slow in making the

¹³Each union was run by a board of guardians. The guardians were farmers, landlords, and country clergy. That was true even in the industrial Madeley and Wellington unions. See V. J. Walsh, 'The Administration of the Poor Laws in Shrops. 1820—1855' (Univ. of Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis, 1970), pp. 326-41 ; copies are in the Inst. of Historical Research and the Shrops. R.O.

¹⁴Diary, 26 Aug. 1865.

prohibitive order & in some it has I fancy only been done in consequence of my writing.

Lord Hill who in London moved some very stringent resolutions, does not seem to have been very active in his own division for it was only on the 21 that the order was issued there, & I have reason to believe it was because I wrote to one of the Wem Magistrates on the subject. Thus many men will make a noise in public but quite forget to carry into practice what they have been publicly urging others to do.

Leighton remained involved in the problem. In February he carried a motion in adjourned quarter sessions to centralize the county's eighteen committees (in petty-sessional divisions) into one quarter-sessions subcommittee.¹⁵ He soon noticed that the magistrates now visiting farmers to appraise their condemned animals were not awarding such high amounts of compensation as the local magistrates had before the centralization.¹⁶ In April he visited the north-eastern tip of the county, beyond Market Drayton, and his remarks show his humanity towards the poor.

April 18 To Market Drayton being anxious to see with my own eyes how the cattle plague is worked in this infected district. Met the Magistrates of the locality at the Clerks office & after discussing the different matters relating to the law which they did not seem to comprehend very well I hired a dogcart & with the Inspector drove up to Woore which is one of the most infected districts in the County. Many of the farmers more especially the women were very sad & it was melancholy to see them. One poor woman at Norton [-in-Hales] had lost 4 cows & when we came to her house her 5th & last cow was lying down with the disease & never likely to get up. It is poor people of this class that perhaps one pities most for to them the loss must be much greater in proportion than to a large farmer even supposing his entire herd is swept off. None of the Magistrates of the neighbourhood offered to accompany me, indeed they all seemed very slack in the business.

The plague was the last major agricultural problem which occupied Sir Baldwin's attention and energies. His relations with his own tenants and cottagers, however, deserve some special review. Here we see him as the paternal lord of the manor, though with a rather martinetish benevolence.

1843 While looking at the workmen at Cardiston Church heard an alarm
 Aug 28 of fire, & perceiving a thick column of smoke on the heath galloped
 up there. Found the cottage of John Morris one of my tenants in
 Fire flames. The fire had then reached the thatch & there was no chance
 Morris of saving the cottage. Both Morris & his wife were from home. Some
 cottage labourers however who were near had managed to save most of the
 furniture which was down stairs but the greater part of the beds &
 bedding was destroyed. The fire is supposed to have originated from

¹⁵Ibid. 24 Feb. 1866.

¹⁶Ibid. 26 Feb. 1866.

the children taking some fire out of the house to play with, which communicated to a leanto . . . filled with straw . . .

I had frequently spoken to both Morris & his wife of their conduct to their children who used constantly to be left at home by themselves while the parents went out to work . . .

In the following comment Leighton uses the word, 'poor', in a very broad sense—as it had generally been used indeed until the early nineteenth century.

1841 Attended Mr. Glover[s] assistant while he vaccinated the children of
Thursday the poor at Wattlesborough, Alberbury, & Wollaston; the whole
March 25 number done this day amounted to 125 & about 25 were obliged to be
sent away from Alberbury owing to the Doctor not having a sufficient
quantity of matter. On the whole the poor appear to be anxious to
obtain the benefits of vaccination for their children & only require
to be told how & where the children must be brought to.

The following entry is much longer than the diarist's usual comments but is included here as a further illustration of Leighton's close relationship to his neighbours, as well as his feeling for history and the process of change. The occasion was a harvest home in which the Loton Park property and the parish church of Alberbury were decorated and provided the setting for an open-air banquet and sports. Landowners, farmers, and 'poor' families from the neighbourhood all attended. Leighton spoke at length and perhaps really held his listeners' interest with these words, subsequently inserted in the diary.

1867 On the present occasion I think it may be interesting to you to know
Sept 17 the state of this district in former years. I will therefore bring before
you what I have heard from some of the old people & also some things
which I have collected from various papers. 100 years ago Watles-
Harvest borough Heath was a waste unenclosed with perhaps a few wretched
Home cottages scattered about built principally of wattle & dab & covered
with thatch. There was no regular road across it and I remember a
very old man who had been a flannel merchant telling me how he used
to have to ride to Welshpool & have to pick his way across the common.
The principal track then lay by the Ivy End cottages which in those
times was a public house. In winter probably a great portion of the
heath was flooded & I can remember the time when the Watlesborough
lawns used every winter for 2 or 3 months to be under water. Now this
land although not dry is never covered with water. Bausley Hill many
of you may remember an unenclosed waste with only a track over it.
Now there is a tolerable road though steep & nearly all the land is
cultivated . . . The old rectory at Cardeston is still standing & here
again a comparison may be made between the comforts of the present
day & of the early part of last century. Our Old Vicar who died in
1828 used to talk with pride how he found the Vicarage at Alberbury
thatched, that he slated it & added a dining room. Now you see a
very comfortable new house building by our Vicar.
The farm houses & farm buildings in the parish are also very greatly
improved and on the Rowton Estate & others in the parish besides my

own instead of miserable thatched dwellings are now to be seen with few exceptions comfortable slated cottages. But perhaps in hardly any case has there been such improvements as in our roads. I remember a Miss Leighton who was born in the last century telling me that one November day her Mother went in the family coach to Shrewsbury with 4 horses. Not reaching home as early as was expected her husband, Sir Charlton, collected a number of his labourers with picks & shovels & sent them off along the road fearing that the coach might have got into the mire or from the bad state of the way some other accident might have occurred. Fortunately however no accident happened & it was only the very bad state of the roads that occasioned Lady L. to be so late. Mrs. Briggs who lived at Benthall in the last century used to come to Church on Sunday in a strong heavy coach drawn by 4 horses . . . now you see the Lady of Rowton on Sundays in a small neat Brougham drawn by one horse who is perfectly able to trot all the way. 100 years since the flannels from Montgomeryshire were brought down to Shrewsbury on the backs of packhorses & old people have told me how long strings of these animals used to pick their way across Watlesborough Heath. As our roads improved these means of transport gave way to the heavy stage waggon which doubtless many of you may remember drawn by 6 & 8 horses, & these in the present day have had to succumb to the iron way & like the pack horses are now a thing of the past . . . Stoney Stretton lane still remains to show us what was probably the state of all our roads in the last century . . . Our horses now probably are of a better class than in former days but in those times most of the higher orders who could afford it purchased Flanders mares for the purpose of drawing their coaches. Hence probably the origin of the proverb, 'The Grey Mare the better horse.' Oxen formerly in this parish were used for ploughing & an old labourer now upwards of 80 remembers the last team in this parish at Farmer Flavell[s] who then held the Upper House farm. They are however used by agriculturist[s] in some parts of England & last winter in Sussex I saw a very fine team of 6 oxen harnessed to a waggon which however 3 good horses could have drawn.

There is another point . . . In the year 1801 I find 1048£ was expended in the relief of the poor of Alberbury.¹⁷ The year ending Ladyday 1866 the sum was only 188 & this year 230. In 1805 there were 125 paupers relieved or in other words 1/5th of the population of the parish . . . Last ½ year there were only 6 or 1 in 100. Yesterday in looking over the books of the [Atcham] Union I found only 2 paupers in the Workhouse belonging to Alberbury & none were receiving outdoor relief. Now some of you may think that the money thus saved goes into the pockets of the farmers, but I believe instead of being paid to the Overseer of the Poor & by him distributed to the paupers¹⁸ it is now directly

¹⁷Poor-relief expenditure was high throughout the country in 1801.

¹⁸A reference to the old poor-law system. The unions had relieving officers to distribute outdoor relief.

paid to the poor man in return for labor. Thirty years since I had always every winter a great number of half ablebodied men applying to me for work. Now hardly any of this class appear to be seeking employment. Where are they gone ? I believe that work being more plentiful, they are engaged.

I am glad to find Agricultural Machines are making progress in this neighbourhood. Although at first they may perhaps in a slight degree tend to reduce the amount of labor required, yet in the end there is no doubt Machines create a demand for labor.

After reviewing the arrival of threshing and reaping machines, he continues :

In these days also education is within the reach of all in the parish and it is entirely the neglect of his parents if a child is unable to read. In regard to food also there is a great contrast. The Landlords who lived at Rowton and Watlesborough 200 years ago never tasted fresh meat during the winter except it might be rabbits, game or wildfowl & perhaps occasionally fish. The custom was to kill the beasts or sheep in the Autumn when they had got some fat on them from the summer grass & salt them down for winter use. Of course in those days the farmers & labourers must have been much worse off. A few pigs fattened on the acorns in Pecknall or other woods probably afforded almost the only animal food during the winter to these classes. Wheat bread was then a luxury, rye or oat cakes being the common food. Now all in this neighbourhood usually eat wheaten bread.

Now owing to better food, a more ample supply of vegetables, good medical advice within easy reach, & more cleanliness in our houses & also in our persons I believe we enjoy better health than fell to the lot of our forefathers, & although none of us are likely to reach to the age of Old Parr,¹⁹ yet the inhabitants of this district are a long lived race. Some years since I calculated the ages of my tenantry, 1/5th were upward of 70 & 1/2 of these above 80.

Improved drainage & perhaps superior cottages & houses may have had something to do in improving our condition.

In regard to dress also there is a great improvement. Now most even of the poor are tidily dressed & cotton being so much cheaper is coming more into use. Formerly the farmers gude wife of a winter evening used to get her maidens about & spin the flax or wool procured from the farm. The former when spun into flax was sent to the weaver & no doubt made good strong useful cloth, while the worsted was knit at home into stockings. But machinery has destroyed the weavers trade & I believe none now remain in the parish.

I trust therefore that we are improving, that we are less given to drink, more honest, that [not] only our men are better but also our women. Still there is room for improvement & perhaps he who may be called to address some of you 50 years hence may be able to compare that

¹⁹*D.N.B.* sub Parr, Thos. (1483 ?—1635).

time with the present in the same manner that I have endeavoured to compare this time with years long passed.

On the other hand Sir Baldwin's neighbours knew that he could also be the stern man of justice. In 1846 he took Mrs. Bennett, the widow of an old tenant, to the assizes. She admitted taking straw and manure from the premises she occupied under him, contrary to a new lease. Since the new lease was identical to those which Leighton had signed with his other tenants, 'I considered if I did not try the question with her all my other offgoing tenants would be doing the same thing & therefore it was some expense to establish the principle. My lawyers amounted to 50£ for this business'.²⁰

A far more celebrated case²¹ involved his gamekeeper and helped to lose Leighton his parliamentary seat in the 1865 general election because of the local ill will generated by the prosecution. The diary presents the plaintiff's side.

[1855]
February 10 Wells Driving to Shrewsbury the Policeman stopped me to say he had found a couple of rabbits & 3 rabbits skins in a basket which Mrs. Wells the wife of the Keeper was carrying to Shrewsbury. I had for some time suspected he had been sending game or rabbits to Shrewsbury by his wife on Market days & had directed the Policeman to watch her. He had only come to me in July & I had found him so very inefficient a Keeper that I had given him notice & he was to have left me the Monday following. He came from And. Corbett of Sundorne who gave him an excellent character which however turned out not to be true. Wells came up as the Policeman was telling me what he had found & said he had sent the rabbits to a Mr. Budgett to whom he used to give a hare every Xmas. I then directed the Policeman to take him into custody . . . to Shrewsbury when he was committed for trial.

Two pages later there is simply a newspaper clipping dated by the diarist March 22 [1855]. Wells was found guilty but the jury 'recommended him to mercy on account of his good character'. The sentence was a mere week in gaol. And the day before the case against Wells was heard, as the same clipping tells, another case, involving Leighton's farm bailiff, James Robinson, on a charge of embezzlement, resulted in an acquittal. In an earlier entry on Robinson, Leighton had noted: 'For the last 6 months he had been addicted to drinking as I now hear and this I fear it is that has brought him to this end.'²²

Sir Baldwin's close familiarity with the bar of justice—like that of many another country gentleman—was the familiarity of the litigant as well as that of the occupant of the bench.²³ This is born out obliquely on two other occasions in which the diarist records his lawsuits. In August 1848 he appeared before a London county-court judge in a contest with his London landlord—the case resulting in a compromise—

²⁰Diary, 30 July 1846.

²¹*Shrews. Lent Assizes, 1855: Rep. of Trial of Sir B. Leighton's Gamekeeper . . . reprinted from the Shrews. Chron. . . . Mar. 30th 1855* (Shrews. n.d.; copy in S.P.L., Watton press cuttings, ix. 279a).

²²Diary, 8 Feb. 1855.

²³There is a second case against a tenant in 1869.

and in September 1864 he went to court in his own county against Oswestry Parish over a rating, and he won.²⁴

The diary reflects the changes in morality which are usually associated with the arrival of the Victorian period. The following are a few of the entries affording that type of commentary.

First, on drinking customs :

- 1849 Party at home . . .
Oct 31 Commenced a fresh pipe of port which was bottled by my father in 1828. At his death there were 4 pipes of port in the cellar as he considered it very desirable to have a large stock of port wine. However, as very little wine is now drunk compared to former days, it has taken 21 years to consume the three pipes including several dozen which I sold some years since. The consumption of port wine in this house averages only from 2 to 3 dozen so that several years may elapse before this wine now about $\frac{1}{2}$ pipe will be consumed. In my father's time when my Uncle Burgh was here a bottle of port was always finished each day, my Mother taking her 2 glass [*sic*] & the little Colonel the rest ; if any other gentleman were here a second bottle was usually called for. Now I find although the above party consisted of 7 men they did not finish a bottle of port & claret any day. Tempora mutantur.

The memories of an older man were to the same effect :

- [1842] At Kinlet. Mr. Childe mentioned as a remnant of the olden time
Sept 12 that 22 years since there was a party [of] 13 Gentlemen at dinner. One of these, John Cotes, did not drink wine, but the other 12 besides champagne & other wine at dinner drank 33 bottles of claret ; among these were Professor Burton & Dick Hill. There [were] only 3 who were able to go into the drawing room, viz. Dick Hill who could stand any quantity of wine & the two Childes ; the others being in such a state that they were obliged to be carried up to bed.

Twenty-five years later the same gentleman, perennially reminiscent, spoke of the same things :

- 1867 To Kinlet . . . As usual he [Childe] talked very much of the times of
Sept 3 his youth & observed how very much better the present generation appeared to be than the last. No drunkenness now after dinner among gentlemen & the few who now indulge in drink are marked men. Among the women also the standard of morality is much higher and there is now no lady in the County with any imputation on her character while he mentioned 5 or 6 of the principal ladies of Shropshire who in the last century were talked about. The husbands giving themselves

²⁴Diary, 6 Aug. 1848, 22 Sept. 1864. With increasing regularity from c. 1848 Leighton rented accommodation in London—usually in the spring.

W.C.
1805

up to hunting, sporting & drinking were in too many instances no companions to their wives & consequently they were too often ready to listen to the addresses of any man who would take the trouble to make himself agreeable [*sic*]. Talking of Waterclosets in our country houses & the time of their introduction, he mentioned that about 1800 his father had a private one at his own dressing room, but there was no other in the house. Lady Jane [*recte* Caroline] & Sir John Wrottesley were staying at Kinlet in the year 1805 when at breakfast Childe remarked he had heard a great noise in the night & thought it was occasioned by burglars but as he heard no more he dropped asleep again. Sir John looked at his wife but there was no further remark till after breakfast when on the ladies leaving the room Sir John explained that his wife being obliged to get up during the night had occasioned the noise by opening the drawing room window in order to go to the Jericho outside and strongly urging the necessity of having the WC in the house. The difficulty however was to find where to make it in the old house & the only place that was then thought available was a closet out of the drawing room, a situation that would never have been thought of in the present day.

Continuing on the arrival of the W.C. at Loton, Leighton concludes with the comment, 'I am now building a farmhouse at Sweeney where one is planned. Thus we are progressing.'

Contemporary society, however, was not without its flaws. Sir Baldwin was critical of his fellow landowners for mismanagement of their estates—whether through extravagance or misappropriation, through unfortunate marriage, or through neglect. Leighton would no doubt attribute such fecklessness to the loose morals prevalent in eighteenth-century society, when beds and goblets had been filled only too easily.

1855
Sept
10

To Lady Erskine's . . . near Conway . . . Lord Mostyn's affairs were much spoken of & if all accounts are true he appears to have behaved in a most rascally manner in regard to borrowing money. Sir Thomas Mostyn left 20,000 to a natural daughter & charged it on the land ; after his death the present Lord M. went to her & persuaded her, it would tend materially to facilitate some arrangements he was making in regard to the sale of land if she would take his bond & free the Estate from this incumbrance. This she unfortunately did & although for a few years the interest was paid it at last ceased & the poor woman is reported to have died in a lunatic asylum, while her husband is at the present time in the Queen's Bench. He has been issuing handbills & placarding the walls offering a reward of 100£ to any person who would give information of any of Lord M's available property & it is said that at the marriage of Lady Augusta Neville with his eldest son which took place this spring these placards were exhibited at the Church door. Lord Abergavenny wished to break off the match between his daughter & Mr. Mostyn when he discovered the state of affairs at Mostyn but the young lady persisted in marrying & the wedding

accordingly took place. Lord A however refused to invite his daughter's father in law to the wedding breakfast. All his property has been made over by a deed to his son so that he professes to have nothing. This however is only a legal fraud to defeat his creditors.

In 1844 Leighton went to Oswestry races and stayed nearby at Sweeney, his father-in-law's seat. There he wrote, on September 23, at the end of his entry :

Young Mytton of Halston is appointed Steward for the ensuing year ; there are reports that he has been betting on the Leger to a large amount. If he continues in this course it is very probable the family property which was saved from the wreck of his father's fortune will not be handed down to his son.

In April 1847, however, the diarist pasted in the notice of sale of Halston from the local press and adds the words ' Halston the last landed possession of the Myttons is now put up for sale '. A Mr. Wright of Manchester paid about £45 an acre for 2,083 acres. The Myttons were one of those ancient families of long pedigree which abounded in Shropshire,²⁵ and elsewhere in his comments on the family Leighton recognized that there were at least two marriages which connected them to the Leightons. Thus he may have felt their failure closely.

In December 1870 Sir Baldwin visited Apley Park, four miles north of Bridgnorth.²⁶ There he found less (though not nothing) to criticize.

- [1870]
Dec 5 With M[argaret] to Apley Park. Met a party of 20 including our host & his family. Although he is supposed to have purchased this property at not a high figure 550,000 yet as the buildings on the estate were in very bad order a large sum will be required to put them in order. Forster took us over one of his farms where he has been erecting an entirely new range of buildings. They appear to be very well done, though it struck me there was more than was required.
- Apley Met at Apley Mrs. Monkton her son & daughter Mr. & Mrs. Chapman Mrs. Peacock the widow of an Indian Official & several young men.
- Dec 6 8 guns shot Patmoss & a few other covers. The lug was 300. Of these 186 were hares. In C. Whitmore's time Patmoss a cover of 20 or 30 acres was supposed to contain more game than any other place in the County of the same size. Forster however does not seem to preserve quite so highly & does not himself appear to be so fond of shooting as Charlton W. was.
- Lord Forester has gradually by purchase brought the Willey property in contiguity to the Apley estate & they both join on the west side of the Severn while for some distance above Apley the river is the boundary.
- Last year 9515 head of game were killed at Willey including only 800 rabbits. Lord F. who is now nearly 70 goes out shooting 2 or 3 times a week ; he . . . is content with killing a moderate quantity on a fresh beat every day. Being very infirm from gout he is unable & goes

²⁵F. M. L. Thompson, *Eng. Landed Society in the Nineteenth Cent.* (1963), 128.

²⁶Apley Pk. was sold by Capt. Douglas Whitmore in 1867 to W. O. Foster, ' M.P. for S. Stafford and an extensive Iron Master ' : diary, Mar. 1867.

about in a little carriage with a lot of attendants to get him over difficult places.

No landed proprietor in the County has added so many farms to the paternal property as Forester. Living during his whole life much below his income he has always had money ready to lay out when the opportunity arrived of purchasing any land adjoining his Estate & thus he has been able to buy

Caughley	from Wylde Browne
Benthall	T. Harries
Tickwood	Dr. Forester's Executors
Linley	Lacons
Albysn,	a portion of Stephens

& many other smaller properties.

Unfortunately however he appears more anxious to increase the quantity of his land than to have his buildings & cottages in good order. For I understand the Willey property is by no means in a good state in a good state [*sic*] of repair. A sad pity that a man of his wealth thinks so little of his duty as a Landlord.

Less happily the diarist had entered, many years before, an altogether different critique of T. W. Giffard of Chillington (in Brewood, Staffs.) :

1864

April

5

Reports that Gifford of Chillington is obliged to put his estate into the hands of Trustees owing to his debts which are said to amount to 300,000£. The rental of the property is estimated at 15,000 pr an & this amount of debt is supposed to have been gradually accumulating through carelessness & not paying any attention to his affairs.

Last year his marriage with his housemaid was publicly announced ; it appears they had been married for 5 years & a daughter had been born during that period, but Gifford had insisted on his wife concealing their marriage till after his mother's death who resided with him at Chillington. After her death which took place about 1844, Mrs. G. was naturally very anxious to be publicly acknowledged the Mistress of Chillington but her husband was continually putting it off till at length last Autumn he allowed her to proclaim it. There has just been a sale of almost all the timber growing on the estate, which sold for £16,000.²⁷

Perhaps, however, the most important estates in the county were those of the Hill family. Throughout the eighteenth century that family's social and political standing had grown and their ascendancy in county affairs was virtually unquestioned throughout the 1850s save by Leighton himself. In the 1840s and 1850s Sir Baldwin's own rise in quarter sessions and his moves towards a seat in the Commons ebbed and flowed around the position of the Hills. Leighton's comments on the history of the Hill family's marriages are therefore coloured with prejudice.

²⁷At the beginning of the diary Leighton had written 'Ball at Aston about 300 present. Charles Gifford very tipsy . . .' Presumably T. W. Giffard's younger bro. Chas. Rob. Giffard was meant. Thus another member of the Giffard fam. had been—in Leighton's phrase (above, p. 146)—a 'marked' man for a number of years. See diary, 1 Jan. 1841.

[1865]

[Nov.]

21

To Oteley Park. [The Mainwaring estate near Ellesmere] . . . Godfrey Hill's marriage a topic of conversation. He has just taken to wife the daughter of a publican in the neighbourhood who was barmaid at a spirit vault in Whitchurch. He has bought a share in a ship & is gone out in command of her to Australia with his wife. It is reported he says he has done better than many others of his family & if one looks at many of the alliances the Hills have it is not so far from truth. His grandfather married a pretty woman at Exeter who was a Surgeon's daughter, the present Lady Hill is the grand-daughter of a cotton spinner. Percy a son of Sir Roberts married a woman with whom he had been previously living, Alfred his brother an illegitimate daughter of Lord Kilmurray, & very lately young John Hill has taken to wife the daughter of a farmer. Godfrey however has for the last few years given his father Clement a great deal of anxiety. Placed in the navy he left his ship & was dismissed. He then entered the merchant service & has been knocking about the world for the last 3 or 4 years a cause of sorrow and vexation to his parents.

In 1869 a scion of the Noel-Hill family of Attingham (kinsmen of Lord Hill) prompted reflexions in a similar vein :

June

9

It is reported that young Dick Hill of Berrington & heir to Lord Berwick has married a woman of the town called Mrs. Norton. She is described as being upwards of 30 while he is only 22 & although at one time handsome yet now passe. His father & Uncle are naturally very much annoyed at this occurrence. Owing to his debts he was in the winter obliged to leave the Army. His uncle Lord Berwick paid what he then owed & since then he appears to have been idling about town. It seems as if there was something hereditary in this sort of thing. For his great uncle Thomas Noel, 2nd Lord Berwick, married Sophia Dubouchet, better known as Harriet Wilson's sister [around ?] 1812 & owing to her previous conduct was not visited. His 2nd brother William Lord Berwick lived with a lady of the Court of Turin by whom he had a son & 2 daughters without going through the ceremony of marriage. These children he educated & I remember the son was a young man going about the County sometime between 1835 and 40. He went by the name of Algernon Hill.²⁸

During the last $\frac{1}{2}$ century Attingham has with the exception of a few years been a shut up house & it seems probable it will be the case again if young Dick Hill becomes the possessor of the property.

While Leighton contemplated the marital course of the Hills, he was, therefore, considering the condition of their estates. He nevertheless noted with the greatest surprise a hint that Hawkstone itself, the estate of the senior branch of the Hill family which remained most powerful in the nineteenth century, might be facing financial problems.

²⁸J. A. LLoyd, writing to Ld. Powis on 16 Aug. 1842, had referred to 'poor Algernon Hill' being 'quite destitute' after the recent publication of his father's will: N.L.W., Letters and Documents relating to Chartism in Shrops. in the possession of the Earl of Powis, group I, no. 2. Cf. diary, 14 Aug 1842.

1863 Reports that Dod of Cloverley is obliged to leave his house owing to
 Dod his debts.²⁹ Walking one Sunday with Atcherley of Marton in the
 [June Park, he told me that the previous year he had been staying at Clover-
 11] ley. A party was formed to visit Hawkestone & on entering the grounds
 talking with Dod about the circumstances of the owner, Dod remarked
 that although Lord Hill was supposed by many to have a large income
 he should be sorry to change places with him.

There was truth in the rumours. In 1894, many years after Sir Baldwin's death, his son placed extensive newspaper clippings in the diary on the bankruptcy of the owner of Hawkestone, the third Lord Hill.³⁰ But the diarist had long ago had some foresight of the catastrophe.

Sir Baldwin's sense of usefulness and his desire to improve were not confined to his family and estate. When the variety of his public activities is considered, there should be discerned among the others a central office, that of a county magistrate. This office of local authority was through the centuries a supervisory post watching over poor relief, wages, and divers other matters. Sir Baldwin took the magistrate's oath in 1833, when he was in his 28th year and a year past his wedding.

The first significant public business which Leighton took up as a magistrate was the administration of the Poor Law. In 1836 the New Poor Law began to operate in Shropshire when Assistant Commissioner William Day arrived in the area to establish the unions prescribed by the 1834 Act.³¹ The union which included Loton Park was the Atcham Union: forty-two parishes were placed in it, and it was the most extensive in the county. It covered central and western Shropshire; it was, however, entirely rural because the six Shrewsbury parishes refused to dissolve their Incorporation and join the union. Leighton, with the backing of the earl of Liverpool, was nominated chairman of the union's board of guardians—a post in which he excelled.

Sir Baldwin was a remarkable chairman of guardians not so much because he was an aristocrat or magistrate—such men could be found on the boards of countless rural unions—but because of the thoroughness with which he applied himself to his duties. He studied the New Poor Law and its rigorous logic and, informed by all that he had learnt as master of Loton and by his experience of the local poor, he set out to apply its philosophy and rules. He was a very active chairman and held the post for the rest of his life, even after 1855 when his magisterial work was increased by the chairmanship of Shropshire's quarter sessions, and even when he sat in the Commons from 1859 to 1865.

From the early 1840s Leighton's Atcham Union gained recognition, especially from the poor-law authorities in London, as the best run union in the kingdom. Its costs were kept low and its paupers received the due entitlement of outdoor relief or—more usually—institutional (workhouse) relief. Leighton's success rested upon his

²⁹Some years earlier Dod had sat in the Commons for N. Shrops. on Ld. Hill's interest. Leighton had wanted Dod's seat.

³⁰Sir Baldwin, 8th bt., entered occasional notes etc. at the end of his father's diary, in the 3rd vol. The clipping is dated 31 Aug. 1894.

³¹4 & 5 Wm. IV, c. 76.

willingness to sound out his fellow landlords about employment for able-bodied applicants for relief and upon his endeavours to investigate the backgrounds of other applicants. For example, he would often seek out responsible relations living locally to make them pay for the relief which the union had meanwhile afforded. (His familiarity with the law and with other magistrates—even beyond the county boundary—helped him in that regard.) And Leighton's ability to hire proper staff for the union's salaried posts helped the union's programme to thrive.³²

Yet, despite his attendance at almost all the board meetings and despite his union's increasing fame among the believers in the 1834 Poor Law, Leighton the diarist makes only occasional mention of poor-law administration. Such entries as the following are rare in this regard.

In the spring of 1841 Leighton twice travelled to London where he visited teacher-training institutions, workhouses, and prisons. On 6 May 'Owen, Master of Atcham Union W.H. [workhouse] called; I also gave him £5 to come up to town & look over the Schools & Workhouses.' (He had just earlier done the same for the chaplain of the county gaol, Mr. Winstone, that he might visit the London prisons.)³³

On 4 August of the same year the diarist records his acceptance of the presidency of the 'Society for bettering the condition of the Poor' in Oswestry for the ensuing year. Oswestry, near to Sweeney, the home of the Parkers, Leighton's in-laws, was a market town in the centre of the Oswestry Poor Law Incorporation, not in the Atcham Union nor even under the New Poor Law authorities yet. The society was a charity. Leighton's appointment, therefore, was probably far more an honour than a means for him to work changes in this region among the poor. Indeed he seemed far more enthusiastic about his visits to Oswestry's National schools in the earlier part of the same entry.

In 1849 a guest at Loton accused his host of faulty management of the Atcham Union:

Aug. Everard Fielding very violent on the administration of the Poor Law
30 in regard to his parish & accused me & the B. of G. of ordering an old woman into the workhouse to die of the Cholera; this last expression made me very angry & I thought it very unjust as I had since the first outbreak of the cholera 10 days since, visited the Workhouse 4 times & seen those paupers who were ill of cholera. He also attacked me on several other points in regard to the Poor Law. On enquiry afterwards at the Office & referring to the books I find several of his statements perfectly false & others very much exaggerated. Don't think I shall ever ask him to Loton again.

Within a fortnight, however, Leighton makes another of his rare entries on the Poor Law, recording some alleviation of the injury inflicted on his *amour propre* by Feilding.

Sept. Went to the Palace at Hereford for the triannual music meeting. The
10 Bishop improves on acquaintance but is evidently a very shy man . . .
Mr. Whateley rector of Chetwynd was there with his daughter Elizabeth who he called Totty: he was formerly Vicar of Cookham near

³²Leighton's role in the remarkable Atcham Union is treated at length in my thesis, 'The Administration of the Poor Laws in Shrops. 1820—1855', chapter IV ('Indoor Relief').

³³Diary, 5-6 May 1841.

Maidenhead & while their [*sic*] effected during the years from 183 [*sic*] to 1834 great reforms in the administration of the Poor Law. When he first began to take a leading part in this business the rates amounted to 5000£ & every person in the parish except the clergy, the farmers, shopkeepers & their servants were pauper. By his exertions he reduced the rates to 1000£ & also contrived to persuade the poor to lay by in a Saving Bank which he established. On quitting Cookham he had the satisfaction of seeing 22,000£ in this Bank a portion of which only however belonged to his parishioners.

On the passing of the New Poor Law in 1834 he was offered the Chief Commissionership with £3000 pr ann salary ; this however he declined considering it a situation a Clergyman ought not to hold . . . Cornwall Lewis & Lady Theresa were also of the party at Dr. Hampdens. He is now Under Secretary for the Home Dep. & was formerly Poor Law Commissioner. It was so far flattering to me that he was aware I was Chairman of the Atcham Union & that he had always heard of it as a wellmanaged Union.

Several years later, in 1862, the diarist visited the county suffering from the Cotton Famine, taking his son along. At that time, of course, Leighton was a Member of Parliament.

Sept 30 Went with B. to Lancashire to visit & investigate into the distress now prevailing in the manufacturing districts owing to the want of cotton. Remained a day at Warrington, Blackburn, & Preston the 2 latter being represented as the most distressed towns in the County. We found every one very willing and anxious to give us information & shew us every thing in their power. It struck me however that one principle was wanting in all their plans for affording relief, viz., trying to find profitable employment for those thrown out of work. I have offered to take 5 or 6 operatives & find them work at draining but although my letter has now been before the Relief Committee of Blackburn for a fortnight I have not yet had any men sent & I think it not unlikely none will come.

But the very next entry records that :

Nov. 4 mill hands sent by the Mayor of Blackburne [*sic*]. Set them on to drain at Bragginton with the other drainers. On going to see them the first day they seemed very well contented with the work. Next morning however without waiting to see me they all went off & returned home. I then wrote to the Mayor & offered to try 2 more. These after a short time were sent & seem to promise well.

Leighton's interest in Lancashire should not be attributed to a broadening of his interests that endured only while he sat in the Commons, for in 1869, four years after leaving Parliament, he visited some of the London boards of guardians.

17 May 1869 As great distress has prevailed among the poor in London for the last 2 years I was desirous of ascertaining how the Guardians of the Metropolis worked the poor law in their respective districts. Having written

first to Uvedale Corbett [at] the Poor Law [Board] to ascertain where I could be admitted he very kindly communicated with several Chairmen of B. of G. & sent me a list of those who were willing to allow a stranger to witness their proceedings. I accordingly attended the following Boards

Poplar
Bethnal Green
Westminster St. Ann's & St. James
Kensington
& Chelsea

At none of these did the Chairman or Guardians appear to have much idea of the principles on which relief ought to be administered. They constantly supplemented wages by giving outrelief without seeming to have the slightest idea of the injury they were thus doing to the poor themselves. There was little or no investigation into the circumstances of the children or other relatives of the applicants with a view of seeing how far they ought to support them & frequently relief was given quite illegally ; they however never seemed to me to err on the side of harshness to the poor. What however struck me most was the little deference that the other members paid to the opinion of the Chairman & the coarse language used at the Board. It appeared to me a great misfortune that in so few of the Metropolitan Unions do any gentlemen attend as Guardians.

In 1869 and 1870 the Poor Law Board began the process of combining the Shrewsbury parishes with the Atcham Union. Leighton wrote many lengthy arguments to London protesting against such amalgamation.³⁴ He had long known that the financial well-being of his Atcham Union was very much due to the completely rural nature of its parishes. He also knew that the corrupt politics of Shrewsbury had always inflated the generosity of the poor-law authorities there towards the pauper applicants who were on the right side. Nevertheless his recent tour of London's boards of guardians may have reinforced his opposition to the amalgamation of Shrewsbury and Atcham.³⁵

Sir Baldwin began to deliver papers at regional poor-law conferences in the late 1860s when such conferences began to be held. In 1868 he spoke on outdoor relief at the Social Science Congress at Birmingham. Two years later at the Malvern conference of poor-law union chairmen he chaired the meeting and gave a paper on the ideal union chairman.³⁶ Thus his visits to Lancashire and London fall into a pattern. Leighton was assuming an enlarged—a national—view of poor-law matters in the 1860s.

Leighton's magisterial duties took him into several other fields of activity besides the Poor Law, but none of these others was as regular a tax on his time as the work of Atcham Union. Often an entry shows the multiplicity of his interests—as the already

³⁴See the Atcham Union records at the P.R.O. (M.H. 12) and the corresp. of the asst. poor-law commissioner, Doyle (M.H. 32).

³⁵Shrews. and Atcham were united in 1871 shortly after Leighton's death ; the union kept the name Atcham.

³⁶Diary, 30 Sept. 1868, 3 May 1870, and a clipping from the *Hampshire Chron.* about the Basingstoke Poor Law Conference 20 Aug. 1870.

quoted entry about the visits of the Atcham workhouse master and the county gaol chaplain to London at his request and under his patronage. In the context of his new taste for delivering papers, he addressed the Bristol Social Science Association in 1869 on the matter of raising the condition of agricultural workers. He frequently toured prisons and reformatories, even while on holiday with his family. On such occasions the diary entries usually make no analytical note of the character of the institutions visited, but analysis there certainly was : his views on reformatories and pauper education, for example, became integrated into his thoughts on outdoor relief. Thus the following entry :³⁷

The amount of prosecutions was much reduced last year. At the sessions in 1868 the expenses of the prosecutions were £1,100. In 1869 it was £993 : and last year £689. The cost of prosecutions at assizes had likewise decreased. In 1868 it was £602, in 1869 £340, last year £252. They had had a considerable increase in the cost of maintaining boys and girls in reformatories, and in regard to that point he might say he did not know if many of the gentlemen on the grand jury were guardians or not, but he thought Boards of Guardians were often rather to blame in not insisting that the children of paupers receiving outdoor relief were sent to school, where they would not only get some amount of education, but undergo a valuable discipline . . .

This grand-jury charge was quite long in its entirety. In it he also touched on highways, cattle disease, county finances (obvious to some extent from the above excerpt), the special nature of parochial government in England (as contrasted to France), and lunatic asylums. It must have been a rambling address, but in it relationships were indicated between these various aspects of local affairs which it would have been impossible for one not experienced in all of them to delineate.³⁸

One of the other specific interests which Sir Baldwin regularly pursued was improved provision for pauper lunatics. In January 1841 Leighton was appointed to a quarter-sessions committee on a pauper lunatic asylum. One of the principal tasks was to select a site for such a county institution. Leighton was very influential in selecting the site at Shelton on the road west from Shrewsbury.³⁹ In August and September Leighton devoted himself to travelling to various lunatic asylums around the country. Some contrasts became apparent to the visiting Shropshire magistrate.

Aug. Went this morning to see the Lancaster Lunatic Asylum. It was
25 built in 1816 & the Architects plan appears to have been to render it
as much of a prison as possible. The windows have iron bars before
them, the cells have double doors, . . . The walls of the courts are 16 ft.
high which besides their prison like appearance tend to impede the
proper circulation of air . . . the new buildings lately erected have a
much more cheerful appearance. The Asylum contains at present
about 600 & is very much crowded ; there are several wards in some
from 20 to 24 beds ; Dr. Gaskell does not consider this objectionable.
The site of the building is very bad being in a hollow surrounded on 3

³⁷Newspaper clipping in the diary of his last grand-jury charge at the Epiphany sessions 1871.

³⁸The diarist has already spoken privately of resigning as he feels his age. He comments at the end of the clipping : ' This charge occupied 30 minutes in delivering—much too long a time. Fortunately I seldom speak above 10 minutes on charging the Grand Jury.'

³⁹Diary, 5 Jan., 3 Apr. 1841.

sides by higher ground. Owing perhaps in some measure to this & also to improper treatment the mortality has been very great from 18 to 20 pr cent. The male keepers rec. from 25 to 30£ & the female dit. 13 to 16.

Two days later he was taken round the Dumfries asylum.

- 27 Visited the Dumfries Lun. Asylum built on a beautiful situation about a mile from the town. A Mr. Crichton who had made a fortune in India after leaving some legacies to his relations bequeathed the residue of his property to found a charitable institution leaving it to his widow to choose of what description it should be. After consulting for some time with her friends she determined on building an Asylum. The building is on a most magnificent scale, only half however is yet completed which will contain 110. All ranks are admitted to this Institution. The highest pay 350 pr an & for this they have the daily use of a carriage, an attendant entirely to themselves, a sitting & a bedroom, also wine, dessert, game, &c. The 2nd pay 200£ who for this have an attendant, 2 rooms, but only the use of a carriage every other day . . . the lowest rates are 15£ and 18£ for paupers. The upper classes have a drawing room where the two sexes meet together. It is well furnished & contains a billiard table. The Architect seems to have been aware there were large funds at his disposal for many parts are fitted up at much greater expense than necessary. The washhouse has . . . grained oak & a cornice runs round the sides. The establishment seemed very well conducted under Dr. Browne & every attention paid to the patients. He recommends about 10 as a good number to sleep together in a ward of pauper patients.

Sir Baldwin was also an active magistrate in Montgomeryshire at this time and was doubtless urging that county's quarter sessions along the same path. In July 1842 he proposed in Shropshire quarter sessions that the two counties share the costs of the new asylum, pointing out that most of the Welsh county's magistrates were in favour. Leighton's motion failed then—mainly perhaps because all Welsh patients would have had to be treated as one class owing to the language problem. To assign Welsh-speaking patients any multi-class service as evidently had been decided (perhaps on the Dumfries model) would compound staff costs.⁴⁰

By 1846, however, Leighton had convinced his fellow magistrates of the feasibility of a joint venture with Montgomeryshire. Soon after the Asylum opened, however, there came a personal setback for Leighton :

- 1846 Quarter Sessions at Shrewsbury. At these sessions I declined continuing
Jany to act as a Visiting Justice of the Lunatic Asylum, as I found Dr.
5 Oliver not the sort of person I could act with, with any pleasure to myself, considering him very ignorant & not the efficient officer I wished to see at the head of the Establishment. Having brought this twice forward before the Visiting Justices & been in a minority, I considered it my best place to decline acting any longer after the year

⁴⁰Ibid., newspaper clipping dated 1 July 1842.

expired ; I certainly felt very much annoyed at thus leaving an establishment which had been erected & opened I may say almost entirely through my exertions. But where the Chairman & the head of the Executive do not work cordially together it is not likely the concern can prosper & under these circumstances I considered the best course for me was to retire.

Leighton's interest in lunacy, however, did not cease. Twenty-three years later another newspaper clipping in the diary states that he, then chairman of quarter sessions, wanted the establishment of a county lunatic asylum for the middle and upper classes, for which the existing asylum did not provide : many were having to use costly private asylums.⁴¹

The quality of justice and the administrative flow of justice only occasionally drew a comment from the diarist.⁴² On the volume of cases he commented once briefly :

[1857] Quarter Sessions. 16 prisoners in the calendar only 3 acquitted. This
June 29 is the smallest calendar I ever remember.

But a much longer review came on the occasion of his resignation of the chairmanship of the Montgomeryshire quarter sessions. After recalling the circumstances which led to his selection for that post, he continued :

[1855] The total number of prisoners in the calendars during the 11½ years⁴³
Jan I acted as C were 636
4 Of these were tried 290
convicted 232
acquitted 58
pleaded guilty 245
no bills or not prosecuted .. 101
sentenced 496

of these last were sentence to transportation or
penal servitude 58

The number of appeals tried was 23

The smallest number in the calendar was at April Sessions 1847 when there were only 3 the largest number 22 at July 1844. The longest sitting was the last in January 1854 when the Court did not break up till 5 on the 3rd day (the 2nd of the trial of prisoners).

* * *

During the period from January 1844 to January 1855 I tried at the Montgomeryshire Q.S. 264 prisoners, having been absent only once viz. at the Easter Sessions in 52, and 23 appeals.

⁴¹Ibid., newspaper clipping dated 16 Oct. 1865. There is no indication of any outcome of this proposal.

⁴²These questions concern the modern analyst of court administration. See U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (U.S. Govt. Printing Office ; Washington, D.C., 1967). For a recent study of Pennsylvania magistrates see V. J. Walsh, *The District Justice System* (Media, Pennsylvania : Pennsylvania Governor's Justice Commission, Southeast Region, 1973).

⁴³For several years before his election as chairman in 1847 Leighton had acted as chairman.

Once there appears a comment on the nature of rural justice. In 1867 the Market Drayton petty-sessional bench had to hear a charge against a former governor of Jamaica, E. J. Eyre, who was accused of complicity in the murder of a mulatto, W. G. Gordon, during the 1865 disturbances on the island. The charge had attracted national notoriety, and Leighton assumed responsibility over the (preliminary) hearing because the division's own magistrates had weakened their bench : three had contributed to Eyre's defence fund and another was Eyre's landlord. The entry is quite long and is presented here in an abridged form.

- 1867
March
18
25
- Quarter Sessions . . . An application having been made to the Market Drayton Bench of Magistrates to fix a day for hearing a case against Mr. Eyre . . . I was asked if I would attend & preside over the meeting . . . George Hill also felt himself as Senior Magistrate quite unable to cope with the Law of the case or the Counsel who were to appear on both sides. Feeling that it was most desirable that these Magistrates should have every assistance they could legitimately claim I consented to attend provided the invitation was in writing and signed by most of the Justices of that Division and also that the Deputy Chairman should be also asked to attend . . . on Monday 25 Stanley (who was very anxious to hear the case) & I started early for Drayton . . . Mr. Stephen a Counsel of the [sic] Circuit applied for a warrant against Mr. Eyre for being an accessory before the fact to the murder of Gordon ; after hearing a short opening statement from Stephens, he was anxious to make a speech of 4 or 5 hours duration only I prevented him & hearing the evidence of 3 or 4 witness[es] we came to the conclusion to grant a warrant . . .

It was arranged nevertheless that Eyre would voluntarily arrive at their court on Wednesday.

- 27
27
- Although my brother Magistrates on the Bench were quite as able as I was to give an opinion on matters of fact yet I knew they [were] quite unable to deal with questions of law that might arise or to control the Counsel. I felt therefore that a great amount of responsibility rested on me & more especially as this case created great interest through England generally and Sir Thomas Henry at Bowstreet had committed for trial Lieut. Brand the President of the Court Martial who had tried Gordon & sentenced him to be hanged & Col. Nelson who had approved the proceedings officially. I however quite disagreed with the reason he assigned for sending these two officers for trial, viz., that as there are doubtful & difficult questions of law & disputed questions of fact it is not the province of a Magistrate to determine these but to send the case for further inquiry. Now the Act of Parliament says that the Justice shall commit if he has a ' strong or probable presumption of the guilt of the accused ' and I consider no person ought to be committed for trial unless there is a reasonable presumption that on the same evidence adduced before the Justice & not rebutted a jury would convict.
- Court opened at 10 o'clock. Mr Eyre shortly afterwards appeared.

On his entrance a few persons began to applaud. This I immediately checked. I afterwards learned that some clergymen and their wives intended to rise from their seats & heartily applaud the ex-Governor on his appearance. Fortunately a Magistrate (Hugh Sandford) who was not on the bench heard of this just before we entered & strongly advised the ladies to do no such things . . . One of these [clergymen] most inadvisedly offered up prayers on the previous Sunday . . . Fitz James Stephens the Counsel for the prosecution opened the case with a speech which lasted 6 hours . . . He mentioned that if he proved that Eyre arrested Gordon & that the latter was hanged it would be our duty to commit Eyre. I thought it necessary at once to stop Counsel telling us our duty as I suspected he had an idea he could bully the Country Magistrates ; I also had to remark that Sir Thomas Henry's decision who at Bow Street had committed Nelson & Brand would not influence our opinion as it was only the decision of a similar Court to our own.

* * *

29

Both Counsel spoke more for the public ear than to convince us & had it been a common case I should have stopped Gifford after the first hour. While Stephens rather began by an attempt to bully us, Gifford on the other hand was too complimentary. We retired when Gifford had finished for he called no witnesses and were quite unanimous that there was no case made out to send Eyre to trial, the only discussion being how we should word our decision. My advice however was at last taken that we should give our decision in as few words as possible & accordingly the following was written down . . .

There followed the decision.

. . . in getting into the Street to go away Mr. Eyre was loudly cheered. I feel convinced that our decision was right, for it is not fair in order to have a legal question decided to put any one on his trial for murder. In this case no attempt was made to prove that the Court Martial that tried Gordon was illegal and of course unless this could be made out the whole case against the accused fell to the ground.

There follows a brief review of the Jamaican uprising in 1865 and Gordon's arrest and trial. Also Leighton explains how Eyre had fallen under the jurisdiction of the Market Drayton magistrates :

By the of Vic a person accused of a murder committed out of England may be apprehended and brought up before any Justices who have jurisdiction in the place where the accused is residing. Mr. Eyre in the Autumn hearing that Adderley was to be let agreed to rent it for 6 or 9 months & thus came within our jurisdiction.

March

The proceedings created great excitement throughout the Country. We had 17 or 18 reporters in the room belonging to the press & a shorthand writer who was engaged by both parties. This was the most serious case I ever was engaged in as a Magistrate and although

our decision has been very much found fault with by the radical papers yet I believe on the whole it has given satisfaction. On looking back I see nothing to repent of in the view I took or the part I acted in the investigation. I have received several letters, some very abusive, others on the contrary praising me for my conduct. Both parties probably are wrong for except in very extreme cases I do not think it desirable to abuse or praise a Magistrate. One gentleman writes that he admires my conduct so much that he begs my acceptance of some strawberry plants of his own rearing. The present is of small value & therefore I accept it though I had rather it had not been sent. Reginald Corbet who is Eyre's landlord sat on the bench the first day notwithstanding all I could say to [the] contrary, but I heard his conduct so much canvassed afterwards that I wrote to him on the subject pointing out that his adjudicating on the case would doubtless be taken up by the press. In answer I received a letter saying he would not attend again. However it is an illwind that blows no one any good & our host at the Corbet Arms Hotel must have made a very good thing of it. The prosecution it was reported engaged 19 beds there & the parties remained just a week, probably not being stinted in the way of living. I calculate this Prosecution must have cost the fund 500£ while probably 200£ was expended in the defense.

Thus the diary gives a quite rare and lengthy comment on provincial justice and its administration.⁴⁴

Lastly to be considered are the descriptions of the politics of the county centering on quarter sessions and on parliamentary politics.

The Hills of Hawkstone were probably the most influential political force resident in Shropshire in the mid nineteenth century. Leighton was sensitive to Lord Hill's strength and to his occasionally presumptuous use of it. When, in 1848, J. A. LLoyd resigned the deputy charimanship of Shropshire quarter sessions for reasons of health :

Sessions
Oct. 16

Lord Hill after dinner proposed it should be left to his Honour Kenyon to nominate the V.C. It was a delicate point for any one to oppose & therefore no one dissented, but I do not think it is a plan that ought to be adopted in future. His Honour at once named Panton Corbett the most fit person ; although not a good speaker he has much more knowledge of Sessions Law than Lloyd & gets over the business very well having been accustomed to it in Montgomeryshire for some years.

Leighton himself had followed Panton Corbett as deputy chairman of the Montgomeryshire quarter sessions when the latter had resigned in 1845.

In 1850 the Hon. Thomas Kenyon, chairman of Shropshire quarter sessions,

⁴⁴Leighton's decision was in effect upheld when a grand jury elsewhere returned no true bill against Nelson and Brand : diary, 11 Apr. 1867.

sought to resign, but, when he heard that the deputy chairman, Corbett, would not accept the vacated seat, he took a roundabout way to have himself asked to stay on—for Leighton, who had been elected deputy chairman during Corbett's shrievalty, then loomed as the likely alternative to Corbett. The diarist commented, 'I very much suspect there is a great jealousy on the part of Kenyon against me'.⁴⁵ When it became apparent that all in Shropshire would keep their places, Leighton communicated with Lord Powis: evidently Leighton had earlier begun the process of finding a successor to himself as chairman there, and Powis had indicated his readiness. Now, however, Powis told Leighton that he was not interested in the seat there.⁴⁶ All kept their places in Montgomeryshire too. Over the next three months Corbett managed to change his mind about succeeding Kenyon; when it also became recognized that Leighton and Robert Clive (Lord Powis's uncle) would support Corbett, all was set for Kenyon's resignation and Corbett's move up to the chair. In return Leighton was chosen deputy chairman. Leighton and Clive nominated Corbett; Powis and Wolryche Whitmore then nominated Leighton.⁴⁷

Leighton's rise in Shropshire in 1850 may have seemed to threaten Lord Hill's position. The three men who had joined in the above nominations were major powers in south Shropshire: the Whitmores (Wolryche Whitmore's cousins) might be considered masters of Bridgnorth, and the power of Lord Powis and his kinsmen had not collapsed altogether when the Reform Act had abolished the rotten borough of Bishop's Castle. Although Sir Baldwin does not reflect on this matter in his diary, the Hills with their support resting especially in north Shropshire probably saw Leighton as an ally of the Powis interest in Shropshire and Montgomeryshire. Thus in 1852 Lord Hill made a counter move. The entry speaks for itself. Nevertheless it should also be recalled that Leighton was always mindful of finances, while the Hills (with the ultimate results already referred to) were easier with their money.

1852

Jan.

At the January Quarter Sessions I brought forward the report of a Committee whose appointment I had procured at the previous Sessions to enquire into the salaries of the County Officers. In consequence of the great reduction in the price of corn & every other necessary of life I consider the incomes of these parties were greater than when their salaries were fixed, while on the other hand the incomes of almost all the ratepayers were reduced from 10 to 20 pr ct. On discussing this question in Committee my proposition was carried by a majority of 8 to 1. In the Court however Lord Hill opposed the adoption of the report & on taking the votes there were 16 in favor of Lord Hill's motion & 8 against it.

In 1855 Sir Baldwin succeeded Pantton Corbett as chairman of Shropshire quarter sessions. But the Hills had proposed another magistrate and in the entry describing his election Leighton wrote: 'I was exceedingly sorry to find there had been any division among the Magistrates & certainly would not have accepted the Chairman-

⁴⁵Diary, 11 Apr. 1850.

⁴⁶Ibid. Leighton had hurried away from his family holiday in Paris to be present at this sessions.

⁴⁷Ibid. 14 Oct. 1850.

ship had I not thought the Hills proposed Uvedale Corbett not for his own merits but out of spite to me.⁴⁸

The richest vein of political comment in Sir Baldwin Leighton's diary is that dealing with parliamentary politics. It deserves to be considered last for two reasons. First, because the diarist's parliamentary career came towards the end of his life and formed a climax to it. Secondly because any effort to evaluate what Leighton did in the Commons from his election in 1859 to his defeat in 1865 presupposes familiarity with his manifold activities in the county.

Leighton made his first attempt to get a seat in the Commons in 1848.

1848

Jany

18

Owing to the death of Lord P[owis] there is a vacancy in the representation of North Shropshire. I therefore wrote to J. A. Lloyd to ask his advice about coming forward at the same time saying if he had any idea of it I should not think of offering myself, & in case I did hoping for his support.

19

Received Lloyd's answer which was very diplomatic but sliding by saying he did not wish to pledge himself to support me.

Very different was an answer I received from Wingfield who although he differed with me on the question of the corn Laws yet promised me his support. Having written to Dod of Cloverley I found he had been persuaded by the Hawkestone family to offer himself. Such being the case I immediately wrote to him to say I should withdraw and be happy to support him.

In January 1854 Lord Powis's uncle the Hon. R. H. Clive died leaving a vacancy in South Shropshire.

Jan.

A vacancy having occurred by this death in the representation of South Shropshire I wrote to several of the leading gentry to ask if I came forward whether I might reckon on their support. Several in flattering terms promised me their votes & interest; the Duke of Cleveland to whom I wrote as the largest landholder in the County replied that Botfield had also canvassed him . . .

Smythe Owen told me he could not support me for apart from politics 'which would be too long to enumerate'—[sic] Young Robert Clive however having made up his mind to come forward in his father's place I gave up all idea of further canvassing.

In 1857 Sir Baldwin believed that he missed a good chance by not running.

1857

March

21

Parliament dissolved & the writs issued for a new election. It had been known about 3 weeks previously that a dissolution was about to take place. Gore however only declared his intention of retiring on

⁴⁸Ibid. 2 July 1855. The entry continued: 'The Office is a very responsible one & if the work is to be done efficiently requires a great deal of exertion & I consider not only at the Sessions ought the Chairman to give up his time & talents but that he must also look to the effects of punishment in regard to the criminal & must also by reading keep up & increase his knowledge of the administration of our laws. While at the same time he ought to be acquainted with all the details of the Court so as time advances to bring all the improvements carried out in other districts into his own Court. I feel in undertaking the duties I am incurring a responsibility in which I may fail, for though during the 11 years I presided in the Montgomeryshire Court, I believe I generally gave satisfaction still this is a more onerous office & I have to compete both at the bar & on the bench with superior intellect. However I must do my best & leave the rest to Providence.'

the day of the dissolution & then his intentions were only published in the Saturday *Shrewsbury Conservative* a very obscure print read by few. My own impression is that this was all arranged beforehand & probably the Hills wished to see if I intended to offer myself, but till Gore had resigned I felt a great delicacy in taking any steps toward offering myself. On this Saturday a requisition was got up by Howe the Attorney & copies sent to all the towns of N. Shropshire requesting young Rowland Hill to allow himself to be put in nomination. It appears however many refused to sign it & I believe indeed very few did sign it, considering Rowland too young & inexperienced. The Assizes were on Tuesday. Only one however of the Grand Jury spoke to me on the subject & offered me his support—Richard Corbet. From what I hear now I think it is most probable had I come forward either R. Hill or Dod would have retired, for great dissatisfaction is expressed at the Hawkestone interest returning both members, Dod having been considered as the warming pan for R.H. 2 letters appeared in the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* but I do not know the author rather severely animadverting on the Hills but still only stating what appears to be the opinion of all the electors almost. They also contained some flattering allusions to me which perhaps were not quite so near the truth.

In 1859 therefore Sir Baldwin was ready enough to move when a new opportunity arose. The material in the diary is worth extended quotation at this point.

1859

March

27

Received a letter from Frank Harries dated from London saying he heard a rumour that Dod was about to retire from Parliament. As Mary and B[aldwyn] were both very anxious I should come forward on the next vacancy I wrote to several of my friends to ascertain what support I was likely to receive. Having received several very satisfactory replies on the 2 of April I made up my mind to canvass the division against Ralph Gore. Went to Peele & found he had been already retained by Gore upwards of a fortnight before. I then went to Wellington to engage Newill who unfortunately was from home & no one knew where to find him. This as it turned out made a very important difference in the contest as it gave Gore 2 days more start & although I retained Newill on the Monday following yet I found at Whitchurch owing to this delay Peele had retained every attorney in the town & at Wem only Browne a very inferior man was unretained. It appears Dod had stated his intention of retiring some weeks previously probably 3 & I imagine had taken steps so that Gore should know of it. This I consider was most unfair conduct on his part as he was quite aware I was likely to come forward & having at once withdrawn when he first was elected & given him my support & also having once proposed him I think I was at least entitled to receive the earliest information of his intended retirement. I have reason to believe however it was a prearranged job to which the Hills were a party.

The following resident Country Gentlemen supported me

Robert Burton of Longner	
Broughton Strey of Tunstall	
Richard Corbet of Adderley	
John Cotes Woodcote	F. Harries
Sir John Kynaston—Hardwick	J. Wingfield
Heber Percy of Hodnet	J. A. Lloyd
Jebb of The Lyth	
Griffin of nr. Market Drayton	

Robert Herbert of Orleton

Donaldson of Cheswardine

Mainwaring of Oteley

T. Lovett Fernhill

T. Sandford of Sandford

Twemlow of Peatswood

Cheney of Badger

Wright of Halston

B. Botfield

At Market Drayton I received almost unanimous support, Gore only having the promise of 2 votes in the town & 35 in the district. Also in the works about Dawley the Ironmasters & their workmen gave me their support very generally.

Among the non residents who assisted me

Lords Bradford

Powis

On the other hand Gore reckoned among his supporters

Burton Borough Dod

S[t] John Charlton

T. Eyton

Joseph Lovett

Venables

Sparling

Buckley Owen

Justice

& everyone connected with the Hills except Sir Vincent Corbett who was neutral but whose tenants all with one or 2 exceptions promised me their votes.

Duke of Cleveland

Lord Forester

Lord Kenyon

Combermere

The Trustees of Lord Brownlow

Dod

1859
Election

It appears Gore had been canvassing privately for some time previous having written letters to several of the Electors marked private soliciting their support but by this means not making it known that Dod was about to retire . . .

I thought at first commencing that the Country Squires of whom the majority were in my favour would be able to carry the election, but I was soon undeceived & discovered that a great deal depended on having active agents. As we all were of the same political opinions I was anxious to come to some compromise & let our claims be decided by some arbitration. Gore however always refused any compromise although several attempts were made by mutual friends. To Lord Hill the contest was very annoying as he was put to considerable expense in employing agents & canvassing while he considered his son was certain of having a majority. He however brought this contest entirely on himself, for as soon as Gore begun to canvass he wrote to Lord Hill asking for his support & adding I was likely to become a candidate. Lord Hill however took not the slightest pains to prevent a contest till after we were both in field when of course it was much more difficult.

1859

Ap.

Contest in
N.S.

Mrs. Ralph Gore took a very active part in the election & I believe wrote the greater portion of her husband's letters. She canvassed the farmers in the Market Square at Shrewsbury, a proceeding that was very much remarked upon & observations were made upon her which it is to be hoped did not reach her ears. At Oswestry also she was very preserving [*sic*] & pressed the electors too hard for their votes. Indeed I did hear she used to go into the shops & would not leave till she got a promise or an insult.

The trustees of Lord Brownlow told Leighton that he might canvass the tenants but then the screw was put on them. Lord Hill's agents became more involved with Gore's agents the more the latter were preoccupied with Leighton, and the diarist believed this move on the part of the Hills' agents must have been known to Hill, whatever he repeatedly said about his neutrality. The diarist continued :

There were about 4,000 names of [*sic*] the list of electors. It was reckoned however that not more than 2600 to 3000 would poll. I received 1640 promises but I found as the time of the election drew nigh that Gore's agents were playing all sorts of tricks to obtain votes. Many who had promised Hill & Leighton were induced to break their promise of giving me their 2nd vote by being told Hill's seat was in danger & thus they were persuaded to plump for Hill, while those who had previously agreed to plump for Hill were told by his agents and Gore's that Hill's seat was safe & so they might give their 2nd vote to Gore.

Considering as this course was being pursued that I had very little chance of being in a Majority I determined on the 21st of April to retire from the contest . . . It was evident he [Hill] was strongly prejudiced against me. The contest however has taught him that his influence is not so strong as he might wish in N.S. & I should not be surprised on another contest taking place at the next election & a liberal starting & I think he may have a very good chance of success.

However disappointed Sir Baldwin may have been, he had not lost the desire for a seat in the Commons. His response to news of an early by-election in the county was quick.

[1859] At Caynham bowmeeting—a report came at 12 that Robert Clive
Aug. 4 had died that morning . . .

On Sunday 7 Baldwin went to London to consult Lord Powis as to whether he would give me his support in case I came forward & offered myself to represent the Southern Division in the place of his cousin Robert Clive. At first as usual Lord P. would not give a decided answer except that he mentioned none of his own family were coming forward . . .

7 In the mean time I had written to the D. of Cleveland as after Lord
9 P. his interest is the largest in S S & receiving a favorable answer I
11 went over to Wellington & retained Newill. The same day a letter arrived by special messenger from Lord Powis giving me his support. I have no doubt in turning it over in his mind he thought I should most likely receive the interests of most of the Independent gentry of the Division & therefore it was as well to give me his influence at once. I sent a lithograph letter to each electors [*sic*] except those I personally knew to whom I wrote. Most of them gave me their votes. Among those who however declined to support where [*sic*] Charlton Whitmore & Sitwell who said they should vote for *any* of the Clive family who might come forward, thus showing how little they thought of the qualifications of the individual candidate. Smythe Owen, Sir. F. Smythe, Sir F. Acton, Penley Williams also declined being liberals. Nevertheless I found many of that party were favourable to me.

Young Baldwin and Leighton's new son-in-law, Beriah Botfield, helped in the process. Parliament, however, was prorogued just before Botfield could move the writ for a by-election in South Shropshire, and the diarist wrote in perplexed vein :

. . . . in consequence of this contretemps the writ was not moved for. This was a source of great vexation to me as it delayed the election a month and of course there was a chance though a slight one, of another candidate coming forward. It also occasioned an expense of 25£ to 30£.

Sept The election took place at Church Stretton. A very small attendance.
14 Indeed, except a number of my own tenants with some of their wives & daughters I don't think 20 others were present besides the officials. I was proposed by Robert Burton of Longner and seconded by Sir C. Boughton.

The whole proceedings were over in an hour.

Thus having become M.P. it perhaps may be doubtful whether I shall be happier or whether I shall be a more useful⁴⁹ man. Of course I shall not be able to attend so much to the business of the neighbour-

⁴⁹See above, pp. 133-4, 148

hood as heretofore which perhaps may not be balanced by any good I may effect as a Member.

The diary is not the very best document by which to trace the range of topics on which Sir Baldwin spoke and with which he dealt in committee. Hansard is the best source in this matter. In general Sir Baldwin commented on a variety of domestic issues and grew to be appreciated as a knowledgeable authority on whatever he chose to speak about. There are occasional references in the diary to his parliamentary work but, disappointingly, there is no comment on his work on the 1862 Night Poaching Prevention Act.

The first committee which he mentions, in 1861, was the new Public Accounts Committee. 'Sir Francis Baring, Chairman, who with Sir J. Graham, seemed to be the only two Members of the Committee who understood much of the subject. I soon found out that I was very ignorant of all matters relative to this affair . . .'⁵⁰ In the same entry he later commented 'A few days after I was asked by Sir Stafford Northcote if I would serve on a Committee to inquire into the education of Destitute Children. As this was a subject on which I was better acquainted I thought I could be of more service . . . I found this Committee much more to my taste.' In the same year he was also on the committee on the Drainage Bill.⁵¹

By 1864 Sir Baldwin was able to comment :

July	This Sessions of Parliament I found I made my way better & appear to have more standing in the House. I was Chairman of a private bill
Parliament	Committee the object of which was to empower the Metropolitan Board of Works to compel the gas & water Companies of London to place their pipes in the Subways which the [<i>sic</i>] had already made or would in future construct in their district. After sitting 12 days and hearing a number of witnesses the Committee through [<i>sic</i>] out the bill. I was also a member of the Highway Committee in which I took an active part. Towards the end of the Sessions there was a very violent debate with a view of turning out the Palmerston Ministry. The subject of attack was the conduct of the Lord Russell in the negotiations between the German powers and Denmark. As I did not think the Ministers had acted in the unfair manner their opponents accused them of and I had no chance or wish for place I declined to vote with my party. About 15 other Conservatives followed my example and the Ministry gained by a small majority. Of course some of the more violent conservatives were very angry and expressed themselves in no measured terms against those conservatives who did [not] vote or voted with the Government ; but I have no idea of being dragged through the dirty [<i>sic</i>] by my party & hope I shall always be able to have an opinion of my own. ⁵²

Earlier in the same year Leighton had had another experience of appearing to help a Liberal minister.

⁵⁰Diary, 17 May 1861.

⁵¹Ibid. June 1861.

⁵²See above, p. 127.

Feb 8 To London for Parliament. A violent attack was made on Sir George Grey the Secretary for the Home Department for the part he took in respiting Townley, convicted of the murder of Miss Goodwin, on the ground of his supposed insanity.

I was the first after several members had spoken who got up to defend Sir G G & I said had I been placed in similar circumstances I should have acted in the same way & I believed every member in the House acquainted with the criminal law would also have acted in a similar manner. This coming from a political opponent was received with cheers by those sitting near the Home Secretary which so far did not much surprise me but I was very much astonished 3 nights after. Sir G. G. came over to our side when I was sitting almost alone on the bench & after talking a little on the Highway Act said 'It was very kind of you saying what you did the other night ; I am very obliged to you for it. I feel it very much.'

It thus shows that Ministers do feel the attacks made on them much more perhaps than the public are aware of.

In 1865 all expected the dissolution of Parliament. In North Shropshire anticipation resulted in the announcement of a contest. The Duke of Sutherland's twenty-two-years-old brother, Lord Albert Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, issued his address.⁵³ He retired from the campaign after his agents had worked only a week. But the Hill family had already reacted to the possibility of a contest's costs. 'Lord Hill however found it not convenient for his pocket to pay the expenses of a contest more especially as Rowland [his son, the sitting M.P.] detests Parliament. He therefore consulted with the Cust family & Rowland retired in favour of Col. Cust an uncle of Lord Brownlows. It is supposed he is only holding the seat for young Adalbert Cust, Lord Brownlow's brother.' Sir Baldwin and Lord Hill discussed the matter at the Carlton Club, as has been noted earlier.⁵⁴ As June began Sir Baldwin was thus on better terms with his old antagonist. Also he felt his standing in the Commons was better than ever : 'I consider during this sessions I have continued to make my way in the House and that I am listened to with more attention on those subjects upon which I address the House.'⁵⁵ At that very moment, however, a new foe appeared and ended his parliamentary career.

On 17 June news reached Sir Baldwin that there were strong rumours of a contest in South Shropshire. John Pritchard, the Liberal member for Bridgnorth, had been mentioned but had declined, and the names of Lord Granville's brother, Leveson-Gower, as well as Jasper More of Linley, another Liberal, were mentioned. Five days later More published his address ; already, however, Leighton and the other South Shropshire Conservative, Percy Herbert, had retained agents together.⁵⁶ Then the contest began in earnest.

July 6 Parliament dissolved & new writs issued. More very active canvassing. His agents are of a very low class and very unscrupulous [*sic*] obtaining votes by lies & misrepresentation.

⁵³Diary, 3 June 1865. Leighton commented on Ld. Albert : 'Although a man of good name against whom nothing can be said as to character, perfectly unfitted for a Co. M.P.'

⁵⁴See above, p. 134.

⁵⁵Diary, 3 June 1865.

⁵⁶Ibid. 17 and 22 June 1865.

It is not known who has undertaken to pay. Lord Wenlock gives him something. Duke of Cleveland also probably subscribes & possibly the Duke of Sutherland may have handed over the money he intended to have applied for contesting the North. More himself has nothing & I imagine may find it difficult even to pay his own personal expenses. His father is very much involved & has now a judgement against him for 3,000£ and More's profession of a barrister at present instead of a profit must be an expense to him.⁵⁷ He is going about the County speaking at many different places, having a great amount of fluency & can express himself well but without much knowledge but a great deal of vanity. In consequence of this Percy Herbert & I have thought it necessary to go to several places & address the electors & non electors. The latter have always on my endeavouring to speak caused a great uproar so that few could hear. Reporters however being present what I said appeared in the public prints.

Stanley made himself very useful canvassing & writing letters and was very anxious about the result.

More's party & Agent are opening several beer shops at Minsterley & Pontesbury giving Ale to all comers & spreading abroad a great many lies.

July
15

Nomination at Church Stretton. As More's Agent has been in the habit of hiring a lot of roughs whenever we went to address the electors our agent procured the services of a number of the same sort of persons.⁵⁸ I also took down from Loton about 100 of my tenants & neighbours. Herbert & myself had 2 special trains from Shrewsbury at 8.30 & 9.30 & More started one at 9.15.

The proposers & seconders were

Sir Charles Boughton

Sir B.L.

John Rocke of Clungunford

Edward Corbett of Longnor

Percy Herbert

Edward Gatacer

John Cotes

Jasp. More

John Meire a tenant farmer

There was a very large crowd in front of the hustings & the husting itself was very full. More however had only 2 gentlemen (except 3 or 4 Clergymen) viz. Cotes & Walter Blount. I managed to obtain a hearing from the mob though with some difficulty & spoke for 25 minutes. Herbert was also about the same time speaking while More occupied 50 minutes.

On the show of hands being called for More was in the majority & the Sheriff declared I was second, when Corbett demanded a poll for Herbert.

18

Polling day, went on horseback with B. and S. to Pontesbury accom-

⁵⁷Sir Baldwin had recently been following the beginnings of his younger son's legal career.

⁵⁸More's recollections of the same contest were—as might be expected—just the reverse ; he states that the Conservatives were the first to hire roughs. See Shrops. R.O. 2836/1.

panied by 60 to 80 electors from this neighbourhood in gigs and riding. On the adding up the numbers in the afternoon found I was in a great minority . . .

The districts' votes for each candidate are carefully entered in the diary. Sir Baldwin then continues :

The returns made by Peele & Newill, Herberts & my Agent a few days previous to the nomination showed quite a contrary state of things.

The careful transcription of these agents' survey, made on July 14, follows—including even the doubtful voters and the total electors registered in each section of the division.

. . . I have no doubt many of our Agents very much neglected their business while our opponents were exceedingly active . . . This therefore is probably the end of my political career.

But the matter might not have ended :

[1865] Peele gave me a letter from a Mr. Spofforth who is employed by
Oct Henry Whitmore to get up his petition against Acton's return for
24 Bridgnorth. He says in looking up the case for Whitmore he has
 traced through the Banks large sums of money spent for More's election
 & that he hears individual cases of bribery can be substantiated against
 him & asking Peele to inquire from me whether I will proceed with a
 petition to unseat More. Although from what I hear from different
 quarters a large number of voters were bribed & a great deal of
 treating was carried on by More's party yet I am not desirous of
 spending more money for the empty honour of a seat in Parliament.
 I therefore replied I did not intend to take any action in the matter.

There are several other parliamentary entries in Sir Baldwin's diaries. They include commentaries on the corruption of Shrewsbury, the South Shropshire election of 1868, and some odd notes on contests in other counties. Nevertheless enough has been presented here to display the richness of the material, and the variety of its range.⁵⁹

⁵⁹A fuller publication of the diary is at present under consideration. There is a microfilm of it in the Shrops. R.O.

APPENDIX

The following sketch of a model Chairman of a Board of Guardians was given by Sir Baldwin Leighton to the Conference of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Boards of Guardians for the West Midland Counties held at Malvern (Worcs.) on 4 May 1870. It survives as a loose printed sheet (evidently offprinted from the local press some time after his death) in Loton Hall MSS., 'Some Intimate Details Concerning Several Shropshire Families by Sir Baldwin Leighton & His Daughter' (a book originally at Kinlet).

'I will presume that on his election the chairman possesses the confidence of his board ; but it is also necessary that he should use all means in his power to show that that confidence is well placed. In order to retain it he ought to make

it manifest that his knowledge of all details is superior to that of the other guardians, and instead of referring to the clerk when points of law arise, he ought generally to be able to answer them himself. To do this the chairman ought to have a good memory, and be able, with a little assistance, to remember the case of each applicant for the last month, and to be able at once to give the reason that induced the board to give or withhold out-door relief. An acquaintance with the law can only be obtained by reading and practice, and if the chairman has no previous knowledge he must rely on his clerk. It is, however, very desirable that the chairman himself should look into the law, and gradually obtain a tolerable knowledge of the acts relating to the poor, as well as the orders of the Poor Law Board. He must remember it is his part to lead and direct his board, as upon the chairman devolves almost all the responsibility of the acts of the board ; and I would impress upon chairmen the necessity of endeavouring, when they accept office, to lead their board to administer the law upon right principles, for this reason—supposing other things equal, a magistrate is more likely to be qualified than one who knows nothing of the law. I would suggest that one of the first duties of a chairman on accepting office ought to be to consider how far the practice of granting relief, as carried on by his board, is founded on correct principles, and what alterations, if any it may be desirable to carry out. One of the great failings, it strikes me, at most boards, is the little information that is obtained by the relieving officer of the circumstances of the applicant. The name and ages of the children under 16 are put down, and age of the applicant, but not those of the children who are grown up and in service, nor of any relatives. Rent, quality of land, state of the house, whether tidy or dirty, number of rooms and beds, and number of inmates, are subjects that ought always to be inquired into. It is also very desirable that the chairman should have some knowledge of the art of cross-examining the applicant, so as to elicit the whole truth respecting the alleged destitution. It is only by obtaining this information that the chairman and board can be in a position to ascertain how far the applicant is a proper object for relief. I would suggest, also, that the chairman should trace out, if possible, the condition of those who have been refused out-door relief, and endeavour to discover how they have maintained themselves. For example, a widow with a family may have been among these ; on investigation it may turn out that the relatives have taken several of the children, and the woman is well able to support those who are left with her ; or, on the other hand, it may be that she is existing in want and penury, and thus, mayhap, the law has been strained too far. It is thus, by tracing out these cases, that a chairman can obtain a more accurate knowledge of the working of the system adopted by his board, and ascertain where the abuses exist, and having obtained this knowledge he will be in a better position to adopt a remedy. The chairman ought also frequently to go over the workhouse, and by talking to the inmates he may obtain a good deal of information of the causes that have brought them there, the chief of which I fear will be found to be intemperance ; and at the same time he may hear complaints to which his attention would not otherwise be drawn, but which may be true or false. In going over the sick and infirm wards, a kind word to the inmates will tend to break the monotony and dullness of workhouse life among the aged, and lessen the unpopularity which occasionally will attach to the office of chairman. By frequent visits to the workhouse, the officials will be better kept up to their duty. If an officer is doing his work well, it is very heartbreaking that his exertions are not noticed by his superiors, and especially by his chairman, while on the other hand the neglectful man wants looking to and his faults pointed out. But it is to the children in the workhouse school that the chairman's attention ought to be principally directed in his visits. It is by the proper education of these strays of humanity that we may in some measure hope to lessen pauperism, and by giving them the means of rising in the social scale and becoming useful members of society, thus enable them in old age to do without parish pay. As the subject

of pauper education will be discussed to morrow, I will say no more on this subject. But I do not consider the duty of a Chairman of a Board of Guardians is confined only to the administration of relief. His work ought to embrace a much wider sphere, it ought to be his duty to endeavour to raise the condition of the lower class in his Union, including those above the grade of paupers. In most rural unions the Board of Guardians is the nuisance committee, and the chairman therefore ought to get rid of all accumulation of filth which are likely to be detrimental to health, and to take measures to have sewers and drains laid down where requisite. In towns and a few other places where the Board of Guardians is not the local authority, the Board of Guardians, by calling the attention of those who have the power to prevent, and by giving publicity to their representation may, I believe in most instances, have the nuisance abated. In case of any epidemic, it will be as well for the chairman to visit the locality, in order to discover if there is any preventible cause, and thus prevent the recurrence of the disease. The presence of the chairman will, in a great measure, tend to reassure the officials should they have been alarmed and also the poor themselves in case they have been frightened from fear of infection. The proper assessment of the Union is also a subject for his consideration, as probably he may be the person selected as chairman of that committee. He ought therefore to have some idea of the value of land and houses, and it would be as well that he should make himself acquainted with the law of rating as affecting railways, gasworks, &c. In conclusion, I would suggest that our chairman should not only be acquainted with the pauperism of his own Union, but by obtaining the returns that are printed by the Poor Law Board he should compare the state of his own district with that of his neighbours ; and not only in regard to the total number, but also the different classes, and also the expenditure under the different heads. By this means he may be able to discover things requiring alteration in his own Union. It would be a great advantage if he would take every opportunity of visiting different boards of guardians and their workhouses, and observe how they transact their business. In every trade, if a man keep to his own shop, he is not so likely to thrive so well as his enterprising neighbour, who looks about and sees how others manage their affairs ; and I fear chairmen and guardians are no exception to that rule. Although some now present may think my model chairman an ideal person, all perfection, like a bachelor's wife, yet I believe there is at least one among us (and that not the gentleman who now presides) who has most of the qualifications I have named. However, we shall all agree, I think, that if he wishes to become more perfect my model chairman ought to be present once a year at our meeting at Malvern.'

FARMERS' REVOLT : THE NORTH SHROPSHIRE BY-ELECTION OF 1876

By JULIAN R. MCQUISTON

THROUGHOUT the eighteenth century the landed gentlemen of Shropshire fashioned the politics of their county, and their sovereignty extended unchallenged well into the nineteenth century. The great majority of these patricians came from the squirearchy, but several belonged to the great dynasties that consistently exercised decisive influence in county elections and nominated candidates to be dutifully returned by small boroughs, such as Ludlow, Bridgnorth, Much Wenlock, and Bishop's Castle. Sir Lewis Namier first recognized this characteristic of Shropshire politics, and the territorial sway of the earls of Powis continued under the Clives, whose nabob fortune permitted them to acquire estates in their native county and eventually to marry the heiress of the Herberts. In 1804 the Clive family's steady rise reached a climax when the earldom of Powis once again found a prominent Shropshire family able to maintain the lustre of a title of undisputed dignity and antiquity.¹

Other leading political families that flourished in the nineteenth century were the Bridgemans headed by Lord Bradford ; the Weld-Foresters headed by Lord Forester ; and the Hills represented by Lord Berwick, of Attingham, and Lord Hill, of Hawkstone. In addition to these baronial clans there were also a number of county families of moderate acreage, such as the Severnes or the various branches of the Corbets, that were spasmodically active in politics. In this latter category, including those who owned under 5,000 acres, were the majority of Shropshire squires, and only a few could claim more than 10,000. The country gentleman, therefore, was the linchpin of landed society in Shropshire, a county in which aristocratic leadership obviously had to be exerted through co-operative gentry.²

Politics in Shropshire had a cohesive quality that dampened the spirit of outward rivalry. In the county, for instance, there was no poll—and only one serious contest (1766)—between 1727 and 1831. Only the excitement over the Reform Bill was sufficient to upset the customary procedure of unruffled negotiation among the landed gentlemen. Yet even after the county had been divided into two constituencies by the Reform Act of 1832 there was little inclination to adopt new habits, and

¹In *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of Geo. III* (2nd edn., 1957), chap. V, Namier discusses at length the political leadership in Shrops. of the 1st earl of Powis of the 2nd creation. His daughter, the Lady Henrietta Antonia, married the eldest son of Clive of India in 1784, and in 1801, on the death of her brother, she became the Herberts' sole heiress. It was for her husband, the 2nd Lord Clive, that the earldom of Powis was revived in 1804. T. H. B. Oldfield, *The Representative History of Gt. Brit. and Ireland : being a history of the Ho. of Commons, and of the counties, cities, and boroughs of the United Kgm.* (6 vols., 1816), iv. 374-405, analyses the borough constituencies in the latter years of the unreformed Ho. of Commons. The 1832 Reform Act disfranchised Bishop's Castle and split the county into two divisions. The 1867 Act reduced Bridgnorth and Ludlow to single-member boroughs.

²Ld. Powis's estates were the most considerable in Shrops., amounting to 26,986 a. Next came the duke of Cleveland with 25,604 a., Earl Brownlow with 20,233 a., and the duke of Sutherland with 17,495 a. Those landlords, however, seldom resided in Shrops. Ld. Hill had 16,554 a., Ld. Forester 14,891 a., Ld. Windsor (head of a cadet branch of the Clives) 11,204 a., and Ld. Bradford 10,883 a. The Corbets led the gentry in acreage. H. R. Corbet of Adderley had 8,856 a., the Revd. J. D. Corbet of Sundorne 8,500 a., Sir V. R. Corbet of Acton Reynald 7,080 a., and Col. Edw. Corbett of Longnor 4,000 a. Approximately half of the total acreage of Shrops. (4,18,705 out of 811,615 a.) was owned by 52 peers and commoners possessing at least 3,000 a. producing a rental of at least £3,000 p.a. There were 65 squires whose estates ranged from 1,000 a. to 3,000 a. See J. Bateman, *The Great Landowners of Gt. Brit. and Ireland* (1883 edn., reprinted 1971 ; Leicester Univ. Press).

contests therefore in both divisions were infrequent before 1885. The Northern division was contested only in 1832 and 1868, the Southern only in 1865 and 1868. In all those contests the rival claims of landed families formed the real issue, and debate on national policy or affection for party label provided only a formal facade.³

The ascendancy of the landed interest, feudal in its fundamental assumption that those within its orbit would accept its leadership without reservation, survived the modifications of the franchise introduced by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867. The former permitted the £50 tenant-at-will to vote, and the latter lowered the requirement to £12. In Shropshire the majority of farmers held their land on the customary arrangement of yearly tenancies that could be terminated at the pleasure of the landlord, though comparatively few seem to have suffered from any arbitrary exercise of that authority. An enlarged county electorate confirmed the harmony between farmer and landlord, and on the whole tenant farmers followed the practice of the 40s. freeholders, who alone had held the county franchise before 1832, of respecting the wishes of the squires.⁴

The by-election for North Shropshire in 1876, however, rudely shattered this time-honoured custom. John Ralph Ormsby-Gore, who had sat for that constituency since 1859, received a peerage and, as Lord Harlech, vacated his seat. On 3 January 1876 some forty to sixty prominent squires of northern Shropshire met at the Raven in Shrewsbury to select a suitable successor. To this assembly, various country gentlemen, Lord Newry, Mr. Donaldson-Hudson, Major Meyrick, and Salusbury Kynaston Mainwaring, had been invited to submit their credentials. One squire, Stanley Leighton, had declined to attend and instead had (on 30 December 1875) issued a proclamation announcing his candidacy.⁵

Like Ormsby-Gore, Leighton and those attending the meeting at the Raven were Conservatives, and there appeared little likelihood that the Liberals, none too strong outside Shrewsbury, would have the temerity to challenge Conservative hegemony. The guiding hand of the proceedings at the Raven was C. S. LLoyd, under whose supervision the assembled Conservative landlords repudiated Leighton's independent bid and quickly determined that Mainwaring should be the Conservative nominee. Since neither Leighton nor Mainwaring would step down, a contest between rival candidates became inevitable, and the Conservatives of northern Shropshire faced the unpleasant prospect of bitter fratricidal strife.

³In 1832 John Cotes, a Whig landowner, beat Wm. Ormsby-Gore by 72 votes, but in 1835 the latter was returned unopposed for N. Shrops. In 1868 the Northern division experienced a contest in which J. R. Ormsby-Gore and Ld. Newport, the Conservatives, were challenged (unsuccessfully) by R. G. Jebb, a Liberal. For the Southern division in 1865 R. J. More, a Liberal, beat Sir Baldwin Leighton. More was beaten in 1868, and S. Shrops. returned to its comfortable practice of sending two staunch Conservatives to Parliament. See *The Times*, 22 July, 10, 16 and 19 Nov. 1865; 2, 4, 12 and 20 Nov. 1868. Shrews., however, was contested in every 19th-cent. general election except those of 1820 and 1859. It is significant that as late as 1832 contestants still identified themselves by their personal colours: Sir Rowland Hill used red and purple, John Cotes light and dark blue, Wm. Ormsby-Gore orange and white. National party labels in Shrops. elections came into use only in the middle of the 19th cent. At Shrews. personal colours were replaced by national party titles in the 1857 general election. See *Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 26 Feb. 1876.

⁴H. J. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the time of Gladstone and Disraeli* (1959), 6-14, emphasizes the natural harmony of agricultural society in county politics. His generalization points up the unusual, even sensational, aspect of the subject of this paper, and the result of the N. Shrops., by-election of 1876 modifies his contention that the ballot had little effect on county elections.

⁵*Shrews. Chron.* 7 Jan. 1876; *Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 12 Jan. 1876. Ormsby-Gore had also represented Caernarvonshire from 1837 to 1841; he was the son of Wm. Ormsby-Gore who sat for N. Shrops. from 1835 to 1851.

Both Leighton and Mainwaring were typical squires. The former was the younger son of Sir Baldwin Leighton, Bt. (d. 1871). After Harrow and Balliol he had entered the Inner Temple and, on the completion of his studies, was called to the bar in 1861, practising thereafter for a time on the Oxford circuit. He had sufficient property to assume the customary role and duties of a country gentleman for in 1869 Leighton's father had settled Sweeney on him—a property brought into the family by Lady Leighton (d. 1864). At 39 Leighton was somewhat more accomplished than many country gentlemen and he had broadened his horizon by extensive travel on the Continent and by a trip to India. Ambitious for a seat in Parliament, he had contested Bewdley (Worcs.) in 1874—without success. Mainwaring, 7 years younger than Leighton, had been at Eton and Christ Church. Thereafter he had pursued the usual activities of a son and heir and had served as high sheriff in 1870. In politics, however, he remained a novice.

Five days after the Raven meeting, Mainwaring and Leighton appeared before a gathering of farmers at the Lion in Shrewsbury. Instrumental in arranging this assembly was John Bowen Jones of Ensdon, a prominent farmer. To stimulate debate nine questions concerning immediate agricultural problems had been drawn up, but those limited issues were easily overshadowed by a greater one. Seizing the initiative, Leighton boldly asserted against a background of continued cheering: 'This is, I believe, the first large meeting in the county which has a constitutional and legitimate right to speak on the question of the representation of the county because it is a public meeting and because any one who likes may attend and assert his opinion'. The meeting of squires at the Raven was clearly, Leighton defiantly declared, a brazen attempt by a few gentlemen to dictate the choice of a member of Parliament to the whole constituency. Warming to his theme, he exclaimed in reference to those who had met together at the Raven: 'Don't they know that we are called "Proud Salopians"? Those gentlemen, I think, forget that we, as well as they, were born in Shropshire'. Thereupon Leighton proclaimed that 'My conservatism is not confined to the castle or the hall', for his political principles were those of the Disraeli government that had acquired its mandate 'not from pocket boroughs or provincial towns, but from the support of the multitudinous constituencies of Lancashire, the swarming population of London, and the big agricultural counties which are under no political dominion'.⁶

Then trenchantly Leighton maintained that no meeting of landlords could be described as truly legitimate when Lord Powis had refused to accept its decision, when Lord Bradford had announced his neutrality, and when the Noel-Hills of Attingham and the Corbets of Adderley and Sundorne had not attended. At the end of his speech, to the sound of loud and continued cheers, Leighton vehemently underscored his major contention: 'I appeal to the farmers of Shropshire', he exclaimed, 'to assert their legitimate influence. Gentlemen, the battle is in your hands . . .

⁶Ibid. The nine questions presented to the candidates summarize those issues that were significant to farmers at the end of the great period of high farming: (1) relief from excessive taxation on permanently improved land, (2) reduction of local rates by transferring part of the burden to the national Exchequer, (3) a greater role for ratepayers in the management of county business, possibly through county boards, (4) toll-financed roads not to be supported by local rates, (5) abolition of the malt tax, (6) better regulation of ground game in order to prevent damage to crops, (7) improvement of the Agricultural Holdings Act particularly if its permissive character should prove inadequate, (8) mandatory slaughter or quarantine of animals from foreign countries, (9) measures to contain the spread of contagious disease among animals.

and the victory will be yours, if so be that a victory is in store for us, and the prize of victory is nothing less than the political independence of your county'.⁷

On his part Mainwaring quickly revealed his inexperience of political hurly-burly, and among past sins of omission he acknowledged that he had not joined the Shropshire Chamber of Agriculture. Mainwaring's inauspicious performance provided Bowen Jones, the chairman, with the opportunity to state flatly that the tenant farmers preferred Leighton and to charge that Mainwaring was 'the nominee of an oligarchical clique'. Not surprisingly Bowen Jones declared for Leighton.

Defence of Mainwaring came from J. R. Kenyon, Q.C., the chairman of quarter sessions and one of those present at the Raven meeting. He admitted that the Raven meeting had been private but argued that the intention of those attending had been to prevent a split within Tory ranks in Shropshire. Kenyon declared that Leighton, since he had refused to participate, should not denounce such a worthy endeavour. Kenyon's main concern, however, was to protest against the course of events that day, which were tending 'to promote hostility between the landlords and the tenants'. He hoped, however, that 'the result of the election, if unhappily it went to a contest, would show that the landlords and tenants were as cordial friends as ever they had been'. Kenyon's conciliatory language did not silence angry voices demanding why tenant farmers had not been invited to the private conclave at the Raven.⁸

Immediately before the meeting of farmers at the Lion, Mainwaring's supporters had held a rally in the Music Hall at Shrewsbury. Sensing the direction of the forthcoming contest, Mainwaring had rebuked Leighton :⁹

Let their politics be what they may, it was the greatest mistake in the world to set class against class, and people only lowered themselves and the country in the estimation of their neighbours if they did so. Their interests were in common. He would take his own case. He was a landowner, and lived upon his own property, and was surrounded by his own tenantry. Did they think he should be a happy man if his tenants were against him and when he went to see them he did not receive a hearty shake of the hand and a glass of beer ?

Significantly the Music Hall was packed by a solid contingent of landowners, among whom were Sir V. R. Corbet, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, J. E. Severne, and the Hon. Geoffrey Hill. The squires and their candidate were obviously reacting to Leighton's radical pitch at the annual new market dinner at Wellington held on 6 January. There Leighton had bluntly stated the issue on which he intended to campaign :¹⁰

The real point was this—who is to elect the member for North Shropshire ? The question was should they do so, or should others arrange it in private meeting, and say that a man who had come forward and dared to speak to the electors was to be punished because he had not first asked their leave ? It was a libel on the great landowners of the county to say that they took part in that meeting ; they did not so far forget the respect that should be shown to that independence which was one of the first qualities on which the conservatism of the country depended.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

Fear of a vitriolic contest caused the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* to warn tenant farmers, though justly provoked by the arbitrary conduct of their landlords, not to forsake Leighton for a candidate more closely identified with their interests, such as Bowen Jones. Furthermore a compromise between Leighton and Mainwaring should be arranged, as a result of which the former would be elected now and the latter would be his successor in the future.¹¹

The *Chronicle's* rival, *Eddowes's Shrewsbury Journal*, responded unenthusiastically to Leighton's candidacy and argued that he should have submitted to the decision of the assembled landlords at the Raven, for in North Shropshire it was necessary to have the endorsement of the country gentlemen. The crucial question had now become which candidate would receive the votes of the tenant farmers. Mainwaring became the candidate of the *Journal* but the *Chronicle* supported Leighton. Both papers, it should be noted, viewed the contest as a catastrophe for northern Shropshire and its electorate.¹²

The difference of opinion expressed by the two leading newspapers in Shropshire reflected divided public opinion. In a letter to the *Journal* 'An Old Elector Possessed of Many Broad Acres' recalled that before 1832 the twelve members for Shropshire, the so-called 'twelve apostles', were nominated by an oligarchy of influential landowners. Certainly, the correspondent urged, that practice should not be revived. Yet another writer to the same paper bitterly condemned Leighton's disregard of the authority of a body of country gentlemen who unquestionably stood for the wealth and rank of the agricultural community.¹³

As the schism within Conservative ranks became more apparent, the temptation for the Liberals to take an obvious advantage grew. Rumour suggested that A. P. Lonsdale, a country gentleman and nephew of the late Bishop of Lichfield, might accept the Liberal standard. As the Liberals pondered, however, Leighton made a bid for their support. Speaking in the temperance hall at Dawley, in the heart of the mining district, he recognized that many of his audience did not accept his political principles; nevertheless he still hoped that the Liberals and even the Radicals were prepared to support an 'independent Englishman' against the illegitimate claims of a narrow circle of landed gentlemen who sought to dictate to the electorate.¹⁴

Earlier on the same day, 12 January, Leighton and Mainwaring debated in public at Market Drayton. Mainwaring made a perfunctory speech, but Leighton seized the opportunity to reassert more starkly than ever his main theme:¹⁵

He . . . came forward as the candidate of that great Conservative party that was to be found in every class of the electors, from the highest to the lowest. The true Conservative life-blood of North Shropshire dwelt as strongly in the tenant farmers of Shropshire as it did in the greatest landowners it possessed, and was also found in those who lived in the cottage . . . If they told the true aristocratic noblemen and large landowners that they, as tenants, had really political

¹¹*Shrews. Chron.* 7 Jan. 1876.

¹²*Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 12 Jan. 1876. In general the *Chron.*, formerly a Liberal paper, was strongly anti-Radical by this time; in this contest its support of Leighton led it to show some regard for the Liberals' viewpoint. The *Jnl.* was strongly Conservative.

¹³*Shrews. Chron.* 19 Jan. 1876. During the contest for S. Shrops. in 1868 R. J. More also 'referred to the time when Shropshire sent up to Parliament the dozen Tories, profanely nicknamed the "Twelve Apostles"': *The Times*, 20 Nov. 1868.

¹⁴*Shrews. Chron.* 14 Jan. 1876.

¹⁵*Ibid.*

opinions of their own, there was too much true nobility of character in those gentlemen of Shropshire to try and force any candidate down their throats that was not acceptable to them. It was time that they could appeal to the security of the ballot, but he would rather that they appealed to their own landlords, who, he felt sure, would not only hear them, but listen to the reasonable appeal. Time gone by, people thought that the tenant farmers had no political opinion, or will of their own, other than their landlords, but that time had gone by for ever.

Bowen Jones, now the head of Leighton's election committee for the county, sturdily supported his candidate's sharp language. The tenant farmers of England, Bowen Jones warned, had invested some £800,000,000 in their land, and as a consequence they expected candidates who were willing to respect their wishes.¹⁶

The *Chronicle* emphasized the power of the ballot : in an editorial it observed that landlords could no longer instruct their tenants how to vote. The Ballot Act had introduced a new morality, and henceforth no citizen could be coerced in the exercise of his right to vote, though 'Landlord terrorism' (admitted the *Chronicle*) still existed in Shropshire. One tenant farmer, for example, had requested that his name be withdrawn from those advertized as belonging to Leighton's election committee for the county ; the reason he advanced was his landlord's vigorous support of Mainwaring. In another column the *Chronicle* bluntly stated that 'the English tenant farmers are not yet reduced to such political serfdom as to succumb to a demand which might have been made in feudal times with impunity, but which the ballot-box had happily exorcised as an injustice and a wrong when gravely put forward in the last quarter of the nineteenth century'.¹⁷

Leighton continued to hammer home his accusations of the overpowering exercise of influence by Shropshire landlords. At a rally of his supporters at Whitchurch on 14 January he again sought the backing of Liberals and Radicals against the authoritarianism of Conservative squires. To vindicate his position he read a letter from a near-by landed gentleman requesting a farmer's vote for Mainwaring. His strategy had at least moderate success for R. G. Jebb, who had tried to break the Conservative grip on North Shropshire in 1868, now publicly pronounced his support for Leighton as the independent candidate battling to preserve the freedom of the electorate.¹⁸

Similar support came from David Mountfield, Rector of Newport, who at a meeting in that town on 17 January declared that as a Liberal he intended to vote for Leighton. 'Born and bred in Lancashire', explained Mountfield, 'the home of Liberalism, I have always been a Liberal', but Leighton, 'though a Conservative is acting on a Liberal principle in throwing himself on the whole constituency'. The claim of a select number of landed gentlemen arbitrarily to nominate a candidate who should then be quietly accepted by a submissive electorate, must be repudiated, especially since no tradesman or tenant farmer had been consulted. 'That is not the doctrine', Mountfield proclaimed, 'of the present Prime Minister, of Mr. Cross, or of Mr. Smith, the Westminster bookseller', for 'these men', he reminded his audience,

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ibid. 21 Jan. 1876. Leighton may possibly have recalled the proud declaration of R. J. More on his victory in S. Shrops. in 1865. On that occasion, when Leighton's father, Sir Baldwin, had been beaten, More had acknowledged his considerable debt to 'the tenant farmers who have given free and independent votes, as I invited them to do': *The Times*, 22 July 1865.

¹⁸*Shrews. Chron.* 21 Jan. 1876.

'were not born in the mansions of the high and wealthy . . . they sprang from the ranks of the people, and the landowners cannot do without them'.¹⁹

At this meeting also appeared Bowen Jones to warn that 'it rested chiefly with the tenant farmers of the division to say whether Mr. Leighton should be returned or not' for, as Bowen Jones observed, 'their opponents had great influence' and 'they used that influence energetically—he thought he might also fairly say that they used it unsparingly'. On the same note, Leighton, speaking to a combined gathering of Oddfellows, Foresters, and freeholders of Oswestry, indulged in passionate oratory that touched demagoguery: 'Throughout history' he cried, 'we may always see how much one class hates a man of their own class who seems to have sympathies beyond it'. He then ominously asserted that 'to-day there are banded together against me in Shropshire the great landowners of the county, because they say that I, a landowner, belonging to one of the ancestral families of Shropshire, have dared appeal to you'.²⁰

Against such a profusion of fervent oratory Mainwaring doggedly strove to maintain a respectable pace. He too campaigned throughout the mining district of the county, and at Oakengates he addressed an assembly of his well-wishers chaired by an ironmaster, Henry Harrison. To broaden his appeal Mainwaring portrayed himself as the candidate of all classes and sections of society in Shropshire. Not one word from his rival, he claimed, had been uttered on behalf of 'the great commercial interests of this division'. 'How would the agriculturists and country generally', Mainwaring asked, 'get on without the great works like those in this neighbourhood and in other manufacturing and mining districts of England?' He further queried: 'Now would farmers in these days of high farming get on without machinery?' He concluded that the agriculturists 'as a class are largely indebted to the great centres of industry like this in which we are now assembled'.²¹

Debate over the views of the tenant farmers increased considerably when an advertisement printed in the *Journal* on 19 January presented a long list of tenant farmers supporting Mainwaring. Its authenticity was promptly challenged by Bowen Jones who pointed out that in the *Journal* there were 361 names but in the version printed in the *Oswestry Advertiser* there were only 354. More significant than a small discrepancy in numbers was the failure to provide the addresses of those listed. Laboriously tracing the residences of 263 of the tenant farmers listed as supporters of Mainwaring, Bowen Jones discovered that 101 of them had names 'identical with those of Tenants holding under the following great Landed Proprietors, viz:—Earl Brownlow, Mr. Corbet of Adderley, Mr. Salusbury Kynaston Mainwaring, Lord [Arthur Edwin] Hill-Trevor, and Mr. Burton Borough, all of whom I am under the impression were either represented or present at the Raven Meeting'. In sorting out the names among the twelve polling districts of the constituency, Bowen Jones observed that few came from the large districts of Wellington and Shrewsbury which together had 1,999 electors and that only 18 came from Oswestry which had 1,083 registered electors. Forty-seven names, moreover, were recorded in the category of £12 occupiers and 14 were registered as small freeholders.

¹⁹Ibid. Mountfield was an outspoken partisan, for in the 1868 general election he had publicly supported R. G. Jebb, the Liberal. He had also endorsed Gladstone's pledge to disestablish the Church of Ireland: *The Times*, 44 Nov. 1868.

²⁰*Shrews. Chron.* 21 Jan. 1876.

²¹*Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 19 Jan. 1876.

Bowen Jones accordingly concluded that 'although I fully appreciate the value of their interest in matters appertaining to the selection of a County Representative, I leave the public to judge whether the title "Tenant Farmers" is an apt and proper description of their calling'.²²

The *Chronicle*, editorializing on Bowen Jones's analysis, asserted waspishly that the landlords of Shropshire 'would stand on firmer ground if they were to confess that the ballot, and the new-fangled notions of political independence, had not convinced them that a great county election should be fought on the merits, pure and simple, of the rival candidates and the views held by them'. The *Chronicle* therefore bitterly charged the landed gentry with being 'a clique': 'Mr. Mainwaring is the landlords' nominee; the tenant farmers who support them are not free agents'.²³

The theme of landlord dominance obviously struck a popular chord, for in Trefonen, near Leighton's seat at Sweeney, an enthusiastic meeting of farmers produced a plentiful crop of florid speeches. D. H. Owen, for instance, after employing reassuring platitudes drawn from Scripture, asked rhetorically 'are those few great and mighty who met secretly in the capital town of our county to select and thrust upon you a candidate of their choice and not of yours?' Replying to his own question Owen urged that 'here is an opportunity to break down old-fashioned territorial and ancient Toryism'.²⁴

Such an indictment made its mark, for Major the Hon. Geoffrey Hill, Lord Hill's brother and a leading supporter of Mainwaring, offered an elaborate denial of any unethical pressure exerted by his family, especially its head, on tenant farmers. 'I have been in a few electioneering contests', explained Hill, 'and from what I have seen of this constituency I have no fears that any single tenant of my brother's or anybody else indeed, will vote against their conscience'. He admitted, however, 'I have asked them for their votes the same as I have asked every one of you'. Yet he urged that 'whether you go with us or against us for God's sake vote according to your conscience'.²⁵

Before a throng of his supporters at the Shrewsbury Music Hall on 22 January Mainwaring vigorously defended the integrity of the list of tenant farmers supporting him. Moreover he denounced the appearance of placards carrying slogans of 'Leighton and Protestantism' or 'Mainwaring and Ritualism' as crude devices pandering to religious prejudice, particularly that of the nonconformists. Mainwaring felt compelled to explain on this public occasion that his parents had been the patrons of a high-church parson.²⁶ Violence flared up in the last vitriolic stages of the campaign.

²²Ibid. 2 Feb. 1876. Inf. on the size of Shrops. holdings is not readily available, but in 1888 Ld. Hill's Hawkstone estate contained 49 farms having more than 100 a. and 324 having fewer than 25 a. The total acreage of the Hawkstone estate was 14,647, and of that amount 8,787 a. belonged to farms larger than 100 a. Farms under 100 a. occupied 5,860 a. In general there was a steady trend towards larger holdings after the middle of the 18th cent., though the relation between the greater and smaller farms remained approximately the same. Using the Hawkstone estate as a typical illustration, Bowen Jones appears as the spokesman for those tenant farmers who held considerable acreage, and his scorn for the smallholder suggests that the tenant farmers involved in the N. Shrops. contest were sufficiently prosperous and secure in their holdings to challenge the political direction of their landlords without serious fear of reprisal. I am indebted to the late Mr. A. T. Gaydon, formerly county editor of the *Victoria History of Shropshire*, for statistics of the Hawkstone estate, which he obtained from the records deposited in the Shrops. Record Office by Henry Lee, Bygott & Eccleston, solicitors, of Wem (S.R.O. 731).

²³*Shrews. Chron.* 28 Jan. 1876.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶*Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 26 Jan. 1876.

On 26 January, at a meeting held in Ellesmere town hall, pent-up emotions nurtured by the contest provoked fighting that disrupted Leighton's speech. Whether the candidates spoke at Whitchurch, Wem, Oswestry, or in the mining communities near Wellington, they encountered excited and occasionally riotous men.²⁷

Behind the constant barrage of oratory scurried the professional workers such as G. de Courcy Peele, chief agent for Leighton, who wrote in the last weeks of the contest that 'it has occurred to me that the time has now arrived when the District Agents should take special measures in reference to those Voters whose names have been inserted as "doubtful" in their previous returns'. 'The question arises', Peele observed, 'how they can be legitimately influenced in Mr. Stanley Leighton's favour by some friend?' Peele advised that if up-to-date records of uncommitted electors were kept for each parish, then those potential supporters could be more readily approached.²⁸

Both Mainwaring and Leighton naturally commented on current political topics, like the recent Agricultural Holdings Act. They readily expressed approval of that measure, since it favoured the tenant farmer. As for local taxation, both wished to see more of the burden placed on the national Exchequer, particularly in such matters as road construction and maintenance, an issue that had become critical with the disappearance of turnpikes and the introduction of highway boards. Strict regulation of Irish and foreign animals entering England received unreserved support from Mainwaring and Leighton as the most effective method of preventing the spread of foot-and-mouth infection and similar diseases afflicting livestock. In foreign affairs the two contestants enthusiastically approved of Disraeli's acquisition of the Suez Canal, both asserting their belief that it was the vital link with India. Yet these and other issues were not the crux of the debate; they were merely ancillary.²⁹

Throughout the contest, but especially in the last days, Mainwaring and Leighton drew large crowds. When Leighton returned home to Sweeney at the close of his campaign, he addressed a final meeting of his friends and supporters at Oswestry. Some two thousand had gathered at the Corn Exchange and Butter Hall, which had been joined together to hold the unprecedented crowd. Mainwaring also collected sizeable numbers when he spoke at Newport and at two small communities at Whixall and the near-by Platt Lane, an area where he anticipated strong support.³⁰

As the electors of North Shropshire prepared to vote, the *Chronicle* sharply avowed that the pressures exerted by landlords must be repudiated. 'The whole tone of English politics is lowered by it', the *Chronicle* asserted, for 'the landlord virtually says to his tenant: "Part of the rent you pay me for my land is to come from you in the form of political subserviency"'. The *Chronicle* therefore proclaimed that 'we desire to arouse the tenant-farmers of North Shropshire from the state of lethargy in which they are necessarily placed by such a state of things', and 'we trust', the *Chronicle* advised, 'that they will have strength to set themselves free from the thralldom in which they are placed'. Finally the *Chronicle* focused on the central issue. 'The point in dispute', it claimed, 'is whether persons in a more or less dependent position are to be allowed to hold political opinions or not', and 'it is hardly too much to prophesy [it added] that not many years will elapse before such a contest as the

²⁷*Shrews. Chron.* 28 Jan. 1876.

²⁸S.R.O., Leighton MSS., Peele to district agents, 14 Jan. 1876.

²⁹*Eddowes's Shrews. Jnl.* 19, 26 Jan. 1876; *Shrews. Chron.* 28 Jan. 1876.

³⁰*Shrews. Chron.* 4 Feb. 1876.

present one and all landlord coercion will have disappeared for ever from England'.³¹

Voting was brisk but quiet on election day, 2 February. In Shrewsbury the voters trooped to the Market Hall where three booths had been erected to expedite the anticipated throng. Voting took place from eight o'clock in the morning until five in the afternoon, and by nine in the evening boxes from the eighteen polling stations began to arrive at the Music Hall in Shrewsbury, where, in accordance with the Law, all the ballots were collected and thoroughly mixed before tabulating the score for each candidate. Not until two o'clock in the morning was the result finally known. Out of a total of 5,437 votes cast Leighton won by 37. His narrow victory, however, did not dampen the jubilant spirits of his supporters who carried him through the streets.³²

The *Chronicle* forthwith interpreted the result of the election :³³

The squirearchy of Shropshire have put forth their full strength. They held their meeting at the Raven without the slightest sense of reserve or reticence, although, of course, it was not public. The blank astonishment with which they have received the criticisms, which have been freely pressed upon them, has indicated with considerable accuracy the state of mind in which these gentlemen have long been living. In view of the steadfastness and confidence of the landowners, and the fact that, almost to a man, they rallied round the standard of Mr. Leighton's opponent, and considering not only the enormous power possessed by them, but also the vigorous manner in which that power has been applied during the past month, it almost surprises us that they have not won the day.

Among reasons that might be assigned to describe Leighton's triumph and yet should be discounted, the *Chronicle* rejected any suggestion that the Liberal or Radical vote had provided the thin edge of victory. Since voting in Shrewsbury, the centre of Liberal power in Shropshire, was moderate, a reasonable conclusion was that most Liberals had abstained. Through the use of the secret ballot, the *Chronicle* declared, 'enlightened Conservatives' had emphatically resolved to put an end to unchecked domination by the gentry of North Shropshire.³⁴

The cost of victory was high. Leighton's agent, Peele, drafted an account that amounted to £11,953. The greatest sum for canvassing was spent in the Oswestry area where Leighton had his seat ; then followed Wellington and Shrewsbury. In the latter town more money went on advertizing than on canvassing, a fact revealing Leighton's decision to court sympathetic Liberals who normally would turn from a Conservative candidate.³⁵ In 1880, when Leighton had no opposition, he received a bill for £1,172 from Peele, who argued that a large staff had been maintained until Leighton's nomination had been accepted without challenge. 'Had a Candidate come forward', Peele observed, 'the papers, with returns of each particular Districts, could have been placed in the hands of every under Agent in a few hours, so that the whole of the Agents would at once have commenced the canvass under most favourable auspices, a great deal of the District Agents work having actually been done here in anticipation'.³⁶

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵S.R.O. 365/1. Mainwaring spent on the same scale : *Eddowes's Jnl.* 26 Apr. 1876. Hanham, *Elections and Party Management*, chap. 12, has an enlightening discussion of election expenses at this time.

³⁶S.R.O. 365/3 (Peele to Leighton, 31 May 1880). Leighton was expected to pay only £586 of Peele's bill. The rest would undoubtedly be absorbed by a subscription launched by friends. Peele's fee was 100 gns.

Leighton's success reverberated in the Southern division of the county, where at least one tenant farmer sought to promote the candidacy of Robert Jasper More in a future contest as an authoritative spokesman for the farmers. Moreover a possible result in county constituencies, especially those that were purely agricultural, would be the selection in the future of one candidate by the landlords, the other by the farmers. *The Spectator* commented on the North Shropshire election with the observation that 'no tenant-farmer is made a magistrate, or decides on the raising and distribution of taxes, or guides a municipal council, or, till he has revolted, is consulted in the selection of a representative'. The farmer was still a victim of the social order 'for he raises game to his own hurt, for others to shoot . . . and if he attends a county dinner is seated, in many counties at all events, and we presume in North Shropshire, without reference to education, character, or history, at a lower table'.³⁷

The Spectator looked beyond the political emancipation of farmers to the end of the territorial dominance of the landed interest. 'The landlords, Whig and Tory alike', it argued, 'want to keep their ascendancy, to be an oligarchy in the counties, to avoid descent into the "dim, common multitude" of voters, to rule the country districts as they once ruled Great Britain.' With the approach of household suffrage for the county electorate, the landed class, deprived of the loyal support of farmers, would have to seek the approval of a wider public. Principle more than influence would be the essential quality of future leadership in county politics.³⁸

There were, of course, second thoughts, for though the *Chronicle* rejoiced over Leighton's victory and scorned the obduracy of the Shropshire squires, it had no desire to witness the dissolution of the ancient bonds between landlord and tenant. Indeed, it observed, 'the landlord and tenant are in direct, almost in daily, contact, and it is to the interest of the latter especially that he should look to the owner of the soil for sympathy and support'. Furthermore, if the agricultural community should become disunited, 'there would be little power to withstand the masses and to frustrate the designs of the more aggressive politicians'. Above all the farmers should not desert their old friends, the country gentlemen, and their natural party, the Conservative, to join forces with Radicals who had scant respect for the traditional fabric of rural society and little zeal for the problems of the countryman.³⁹

Leighton's victory, however, produced no lasting schism within the ranks of Shropshire agriculturists, for he was quietly returned without opposition in the general election of 1880, and elsewhere he was not emulated. In a Dorset by-election contemporaneous with Leighton's battle, for instance, the avowed candidate on behalf of tenant farmers suffered defeat.⁴⁰ In retrospect Leighton seems not so much the candidate of tenant farmers in North Shropshire as an astute campaigner who recognized that his only sure course against a solid phalanx of squires was to break up their hitherto unquestioned influence. He did nevertheless make it apparent that the long respected alliance between farmers and landlords was subject to change—as indeed are all political alignments.

³⁷*The Spectator*, 5 Feb. 1876.

³⁸*Ibid.*

³⁹*Shrews. Chron.* 18 Feb. 1876.

⁴⁰Soliciting the support of tenant farmers Rob. Fowler challenged E. H. T. Digby, the landlords' candidate: *The Times*, 10, 13, and 25 Jan. 1876.

ALEXANDER THOMAS GAYDON, F.S.A.

1929-74

THE Society was greatly saddened to learn of the death in April 1974, after a long and painful illness, of Alec Gaydon, a former Honorary Editor of its *Transactions*. Many of the Society's members and officers attended his requiem mass in Shrewsbury Cathedral to pay their own tribute of respect, at the same time marking the Society's sympathy and condolence with Mrs. Gaydon and her children in their bereavement. Public tribute has already been paid not only to those qualities best known to his professional colleagues but also to the readiness and generosity with which he placed his great enthusiasm and scholarship at the disposal of all serious students of the history and topography of Shropshire.¹ These pages must record, however inadequately, the loss sustained by the Society and keenly and widely felt by the members—first of all as knowledge of the seriousness of Alec's illness became known and finally when his death at the early age of 44 was announced.

Alexander Thomas Gaydon was born at Warkworth in Northamptonshire on 13 July 1929, the only child of Mr. Thomas Gaydon and his wife Frances Daisy (née Rogers). After beginning school at Hinton in the Hedges he attended Magdalen College School, Brackley, from 1938 to 1948, and in the latter year he went up to St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. In 1951 he was placed in the second class of the Final Honour School of Modern History. He read for the Diploma in the Study of Records and Administration of Archives at Liverpool University from 1951 to 1952. After the conclusion of his studies Alec Gaydon spent some months in Oxford as a research assistant: he worked for Mr. (now Dr.) A. B. Emden, then the recently retired Principal of St. Edmund Hall who was engaged on the preparation of his biographical register of mediaeval Oxford alumni, and for Dr. Beryl Smalley who was then studying late-mediaeval biblical commentaries. For a short time thereafter he was assistant to the editor of the *Victoria History of the County of Oxford*, and his work included a contribution to the history of Somerton—a parish some eight miles south of his native Warkworth. In 1953 he was appointed assistant archivist in the Bedfordshire Record Office, then under Miss Joyce Godber; there his duties included the curatorship of Elstow Moot Hall, a museum established in 1951 to house collections illustrating 17th-century life and traditions associated with the life of John Bunyan. While he was working in Bedfordshire he married Miss Mary C. A. McGloin whom he had met at Liverpool University. In 1955, the year following his marriage, he was appointed senior assistant archivist in the Gloucestershire Record Office. During these years he edited 'The Taxation of 1297' for the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society's *Publications* (vol. XXXIX for 1958) and contributed to guides published by the Bedfordshire and Gloucestershire record offices. In 1960, when the *Victoria History of Shropshire* was revived by the University of London and the Salop County Council, he was appointed local editor, beginning work in January 1961. For over nine years thereafter, sometimes with an assistant and sometimes alone, Alec Gaydon's professional energies were expended on the history and topography of Shropshire. Volume VIII of the *History* was published in 1968, volume II in 1973. Those volumes remain the most substantial monument to his abilities as historian, topographer, and editor. The first of them, when it appeared, was recognized as a distinguished contri-

¹*Shrews. Chron.* 19 and 26 Apr. 1974.

bution to the *Victoria County Histories*.² In 1968 Alec Gaydon was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

Alec Gaydon became a member of the Shropshire Archaeological Society in 1961 and was soon co-opted to the council and to the editorial committee. In 1964 he succeeded Mr. M. C. de C. Peele as Honorary Editor of its *Transactions*, and under his editorship (1964-70) the three parts of Volume LVIII were published. P. A. Barker's *The Medieval Pottery of Shropshire from the Conquest to 1400* appeared in 1970, the first of a series of occasional supplements which Alec Gaydon hoped to bring out for the Society. In 1972, after illness had compelled his retirement, he was elected an honorary member of the Society.

Alec Gaydon's main interest was the rural landscape, and in the study of its evolution he drew upon a wide range of skills. An able palaeographer, he could work quickly through great quantities of documentary material—often haphazardly arranged. Topographical fieldwork, however, was as much his element as were the muniment room and record office. He was a farmer's son, and an early familiarity with agriculture informed his study of agrarian history. He mastered the study and recording of vernacular buildings—techniques pre-eminently useful to an historian who looked forward to writing the history of Shrewsbury, a town with a richer heritage of timber-framed buildings than perhaps any other in the kingdom. As he developed an interest in urban history Alec also acquired the statistical and other techniques of demographic history.

He lived and worked strenuously. Indeed he had an extraordinary capacity for work. Evening after evening and year after year he travelled up and down the county, lecturing and conducting classes and research groups. In all this he managed to convey not merely the historian's knowledge, techniques, and skills but also an enthusiasm which was his own and which served to irrigate what are for many the more arid stretches of parochial history. All this took its toll, and Alec Gaydon did not live to write all that he could have written well. Nevertheless he left much behind him, and others will enter into his labours. It is what—in his practical way—he would wish.

²*Agricultural History Review*, xx. 78-80.

REVIEWS

Trevor Rowley, **The Shropshire Landscape** (Hodder & Stoughton, 1972 ; price £3.25 ; 272 pp.).

Trevor Rowley has written an invaluable and interesting book born of his researches in Corvedale and on the Clees. Those areas figure very largely in his text, and there is no doubt that, given a different brief outside the format of the series to which his book belongs (*The Making of the English Landscape*, edited by W. G. Hoskins), he could have written an excellent study of them alone. As a recipe for the whole county this bias is less satisfactory, although, when it is added to volume VIII of *The Victoria History of Shropshire* (1968), the book does reflect the current state of topographical research in the county. The book provides insights into all aspects of the landscape, and the author brings to it his particular skills as a geographer and archaeologist which are especially valuable in this field. As an historian he is less happy, but his interpretations are generally sound and suggestive of important lines of research. His maps are excellent and his illustrations well chosen.

It is not, however, a work well rounded by maturity, and it bears all the signs of having been written in haste. The innumerable errors of place-names have been noted elsewhere¹ and to these can be added erroneous personal names and titles as well as other mistakes of detail—some derived from defective sources. At times there is an element of pastiche in the work, and a greater degree of digestion would have avoided possible accusations of plagiarism where paragraphs have been borrowed without alteration or acknowledgement. This lack of exacting editorial discipline mars the book, although it does not detract from its value to the general reader.

The author's work is seen at its worst in his treatment of his native town of Shrewsbury. He has confused Claremont Bank with Claremont Hill (p. 202) and Bennett's Hall with Vaughan's Mansion (p. 199) and has called Cherry Orchard 'Cherry-fields' (p. 205). George Steuart's name is rendered as 'Stewart' (p. 127) and elsewhere as 'Steward' (p. 202), and the Marquis, rather than the Earl, of Bath is named as the builder of Swan Hill Court (p. 202). The Welsh Bridge is curiously alleged to have been built by Robert Mylne (p. 194), an error culled from John Betjeman's *Shell Guide* (1951) to the county.

More serious than such errors of detail, however, is the author's defective knowledge of the town's development. He widens Pride Hill, High Street, and Mardol Head in the 13th century on grounds of morphology (p. 198) but without historical evidence. He is unaware of the rebuilding of the castle by Henry III in the 1240s (p. 197) or of the fact that the 'small trading community' around the abbey (p. 198) was a fully fledged seigniorial borough under the abbot with a market and fairs in constant rivalry with the town. Indeed in all likelihood the Abbey Foregate is a planned borough of a type described elsewhere in the same chapter. The author claims that the 14th century was prosperous and that that prosperity was mirrored by 'a great deal of church building' (p. 200). The surviving evidence at St. Mary's hardly bears this out, nor does a study of 18th-century drawings of St. Chad's and St. Alkmund's where most of the building was of the 12th, 13th, or 15th centuries. Confusion is likely to be caused by saying that Shrewsbury School was founded by merchants (p. 201) when all the endowment was given by the Crown. The communications revolution in the later 18th and the 19th centuries is unappreciated. No mention is made of the thriving road traffic of the town from the 1770s or of its subsequent collapse ; nor is it shown how the tardy arrival of the railway in 1848 adversely affected the town's fortunes. Some of the developments of the small-scale industrial revolution of the early 19th century are described, but they are not really understood ; nor is there any mention of the Improvement Act of 1821 which led to considerable road widening and replanning of frontages. The author's judgement of Telford's work at the castle (p. 203) is a rather naive. His judgements of modern

¹*Shropshire Mag.* Aug. 1972, p. 23.

developments, however, are just and perceptive—except perhaps when he castigates the ‘destruction’ (p. 202) of the lime avenues in the Quarry (not ‘Quarry Park’) which were over 200 years old when felled in the mid 1940s and were immediately replanted after felling.

The standard of accuracy in the remainder of the book is fortunately of a much higher order and, although one may cavil at some judgements and chip at the irritating small errors, there is a great deal of invaluable original scholarship here which adds much to our understanding of the Shropshire landscape. Should a second edition be contemplated, the text ought to be carefully and critically examined to remove errors.

J. B. LAWSON
Shrewsbury School

A History of Shropshire, Volume II, ed. A. T. Gaydon, published by the Oxford University Press for the Institute of Historical Research (the Victoria History of the Counties of England), 1973 ; pp. xx, 320 ; £16.50.

Volume II of the Shropshire *V.C.H.* covers ecclesiastical organization and religious houses, public and endowed grammar schools, sports, and population tables. It also contains an index to Volumes I and II and *corrigenda* to Volume I. The volume is mainly the work of three authors : Marjorie M. Chibnall contributes the articles on monasteries, friaries, and the single nunnery ; the county editor those on the military orders, hospitals, almshouses, and collegiate churches ; and the Revd. D. T. W. Price, assistant county editor, the articles on schools and some of the sports.

The accounts of religious houses are thorough and careful, covering the initial foundation and endowment and later economic, social, and intellectual history. Mrs. Chibnall is particularly strong on the intellectual life—for instance in discussing the library of Buildwas Abbey and the evidence of the abbey’s having had an active *scriptorium*. She also treats in detail the relationships of the houses with their patrons and benefactors and with lay society in general ; the articles on Wombridge and Haughmond are good examples of this. The common factors in Shropshire monasticism are usefully brought together in the brief introduction. The houses were not exceptional for wealth or piety. Several suffered from Welsh incursions. At Alberbury Welsh rectors and their parishioners carried off corn and cattle and even removed bodies from the graveyard ; at Chirbury similar disputes led to bloodshed, and in 1441 warlike Welshmen were said to have intruded one of their kinsmen as prior. Buildwas Abbey was involved in attempts to control nationalist feeling at Strata Marcella and 13th-century priors of Wenlock were sent on embassies to the Welsh.

The sources consulted by Mrs. Chibnall are wide-ranging. The only question which might be raised is why ordination lists are used only once—for Buildwas in the 15th century—and are not used for any other house. They are not even used for Buildwas itself in the 14th century, when conclusions as to the origins of monks are drawn from a few names taken from less comprehensive sources. There are a few minor slips. On page 74, n. 81, for ‘ff. 70-70v.’ read ‘ff. 97-97v.’ The injunctions referred to do not in fact immediately precede injunctions for Wombridge (as implied : *loc. cit.*) ; they precede ones for St. Werburgh’s, Chester, dated August 1323, and then come the Wombridge injunctions of September 1324. The suspension of Stephen de Lee’s penance (p. 65) dates from 1354 not 1350, and the Haughmond injunctions dated on p. 67 to 1354 are in fact dated March 1354/5.

The most fascinating of Mr. Gaydon’s articles on collegiate churches, almshouses, and hospitals is the account of the Ludlow palmers’ guild. Its stewards toured Midland England, taking as payment wine from Bristol and iron goods from the West Midlands to support the worship, furnishings, and music of the parish church. The articles on collegiate churches are notable for the analysis of the canons’ backgrounds in the chanceries of kings and bishops.

However few tears may have been shed for the monasteries at the Dissolution, it is probable that they were at no time considered by their contemporaries to be as irrelevant to local needs as the grammar schools were by the first half of the 19th century. At Donnington (p. 144) 'the eccentric John Meredith (1838-79), found one boy at the school on his arrival and left it with none'. Farmers feared that a classical education would make parsons of their sons. Mr. Price comments drily of Market Drayton (p. 145) that 'if the school had ever had a good reputation this had been lost by the early 19th century'. After a brief revival there were only two boys in the school in 1829. Wem was in decline by about 1800, Newport by 1810-20. At Ludlow as late as 1866 the curriculum did not attract the sons of local farmers and tradesmen, and Bridgnorth was down to six boys by 1865. Shifnal, High Ercall, and Worfield tried to adapt to changing needs by subordinating or eliminating the classical grammar which gave them their status. Even at Shrewsbury under Kennedy the narrow curriculum was partly responsible for a decline in attendance, though the high quality of its teaching enabled Shrewsbury to draw on a wide catchment area. Of the smaller schools some, like Bitterley, became elementary, some struggled on until the late 19th or early 20th centuries when they became modern grammar schools, like Bridgnorth and Ludlow. Other schools, such as Donnington and Shifnal closed. The articles are thorough and, if the adjective may be permitted, comprehensive, and draw attention to less depressing evidence where it can be found. Perhaps the section on 'Education' promised for a later volume will relieve the sense of waste which these histories convey.

The articles on sport are concerned to place the various sports in their social settings. Cock-fighting was deserted by the gentry and later it was replaced (together with bull-baiting) as a working-class pastime first by 'Old English' sports and then by the wide range of competitions covered by the title 'athletics'. In horse-racing the balls, assemblies, plays, and concerts which accompanied Shrewsbury 'Race Week' ensured the support of the local tradesmen, and at other courses there were innkeepers' purses. The emergence of the professional gamekeeper and the professional footballer is noted. It is surprising to read in the article on cricket that the match between Shropshire and Herefordshire in 1847 ended in uproar when the Shropshire team left the field after disputing the umpire's decision. Also surprising to the non-Salopian is the very late date of entry to the Minor Counties cricket championship. The follower of Shropshire sport might wish that the articles had been able to cover the greater success of the county cricket club and Telford United Football Club in the years since they were written. The article on fox-hunting, the longest in this section, is undoubtedly a major piece of research and was written by Dr. M. J. Angold a former assistant county editor. There are a couple of curious links between the chapters on sport and those on religious houses. The chapter house of Haughmond Abbey was used for lunch at a coursing meeting in 1855 and Gay Meadow appears first as a possession of Shrewsbury Abbey and later as the ground of Shrewsbury Town F.C.

The population tables, which include the reasons given in the original Census volumes for major population changes, are remarkable for the great amount of information expressed clearly and in a limited space. The degree of complexity required may be illustrated by the figures available for Bishop's Castle. From 1801 to 1871 totals were struck for the ancient parish and for its two constituent parts, the borough and the out liberties. For 1881 there are figures for the 'In' Civil Parish and the 'Out' C.P., from 1891 to 1961 for the municipal borough, for 1891 also for the C.P., and from 1901 to 1931 for the Bishop's Castle Rural C.P. It required skilful compression—first seen in *V.C.H. Leics.* III—to devise a framework for tracing all these changes. The lists of hundreds and rural districts with their constituent parishes, including the changes of 1966, will be of considerable use for researchers. It is a pity that areas could not have been given, at least for the ancient parishes. Despite minor errors and variations, it is invaluable to know the areas to which population figures relate, and these statistics are not always easy of access. One

warning which might have been given in the text is that the figures, being taken uncorrected from the original Census volumes, may be misleading or inaccurate. The population of Brimstree hundred ostensibly more than doubled from 9,274 to 19,444 between 1801 and 1811 and then declined to 18,817 in 1821 (p. 220). This is partly explained by the fact that the figure for Halesowen was not given in 1801 (p. 208 n. 13) but even in 1811 the population of the Shropshire part of Halesowen was only 6,888 (p. 223) and in 1801 it was probably about 5,500. The remainder of the 'increase' was in fact caused by the double enumeration in 1811 of Hatton, Woodside, and Priorslee, both as separate townships and as parts of Shifnal parish. Correcting this error would produce less sensational but more accurate figures.

It is tempting to criticize omissions in volumes of the *V.C.H.* Realism dictates that to some extent they are bound by their own history and by pressures of time and space. No doubt it was too much to hope for a study of population with supporting tables on the scale of the article in *V.C.H. Leics.* III or even subsidy and other totals as given in topographical volumes of the Oxfordshire *V.C.H.* One omission from this volume, however, is serious and is justifiable neither by *V.C.H.* tradition nor by the needs of the modern reader. This is the absence of general articles on the ecclesiastical history of the county. Without them the volume is seriously incomplete. It is true that the mediaeval section would inevitably have been very brief, lacking diocesan organization as the central theme, but for the post-Reformation period a recent Staffordshire volume shows how valuable such general articles can be. As it is, the chapter on 'Ecclesiastical Organization' gives tantalizing glimpses of the ecclesiastical history, for instance when discussing the rôle of the rural dean in the diocese of Hereford and when mentioning the rift caused in Shropshire Methodism by the theological disputes between Fletcher of Madeley and Richard Hill.

This volume combines the insights of modern scholarship with accuracy and a vast range of reference, and it will be used extensively, both within the county and elsewhere, by specialists on the subjects with which it deals. Its sources range from *Analecta Sacre Ordinis Cisterciensis* to works on fox-hunting by pseudonymous local gentlemen: 'Cecil', 'Borderer', and 'Dalesman'. It is also, despite the compression of individual articles, well written and extremely readable. This very compression, however, means that local historians should find it a stimulus to research rather than a closing of its various subjects. The *Victoria History* tills and cultivates the ground; it does not exhaust it.

D. B. ROBINSON
Surrey Record Office

Michael Moulder, **Shropshire, A Shell Guide** (Faber & Faber, 1973; price £2.95; 159 pp.).

The appearance of a new edition of the *Shell Guide* to the county is to be welcomed as Sir John Betjeman's was long out of print and, although delightful and stimulating in its commentary, it contained egregious errors. This is not an entirely new guide for, as the author admits, it is derivative from the original and heavily reliant for judgements and comment on Sir Nikolaus Pevsner's Shropshire volume in *The Buildings of England*. New developments, especially those at Telford, are perceptively and critically assessed, and, as one might expect, early industrial buildings and monuments are sympathetically treated. Among the best features are the illustrations which are unusually well chosen and freshly taken; the inclusion of Gobowen railway station in the architectural canon is especially pleasing.

The welcome, however, is muted, for there are errors of fact which could easily have been corrected by reading readily available sources—some of which the author says he has used. The Council in the Marches of Wales was not the 'Council of the

Lords Marcher' nor was it abolished by Henry VIII (p. 9). The siege of Rowton Castle (p. 48) was a figment of the imagination of a usually accurate antiquary, and the same may be said of the alleged meeting of St. Augustine of Canterbury with the 'English' bishops at Cressage (p. 72). A reading of the relevant page of *The Victoria History of Shropshire* would have prevented the first of these errors¹. Stapleton church has been rebuilt in 1786 by a misreading of the *V.C.H.* whose text² merely refers to a watercolour of that date. Pious error is perpetuated in attributing the cast-iron frame of the Shropshire Maltings at Ditherington to the Coalbrookdale Company rather than to William Hazledine;³ and Tern Bridge between Atcham and Wroxeter continues to be ascribed to Robert Mylne rather than to William Hayward—an error spawned by Mr. Christopher Gotch and canonized by Sir Nikolaus Pevsner.

The account of Ludlow is sadly unsatisfying and much goes by default: no mention here of the Palmers' Guild or its buildings, of the Guildhall and Grammar School in Mill Street, or of the surviving Broadgate. Shrewsbury receives fuller treatment, but curiously there is no mention of Henry III's rebuilding of the castle, which is further described as 'one of the best late Eighteenth century houses in the town' (p. 127); that it might once have been—but only until 1926 when all but a few fragments of Telford's work were swept away. The description could have been applied more correctly to Swan Hill Court built for William Pulteney, Earl of Bath, in the early 1760s. It was, incidentally, Bath's distant relation by marriage, Sir William Pulteney (formerly Johnstone), Bt., for whom Telford renovated the castle; Mr. Moulder is wrong in stating that he was Earl of Bath (p. 127).

One's confidence in the *Guide* is dented by the inclusion of buildings demolished since the publication of Pevsner's volume (1958). Other buildings mentioned are mislocated. St. Michael's Church, Shrewsbury, is said to lie inside the circle of the River Severn rather than in Castle Foregate. Longnor Hall, correctly located on p. 94, is captioned 'Longner Hall, Atcham' on p. 53. Shavington Hall has been demolished, and the Parliament Barn at Acton Burnell, of which the author sees 'no trace', is illustrated on the same page (p. 47). There are no lead mines at Habberley (p. 80) nor did the mineral line from Snailbeach run to Minsterley (p. 129), which it by-passed, but to Pontesbury.

The most egregious error is the confusion of Donnington in Wroxeter with Dorrington in Condover (p. 73), which provides Dorrington with an unlooked-for grammar school and distinguished alumni. Mere errors in place-names are relatively few: Charlton House for Ludford House (p. 97), Shrewsbury College for Shrewsbury School, in Grinshill (p. 80), Hawick Grange for Hardwick (p. 80), and Hordely for Hordley (p. 87). There is, however, a considerable degree of originality on p. 17 where the quarry on Callow Hill, near Minsterley, has been rendered as 'Kelvil' quarry.

It is the greatest pity that this guide could not have been more carefully read in typescript. There is more material in this than in the earlier edition, but the information could have been more critically examined, and in the general architectural section advantage ought to have been taken of the increasing knowledge of vernacular architecture as well as of men like T. F. Pritchard whose work was unknown when Sir Nikolaus Pevsner wrote.

J. B. LAWSON
Shrewsbury School

¹*V.C.H. Salop.* viii. 202.

²*Ibid.* 169.

³*T.S.A.S.* lvi. 51.

R. T. Mason. **Framed Buildings of England**, (Horsham, Coach Publishing House [1974]; price £3.00; pp. 136, 33 pls., 30 figs., sketches).

The growing interest in our smaller buildings in recent years has produced a spate of books and articles on aspects of vernacular architecture, both at the specialist

and the general level. Until very recently, however, there was no overall account of the structural features of the timber-framed buildings which predominate in many parts of England. A not very satisfactory introduction for the general reader was published in 1971.¹ The present work, by one of the most experienced researchers in the field, seeks rather to summarize the existing state of technical knowledge for those who have already mastered the elements of the subject. It is a short book on a complex topic: the text covers less than 67 pages. There are chapters on 'Historical Background' (actually a review of problems and of social, cultural, and economic factors); on plans and design (mainly of medieval houses); on development; on structural details and techniques; on special types of houses and other buildings; and on repair and restoration. Most aspects are thus covered, though brevity precludes much detail. The emphasis is primarily on medieval material, and Mr. Mason is at his best when dealing with the Eastern buildings with which he is most familiar. Their standard aspects are adequately covered, and the results of some very recent research on archaic buildings and on joints are included, with the author's own observations on the assembly of crown-post roofs (which incidentally raise questions about the relative labour costs of 'Highland' and 'Lowland' techniques).

The reader who is chiefly interested in Western, Northern, or Midland England, including of course Shropshire, will find the book less useful. Mr. Mason's usage of the Highland-Lowland antithesis is confusing, and he says little about structural development and variation in the 'Highland' zone, about post-medieval construction there, or about regional variation in many of the topics he deals with, particularly planning. This leads to some confusions and omissions. The jointed cruck, the predominant roof type in much of Western Britain, is not discussed. It is rather unhelpful to consider the transition from medieval to post-medieval in the 'Highland' zone in terms of crucks alone (p. 47), since it usually involved replacing one-storeyed crucks by two-storeyed box frames, or by stone or brick buildings. The remarks about side purlins on p. 57 might lead the reader to think that medieval box-framed buildings in the 'intermediate' zones have uniform-scantling roofs: most do not. The 17th-century roof types discussed on pp. 53-6 are by no means general, while what Mr. Mason says about, for example, dragon ties (p. 44), the timbers used for rafters and joists (p. 13), and scarf joints (p. 71) applies mainly to the east. For provincial timber framing the earlier articles by J. T. Smith, which Mr. Mason cites and which should be familiar to the type of reader he has in mind, remain the most useful summary.

The book is copiously illustrated. Clear line drawings illuminate specific points, though it is a pity that most of the examples are not identified and that there are not more of them. There are pleasing sketches with almost illegible captions; and many photographs, good in themselves but badly reproduced and not tied to the text. Of the six photographs purporting to show Shropshire buildings, only one (plate XXX of Molverley church) is identified. Plate VII in fact shows a house at Eardisley (Herefs.). Of the others, plate VIII illustrates Holly Cottage, Loppington; plate XV Manor Farm, Berrington; plate XVI Cherrington Manor; and plate XVII Top Farm, Knockin. Manor Farm, Berrington, was probably a freehold farmhouse, not a manor house.

The book has an index which is not comprehensive. The reader should also be warned that periodicals are cited in the footnotes sometimes by date of publication, sometimes by serial year, and sometimes by volume number only. Some titles are inexact. The only significant misprints are 'Denieux' for Deneux and 'Hewitt' for Hewett throughout.

C. R. J. CURRIE
Victoria History of Staffordshire

¹Trudy West, *The Timber-Frame House in England* (David & Charles; Newton Abbot, 1971).

GWASG GOMER, LLANDYSUL