

From the *Transactions* of the  
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

**Temple St. Sugar House under the First Partnership of Richard  
Lane and John Hine (1662-78)**

by I. V. Hall  
1957, Vol. 76, 118-140

© The Society and the Author(s)

TEMPLE ST. SUGAR HOUSE UNDER THE FIRST  
PARTNERSHIP OF RICHARD LANE AND JOHN HINE  
(1662-78)

by I. V. HALL, M.A.

THE credit of introducing the sugar industry into the southern sector of Bristol goes to two young men in their early thirties—Richard Lane and John Hine—who were associated in their sugar house in Temple St. between 1662 and 1678. They dissolved their partnership in 1678; thereafter each managed and owned a refinery of his own; Lane at the Great House on St. Augustine's Back (1679-96), and Hine at the Temple St. site (1679-99).

Their constant endeavour was to eschew all actions which might endanger their joint effort. During the Commonwealth the Lane family inclined to Puritanism but young Richard officiated as a churchwarden at St. Augustine the Less in the years after the Restoration.<sup>1</sup> John Hine adhered to the Church of England. Not only was he churchwarden at Temple Church, but his entire family was interred in its churchyard, as a mural tablet set in the chancel used to testify before the edifice was blitzed.

This support of the Anglican Communion by Lane and Hine stood out in contrast to the sectarian views of two of their business rivals—John Knight, junior, at the Great House on St. Augustine's Back (1654-79)<sup>2</sup> and Thomas Ellis, the Baptist

<sup>1</sup> *Bristol Bargain Book*, f. 86. 28 September 1677. Richard Lane was a churchwarden of St. Augustine the Less.

<sup>2</sup> *Trans. B.G.A.S.*, vol. 68 (1948).

Elder, at the Whitson Court Sugar House (1665 - 83)<sup>1</sup>.

The two partners realized the future prospects of this new undertaking in the West Indies, where English merchants and planters were replacing a sugar cane for a tobacco economy. At the end of their partnership (1678) Lane, the senior member, branched out on his own by purchasing Knight's sugar bakery at the Great House, where he remained until his retirement from business seventeen years later (1696).

When Lane and Hine separated in 1678, each entered local politics, with the object of promoting Bristol's economic interests, gaining enough influence as councillors and aldermen to be selected as sheriff and mayor of the city. They took their share in moulding the future of the sugar industry by organizing an industrial circle within the City Council, just as local merchants in the past had consolidated their interests in the Merchant Venturers' Society. So Lane started his political career in 1674 (that is, before the dissolution of his partnership with Hine) and continued it until his death (1704). During his thirty years' service he was honoured with offices of distinction: in 1681 as sheriff; in 1688 and again in 1691 as mayor, and from 1696 as alderman. On the death of his brother (1679) who in

<sup>1</sup> *Trans. B.G.A.S.*, vol. 65 (1944).

*Religion of the Early Bristol Sugar bakers.*

*Members of the Church of England.*

- (1) *John Hine*. Churchwarden of Temple Church.
- (2) *Thomas Eagles*. Churchwarden of Temple Church, 1690. Poll Book.
- (3) *Richard Lane*. Churchwarden of St. Augustine the Less. 1677.
- (4) *Henry Gresley*. Churchwarden of Temple Church. 1775 Temple Minute Book.
- (5) *George Daubeney*. Feoffee of Temple Church. Temple deeds 1712.

*Members of the Nonconformist Church.*

- (1) *Thomas Ellis*. See my account in the essay of Whitson Court Sugar House. He went over to the Anglican Church at the end of his life. (See St. James' Church records, 1680).
- (2) *Godfrey von Itterne*. See Lewin's Mead Records. By 1680 he also had gone over to the Anglican Church of St. James. (See St. James' Church Records, 1680).
- (3) *Anthony Wood* and his wife. See her will dated 1706 for her benefactions to the Minister and members of the Lewin's Mead Chapel and their wives.

earlier life had succeeded to his father's business, Richard Lane, as next successor, entered a new sphere of activity, gaining entry into the Merchant Venturers' Society, whose Master he became in 1684-5.

On the other hand, Hine, a newcomer to Bristol from Somerset, without the social influence which Lane possessed had to make his own way to distinction. Consequently, his entry into politics was deferred until 1680, two years after his new business alliance with Thomas Eagles had begun. His second partnership at Temple St. afforded him time to devote to public affairs: he served as common councillor from 1680-4, and from 1688-9. During the months from February to September, 1688, he acted as sheriff and in 1696-7, in his old age (he died in 1699, aged 68) he was honoured as mayor.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Partnership and Local Industry*

Undoubtedly their greatest contribution to business technique was their application of the partnership idea to the sugar industry. It was they who were credited with producing a workable scheme for developing an industrial unit, capable of expansion in accordance with the needs of the increasing imports of raw sugar into the port. During the Civil War a group of Londoners had made a vain effort to revive Bristol's only sugar house at St. Peter's Churchyard. They failed because they had not associated themselves with a local mercantile group. It was left to the Lane-Hine partnership to achieve a successful combination in the first decade of the Restored Stuarts.

The mercantile class could no longer afford to finance new transatlantic undertakings on the scale of their fathers' and grandfathers' continental ventures. Merchants welcomed capital from investors outside the city. A combination of efforts by Bristol merchants and clothiers from the neighbouring counties restrained metropolitan ambitions to monopolize the new West Indian sugar ventures. The family histories of

<sup>1</sup> Rev. A. B. Beaven's Bristol Lists—'Hine'.

the pioneers Lane and Hine illustrate the process: Lane the child of a local mercantile family who, from the days of Elizabeth I to the outbreak of the Civil War, had been accustomed to leading colonial enterprises; and Hine, representative of wealth accumulated in the counties bordering on Bristol, in the farming and clothing industries. Bristol's industrial organizations were to welcome investments from these two sources, and the Lane-Hine partnership illustrates the early stage of the development. Their partnership characterized enterprise throughout the remaining decades of the 17th century, but gave way to quinquupartite and even sexpartite associations in the early decades of the subsequent century. The Temple St. sugar house provides instances of both types under John Macie & Co. (1712-31) and John Pinfold & Co. (1731-41).

### *The Lanes*

The story of the Lanes can best be told by a genealogical table which comprises 17 members beginning George (i) (1560-1613), the Elizabethan progenitor of the family, and ending with Richard's eleven children, who flourished during the first half of the 18th century.

When the Lanes are first heard of in the second half of the reign of Elizabeth I, they had already established themselves in Bristol as mercers and were in a fair way of business. They had entered the compact body of tradesmen, some twenty in number, who, though comfortably off, were considered socially of secondary importance.

### *George (i), c. 1560-1613.*

Richard Lane (i), the first member of the family, figures only as the father of George Lane (i). He apprenticed his son to Francis Knight, one of Bristol's leading mercers. Knight was about to start on a career in the city as a common councillor (1579-99), alderman (1599-1616), and mayor (1594-5). Richard Lane contracted, under a bond of £40, for his son's service and

truth. The apprenticeship was for eight years and formed the basis of the Lane family's fortunes.

Nothing is known of George (i's) business between 1585 and 1606, but by 1606 he had become an independent tradesman. In that year it is recorded that he bound himself before the mayor to train his own son, George (ii), *c.* 1588-1661, as a merchant, a privilege withheld from a burgess unless he had acquired independent status. By middle age he built up a moderately extensive business, partly in mercery, partly in general merchandize, and partly by selling goods on credit. He invested his surplus profits in house property and in a farm and a couple of fields which he let. He had thus acquired a comfortable living by the time he met an untimely and unexpected death in his early fifties (1613).<sup>1</sup>

#### *George Lane (ii), 1588-1661*

George (ii) eclipsed his father as a social climber. His name frequently occurs in four different kinds of documents: the Apprentices' Lists and Burgess Rolls; the Minute Books of both the Common Council and the Merchant Venturers' Society, and the port books of the city.

He was born most probably in 1588 and survived until the early months of the Restoration. As he emerged into maturity the family prospects brightened. George enjoyed the advantage of a good business training, a privilege which gave him admission to the Merchant Venturers' Society at a time when that body was being reorganized.

George, who spent an active life as a merchant for over forty years, knew the rigours of trade before and during the Civil Wars. As early as 1629-30 he served his merchant associates as their warden, an honour which they again conferred in 1647-8; and though he never attained the mastership of the Society, he acted as the treasurer during 1652-3. He remained a member to his death in 1661. A public career was

<sup>1</sup> Bristol Record Society's Publications (1955). *Merchants and Merchandise in 17th Century Bristol*, by P. McGrath, M.A., p. 71.

possible for George (ii) because he had an able substitute in his brother John, who managed the business. In their more flourishing period during the Civil War, George (ii) entered the Common Council in 1645 and served on it for sixteen years, until his death. In 1651-2 he acted as sheriff.

Throughout these decades, the two brothers developed their trade as Mediterranean merchants dealing in sugars sent from Lisbon, and in oils, lemons and woad from Spain and southern France. Two typical entries from the port books during the decade 1613-23 show that the Lanes bought sugars which came to Bristol direct from Lisbon, 'the port of Portugal'. This was a time when English merchants were still dependent upon foreign sources for sugars. They were apparently products 'dried in the sun' for such is the term applied to sugars processed without the use of coal. They reached England principally from Portuguese Brazil but were fetched in English ships from Lisbon, where all the Colonial trade of Portugal was concentrated. The agents of foreign merchants there bought brown, white, refined sugars, molasses and muscovadoes, pannelles and syrups. Quantities of these sugars were brought to Bristol in ships which auctioned on the quayside. It was apparently from this source that George (ii) bought his sugars. A score of local merchants would make their separate bids for quantities averaging from five to seven hundredweight.

Thus under the date 5 July 1613, the customs entry book shows that George (ii) acquired two chests of sugar weighing 7 cwts.; and again on 26 March 1625, John Lane obtained three chests of white sugar from a local ship *The Grace of God*. Small merchants such as the Lanes could not afford to send their factors abroad to negotiate large purchases, and so had to depend on buying small lots at the wharfside.

After twenty years of trading George (ii) acquired a ship of his own which apparently plied across the Atlantic under his own supervision, or through a paid service to a captain and a crew. The Apprentices' Lists and Burgess Rolls from 1661 onwards record him as apprenticing four youths, one of whom was his own son George (iii), (c. 1630-79) as sailors or 'as merchants.

The first was Nathaniel Consett who, on 3 February 1641, entered on a seven-year term of engagement as a sailor. On the termination of his service, George Lane pledged to pay the corporation clerk the sum of 4s 6*d* for his registration as a burgess<sup>1</sup> and to present the young seaman with a double set of apparel—one for Sunday and the other for weekday use. No bond money was paid for Consett's training, as he was a poor orphan, and he remained an able-seaman all his days.

A different story emerges from the next two entries in the Apprenticeship Lists. Two lads, one the son of a Sussex knight, and the other the orphan of a merchant of some wealth and standing in the city, sought training as merchants, a privilege for which their guardians each paid handsomely, depositing £500 for their service and truth. The first was James Cole from Farnham, who came to Bristol in 1647 in the company of his father, Christopher; a bargain was struck with George (ii) for a reliable and continuous training as a merchant, and for this he agreed to pay bond money—£500. The second was Thomas Nethway, the son of a deceased merchant of Bristol of the same name. The Nethway family were willing to sacrifice £500 to retain the mercantile privileges attached to the service.

George (ii) displayed an equal sagacity in the education of his two sons, George (iii) and Richard (ii). He planned a joint scheme of expansion whereby his elder son, George (iii), should follow in his own footsteps on retirement, and advance the family business to Virginia and to the Antilles, whilst the other son, Richard (ii), should manage the distributive side of the trade in England. The two branches were inter-related, because the more the purchasing market widened, the greater was the wholesale trade, coastwise to the West Country and Wales, over the St. George's Channel to Ireland, and by the Severn and its tributaries into central England.

This scheme developed in the later years of George (ii's) life. On 30 August 1646, he registered George (iii) as his own

<sup>1</sup> His apprenticeship—but not his burgess-ship—was registered in the civic records.

merchant-apprentice, and in the same month negotiated with Thomas Goldney, a prominent grocer in Bristol, to train young Richard under a seven-year agreement with a bond of £80 for the lad's service and truth. By the time that the first twin had completed his years of training (1648) and Richard his seven years later, and they had both become burgesses of Bristol, their father had advanced his own political and social position by entering the Council (1645-61) and had won the esteem of his Puritan brethren by a year of office as City Sheriff (1651-2).

The crowning success of George (ii's) project occurred during the last decade of the Commonwealth, when he saw his two sons enter his own field of activity and begin to transport new settlers to Virginia and Barbadoes. The qualities required for such family establishment, common enough in Bristol at the time, were energy, enterprise and foresight to combat the rigours of trade in a competitive market overseas and dogged persistence in withstanding ill-fortune that followed the Anglo-Spanish rivalry between the outbreak of that struggle and the treaty of 1604. If these small families revived in the opening up of the Iberian markets in the next century, they experienced a pioneering age when they entered the American and West Indian colonial markets. Not for them were the Indian and African prizes which went to the Londoners. The Bristolians had to fend for themselves in the American waters. As far as the Lanes were concerned, George (i's) rewards were reckoned in tens of pounds sterling; those of George (ii) amounted to hundreds, and those of Richard (ii) were numbered in thousands of pounds in the last decade of the 17th century.

*George (iii)*, c. 1630-79, and

*Richard (ii)*, c. 1630-1704/5

The third generation, covering the second half of the 17th century, prospered greatly by reason of their ancestors' work and by their own good fortune in living when they did. Trade with the newly-founded colonies in Barbadoes (1627) and St. Kitts (1624), Nevis, Antigua and Montserrat (between 1628 and 1632) and Jamaica (1655), was developing. The two

brothers prospected in these fields of adventure and made new contacts, first among the tobacco and later among the sugar cane planters. George (iii), like his contemporary, Thomas Ellis, the merchant-founder of the Whitson Court sugar house, sojourned for some fifteen years in Jamaica and subsequently anchored his business connexions by sending out agents to the West Indies and Virginia. Here, too, he made a lasting friendship with the Jamaican planter family of Swymmer, who later sent two of their sons, Anthony and William, to Bristol, to receive a training as English merchants. Close business ties sprang up between the two families, and Richard Lane welcomed William into his household as a son-in-law, and into his own firm as a sleeping partner, whilst in Jamaica the Swymmers watched the Lane interest and consigned their sugars to the Bristol sugar refinery.

#### THE HINES

Little is known of John Hine's family prior to his arrival in Bristol. What has been gleaned shows that his father, with whom young John travelled to Bristol in 1647, was a well-to-do farmer near Wincanton in Somerset. He paid a £100 bond for the apprenticeship of his son to John Sanders, a local grocer. This fee not only protected the lad from too scrupulous an enquiry into his Anglican beliefs by the Commonwealth Fathers, but also assured him a privileged status amongst the influential merchants. On the completion of his apprenticeship in 1654, when he was 24, he allied himself in a sugar undertaking with Richard Lane. He was soon interested in a scheme which encouraged emigration from the West Country to the West Indies, and Bristol, as a port of embarkation, became a focal centre for thousands of men and women from Wales and the Severn Valley, from Gloucestershire down to Devon, who there awaited transportation to the tobacco and sugar colonies abroad.

This stream of human traffic continued its constant flow for a generation and conveyed as many as 10,000 souls overseas. From the beginning of 1654 the Bristol authorities were made responsible for its supervision and management. The

mayor registered not only the names of the refugees, their parents, parents' occupations and homes, but also the names of the Bristol citizens who allocated the refugee to a specific destination on the American mainland or on the West Indian island, and determined the years and terms of service in the 'Lists of Servants to Foreign Plantations'. Under the date 1659 Hine's name recurs as a sponsor for Richard Howell who served four years in Virginia before receiving his freedom, presumably from service on a tobacco plantation. It seems as if in 1659, five years after leaving his grocer-master, and three years before founding his sugar house, Hine had not made up his mind whether to dabble in the Virginian tobacco market or in West Indian sugar. Perhaps it all depended whether he could amass sufficient capital to establish a sugar house, or whether smaller financial resources indicated the tobacco trade. Hine characteristically came down on the right side when he favoured sugar.

#### THE SUGAR HOUSE, 1662

That John Hine was in the sugar trade in 1662 is shown by a complaint made against his attempt to establish a sugar house and store in St. Thomas St. in January of 1661. On the eleventh of that month a certain Captain Rich, Mr Day and others inhabiting St. Thomas St. made representation to the Mayor and Aldermen in their Court (04417 (2)) against a store and sugar house in the holding of John Hine, a grocer, stating that they were very dangerous in that they might cause a fire in the neighbourhood. The Court duly considered the complaint; the Mayor decided that Mr Hine should remove his works and cease refining sugar in that locality. This order was to be obeyed by 25 March next.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was no hasty decision on the part of the authorities, because as far back as 1594 they had decreed that the chandlers, apothecaries and other inhabitants dwelling in the 'hart of this cittie that commonly use a house to boil tallow, oils, pitch or such like in their houses, henceforth should provide themselves with out houses in their gardens, or in other convenient places in the outskirts or suburbs of the cittie for the prevention of the danger of fire, which, of late, hath happened by occasion of melting and boiling thereof in their dwelling houses on pain that every one offending in doeing the contrary, shall forfeit for every offence, 15s'.

(Bristol Council Ordinances Henry VIII to William and Mary (1702) cf. 1647 Ordinance to Chandlers).

Hine complied with the Council's decree, agreeing that the site of the house was in a populous area on the river bank, near Bristol Bridge. He therefore removed to different quarters in the neighbourhood of Temple church on the confines of the city, where he could give no further offence. By so doing he sacrificed the advantages of a wharf on a river bank for what was perhaps of equal value, the siting of his works on land and property previously devoted to industry. A brewery, known as Shuttleworth's, had already been in operation on the site for sixty years, at the time of his purchase. This, too, had solved its own problem of water supply, which was no small benefit to the refinery. In addition, the new site lay alongside a low ditch (a common sewer) where surplus water could escape.<sup>1</sup>

From the start Hine introduced a new plan of workshop construction. By pulling down an existing brewery and buying additional plots of ruinous property in the immediate neighbourhood, he adapted his new premises to his specific design. This required a larger capital at the start of the undertaking but was to be more economical in the long run than the practice of other Bristol sugar refiners of reconstructing old houses. Hine set the new style of works construction which developed later in the sugar refineries in Lewin's Mead, Duck Lane, Halliers Lane and Nelson St. on the banks of the Frome, and at the Counterslip, St. Thomas St., Redcliffe St. sites in the neighbourhood of the Avon.

No sooner had the new refinery begun to work than another complaint was levelled at Hine, for not complying with a recent bye-law enforcing the pitching of pavements before both dwelling-houses and workshops. Hine, who had hardly got under way with his new undertaking (1662) left the pavement before the sugar house door unpitched. The Grand Jury who adjudged the offence punished Hine with an amercement of 6s 8d, a fine subsequently reduced by 8d. Another order

<sup>1</sup> The local inhabitants and the Corporation must have felt pleasure at their action in 1670 on the occasion of a fire at another house in Redcliffe St. when £1,000 was the recorded damage. See Latimer's *Annals of Bristol in the 17th Century*, p. 358.

commanded compliance within a fortnight's time on pain of another 3s 4d. Since this sum is not referred to in the contemporary Audit Book, it appears that the matter received immediate attention.<sup>1</sup>

At this juncture it is possible that Hine, realizing that his venture in Temple St. was not popular, planned to strengthen his position by offering a partnership to young Richard Lane. Henceforth the references to both men in their legal agreements as well as in the public petitions of complaint against their workshop, suggest that joint ownership and management began in 1662. After this date a strict division of management on the part of the two partners is evident, Lane being the general supervisor and Hine in control of the workmen. Both engaged in the purchase of raw sugar supplies on the quayside. In one of the port books, however, the firm rather than the proprietor is mentioned under the name of Richard Lane & Co.

In 1664 another complaint was directed against 'Mr Hine and Mr Lane' by members of the Temple Ward, who felt aggrieved that the refiners had 'not made good an arch that had fallen into the law ditch in Temple St.' This last remonstrance from the public taught them a lesson, for they were not brought up before the General Sessions until 1678, when they were cited for failing to carry away dirt from before the sugar house door.<sup>2</sup>

Hine's name appears more often in the Sessions Book than Lane's, because he lived in the neighbourhood and trained his apprentices there: he seems, too, to have been a more boisterous character than Lane, and so attracted popular attention to himself. On the other hand, Lane lived amongst his influential friends, Matthew Warren and the Cann family, in the centre of the city, where he kept shop, and housed his grocer apprentices. Not until 1668 did he take up his abode next to the refinery.

<sup>1</sup> Presentation by Grand Jurie 1666. Temple Ward 1662.

<sup>2</sup> A General Sessions Act 04452 (1) fol. 22, 1678. Bristol Archives Dept.

## INITIAL DIFFICULTIES

The primary difficulty concerned their financial resources. They required a workshop or bakery, a warehouse with a counting-house, a cooperage and stables, as well as residences for the two partners and their families and apprentices. Poll tax records show that each house contained nineteen windows and that they were among the largest dwellings in the area. In 1681 a separate house was secured for the works manager's use.

Other expenses covered utensils and implements, copper boilers and coolers, furnaces, spades and a dozen other iron tools, drip pots, clay, lime, coal as well as a supply of blue paper for wrapping purposes; these constituted the permanent stock for the possession of which a declared percentage profit was allowed in the annual assessment.

The third category included such liquid assets as adequate constant supplies of brown sugars, muscovadoes, molasses and syrups which were the objects of the refining processes, and again on the ownership of these another percentage profit was declared. It was the clerk's duty to declare an annual dividend after a consideration of these three headings.

The creation of a sugar colony, comprising two managers' houses, as well as workmen's cottages, is a rough indication of the period which a young firm took to stand on its own feet, since, generally speaking, it depended on the time it took to accumulate profits which could be ploughed back into bricks and mortar. The Temple St. deeds tell us that this did not take place before 1681, nearly twenty years from the start, and three years after the dissolution of the Lane-Hine partnership.

It says much for the financial resources of the two partners that they could call on the necessary capital at a time so near the conclusion of the Civil War. A survey of the firm's purchases of raw sugar at the quayside suggests that their facilities warranted no more than one pan to supply their needs. The partners had to find £1,000 each to cover the initial expenses of the undertaking. That such a sum as £2,000 was necessary means that the risks, especially that of fire, were great.

*Richard Lane's Years of Preparation (1630-60)*

Richard Lane was born in the early years of the reign of Charles I; his first thirty years represented a generation of preparation and training during the hard years of the Commonwealth: the remaining decades of his long life (he died 1704/5) were divided into two periods. The first seventeen years (1661-78) extended his knowledge of industry; after the death of his merchant-brother, George (iii) (1679), he entered into the full status of merchant venturer and sugar refiner and distiller (1679-1704/5). In this period he crowned his successes with political honours in Bristol.

Up to 1660 the Apprentices' Lists mention apprenticeship to the Puritan grocer and sugar baker, Thomas Goldney. His was Bristol's sole sugar house at this time and it seems likely that young Richard received his first acquaintance with this business there. In all probability he first met some of his later business rivals there, for Thomas Taylor had been made a Bristol citizen on 8 March 1666, after an apprenticeship under Thomas Goldney.

The Apprentices' Lists show that on attaining his burgess's rights in 1654 he founded a grocery business, and took his first trainee, John Steward (1654-61).<sup>1</sup> The Corporation archives provide the documentary substance for the second period (1662-78) in the Apprentices' Lists and the property deeds. The first source shows that he trained five lads as grocers, but not as sugar-bakers. He divided his activities with Hine whose authority covered the work of the refinery and the management of the workmen there. Hine contracted with Henry Snell's parent, of Evershall, Somerset, to train him in the art of a sugar baker.<sup>2</sup>

*Richard Lane's work at the Temple St. refinery, 1662-78*

Three of the Temple St. property deeds show that Lane

<sup>1</sup> Apprentices' List, 18 October 1654 John Steward, son of John Steward, late of Bristol, merchant, deceased, apprenticed to Richard Lane and wife for seven years—no fee.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Snell's apprenticeship 1671-1678.

was the moving spirit in the partnership in the first decade of its existence (1662-69). They record the creation of the sugar house out of a brewery (1662), the building of two substantial residences side by side on four moderately sized plots, to accommodate the two partners (1664); and the erection of a new warehouse covering the garden ground attached to the two messuages (1669). The final stage, the creation of a genuine sugar colony, was not reached in Lane's lifetime. It depended on the accommodation for a works manager which was not achieved until 1681, three years after the dissolution of the partnership.

The rental of the refinery is recorded in the 1661 lease on a piece of freehold property which was let to Richard Lane and John Hine for 40 years (1661-1701) by Richard Crabb, a local clothier.

The premises stood on ground which extended some 300 ft. from Temple St. on the west and the Law Ditch on the east. The land occupied the site of Shuttleworth's brewery, a messuage wherein presumably dwelt the proprietor, a stable and a garden. The block of buildings stood on four plots of land whereon (originally) had been seven small household sites, together with a larger plot on which the brewery stood. One deed concerns a tenement with a stable adjoining which the partners absorbed into the sugar house as offices and accommodation, paying from 1662 an annual rental charge of £25. There was, however, a drawback on entry into the buildings; existing utensils consisting of a furnace, a mill, a tunn, the irons belonging to the furnace, and the 'meshoote'. The late owner promised to allow £20 off the first year's rent to compensate the sugar bakers for their trouble in clearing the last tenant's utensils and for the repair of the works. Eventually the refiners must have purchased the property, because in 1712 George Hine, the legatee, sold it for £520 to the quinquepart of association who succeeded to the sugar house.

*The dual residences, adjacent, occupied and owned by the initial partners, 1668*

It is surprising that negotiations for the purchase of messuages whereon to erect two substantial residences for the

two partners were deferred for eight years after those of the sugar works. At that time Lane and Hine each found £400 out of their private funds to pull down the four houses and to erect two of their own pattern. Even then there was enough garden left to house a new warehouse at a later date. The 1668 deeds record that both residences faced Temple St. and ended at the Law Ditch, thus covering the 300 ft. stretch between those two landmarks. Lane, as the senior partner, had the house next to the sugar house.

In 1671 Lane made it clear in a separate deed with his partner that each had contributed £400 out of his private means and not out of the co-partnership funds. This statement was the more necessary on the building of the next warehouse in the garden grounds of the two family mansions. Without this denial it might have seemed that the partnership capital, which had paid for the warehouse, also covered the expense of the residences.

It is not known what Lane charged Hine for his own residence on the dissolution of the partnership in 1679, but Hine's will (1698) gives both houses to his sons George and Edward, both of whom succeeded to the entire sugar establishment on the death of John Hine (1699).

#### *The Manager's house, 1681*

The latest property deed refers to the manager's house which was situated in Temple St. though not adjacent to the refinery. It was purchased by John Hine in his own capacity as sugar proprietor and as part of the sugar works unit, as is shown by the 1712 negotiations with the five partners of John Macie and Co.; George Hine sold both the works and the manager's house for a total sum of £520. John Hine's will (18 February 1698), refers to this particular tenement together with his other properties in Temple St. as legacies to his second son George, the future owner and manager of the works.

#### *John Hine—the junior partner*

The threefold character of Lane's career was repeated in the affairs of the junior partner. Hine, born and bred in the

Somerset village of Wincanton, favoured lads similarly reared, as is evident in the number and character of the apprentices whom he took into his service, as a small landowner's son himself. Three of the six whom he trained at the refinery with Lane came from the neighbouring counties of Wiltshire (his wife's home), Dorset and Monmouth. Even before he was a sugar refiner he took his first apprentice, Henry Earle, a son of a Wiltshire yeoman and a near relation of his wife's, who, like her, came from the village of Holt. John Hine clung to the countryside; he left his tenement and farmstead in Holt together with all grounds, meadows and 'feedings' and appurtenances, there, to his eldest son John. If in 1647 he left his home at Wincanton for good, it was not long before he resolved to marry a Wiltshire country-woman and to put his city profits into more land at Holt. Hine proved a hard task-master both to his apprentices and his servants. He was a hard worker himself, and intolerant towards those under him.

The difference of function that separated the pursuits of Lane and Hine in the sugar house is indicated by their attitude towards apprenticeship. Lane's trainees were all associated with the grocery trade, whilst Hine's (four out of the six) were connected with sugar boiling and baking.

The apprenticeship entry form for Hine's next two trainees—James Weare<sup>1</sup> and Thomas Phillips, indicate that their instruction was in the art of sugar baking and at the end of their seven years' training they were taken under the care of Thomas Eagles, the works manager. Weare and Phillips, both bondless and in all probability sons of local labourers, found employment under Hine at an annual wage of between £12 10s 0d and £13 and so were destined to the heavy work of the boiler house and the drying room. These may have been the two servants referred to in the Ward Poll books.

Hine's younger son, John, was a more interesting apprentice. It would seem that the future of the family depended on the

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps another member of the Weare family found employment in the Hine household for, in 1702, John Hine (ii) gave £10 at his death to Ann Weare, the daughter of Samuel Weare, to be paid her at the age of 21, or on the occasion of her marriage. She appears to have been a maid-servant in his household.

efforts of the two elder boys, Edward, apprenticed as a merchant and John as a grocer. Together they were to re-enact the functions of the Lane brothers of the previous generation. Edward was to travel the seas even to the Antilles to deal with West Indian planters through whose agency the refinery, under John's care, was to be assured of constant supplies of raw sugars. John was to learn the distributive side of the grocery trade, by journeying along the Severn Valley through South Welsh ports and even to Ireland. This required more than the customary seven years' apprenticeship; it occupied ten years. He became a burgess in 1684, three years after the ordinary term of service. Then he seems to have entered his father's house as a manager. References to him in the Temple Ward Poll books show that he made his will in 1702, three years after his father's death, in 1699; he was then a bachelor, living and apparently thriving as a sugar refiner at the Temple St. house.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Genealogy of the Hines of Bristol*. This genealogy of the Bristol family of Hine, comprising thirteen members, eight of whom were males, stems from a certain Somerset yeoman, named Edward Hine of Wincanton, and ends three generations later, with the three sons and one daughter of a second Edward; it thus covers a full century, generally called the Early and Late Stuart periods. The table was constructed partly from such public sources of information as the Apprentices' Lists and Burgess Rolls of the Bristol Corporation, and partly from the last wills and testaments of four principal members of the family. Though it makes no claim to completeness, even from the male point of view, it is necessarily faulty from the female view by reason of the paucity of material of a domestic nature. Nevertheless, the record indicates fairly accurately the family ascendancy during the second and third generations as the result of John (i's) prosperity as a Bristol sugar baker (1662-99), as well as the rise in social status, on the occasion of the marriages of two of John (i's) daughters into the Brickdale family—Lord of the manor of Felton in the neighbourhood of Bristol.

A second set of original documents was consulted in order to establish the activities of a social and personal character of the various members throughout the several generations. These comprised the Poll Tax Assessments which showed their status as bachelors or married men, their household dimensions, the numbers of their children—all points for assessment of taxation—as well as the property deeds which, at various periods, showed the growth of their wealth. Alongside these facts were placed the public duties then assumed from time to time. All this investigation was made in an effort to establish the reasons why certain business men's families in the sugar industry—whether proprietors or managers—failed to maintain the high office and status of their great progenitor.

The older Hine was haunted by the fear that technical secrets might leak out to rivals in the city. His four workmen were always under suspicion. The principal one was a German, Abraham Short<sup>1</sup> of Hamburg; he is referred to in local documents as a sugar baker, but he never attained recognition as such by the City Fathers. It seems likely, from arrangements at other English and Scottish sugar firms, that Short lived under Hine's roof at an annual salary of £60 a year and was one of the unnamed servants mentioned in the 1690 and 1692 local Poll books. He may have been a naturalized denizen of England like Godfrey von Itterne at the Whitson Court sugar house, but received no official recognition in the eyes of a local by-law of 1594 which stated that constant employment of strangers or foreigners was forbidden except in times of the fairs. How long Short stayed with Hine and when he first arrived here is not known.

The identification of Hine's second servant mentioned in the 1690 Poll Book is less certain, but there is independent evidence to suggest that it was Henry Snell, already mentioned as an apprentice.

John Dew, sugar baker, may have been another workman under Hine. Until 1690 (Poll Book for St. James' parish), he was employed at the Whitson Court sugar house (see *Trans. B.G.A.S.*, vol. 65, 1944); but in 1699 he was living in the Temple district. According to the Bristol Audit Book 1699-1700, p. 1,

<sup>1</sup> Barrett, *History of Bristol*, p. 551, speaks of Mr Abraham Short as 'of Hambrought'. *Manchee*, vol. 1, p. 407 refers to Abraham Short as a sugar baker, servant to John Hine.

*List of Foreign Sugar boilers (not refiners) to Bristol Sugar Houses.*

- (1) Swearingen, 1755. 'Sunday died, Mr Swearingen, an eminent Sugar boiler of this City'. 'F.F. B'tol Journal. 25 Oct-1 Nov. 1755.' Samuel Swearingen married Frances Foster, 24 May 1710, by licence. (Temple Church Weddings Register).
- (2) Abraham Short of Hamburg, c. 1670.
- (3) Godfrey Vonittern, c. 1669.
- (4) Imer Peden, c. 1775. cf. 1775 Bristol Directory.
- (5) John Otto, c. 1770.
- (6) Harman Wintman, was made a citizen of Bristol 17 December 1768, by virtue of his marriage with Sarah, daughter of Tho. Price, labourer, decd. cf. Bristol Burgess Rolls.

# THE HINE GENEALOGY

EDWARD HINE (i), of Wincanton, Somerset, Yeoman.

JOHN HINE, b. 1631. A.L. 25-1-1647  
 Jn. Hine was apprenticed to John Sanders. £100 was paid with the apprenticeship.  
 B.R. 29-1-1654, Jn. Hine, grocer, ad. app. of Jn. Sanders.  
 C.C. 1680-4 and 1688-9  
 Sheriff, Feb.-Sept. 1688.  
 Mayor 1696-7.  
 1696 'designated gentleman' in 1696 Commissioner (Poll Book).  
 1698 died 28 April, aged 68.  
 1699 Will proved 19 May.

= MERCY, d. of Jn. Earland  
 Joan Bush, of Holt,  
 Wilts.  
 Died 14 May 1696.

JOHN HINE (ii), b. 1660 (?). A.L. 6-4-1674  
 app. to father as sugar baker.  
 B.R. 25-2-1680 app. to father as sugar baker  
 By his father's will (1699) he was given his farm lands, meadows, feedings, etc. in Holt, Wilts.  
 1702 His will dated Apr. 18. P.C.C. 10 Dec. 1702. Designated 'sugar baker' in his will.  
 In 1726 he was to have £100 from brother George's will.

EDWARD (ii), Merchant. Called a 'merchant' in bro. Jn.'s will 1702.  
 Widower in 1706 Assessment

= REBECCA

GEORGE (i), b. 1678 (?) A.L. 1692 to father as sugar baker.  
 B.R. 14-5-1699 to father as sugar baker.  
 1704 Poll Bk., then unmarried. £600 qualification.  
 1726 will dated 8 Dec. 1725. P.C.C. (15-1-1725/6).  
 Buried in Temple Church.

ANN. £600 qualification in 1704 Poll Book. £500 from father's will.

ELIZABETH, £600 qualification in 1704 Poll Bk. 1705 will dated. £500 from father's will.

JOANNA, b. at Holt, July 1661. £600 qualification in 1704 Poll Book.  
 1699 heiress of her father. £500 from father's will.  
 d. Jan. 1747. Buried in Temple Church, Bristol.

= RICHARD BRICKDALE

HESTER, m. at Temple Church, Bristol. 27-6-1701.  
 1706 mentioned in Poll Book.  
 £500 from father's will. Buried in Temple Church, Bristol.

= JOHN BRICKDALE

MERCY. Will dated 1704. Mentioned in 1706 Poll Book. £500 from father's will.

JOHN (iii)

EDWARD (iii), b. before 1706.  
 A.L. 31-11-1725 £48 paid with his apprenticeship as a hooper. (Rd. Spencer.)  
 B.R. 1-9-1733.

GEORGE II, b. before 1706.  
 B.R. 4-3-1736 mariner. 1739 will.

ANN

= THO. MANSELL,  
 jeweller.

JOHN BRICKDALE, of Knowle, Lord of Manor of Felton.

= ELIZABETH BOUND, d. and eventually co-heir of Rt. Bound, Esq. d. of Rt Bound by Eliz., d. of Sir Jn. Hawkins, Kt.  
 Bapt. Bristol, 18 Dec. 1705.  
 1731 married at Redcliffe Church.  
 Died Nov. 13 1742, aged 36.  
 Buried in Temple Church, Bristol.

John Dew lived on the north side of Temple Church, previously called 'The Cow House'.

The most revealing side of Hine's character comes out in the story of Roger Newport, reported in the Corporation records known as the Recognizances.<sup>1</sup> There was a material difference in status between apprenticeship with a money bond and one without it. Roger Newport, because he was in the position to pick up the inner secrets of the refining processes, was in his master's grip; and how tight that hold was we shall recognize in the behaviour of the magistrates to whom the case was reported.

We first hear of Newport in 1672, when he was serving Hine as his hewer of wood and drawer of water. After four years' service it appears that his position irked him, so that he connived at apprenticeship with another tradesman of the city—one Francis Child, a victualler who told the City authorities in 1683 that he had sheltered Newport in his household as his trainee. The true story leaked out, however, when Hine discovered that Newport had obtained his apprenticeship papers from the City Chamberlain. Hine thereupon took proceedings against the delinquent. In 1676 whilst Newport was living under Hine's roof at an annual wage of £12 10s *od* to £13, with food and lodging, he made a compact with one Francis Child to undergo a seven-year period of training as a victualler.<sup>2</sup> Together they obtained papers from the City Fathers, unknown to Hine: and so things continued until two days before the expiry of this service when the City Chamberlain granted Newport permission to set up shop and refine salt. When Newport thought his service to Hine had been completed he told his master the actual state of affairs. Newport had not reckoned on Hine's masterful nature. The latter reported the case to the Tolzey Court on 9 January 1683. The City officer

<sup>1</sup> 'Wages in the Sugar industry 1672'. Recognizances 1683-93, pp. 2-3. 'Case of Mr Hine's journeyman, Roger Newport, sugar baker' from 1672.

<sup>2</sup> Burgess Rolls. 27 August 1683.

took proceedings against Newport by shutting down his shop window and casting him into gaol at Newgate until his case should be tried. In October 1684, the Mayor and Common Council reviewed the case and decided to set Newport free and to fine him £40. Newport was at liberty to set up shop again, as he did, for in 1696 Assessment Window Tax for Redcliffe, Roger Newport was carrying on the trade of a salt refiner in that area.<sup>1</sup>

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the absence of a firm's business ledgers, letters and minute books, there is no better set of records on which to base the story of a firm's development than the property deeds. Consisting generally of indentures and assignments, articles of agreement and wills, they provide a background of fact. In the interests of clarity I have allowed them to shape the course of the narrative.

According to formula, the first item of information concerns the parties to the agreement: by comparing these names in the series of legal contracts, dating from the early years of Charles II (1661) to 1731 (when the refinery was extended by a distillery) we can list the succession of property holders (who very often possessed the majority of the shares in the business concern). In this way we ascertain the exact length of time served by each partner, the dates of his appointment and of his disappearance. The firms occupying the Temple St. refinery were:—

Richard Lane and John Hine	(1662-78)
John Hine and Thomas Eagles	(1679-99)
George Hine	(1700-12)
John Macie & Co.	(1712-31)
John Pinfold & Co.	(1731-42)

<sup>1</sup> Lewin's Mead Chapel. Treasurer's Account Book 1690-1. Roger Newport 1692. His name occurred on p. 22 and continued till p. 26, when it ceased with the following:—

p. 22.	Roger Newport paid in	£7-15-0	(1693)
p. 23.	„ „ „	£7-17-6	(1694)
p. 24.	„ „ „	£7- 2-6	(169 5)

Note on p. 25, 1696. Cash paid to Roger Newport's account, £5-10-0.

Page 26. Balance of Roger Newport's account is the last reference to Roger Newport.

What is equally informative in the remaining part of the contract are the conditions imposed on the participants. These varied according to the necessity and occasion of the event, and arose out of the day-to-day discussions and criticisms of procedure within the firm. Sometimes they concerned new schemes for business expansion, additional premises and facilities, all centring around the all-important question of capital and its extended uses in the art and mystery of sugar baking. As business expanded, so the partners divided their shares into quarters, ninths, thirtieths and even sixtieths, items which are indicative of change in administration. Changes of service and personnel found their way into these records after they had become operative in the affairs of the company. Thus we associate the management of the coeperage with one partner, that of transport with another, that of general management with another, of secretaryship with another, until all departments of the business were controlled by those having capital shares in the company:

#### AUTHORITIES (*Unprinted*)

##### BRISTOL

##### A. (a) *Corporation Archives.*

Apprentices' Lists (A.L.), Burgess Rolls (B.R.)

For Richard Lane and family; John Hine and sons; Thomas Eagles and sons; John Pinfold; Freke family; John Macie; James Haynes.

(b) Servants to Foreign Plantations for Richard Lane, John Hine.

(c) Property deeds. Sugar House in

(i) St. Peter's churchyard (1612-98).

(ii) Temple St. Sugar House deeds.

(d) *Session Books.* 04417 (2) January 1661.

04452 (1) f. 22 1678.

Presentations to Grand Jurie 1628-66 Temple Ward 1662.

Presentations to Grand Jurie 1628-66 Temple Ward 1664.

(e) Bristol Council Ordinances, Henry VIII to William and Mary 1694—pro. 36 Eliz. I (1594).

(f) Recognizances 1683-93 8/5/1691.

(g) Poll books (Temple Ward) 1687.

##### B. Merchant Venturers' Society Archives.

C. Bristol Central Library: Brackenridge Collection Vol. 22 for the Hine coat of arms.

D. Temple Church. Mural tablet to Hine family in church chancel.

##### LONDON

Public Record Office: wills of Hines, Eagles, in Somerset House.  
Bristol Port books.

AUTHORITIES (*Printed*)

## BRISTOL

1. Barrett, *History of Bristol*.
2. Latimer, *Annals of Bristol in 17th century*, p. 358.
3. *Manchee*, vol. 1, p. 407.
4. Rev. A. B. Beaven, *Bristol Lists*, for Richard Lane and John Hine.
5. *Trans. B.G.A.S.* (1944), vol. 65, pp. 1-97, article on 'Whitson Court House'.
6. *ibid.*, vol. 68 (1949).
7. Bristol Record Society's Publications (1955). 'Merchants and Merchandise in 17th century Bristol', by P. McGrath, M.A.