

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

The Daubenys: Part I

by I. V. Hall
1965, Vol. 84, 113-140

© The Society and the Author(s)

The Daubenys:

One of the most energetic Sugar Baker Families in Eighteenth Century Bristol at the Temple St. and Halliers Lane Refineries

PART I under GEORGE DAUBENY I

By I. V. HALL

SINGULARLY little attention has been paid by local historians to the business and public activities of the Daubeny family who flourished throughout the 18th century as top-ranking citizens. Of aristocratic stock, this minor branch displayed all the vigour and initiative of their ancestors and, well before its fourth generation as city dwellers, ascended the social scale from grocer and sugar baker to Merchant Venturer and banker status; steadily generation by generation, each member gathered honours in civic and latterly in national circles, distinctions which ranked them amongst the most eminent of Bristol's citizens. Moreover, by conducting their own refinery at Halliers Lane throughout three generations, they shared with the Popes at the Whitson Court Sugar house (1684-1803), the local claim of serving the industry the longest in the long line of sugar baker families.¹

Each of the four Georges succeeded the other as head of the firm and contributed, according to the needs of his time, to both the firm's and the family's accomplishments. George I (1687-1741) by dint of hard work, initiative and drive, prospered initially as a grocer (1710-1719), later as a partner in the Temple Street refinery (1719-1731) and finally as sole proprietor of the Halliers Lane works (1731-1741). There he laid down the general principles of business management and workshop development carried on by his successors—the fruits of his previous experience in the trade. From the start, he organized the project on a family basis with his son George II (1714-1760) latterly as conjoint partner in the property and specifically in the mercantile side of the business; this was in 1738 when his son, trained in his father's office, was accepted as a member of the Merchant Venturers Society. In the same year he also offered the works-management to Robert Bridle (1713-1780) who had been apprenticed locally as a grocer. This dual relationship between the two juniors formed the basis of the firm's success because both men worked in tandem with

A.L. = Apprentices Lists. B.R. = Burgess Rolls.

¹ *Trans. BGAS*, vol. 65 (1944), p. 80.

pre-eminent cordiality. This simplification of management avoided the perils of a quinquepartite partnership with which George I had been brought up during the early part of his career at the Temple Street refinery.

Furthermore by reinvesting his annual profits in bricks and mortar and the necessary equipment in the refinery, he added a second sugar house alongside the original Halliers Lane works, thus strengthening the manufacturing unit to its maximum capacity, not again extended throughout the remaining decades of the century. In these ways, he established the family's prosperity during the peaceful years of the Walpolean Era.

In furtherance of his parental instructions, George Daubeny II prepared the business for its wartime conditions by adding stabling and warehousing accommodation on three occasions, in 1748 and 1750 under peacetime arrangements, and again in 1757 in the early years of the Seven Years War. And to maintain further the family hold on the concern, he trained his younger brother John I (1719-1749) as well as his own two sons George III (1742-1806) and John II (1750-1795) as merchants, and all three entered the august body of the Merchant Venturers Society, and served it in honoured capacities. Characteristic too of the local sugar bakers in the second half of the 18th century, George II ascended the social scale by acquiring the manorial seat at Norton Malreward on the Somerset foothills of the Mendips in addition to sending two other sons to Oxford, preparatory to their entry into Holy Orders.

In spite of his early death at 46, he accomplished much on behalf of the firm, but his greatest contribution was his lifelong association with Robert Bridle whose activities fortunately covered the succeeding generations of the family, ending eventually in the middle years of the American War of Independence.

The second half of the century was dominated by the most accomplished member of the family—George III (1742-1806) who further advanced the partnership set-up by amalgamating his business with Francis Harris whose father (John Harris) had conducted another refinery at Lewin's Mead. This step not only filled the gap in the Daubeny management, occasioned by the death of Robert Bridle (1780), but also answered the local demand for more industrial capital during the period between the American War of Independence and the French Revolutionary War.

George III planned his activities on a more ambitious scale than his predecessors. A public career ran alongside his commercial and industrial undertakings and for three years he represented Bristol as

her M.P. (1781-1784). Immediately on obtaining the Freedom of the City—in his 25th year—he entered the City Council (1769) and served it both as common councillor and as alderman to the day of his death. In 1769-1770 he acted as Sheriff, in 1786-1787 as Mayor, in 1788-1790 as Governor of the Incorporation of the Poor, and in 1775 as President of the Dolphin Society.¹ In addition to these many and various offices, he helped in the promotion of the Bristol theatre (1764),² in the foundation of the New Bank of Messrs Ames, Cave & Co. (1786-1806)³ and in 1798 he amalgamated the Redcliffe and Phoenix Glasshouses to save them from financial disaster.⁴ Throughout these busy years, he left the control of the refinery in the hands of his brother John II (1773-1795) and later of his son George IV (1800-1812), but both he and they found time to attend committee meetings on behalf of St. James church⁵ with which the family had been closely associated since 1711 on the occasion of his grandparents' marriage there. Undoubtedly the most active-minded of the Daubenys up-to-date was George III.

Within a decade of his death, however, the decline of the Daubeny interest in the sugar house set in. The occasion co-incided with the dying years of the Napoleonic War when George IV, for good or ill, relinquished the family's pursuits for the life of a country gentleman. He retained the ownership of the Halliers Lane property but handed over the manufacturing side to Messrs Biggs and Savery at an annual rental. He then retired to an estate at Cote on the western fringe of Bristol, a mansion set in the midst of lawns and gardens with a glorious view of the Avon valley and the sweeping range of the Westbury Downs.

In view of what happened to the refinery within five years of George IV's retirement from it, one wonders if he did not regret the

¹ Rev. A. B. Beaven, 'Daubeny', *Bristol Lists*, p. 285.

² Latimer, *Annals of Bristol in the 18th Century*, pp. 364-5.

³ C. H. Cave, *History of Banking in Bristol*, pp. 11, 14, 107 and 110.

⁴ The following note on George Daubeny III's undertaking in the Redcliffe Backs Glasshouse (1798-1806) was given to me by Mrs B. Harding who is researching into the history of the Bristol Glass Industry.

'The Redcliffe Backs Glasshouse was in the hands of William Stephens in the 1790s. He became bankrupt in 1798 and it is possible that George Daubeny and John Cave took over the business as sole proprietors and partners from that date, although the firm continued under the name of Stephens. Certainly they controlled the business in 1802 for on 6 Feb. they advised their customers that they had entered into partnership with the owners of the Phoenix Glasshouse at Temple Gate (Ricketts & Evans). In 1807 the executors of George Daubeny received £1834 11 3 from the above company—this represented Daubeny's share as co-partner in the Temple Gate and Redcliffe Backs concern.'

⁵ Extracts from the will of Mrs Mary Lewis, decd. containing her bequests in favour of the parish of St. James, Bristol. Proceedings of the Minister and churchwardens of the said parish in the distribution of the aforesaid charity, Thomas Biddulph, Minister, 1808. St. James church records.

decision. To prevent a fire at the works had been the constant care of his ancestors for a century, but in 1817, the entire buildings, refineries, warehouses and manager's house were engulfed in flames, leaving them in utter ruins. Both the owner of the site, and the occupiers, unwilling to restore the buildings and the business, left the century-old structure for good; another of the city's refineries faced closure for ever. In 1820, George IV sold the site to the Society for the Education of the Poor which straight way pulled down the ruinous buildings and executed elaborate plans for the erection of a school. Life and animation were restored to the neighbourhood. Eventually this institution made way for the more famous 'Trade and Mining School'—itself the forerunner of the yet more famous Merchant Venturers School and College.

This is, in essence, the story of the Daubenys in general outline. Throughout the 18th century the Daubeny family flourished as sugar bakers, merchants and bankers in Bristol and contributed their full share to the welfare of the city.

Even in the 19th century when the family rose to professional levels in the Church, Army and Medicine, they still retained their local connections: Charles Giles Bridle Daubeny, renowned in Oxford and Edinburgh no less than in Bristol, delivered the inaugural lecture to the Philosophical Institute in Bristol in 1823. Later in the century, Joseph Walters Daubeny acted as Sheriff (1850-1851) and George Walters Daubeny presided over the Gloucestershire Society (1887). The last member of the family to concern herself with local affairs was Dame Mabel Daubeny who, on the eve of the last war, organized the Poppy Fund on behalf of the British Legion. Throughout the two full centuries the Daubenys were intimately associated with the lives and activities of Bristol's citizens at top-level status and thoroughly merited their local esteem.¹

The family, however, has other claims to recognition. It possesses a genealogy which goes back to the Conquest. In the words of the *Genealogical Magazine*, 'the House of Daubeny possesses a pedigree of which it can boast is surpassed by no other—the direct male line since the Conquest, bearing Arms from the earliest period—a pedigree including the names of ancestors who have made history to the present generation, the twenty-second in male descent from a companion of the Conqueror. What genealogist could wish better?'² The earliest

¹ J. Reynolds Green, *History of Botany in the United Kingdom*, p. 423. Felix Farley's *Bristol Journal*, 2 Nov., 1822; 28 Dec. 1822 and 11 Jan. 1823. Also Rev. A. B. Beaven, *Bristol Lists* under 'Daubeny', p. 339 and 'Notable Tributes to Miss Mabel Daubeny' *Western Daily Press*, 2 April 1938, and *Bristol Mirror*, 16 April 1938. ² *The Genealogical Magazine*, No. 87, July 1904.

member, Robert de Todenei, came over to this country as the Standard Bearer of William I, whilst his eldest son, William de Albini, commemorated his British birth by taking the additional designation of 'Brito', and a third generation, another William, swore to the observation of the Magna Carta. Each of the succeeding generations tells the story of an active participation in the country's affairs, acquiring manors and lordships throughout the south and west of England, the nearest to Bristol being the manors of Tockington and Swell in Gloucestershire.¹ Eventually the Daubenys settled down on the fringe of the Somerset-Dorset borders where the best monument of their existence—Barrington Court—in South Somerset stands. This pile of Gothic and Renaissance architecture was raised by a family hero in Tudor times who returned home after serving on the Field of the Cloth of Gold (1514) and today, it is in the care of the National Trust.²

By the 17th century, a minor branch of the family congregated as small landowners around the Dorset villages of Litton Cheney, Pulham and Bishop's Caundle³ and around Holwell in Somerset and indeed, it was as a 'gentleman' that Andrew Daubeny, the father of George Daubeny I—in whom we are primarily interested as a Bristolian—was described on the occasion of his son's apprenticeship in Bristol in 1703. Because Andrew Daubeny was the second son with minor stakes in the family holdings, his son George I had to fend for himself and so he was attracted to Bristol, the loadstone of commercial and industrial endeavours in the 17th and 18th centuries. With George I's success in Bristol, this side of the family developed new phases of activity, as grocers and sugar bakers, as Merchant Venturers and even as local and, in the case of George III, as a national politician, activities which paved the way for further distinctions in the following century. Enriched by their transactions in the West Indian centre of trade, the family members again reverted to their landowning proclivities by purchasing local estates around Bristol, at Cote in the large parish of Westbury-on-Trym. These they retained well into the 19th century.

GEORGE DAUBENY I

In August 1703, Andrew Daubeny journeyed to Bristol from Holwell, a small Somerset village comprising some 2,000 acres, to sign an apprenticeship agreement with a distant relative—Dawbeny

¹ W. J. Robinson, *West Country Mannors*—'Tockington Manor', p. 181 and *Friends of Bristol Cathedral*, p. 10, note 16.

² Fletcher Moss, *Pilgrimages to Old Homes*, p. 186 and Robert Cooke, *West Country Houses*.

³ The family's monumental mural tablet in the major line is in Bishop's Caundle church, Dorset.

Buckler—on behalf of his elder son George I. Buckler bargained to instruct the youth in the arts of the grocery trade throughout the coming seven years. The omission of a premium, a customary feature of such a compact, was no doubt due to the family character of the agreement.¹

The occupation of grocer was a pursuit not to be despised because it was the gateway to so many openings in the mercantile world; certainly to the setting up of a grocery store immediately on acquiring the Freedom of Bristol; perhaps to the eventual management of a sugar bakery or a distillery if the youthful grocer married well or fell in with a partner willing to advance his claims as a clerk as the initial step on the ladder of progress to a junior partnership. And if fortune further favoured him, he might be granted other interests—after showing competency as an accountant for a year or two—i.e. a share in the 'profits and losses' of the business; still further in the property ownership if he could find capital to cover the concession. These were the benefits offered to a competent clerk in those days. Should an elderly associate in the firm relinquish his part-share and offer it to the junior member, the advance was the more rapid. Such were the stages of progress that George I experienced so that, within five years of employment under David Macie & Co. (sugar refiners at Temple Street), i.e. well before he was 40 years of age, George I was the proud partner in the sugar house, utensils and business as well as in a distillery attached thereto, and well before his 50th year, the possessor of his own sugar bakery at Halliers Lane. Moreover by 1741, the date of his death, he had launched his nine children well on the road to success.

His Youth and Early Manhood

Two differing sets of local records, covering the years 1703 when he began his grocer apprenticeship to 1719 when he was appointed the clerk to the Temple Street refinery in the firm of David Macie & Co. give the details of his early training and constitute Stage 1 in his career as a grocer. By the end of this period the St. Nicholas parish registers show that eight of his eleven children were born and the rest of them came in the course of the next decade.

Born at Buckshaw Hill in the village of Holwell, he was baptized at Bishop's Caundle on 5 July 1687; this means that he had attained

¹ A.L. 12.8.1703. George Daubeny, son of Andrew Daubeny, of Holwell, Somerset, gentleman, was apprenticed to Dawbeny Buckler, as a grocer for 7 years. Friends to find apparel. B.R. 4.10.1710. George Daubeny, grocer was admitted to the Freedom of Bristol, having been an apprentice of Dawbeny Buckler, grocer.

the age of 16 at the time of his apprenticeship, and that by 1710, when he became a Freeman of Bristol, he was 23 years of age. A year later he married Jane Lloyd, the daughter of a local merchant, John Lloyd, an inhabitant of the parish of St. James on the other side of the city. It was at the bride's church that the couple were married on 3 April 1711 and straightway George I assumed the responsibility for training a grocer assistant.

He may have set up shop for himself immediately on receiving his Burgess Rights, but what is more likely is that he went into partnership with his master. That Dawbeny Buckler and he were parishioners of St. Nicholas church is evident from the lists of their respective families in the St. Nicholas Baptisms and Burials throughout the lifetimes of the two families. Moreover George I was Buckler's last apprentice and a likely successor of his relative's establishment; again Buckler was a man of fifty in 1713 and was more closely interested in the malt industry with his son Edward in the last part of his career than in the grocery store, and therefore the more inclined to hand over the store to George Daubeny. And so we may take it for granted that George I trained his four assistants at the Buckler store.¹

The Second Stage of his Career at the Temple Street Refinery

The death of Dawbeny Buckler in 1719 presented George I with the first crisis of his business career.² He then took over Buckler's store and ran it with hired labour under his own supervision; at the same time he entered the sugar world as clerk at the Temple Street sugar house. The two activities were not unconnected; as a fully-fledged grocer, he not only enhanced his status in the eyes of his new

¹ The four apprentices were:—

A.L. 28.5.1712. John Howell, son of David Howell, late of the parish of Llangunner, in Co. Carmarthen, gentleman, decd. was apprenticed to George Daubeny, as a grocer for 7 years. £100 premium. (Howell's burgeship does not appear in the Burgess Rolls.)

A.L. 13.2.1717/8. Charles Abington, son of Andrew Abington, of Stalbridge, Dorset, gentleman, was apprenticed to George Daubeny, as a grocer for 7 years. £45 premium. B.R. 29.6.1727 Charles Abington, grocer, was admitted as a Burgess, having been an apprentice of George Daubeny.

A.L. 16.12.1718. Joseph Carpenter, son of John Carpenter, of Launceston, Cornwall, iron-monger, decd. was apprenticed to George Daubeny, as a grocer for 7 years. Jane Daubeny was also mentioned in the A.L. (No. B.R. for Carpenter in the Burgess Rolls.)

A.L. 7.1.1724. John Room, son of Solomon Room of Bristol, weaver, was apprenticed to George Daubeny, as a grocer for 7 years. George Daubeny's wife Jane was also mentioned in this A.L. £10, the gift of Edward Colston, Esq., decd. was made to Daubeny. B.R. 7.11.1739. John Room, *sugar baker*, was admitted as a Bristol Burgess, having been an apprentice of George Daubeny.

² Dawbeny Buckler's will, dated 1719—Bristol Archives Office.

employers but also guaranteed his new commitments at the refinery out of his annual profits. Moreover, by offering employment to Howell, his first grocer-trainee, he secured continuity of instruction to his second servant, Charles Abington, who had just completed the second year of his seven years' apprenticeship.

Being now a man of 32, with the responsibility for a growing family, and nearing the end of his second decade of residence in Bristol, George I made several shrewd observations about the economic set-up of the city and the industrial developments on his doorstep. These concerned the growth of the sugar industry and its associated subsidiary, the distillation of rum, brandies, strong waters and vinegar—pursuits intimately connected with Bristol's intensifying interests in the West Indian trade and the country's economy in relation to her late enemy, France. To reduce importations of French wines and brandies was the immediate and insistent cry of the economists and politicians of the day.

George I was the child of fortune in that he lived at the beginning of a boom period in the city's sugar trade and witnessed the early efforts to cope with the increasing importations of West Indian sugars—a steady movement since the 1680s but which in the 1720s took a noticeable rise. Local businessmen responded to the new trade stimulus in many ways. First, George I saw that new refineries on the banks of the Avon and the Froom were replacing the city's two oldest sugar houses at St. Peter's churchyard and at St. Augustine's Back;¹ indeed, it was because these two houses, unable to compete with the new companies in capital funds and structural design, went out of business at the turn of the century. Second, five new refineries sprang up within the space of ten years on the Avon side between the Great House on Redcliffe Street and the Old Market; this development made this half-mile stretch of the river a veritable hive of activity and threw into a shadow similar efforts amongst other refiners on the Froom. Here were created the Counterslip bakery in 1681², the Old Market refinery in 1684,³ the Tucker Street works near Bristol Bridge in 1685,⁴ the Great House on Redcliffe Street in 1689,⁵ and

¹ St. Peter's sugar house ceased its industrial existence in 1696, and St. Augustine's in 1704; see their deeds in the Bristol Archives Office.

² Counterslip Deeds—Bristol Archives Office, No. 557. ⁴ Old Market Deeds, *ibid.* No. 9685.

³ Grand Jury Book (1683), p. 98, No. 14452. This book constitutes a secondary source of documentary material of use when other records fail. Under 1683 we find our first reference to the Tucker St. works. We are told that Anthony Wade, Richard Gibbons and Richard Taylor—partners under the title of Richard Taylor & Co. sugar bakers—were indicted for 'throwing ashes and dung to the tide'.

⁵ A dual set of deeds for the sugar house at the Great House on Redcliffe St. are in the hands of (a) St. Thomas church vestry and (b) the Corporation as trustees of Dr George Owen's lands. Isaac Hort was the sugar baker there from 1689–1700, and his son Thomas until 1715.

finally that at 18 Redcliffe Street in 1695.¹ On the Froom side of the city, two new sugar houses at Halliers Lane in 1712² and at Duck Lane in 1715³ doubled the manufacturing capacity there where in 1665 one of the city's earliest works had started at Whitson Court⁴ and where in 1684 another at Lewin's Mead was erected.⁵ Thus within George I's lifetime seven new houses had been built and two of these since he had finished his apprenticeship.

Moreover, these new foundations were constructed on a well-planned scheme with the manufacturing unit set in the midst of a warehouse, counting house and stables, improvements which demanded an initial outlay ranging from £3,000 in 1684⁶ to £8,500 in the 1715 period.⁷ Under these circumstances there was little wonder that Bristol's oldest sugar bakeries, converted from family mansions and confined within restricted quarters, went out of existence. And now that a small distillery was being added to the new enterprises on neighbouring sites, and a workmen's colony was also springing up around the works, the sugar industry became the object of public admiration.

Equally striking to George Daubeny was the social elevation of the older families connected with the industry—the Hines and the Eagles who sold the Temple Street premises and business in 1712 to David Macie & Co. were moving up the social scale;⁸ the second generation of each family aspired to greater heights as general merchants in the case of the Hines, and as Carolina merchants amongst the latter. These were not isolated tendencies; Richard Lane left the St. Augustine's refinery in 1696 to enter the new salt trade connecting Bristol with the Midlands area; Lawford Cole, the son of the last

¹ The property deeds of John Thomas & Co. 18 Redcliffe St. were loaned me as far back as 1934 by the kindness of Mr Armstrong, the managing director.

² Will of Benjamin Turner 1712 PCC 1731. A copy of this will is in the Halliers Lane deeds. No. 06065 Bundle 677 in the Bristol Archives Office.

From 1712 to 1731 Turner owned the premises and worked under a partnership with his brother-in-law, John Newport, sugar baker, until 1726 when the business was advertised for sale in the *Felix Farley's Bristol Newspaper*, 25 June 1726.

³ Bristol Archives Office No. 00690. This bundle of deeds gives the set-up of the sugar house of Benjamin Lane & Co. 1715-1728.

⁴ *Trans. BGAS* (1944) Vol. 65. pp. 1-97, article on 'Whitson Court Sugar House'.

⁵ Wills PPC—(a) Anthony Wood; 24 March 1686 (Lloyd Ap.f.52); (b) Godfrey von Itterne; 14 June 1686 (Lloyd Sept.f.120); (c) Joan Wood; February 1714 (Aston f.42).

Wills in Bristol Archives Office—(d) Samuel Wood; 1705; (e) Joseph Wood; 1708.

⁶ *Trans. BGAS*, vol. 65 (1944) Whitson Court Sugar House, 1665-1824, pp. 40-53.

⁷ Duck Lane MSS 00876(1-10) Bristol Archives.

⁸ *Bristol Times and Mirror*, 27 March to 30 March, 1928. 'An old Bristol Family—The Eagles of Temple parish', by I. V. Hall.

See the Hine genealogy in 'The Temple St. Sugar House under the Partnership of Richard Lane and John Hine (1662-1678)'. *Trans. BGAS*, vol. 76 (1957).

proprietor of the same house (1696-1704) started a new refinery at Duck Lane in 1715 and soon left it to join the ranks of the local rope-makers; Nathaniel Webb, the son of Nehemiah Webb—one of the tripartite partnership at the Whitson Court refinery (1683-1691)—became a general merchant denized in the St. Mary Redcliffe; Isaac Hort's son, Thomas, became a Merchant Venturer, using his father's money made at the Great House Refinery (1689-1715) and entered the ranks of the merchant traders; and Joseph Knight, the son of John Knight, junior, the founder of the refinery at St. Augustine's Back (1654-1679) renounced industrial life for that of a gentleman and, after marrying into the Selwyn family, retired from Bristol to live at Matson, Gloucestershire. And so, amid all these social changes, George Daubeny saw an opportunity for himself even though it started with a clerkship in 1719 at the Temple Street sugar bakery of David Macie & Co.

Daubeny and Macie had much in common; both men were of the same age-group and had completed the probationary stage of their careers—the former, as a newcomer into the city with a decade of experience in the distributive side of the grocery trade, and the latter, likewise a stranger to Bristol, as an adept businessman with a considerable capital at stake in the Temple Street refinery and the manager thereof since 1712. Mutual attraction between the two men sealed the compact on George I's behalf; and now that Macie, after seven years of management with the control of all the firm's correspondence with buyers and sellers at his fingertips, relinquished these duties to give more time to other schemes in his head, he sought a reliable man in whom to put his trust. So the clerkship was created; this was the post which George I sought and obtained.

Fortunately we can tell the story of George I's business career at the Temple Street refinery during his twelve years of occupation by means of six documents. Two of these, dated 1719, refer to his qualifications for the post of clerkship; two, dated 1723, show his organizing ability in the refining and distilling enterprises, and the last two, dated 1731, reveal the large profits accumulated in the course of the boom period in those pursuits. Of special interest are the financial transactions of the various partners in the two related occupations, arising out of the share-purchases the one from the other, either at their retirement from the firm or on the occasion of the death of one partner. George I's increase of holdings from 1/18th of the profits and losses in 1719, to 1/30th in the entire firm in 1723, and then to 14/60ths by 1731 give an interesting insight into the

business life of the times for a man with initiative and drive.¹

Preparatory to his appointment as clerk on 25 March 1719, George I was interviewed by the five partners as to his proficiency for the post. On the one hand he heard the conditions of his service, and on the other, he presented his qualifications. This ordeal took place on 19 January, the date of his two signatures on the two first documents, the Articles of Agreement between George I and his employers, and the second, his Bond to Perform Covenants to them.

Though the first document is a long and detailed instrument, it is interesting to examine each of the provisions for a better understanding of the business management of the sugar industry in the early decades of the 18th century. The firm, known as David Macie & Co. extended its former existence (1712-1719) for a further 21 years. The partnership consisted of five local men with the following apportionment of shares: David Macie, a grocer $\frac{1}{4}$; Ezekiel Longman, linen draper $\frac{1}{4}$; James Haynes, grocer $\frac{1}{4}$; Paul Weston, grocer $\frac{1}{8}$; and William Freke, merchant $\frac{1}{8}$. With the substitution of Freke's name for William Hendy, grocer, in the former period, the composition remained quinquupartite, and signified that no more capital had been added to the newly constituted firm. The company was the stronger for the inclusion of Freke, a merchant, among its partners since it was his function to transport the raw materials from the West Indies to the company's warehouse. We know that Freke had been biding his time for entry into the company ever since 1715 when he, together with nine other local men and women lent £4,500 to the firm on a short-term loan. When Hendy's death occurred in 1718, a convenient occasion arose by which to stake his claim for membership.

The presence of Ezekiel Longman amongst the group represented the general public, anxious to invest its capital in business rather than in property. In a measure, he linked up with the ten short-loan investors already mentioned.

With the preponderance of grocers over the other partners, this was the usual set-up of these sugar partnerships of the decades between 1680-1720; apparently this grouping enabled them to act in concert, and so function as wholesalers in the splitting of bulk sugars, a run

¹ These six documents, strange to say, are included in the deed of the property at 18 Redcliffe Street where, in 1723, Macie took over control. Apparently he took these particular documents in which he had been previously interested at Temple Street with him and so, by mistake, they are now amongst the Redcliffe Street bundle of deeds.

It is an interesting fact that this offer on $\frac{1}{18}$ th share of the business profits and losses to the chief clerk of a sugar firm faded out of local contracts from the 1730s onwards, i.e. during the Family Compact Era.

of business quite different from their ordinary affairs as individual distributors of groceries. As wholesalers or 'vendors' in the terms of the Partnership Agreement, they dealt with their customers in Wales and Ireland, in the coastwise areas of Cornwall and Devon, and in the Midlands, made accessible by the tidal rivers of the Severn and the Warwickshire Avon.

It was customary at this particular period for the employers to grant a trading-partnership to a manager or a technician to secure his tenure on a permanent basis. In the case of George Daubeny, this amounted to $1/18$ th of the 'profits and losses' of the business together with the offer of borrowing the necessary capital from the company's funds at 10 per cent, and for its repayment within fifty days of his appointment. Presumably if this obligation was not met, the job was at stake, and the money, so far subscribed, was to be refunded at five per cent. No such privilege was necessary in George I's case, and every such occasion where money was offered to him by way of loan, was met free from obligation. Accordingly on 25 March 1719, George I's appointment was legally made, and he became the firm's first clerk and manager.

To establish the partners' integrity in the eyes of the new servant an interesting provision was agreed upon in the event of a quarrel occurring between the employee and the employers; this was the setting up of an arbitration body who should issue an award. If this award was not accepted by either of the two parties, then a single arbitrator, satisfactory to both sides, should decide the affair and his award should be final.

Concerning the living accommodation, the clerk was given the household of the late occupant, David Macie, namely the house, garden and stable alongside the works; these ran from Temple Street to the Law Ditch, some 300 feet away to the west; all these rent free. For salary he was offered £50 for his services as clerk, and with an additional £15 for the wages of an assistant, another £10 for the purchase of a 'horse to grind the sugars' and yet another £5 for treating the customers. In the provision for a horse, perhaps we have an insight into the special features of the Macie business, the manufacture of 'powdered sugars' as distinct from the more usual product of these sugar houses, the making of 'coned sugar'. It was also stated in the Agreement that George I could expect no charges for the keeping of boarders, a stipulation which the eighteen-windowed house perhaps warranted. This was another way of saying that the training of a 'sugar baker' apprentice lay in the hands of the company and not in George's hands.

Such were the precise details covering the appointment of the secretary, an office of great importance to this new company and one carrying privileges no less beneficial to the recipient as we shall recognize in the remaining account of George Daubeny's career.

On George I's part, he promised to spend his time diligently, faithfully and carefully in the keeping of the firm's accounts, but as no mention of the annual 'casting up' of the accounts was made, this last exercise was the particular responsibility of the chief proprietor, Macie.

The interview ended to the advantage of both parties. George on his part, recognized that the experience gained from the clerkship, rendered indispensable information in the event of his acquiring a refining business of his own, but it was the prospects of becoming a partner in the Temple Street undertaking that gave him his best thrill. And so it proved within the space of thirteen years; but many were the steps of advancement before he reached that ambition.

Straightway George signed and sealed a Bond to Perform his Covenants to his new employers, and this at the offices of the lawyer Thomas Fane, on the same day, the 11 January, 1719. In fifty days hence the interval between the date of his signature and 25 March, when he met his financial obligations, he began his appointment as chief clerk and never regretted his decisions; indeed they proved the foundation of the family's future success.

George Daubeny, as clerk and partner

Within the course of the next decade George I's interests grew at a surprising rate, from 1/18th part of the 'profits and losses' in 1719 to 1/30th in the entire undertaking, covering the ownership of the property as well, in 1723, and eventually to 14/60ths by 1731, i.e. in terms of money valuation, from £846 16s. 7½d. for the 1/30th share in 1723 to £4,258 6s. 8d. for his 14/60ths some eight years later. These figures mean that the company had assets amounting to £24,303 10s., making the Temple Street works one of the largest houses in the city.

This unexpected turn of fortune on George I's part came about as the result of two major events among the partners in 1723; David Macie's dissociation from the partnership (preparatory to his taking over the sole control of a neighbouring refinery at 18 Redcliffe Street) and the death of James Haynes, one of the initial partners of the Temple Street works in 1712. These two events caused the complete reorganization of the share-distribution whereby Macie sold his

4/30ths holdings, valued at £3,393 13s. 3½d. to Freke and George I. How Haynes' proportion of the business was sold we cannot tell through lack of evidence, but that George I got some part of it seems evident.

Freke and George Daubeny now moved up to primary places in the new set-up of the Temple Street management. They planned an extension of the enterprise by instituting a distillery plant; this entailed the creation of a subsidiary firm to the sugar concern, a wise move in that the waste products of the refinery became the basis for the manufacture of rum, brandies, strong waters and vinegar. The four eldest members of the Temple Street works branched out on a grander scale than formerly; they became the seniors of two groups, the one to run the refinery and the other to conduct the distillery, and because their previous funds were insufficient to cover the two enterprises, they introduced two new associates to each of the companies; John Tyler, gentleman, and Thomas Horlock, apothecary, of Blandford Forum, Dorset, in the sugar project, and John Milton, the distiller technician, and Amerson Tyte, grocer, of Bristol, in the distillery business. That George Daubeny carried on as chief secretary is indicated in the Lamp and Scavenging Rate books for Temple parish where his name occurred throughout the period to 1731. This increase of partners in both concerns meant an enlargement of the capital funds. Thus George Daubeny's fortunes developed within four years of his participation in the Temple Street enterprise.

For the details of the new arrangements we have the two deeds for the year 1723. Herein we are told that the financial standing of the sugar firm amounted to £24,303 10s. and that Tyler and Horlock were the two new members of this concern. Other than these bare facts we are told nothing of the sugar firm between 1723-1730. For the state of the company in 1731, the year of Daubeny's dissociation from it, we have to depend on one of the 1731 deeds.

The other 1723 deed, referring to the institution of the distillery, is fuller of information by reason of the new undertaking. Apparently the site of the works stood on the banks of the Avon in Redcliffe Street where in 1760 a subsequent company was carrying on, by the name of Rumsey, Jenkins, Milton & Co. Necessarily the distilling enterprise was a small concern by comparison with the refinery and was capitalized at perhaps ten per cent of the larger undertaking. Until recently these distilleries which also made strong waters, brandies, rums and vinegars had been carried on by several independent firms but by the turn of the century, the refining companies themselves incorporated these occupations into their own works. Because the sugar purchases in the West Indies were a hazardous proceeding, especially on the

brink of wars (when fluctuating prices were so prevalent) the refining companies cut their possible losses in trade by this new arrangement.

In the subsidiary firm, the Temple Street organization was repeated with the small share ($\frac{1}{18}$ th?) offered to both John Milton as technician, and Amberson Tyte as manager. It is interesting to note that Tyte—an apprentice of James Haynes, the retiring member of the Temple Street company in 1723—was offered the managership of the distillery because of the new set-up at 18 Redcliffe Street. Macie, having bought out Tyte's father's sugar concern there, did not require Amberson's help, and so he introduced him to the new distillery firm.

What was George Daubeny's part-share in the distillery we are not told, but from the fact that his name occurred amongst the first four partners in the Agreement, it is evident that he up-graded himself from secretary to associate. That he retained his money interest in the distillery after his retirement from the parent sugar firm in 1731 can be concluded from the fact that he trained his two sons, Lloyd and James as distillers.¹ It is certain too that no portion of his distillery share was included in the £4,258 6s. 8d. for his sugar share in 1731.

That both concerns carried on undisturbed till 1731, we know from the two last deeds. Thus Daubeny went on piling up his interests in the two companies. By 1731 when he decided to take over the sole control of the Halliers Lane refinery, his proportion of the sugar shares amounted to $\frac{14}{60}$ ths and were valued at £4,258 6s. 8d. Of this sum Ezekiel Longman paid him £2,003 18s. 5d., Paul Weston £1,001 19s. 2d., Thomas Freke £626 4s. 6d., John Tyler £375 14s. 8d., and Thomas Horlock £250 9s. 9d. This negotiation showed a handsome return for his efforts and business speculations over a span of twelve years, whilst his experience in the world of sugar amongst local and country customers gave birth to a healthy confidence of equal success in an undertaking under his own control² (Appendix I). And even then he was a man in his middle forties. Again we think he must have had David Macie's career in mind when he too, at a similar age, had undertaken similar responsibilities at his second refinery at 18 Redcliffe Street. So constantly we must bear in mind Macie's career as we watch Daubeny at Halliers Lane (Appendix II).

¹ A.L. 9.12.1734 Lloyd Daubeny, son of George Daubeny, sugar baker, was apprenticed to Thomas Bagnold, distiller, and Ann his wife for seven years. £80 paid by the parent.

B.R. 14.11.1739 Lloyd Daubeny, was admitted to the Freedom of Bristol because he was the son of George Daubeny.

Orders for the Binding of Apprentices 13.1.1741/2. James Daubeny was apprenticed to Lloyd Daubeny, distiller at St. Thomas Street. In his will, dated 12.6.1743 James Daubeny, distiller of Bristol, was described as in a weak state of health.

² See Appendix I and Appendix II.

The Third Stage of George I's Career at the Halliers Lane Refinery

The final phase of George I's career covered the years 1731-1741 when he possessed his own sugar house at Halliers Lane. This achievement proved the crowning glory of his arduous climb to independence; then he entered the select number of local refiners who had moved up the social and economic scale to ownership of their own businesses and premises. In George I's case we can trace his change of status in a series of negotiations which occurred during the last five years of his association with the parent firm. That his decision to start out on his own was not taken without due care, we see from the details of the major documents concerned. One was his Bond, drawn up in 1730 on the eve of the crisis. Herein he revealed his main concern for his family in the event of his failure; to his wife and children he left £1,400—presumably £600 to secure his widow's security in the eyes of the world and the remaining sum for the education of his children. These figures take on another aspect now that we know that his real financial backing amounted to £4,000 in 1730 and eventually to perhaps £10,000 by 1741. Other than the provisions for his funeral expenses and the gift of £5 to each of his three executors, there was no other stipulation about the disposition of his estate, a somewhat irregular procedure but perhaps made with a view to later additions which he never sought chance to make. This 1730 Bond was finally passed as a statement of his will by the officials at the time of his decease.¹

It is interesting to observe the names of two of the three witnesses to the Bond, Richard Tyler, grocer, and Jarritt Smith, solicitor; the former a member of the family which intermarried with his own and whose brother John, hooper, whom he introduced into the Temple Street partnership at the time of its reorganization in 1723, and Jarritt Smith who evidently drew up his Bond. The latter was intimately connected with the West Indian trade because he became the owner of a large Jamaican plantation, 'The Spring Plantation' on his subsequent marriage into the Woolnough family. Presumably the Daubeny-Smith connection was already the basis of the firm's sugar supplies at this early date. Thus we have discovered part of the new organization of the Halliers Lane project a whole year before it actually took place.

There were two other families, the Abington and the Bridle, who entered George I's life during these years 1726-1731. No sooner had Charles Abington completed his grocery apprenticeship at the

¹ An office copy of George Daubeny's will is amongst the Thomas Collection of deeds. The will was dated 27 February 1730 and was proved 23 May 1741.

hands of George I (1727) than he undertook two engagements which brought both men into closer contact than ever. These were Abington's marriage to George I's youngest sister Jane, and the young couple's first joint business transaction—the training of Robert Bridle as a grocer.¹ This last negotiation further enforced the Dorset-Bristol connections because Bridle was the son of a Dorset gentleman of Leigh who paid £65 as a premium, an indication that the lad's future prospects in the sugar industry were being secured from the start of his apprenticeship on the understanding that the master would intercede for the pupil's entry into a partnership when opportunity offered. And so it proved, because in 1733, the year after Bridle became a Bristol citizen, he entered the Halliers Lane firm as a clerk, and George I made him a trustee to his first business deal with his son George II. Subsequently on two other occasions a similar show of confidence took place, and by 1738 it is possible that Bridle became a partner in the Daubeny firm. Certainly by 1748, the firm was trading under the title of 'Daubeny and Bridle' when negotiating its purchases of raw West Indian sugars.² Thus was born an association between the Daubeny, Abington and Bridle families which grew the stronger as the years passed by. By 1759 Bridle had married Jarritt Smith's daughter Martha, and again another link in the business negotiations was forged between the three families. Such were the studied methods by which George I covered his moves before he finally left Temple Street for Halliers Lane—proof of his hard-headed acumen in his business career.³

There was yet another factor in the situation which formed the background of the Halliers Lane negotiations—one more insidious in its application in that it concerned not only the Halliers Lane site but also the business rivalry between the Bristol and Gloucester sugar refiners who competed for the Midlands retail market. Whether George I was the prime mover in this scheme or whether he was the scapegoat for the other five Bristol refiners in collusion is difficult to disentangle from the fragmentary nature of the documentary evidence. That he was closely involved in the affair is evident.

¹ A.L. 10.6.1726 Robert Bridle, son of Robert Bridle of Leigh, Dorset, gentleman, was apprenticed to Charles Abington as a grocer. Premium of £65 paid by the parent.

B.R. 12.7.1733 Robert Bridle was made a Freeman of Bristol.

² Isaac Elton's Account Book 1746-1751 which is in my possession.

³ Corporation Rental 1740, p. 322.

'Jarritt Smith of Bristol, gentleman, holds two tenements in Prince St. granted to him 20 April 1727 if the lessee, Martha his wife, and Martha their daughter live so long'.

'Jarritt Smith of Bristol, Esq. holds the above premises by lease dated 4.12.1759 if the lessee, Martha his daughter and now wife of Robert Bridle of Bristol, and Thomas, son of Jarritt Smith, live so long'.

The first sugar house on the Halliers Lane site began in 1712 as a small unit, promoted as a joint enterprise by Benjamin Turner, a haberdasher of small wares, and his son-in-law John Newport, a man of considerable managerial experience in two local refineries prior to his connection with Turner. From the reading of their wills, it appears that the former's interest was that of a business speculator with considerable sums of money invested in both the premises and the business; in 1712 Turner came into possession of the site as a family legacy and straightway converted the premises (hitherto a bakery since the early years of the 17th century) into a sugar house. Newport, on the other hand, supplied the technical and managerial 'know-how' in that he had started as early as 1685 as the manager of the Counterslip refinery and in 1695 advanced his status to manager-proprietorship in another refinery in Redcliffe Street. With 25 years' experience behind him and because he had lately married into the Turner family, he planned a further rise for himself by a joint effort with his father-in-law. For fifteen years the Turner-Newport enterprise flourished, but with the decline of Newport's health in 1725, both partners offered the business to public sale, especially as both men had no male heirs to succeed to the firm. Accordingly in 1726 the Halliers Lane refinery was advertised for sale.¹ However, no purchaser came forward during the course of the next five years, a situation which gave rise to the subsequent negotiations between the six Bristol refiners and the proprietor of Gloucester's sole sugar house. This was a circumstance which brought about a unique feature in the history of the local industry.

The Gloucester side of the story arose from the fact that John Pinfold, the sole proprietor of the Gloucester house, wanted to transfer his business from Gloucester to Bristol. This was occasioned by his engagement to Sarah, the daughter of Edward Whitchurch, the owner of the Counterslip refinery (1704-1736). And now that Pinfold wished to take over the Temple Street refinery (not a stone's throw from that of his prospective father-in-law) his entry into Bristol was welcomed with glee. Collectively six Bristol refiners conspired to take over the Gloucester house at a yearly rental of £6 and convert it into a warehouse for their own sugars destined for the Midlands. George Daubeny became the pawn of the local traders; if he could be

¹ The Halliers Lane deeds—including the wills of both Turner and Newport—are in the possession of the Archives Office and refer to the site of the present Labour Exchange, Nelson Street.

Felix Farley's *Bristol Newspaper*, 25 June 1725.

"To be let. A sugar house and dwelling house adjoining in St. John's Lane, near the Alms-house, late in the possession of John Newport, and a house in the possession of George Rock, grocer, in Wine St. Enquire of Capt. Smith of College Gree'.

encouraged to leave the Temple Street works for a 'new home' in Halliers Lane, all would be well for him. In this way he became a link in a chain of circumstances by which these plans matured¹ (Appendix III).

The six Bristol refiners were William Barnes, George Daubeny, Edward Whitchurch, John Gifford, Michael Pope and Edward Curtis who, on the 28 July 1730, covenanted to take over Pinfold's Gloucester business at a £6 annual rental, and signed a lease to that effect for the following 42 years. Noticeably it was Barnes, a senior member of the group, and George Daubeny, the most junior member of it, who signed and sealed the contract, and together were responsible for the annual payment of the rent to Pinfold. Such was the contract but the fulfilment did not work out so agreeably, because, within a few years, two of the signatories declined to pay their contributions, Whitchurch left the Counterslip in 1736, and Gifford died in 1747.² This left the two contracting parties to continue the deal—a procedure which they maintained throughout the first twenty-one years at any rate.

George I's Occupation of the Halliers Lane site

As in the case of the Temple Street venture, documentary sources supply the background of the Halliers Lane project. But whereas the former records were concerned with the business transactions of George I's early years, the latter evidences revealed the more mature negotiations of a self-made man, interested in the purchases of adjoining sites for the comprehensive manufacturing unit and the organization of his firm, based on a dual association of a partner with his son George II.

These documents comprise two complementary sets of legal agreements—four Abstracts of Title relating to the four separate

¹ Two sets of records refer to the Gloucester sugar house.

(a) in the Ashton Court MSS, marked AC/BS 31(6)a, in the Bristol Archives Office. This is dated 1730 and refers to John Pinfold in his Gloucester Sugar House'.

(b) *Gloucester Journal*, 28 August 1739. Here the sale of timber by John Pasco at the Sugar House near the Westgate, Gloucester, is recorded. Also Appendix III.

² Evidence of Gifford's management of the Second Sugar House at Lewin's Mead between 1731-1747 occurs in the following two quotations: (a) References in the Wyndham family Account Book (ref. 8M49) relate to a consignment of 'three Barll. of Double Refined sugar' and '3 casks of Lofe Suger' (descriptions in invoice entered into book'. There is also a debit and credit statement of account for this sugar and this includes, on the debit side, the following entry: 'Augt. 9. To cash paid Jno. Gifford for suger'. The two books are entitled 'Invoices and Sundry Accounts Anno. 1725 ended 29 Sept. 1753' and 'cash Book for April 1728 to Mich. 1752'. (This information was supplied to me by Mrs E. Cottrill, M.A. the County Archivist, Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, Hants.)

The second reference to Gifford occurs in the *Bristol Oracle* 21 Feb. 1747. 'This is to give notice to the creditors of John Gifford, late of the city of Bristol, Sugar baker, deceased, that on the 25th of this inst. February at the Fountain Tavern in High St. will be made a dividend of the said Gifford's estate, where all claimants are desired to come prepared to prove their debts'.

sites (ultimately incorporated into the entire works)—and eight leases, drawn up within the lifetime of George I. These supply all our information about the premises and the business management. From the Abstracts we learn the whole set-up of the Daubeny enterprise from George I's occupation of the original site to George IV's sale of the entire works in 1821. From the leases we see that George I was the master-mind behind the creation of the building unit, sufficient to accommodate the family business throughout the next century, and the consolidation of the family membership with the major financial interests guaranteed to them but with an associated partnership with Bridle, who was incorporated as a business partner in 1738.

Between 1731 and 1735 George I contracted twice for the purchase of the sugar house. On 15 September 1731 he signed the first indenture with Captain Nathaniel Smith and his wife Mary, *née* Turner, 'for all that messuage with the sugar house adjoining and their appurtenancies for £550', and to seal the bargain, 'all the evidences and writings now in the hands of Nathaniel Smith concerning the sugar house which was built by Benjamin Turner' (in 1712) passed into possession of George Daubeny. Straightway the purchaser started his business but soon realized the inadequacies of the structure, for in 1735, he set about further negotiations with his neighbour, James Furnell, merchant, for the purchase of his property. It consisted of two messuages, one a house and a garden, and the other a stable, and for these George paid £160. Thus for £710 the combined sites were bought—a figure which represented those of Bristol's other refineries. The new works embodied the most recent improvements of construction, the result of George I's experience during his dozen years at Temple Street. A further deed, dated 1738, stated that Furnell's premises had been pulled down and replaced by a second refinery. Henceforward the two properties which were of a freehold character, had a separate set of leases and from them (six in the course of the next few years) we learn about George I's organization of the firm.

George I, now a man of forty years of age, looked to the security of his venture. Whilst most of his sons had been apprenticed to various local traders, it was in George II that he was closely concerned; accordingly he took him under his own wing from 1731 onwards. This meant that he would not be fully trained until 1738, but in the meantime he initiated him into the problems of management and salesmanship. To give him status he gave him one-sixth of the initial property—this was made legal in the 1734 lease which stated that 'out of the natural love of a parent for his son, he rendered him his

gift at the nominal figure of 5s.' After due observation of his son's capabilities, this gift was extended by gradual stages; first in 1735 after the purchase of Furnell's premises when another one-sixth portion was handed over to him for £133 6s. 8d., and again in 1738, after George II had been admitted as a Freeman of Bristol, when a similar gift was made. On these last two occasions the portions covered the double sets of property. We know these arrangements because it was the father and son who jointly called in Bridle to act as trustee at the time of the 1738 Agreement. However George II's holdings never exceeded one half during the lifetime of the parent.

Throughout the years 1731-1741, there were other questions of equal moment for George I's consideration. He saw that his financial resources which amounted to £4,000, were being eaten up; already £1,000 had gone on his property purchases and the equipment of the refineries; clearly the remaining £3,000 were insufficient to run the business. So he entertained a partnership with his aim in view, and introduced Bridle into the business. It is also evident that he resorted to a number of short loans from friends—perhaps from Abington, Jarritt Smith and the Tylers because from the story of the Temple Street firm, we have seen that as much as £23,000 was necessary for the general expenses of a refinery—sufficient to cover bad debts, the buying of West Indian sugars and the running costs in the course of their manufacture. So young Bridle acted as clerk and supervisor of the internal side of the refinery, whilst George II became the overall manager of the firm. This was an arrangement not unlike George I's during his early years at Temple Street, but with the added advantage that the Halliers Lane partnership stayed in the hands of two men instead of the quinquupartite arrangement at the Temple Street enterprise.

It was fortunate for the firm and the family that these business negotiations had been carried out in 1738, for by the time of George I's death in 1741, both George II and Bridle had started their life's work in earnest. With the 1738 deed (the end of the documentary series), the story of George I's career finishes. Presumably he died before he had an opportunity of stating his final wishes in the disposition of his estate. And so his 1730 Bond was taken as sufficient in the eyes of officials at his decease. Even in 1730 he authorized his burial at St. James church, the place where he had been married and where so many of his descendants found their final resting place.

Throughout the three stages of his career, extending over thirty-eight years, George I displayed the same consistencies of character; an assiduous attention to his family's welfare, a keenness for the

Anglican cause, and a meticulous care for business matters, always related to his worldly affairs whether as a grocer, sugar baker or, during the last decade, as a merchant—triple designations corresponding to his advance in economic status. These preoccupations barred him from an active participation in local politics.

That he possessed personality none would deny. Recognizing the tenor of the times, he exerted the utmost vigour to improve his social and economic position, to advance from a working grocer in St. Nicholas parish to a clerkship in the Temple Street refinery, then from a partnership at one works to eventual proprietorship at another. This was no mean achievement for a man who had to plough his way through the rough and tumble of a quinquupartite association at Temple Street awaiting a partnership-share to fall his way. In spite of good fortune attending him, he was forced to keep a tight rein on his activities until late in life; his greatest satisfaction came from the benefits he bestowed on the family. It was they and not he, who broke the upper crust of local society to attain top-ranking status.

We can trace his change of residence from St. Nicholas parish during the grocer stage of his occupation to that in Temple parish when he functioned as a partner at the Temple Street works, and again, to St. James parish where the Halliers Lane refinery was situated and where he carried on as a merchant-manufacturer. The St. Nicholas registers of births show that eight of his eleven children were baptized there, and that the remaining three were born in the neighbouring parish of Temple. He officiated as churchwarden at Temple church in 1724 and acted as a feoffee of its property even after he had moved to Halliers Lane. His final place of worship was St. James where both he and his family found their final resting places.¹

For all his thrusting ways, George I retained the goodwill of his intimate business friends; though domiciled in Bristol from 1703 onwards he never lost sight of his homeland. It was from Dorset that he drew his two closest associates; first, Charles Abington, a man of Stalbridge and his second apprentice, to whom he handed on his grocery store and whom he welcomed into his household as a

¹ Temple church records are deposited in the Bristol Archives Office. Document Ab224(1) shows that Daubeny acted as churchwarden there in 1724; he was also a feoffee of Temple Church property and officiated in Nicholas Bloom's rental of the St. Thomas Street Sugar House. This gave Daubeny an insight into the conditions by which a Londoner like Bloom was welcomed into the city if he was moneyed and anxious to set up a new sugar refinery there.

As late as 1733 (after Daubeny had moved to Halliers Lane) he still acted as feoffee at Temple because he signed the counterpart deed of Caleb Moore's deed (No. 111). See 00149(36) and Ab237(4). Even in 1775 the Daubeny family paid a rental on some Temple church property, still in the Daubeny possession.

brother-in-law; and Robert Bridle, a man of Leigh, who became the secretary and partner-manager at Halliers Lane.

His chief contribution to business life lay in the promotion of the dual type of control as an advancement on the many-partnership form so characteristic of the early days of the century. For this idea, he had to thank David Macie whose business methods he studied closely. Both men learned that supreme control of a sugar house depended upon one man assuming the function of a merchant; this necessitated his accumulation of a sufficiently large pocketbook to make him independent of possible competitors within his own firm such as the grocers, coopers, apothecaries, warehousemen, associated with the quinquupartite organization. Thus he, as the sole controller of the business, garnered the profits previously shared out amongst his partners; he too employed his own labour force instead of allotting these services to associates who, under the former system, had separately supervised these departments and taken proportionate dividends; he also accommodated the employees on the works-site or in the neighbourhood of the refinery. Moreover, by these means, he passed on to his son the benefits of his own enterprise, securing his entrance into the Merchant Venturers Society; only thus could he elevate his family above his grocer contemporaries who had partnered him in the parent firm. So his family rose in social esteem whilst the other grocer-associates of former times, remained merely functioning as distributors of their wares. He now negotiated on equal terms with overseas merchants, e.g. Jarritt Smith, the plantation owner, and guaranteed constant supplies of West Indian sugars, as well as contracting with the other five refiners for the Gloucester works to facilitate their Midland sales.

His own business at Halliers Lane was not however so large as to provide occupations for all his children; it was too small to add a distillery even to the original site as the Temple Street company had done in 1724. So George I apprenticed his two sons, Lloyd and James, as distillers to a reputable local distiller, and found employment for them in the Temple Street subsidiary company. At least, by a similar display of initiative to his own, they had an opportunity of co-operating with their eldest brother in like enterprises.

Because of his long family of eleven children, those juniors too young for his care, he left to the guidance of his widow and the elder members. Andrew became a whitawer and glover, and Giles, a soap-maker and chandler; not mere workmen but of the middlemen sort,

indicated by the second function of their calling.¹ George I demonstrated further his middle class outlook on life by the marriage of Jane, an elder child, to John Scandrett, a grocer, whose country estate lay at Stapleton, on the eastern fringe of Bristol, and of Hannah, his youngest daughter, to Henry Hillman, a currier. Thus the Daubeny family in its new role of city dwellers, maintained as worthy a name as its forebears in the countryside, and George I as an enterprising and praiseworthy father of a large family.

Finally in an effort to estimate George I's life savings, we can compare his career with that of another contemporary, Edward Garlick at the Counterslip Sugar House whose fortune stood at £12,000 in 1740; both men, newcomers to the city at the turn of the century, led equally strenuous existences and advanced by similar stages in their careers. Garlick, as an apothecary and distiller (1700-1728) during which time he amassed roughly £2,500, and Daubeny, as a grocer, clerk and partner at the Temple Street works (1710-1731) when he accumulated £4,250. Since it is known that Garlick garnered £10,000 at his Counterslip refinery (1728-40) at an annual average of £800, Daubeny could have done no less. So his profits over the last decade must have been in the neighbourhood of £8,000. Both men brought up equally large families and set them up in life in a comparable fashion. So the outward appearances being similar, it is feasible that their fortunes were not dissimilar.²

¹ B.R. 20 January 1745, Andrew Daubeny, whitawer and glover, was admitted to the Freedom of Bristol, having been apprenticed to Matthew Waine. Andrew took the following apprentices:

A.L. 11 March 1750 Jonathan Reece, son of Lewis Reece, late of Larne, Co. Carmarthen, glover, deceased, was apprenticed to Andrew Daubeny, whitawer and glover, and Mary, his wife, for 7 years.

A.L. 18 October 1755. Peter Powell, son of Robert Powell, of Marshfield, Co. Glos. wheelwright, was apprenticed to Andrew Daubeny, whitawer and glover, and Mary, his wife, for 7 years. £42 paid with the apprenticeship.

A.L. 1 Sept. 1742. Gyles Daubeny, son of George Daubeny, late of Bristol, sugar baker, decd. was apprenticed to Thomas Whippie, sopemaker and chandler, for 7 years. Friends finding apparel and £47-5-0 paid with the apprenticeship.

B.R. 13 October 1749 Giles Daubeny, sopemaker, was admitted to the Freedom of Bristol, having been an apprentice of Thomas Whippie.

Giles Daubeny took the following apprentice:

A.L. 22 July 1752. Christopher Kidley, son of Rev Edward Kidley of Welch Bicknor, Somerset, clerk, was apprenticed to Giles Daubeny, sopemaker and chandler, and Ann, his wife, for 7 years. £20 gift of the clergy and the sons of the clergy of London.

² *Trans. BGAS*, vol. 80 (1961), 'The Garlicks, Two Generations of a Bristol Family (1692-1781)',

THE DAUBENYS

APPENDIX I

Three Obligation Bonds in The Thomas Collection of deeds refer to the Temple Street business immediately before Daubeny left the firm. Because such records are difficult to come by *re* 18th century businesses, they are worth quoting in full.

The first one shows that the Temple Street refinery went under the title of George Daubeny & Co. and that its sugars were being sold to a grocer in Winchester. '28th August 1730. Condition of this Obligation is such that, if the above bounden John Tomlyns, Esq. well and truly pay or cause to be paid unto George Daubeny & Co. £160 on 28 August 1730 at 5% per annum, then this Obligation is to be void or to remain in full force. John Tomlyns of Winchester, Southampton.

Signed and sealed by Tomlyns.

George Daubeny of Bristol, sugar baker'.

The second Bond is of interest because it shows that Richard Leversedge (one of the ten lenders of money on a short loan in 1715) who lent £800 in 1715 kept it in the firm until his decease in 1730. At his death, his executors increased the loan to £1,000 at four per cent.

'28 October 1730. The condition of this Obligation is such that the above bounden William Freke, Ezekiel Longman, Thomas Freke, John Tyler, George Daubeny, Paul Weston, and Thomas Horlock do well and truly pay Richard Leversedge £1,000 at the rate of 4% per annum on 28 October 1730, then this Obligation is to be void.

Received 3 March 1731 of Mr Ezekiel Longman & Co. £43 18s. 6d. in full for the interest due, the four men present to the estate of Richard Leversedge, decd. pro John Combe'.

The third Bond shows that Daubeny's Principal and interest were paid him on 29 October 1731; by then the new clerk was Nehemiah Champion, junior, who later in life became a partner in the Old King Street refinery. His career in the local sugar world therefore followed the pattern of Daubeny.

'25 October 1731. The condition of this Obligation is such that, if Ezekiel Longman, Thomas Freke, John Tyler, Paul Weston and Thomas Horlock do well and truly pay George Daubeny £1,102 on 25 October 1731, then this Obligation is to be void.

Received 29 October 1731 £1,102 12s. 6d. in full for the Principal and interest (£13 15s. for three months in trust as within)—Bond.

Nehemiah Champion, junior'.

APPENDIX II

Over and above the promptings of his ambitious nature, what particularly stimulated George I to action and goaded him to sole management of a refinery? Just as acute observations about the economic trends in Bristol between 1700-1720 had urged him to take a clerkship at the Temple Street works, so his subsequent experiences as a partner with David Macie as a close associate pointed out further advances in 1731. What his mentor did for himself at 18 Redcliffe Street from 1724 onwards, surely he himself could do at the Halliers Lane refinery.

Both Macie and Daubeney realized that the formative period of the sugar industry (1680-1720) was drawing to a close and that the sugar world in their midst was moving from the small and struggling phase to one of consolidation wherein the dominant figure was the master-proprietor who possessed sufficient capital to control all departments of the undertaking. Their paths were made the easier because the more successful of the older generation were ascending the social scale towards a mercantile career.

The 'new' men of the 1720-1770s comprised (a) the small merchants, (b) the grocers and occasionally the distillers, apothecaries and the coopers, and (c) the junior members of the managerial staffs of the initial sugar houses; in fact, the previous dabblers and short-loan investors in those firms which now sought permanent partnerships in a five or six membership association in the new enterprises.

The merchants were the Whitchurches, the Eltons, the Frekes, the Rogers and the Taylors who, having previously supplied the molasses and muscovadoes to the earlier refineries, now moved up to partnership status. Thus the Whitchurches settled in at the Counterslip works (1704-1736), the Eltons, first at the Old Market Street refinery (1726-1728), then at the Duck Lane refinery (1728-1735) and finally at the Counterslip (1736-1786). The Frekes too began in 1704 at the Old Market Street house where they superseded the Rogers' family, and eventually moved on to the Temple Street (1719-1742) whilst the Taylors founded the Bristol Bridge refinery in 1685 and maintained it until about 1720. Thus these merchants ended their careers in firms and sites other than the one they were initially interested in, and replaced their business organization from one of quadrupartite or quinquepartite proportions to the one-family type, with structures considerably enlarged in size and a pocket book of correspondingly enhanced dimensions.

The grocers, men of lesser rank but nevertheless of some financial standing, were David Macie, George Daubeney, Edward Garlick, Samuel Hunt, William Salmon, Morgan Smith, William Barnes, Samuel Brice, Edward Curtis, John Gifford and many others; these men typified the struggling sort, who had very often come up to the city from the neighbouring counties to make their way, and who were accustomed to hard graft as well as faithful attendants at church and chapel, had rubbed shoulders with their betters. Fortunate circumstances aided their entry into their initial jobs; an agreeable marriage, such as Garlick made with the daughter of Samuel Hunt (a progressive distiller) and the sister of Samuel Hunt II, the manager-proprietor of the Old Market Street refinery (1715-1760). Herein lay Garlick's initial successes as an apothecary who invested his savings in the Old Market Street sugar house with his relative (1726-1728), then moving on to a partnership at the Duck Lane refinery with Elton (1728-1735), and finally with Isaac Elton in a dual partnership at the Counterslip works (1736-1781). The Garlick career was typical of the other men of the grocer-group, and together they and their merchant friends dominated the industrial interests in sugar until the introduction of steam processes in the Early 19th century. (*See Trans. BGAS*, vol. 80 (1961), 'The Garlicks, Two Generations of a Bristol Family 1692-1781', by I. V. Hall.)

There was yet another section of the sugar bakers, sufficiently important to acquire partnership status with the grocers and merchants. They were men like John Newport, William Willcocks, John Collett, Robert Stock, etc. who, starting life as clerks and managers of the early houses, gained sufficient 'know-how' in the trade to exploit their skills during the middle years of their careers and then sold their abilities to other larger firms, and eventually gained partnership status before

they died. They are referred to by their individual rather than their family name because they seldom passed their 'standing' on to their sons who were already skilled in other lesser occupations by the time their parent had 'arrived'. Seldom did they break the social crust, and never, of course, enter the political scene. Of necessity they were birds of passage, flitting from one firm to another, and from site to site, according to their opportunities. Seldom too did they end their careers at the refinery where they learned their skills; the social elevation of William Willcocks was typical of this group. Starting life as manager of the Old Market Street refinery (1704-1715) where the partnership agreed that their firm should go under the name of 'William Willcocks & Co.' he graduated still further higher at the Bristol Bridge sugar house (1715-c. 1730) but apparently never attained the independence nor the pocket book of George Daubeny.

It is interesting to watch both Macie and Daubeny re-acting to the new developments in the sugar industry. Alongside the three-fold types of capitalists who invested their savings in refineries from 1720 onwards, there was another feature of the times—the jostling for sites amongst the same ambitious families, a movement which continued throughout the rest of the century. In addition to the five sugar houses on the Avon and the three on the Froom between 1680-1720, one more had arisen (Nicholas Bloom's on St. Thomas Street (1722-1739) on the Avon, and two on the Froom, namely the Second Lewin's Mead' House, set up by Edward Reed (1728) and the Old King Street House run by Abraham Hooke and Joseph Houlton (1724)).

It was evident from the start that some refineries were more favourably situated than the others although each kept to the riverside for purposes of transport facilities; sometimes the advantages concerned the availability of lime water from neighbouring artesian wells and sometimes, the possibilities of territorial expansion, warehouses, stabling, etc.

Inevitably the earliest refineries such as Whitson Court which was capitalized at £3,000 in 1683 had to increase its accommodation as decade followed decade; otherwise it would fall behind in its struggle for survival against the new house, e.g. at Duck Lane, founded by Benjamin Lane & Co. in 1715 with the enhanced capital of £8,500.

Such were the observations forced on the attention of both Macie and Daubeny between 1724-1731. So the former left the Temple Street firm in 1724 to start up on his own at 18 Redcliffe Street (1724-1750); and the latter to Halliers Lane in 1731. Both left the Frekes, merchant-manufacturers to carry on at Temple Street.

During their conjoint partnership, both Macie and Daubeny realized that their leadership in the industry depended on the size of their individual purses as well as their power to attract short-term loans if they wished to dominate not only their choice of works-sites but also to change the character of the future organization of the industry. As their separate capital funds rose to the £3,500-4,000 mark, i.e. at an annual average profit of £500, they saw that a dual type of partnership must replace the outmoded quinquupartite association. Macie with £3,500 and Daubeny with £4,000 founded their new refineries and thus from the start, were independent of their 'invited' partner. No longer did they bow to the opinions of their associates in their committee meetings *re* policy, etc.; nor did they have to share profits with them but garnered them within their own family; moreover, they employed their own labour force (coopers, carters, warehousemen, etc.) instead of sharing these activities with partners who, under the previous system, each

supervised one of these departments. Again, both Macie and Daubeny functioned as merchants in the future and gave over the internal management of the firm to a secretary who also invested his money in the business side of the new firm but not in the property, refinery, warehouses, etc.

Though this was the new set-up of the sugar industry in the middle decades of the 18th century, the capital funds were not so large as to permit the entrepreneurs' withdrawal from the directional control of the firm. Their future therefore lay in the sphere of business rather than politics.

APPENDIX III

So persistent was the Gloucester-Bristol rivalry for the Midland sugar trade that a second refinery was started in Gloucester in 1760.

Gloucester Journal, 28 October 1760 advertised 'the sale of a freehold Sugar House, four stories high, capable of working 600 hogsheads of sugar every year with a warehouse adjoining. A crane for loading and unloading vessels and a large water pump from the Severn'.

Counsel and Rudge (History of Gloucester). Here it is stated that a sugar house was erected in Gloucester about 1760 by Mr Hannington who was succeeded by Mr Ercks; both ventures were unsuccessful.

The City Librarian of Gloucester, Mr A. J. Parrott, kindly supplied me with these last two extracts.

This trade rivalry between the two cities persisted for forty years. In 1802 it was the subject of comment in the *New Gloucester Guide* which stated that the sugar refining industry of Gloucester stood tolerably flourishing 'forty years ago' when it was stopped by the manoeuvres of the Bristol refiners who contrived to purchase the sugar house.

That this dissatisfaction throughout the Midlands grew in the next year, the Birmingham grocers' complaints were printed in the *Bristol Journal* 7 January 1804; similar ones from those of Wolverhampton on 14 January 1804. Similar correspondence went on in the Birmingham, Stafford and Worcester papers.