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INTRODUCTION

Most of the more recent historical research on Gloucester relates to periods before 1800 and this is reflected in the articles published in the Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, though that coverage is not fully representative of all the work which has been undertaken. Work on the city in the nineteenth century has been on several specialised themes, mainly of a political and administrative nature which also throw some light on the social order. Canal and railway histories as well as some county subjects are also relevant. The very recently published volume of the Victoria History of the Counties of England on Gloucester is a much needed source of information which was previously scattered, not readily available or has been recently researched.¹ It was in preparation when work for this study was in progress. As it follows the established format for the series in tracing the city's development from the Anglo-Saxon period to 1985 there is still room for more detailed analytical themes on limited periods. This study is primarily an economic subject which makes a point of including relevant social considerations, so it is a thematic rather than a biographical urban study.² Both approaches hold pitfalls for the unwary: on the one hand there is the biographical tendency to consider a town in isolation and on the other, one of over narrowness or statistical abstraction which can lose touch with the community under examination.

While scholars have long been concerned with questions relating


to industrial towns those outside the mainstream of that development in the nineteenth century have received less attention, although they were also involved in the general process of economic growth. County towns as traditional economic and social centres for the villages and market towns in wide areas around them, were important in the urban hierarchy because over half the population still lived in the countryside and small towns in 1851. Gloucester was one of these towns of regional standing, and the way it experienced economic growth can add to the understanding of that part of the national economy.

From the Saxon period to the dissolution of the monasteries the city was one of the major ecclesiastical centres of the country, a position closely related to its military and administrative importance for the crown. In a series of charters the town received the privileges frequently conferred on royal boroughs. These antecedents left a legacy of complex territorial divisions with which local government had to contend later and which need to be outlined as references to them cannot be avoided. They help to account for the discrepancy between the 680 acres quoted in the Census Abstracts as the total area of the city, which probably included the town fields out in the county, and the surveys of 1782 and 1851 which gave the borough an acreage of 317 before 1835 and 415 after that date. The additional acres brought the municipal and parliamentary boroughs into line, but did not incorporate all the growing suburbs. Though those outlying areas were in the county, they were out hamlets of city parishes and so were administratively as well as socially attached to the town. Ten of


the 11 medieval parishes were separately rated through the Corporation of the Poor, which is explained in the chapter which follows. For ecclesiastical purposes there had been amalgamations which left six churches, one of which was too poor to function independently, and only the graveyard of another. In size the parishes ranged from about two to 75 acres within the city boundary. Of the three with out hamlets and scattered fragments, St. Mary de Lode was the largest with 3,500 acres. The hamlets were distinguished by amalgamating the names of their locality and the parish concerned, as for Barton St. Michael. Extra-parochial land in the county was another anomaly as the county gaol, though physically in the city was in one such area. The city maps of 1843 and 1851 record these divisions.

As was frequently done, the Corporation had promoted legislation in the eighteenth century to secure expensive improvements for a better water supply, opening up the main streets and putting down nuisances. The clauses against the latter proved ineffectual as the Corporation had to rely on dilatory parish officers for their enforcement. The Market Act of 1821 rehearsed them again at length.

To 1835 the city had a closed Corporation. Before 1800 the status of freemen was already valued as a qualification for voting at Parliamentary elections. There were between 1500 and 2000 freemen as the privilege was acquired by gift, by purchase or by completing an apprenticeship registered in the city, and thereafter by inheritance. The Corporation used its patronage in support of the Whigs, but for most of the period under consideration representation was divided between Whigs and Tories.


The Whig M.Ps had the stronger connections with the city, with the exception of Admiral Berkeley who belonged to the leading Whig family in the county. 7

The period covered here begins in 1820 because it is a generally suitable date to start a consideration of Gloucester's economy in the first half of the nineteenth century, and it ends in 1851 to include the census data for that year and because the direction later developments were to take became more obvious in the 1840s. The subject is developed to show how Gloucester's economy operated at three interlocking levels, namely in the town itself, the town as integral to the region centred on it, and then its main connections with other parts of the country and their local relevance. The interaction of established forms and innovative influences occurred at all three levels.

Several questions underlie the development of the subject and are related to those three levels. The first is how far the town's economy was dependent on the ease and range of its means of communication, and in particular, the extent to which the Gloucester Berkeley Canal affected the urban economy and altered the balance of the city's relationships with other places. Integration into the national economy did not necessarily hinge on the canal alone. More immediately, the influence of the rapid growth of Cheltenham, only nine miles away, has to be part of a study of Gloucester. Thirdly, several issues arise concerning the town itself, namely the relationships between the urban economy and its occupational structure and between economic strength and urban leadership. So it is relevant to ask how far that leadership was used to further the town's interests. Lastly to focus these questions, was the combined potential of the various forces at work sufficient to change the city's economic and social orientation to the point that

its traditional role as a county town became less recognisable?

Answers to these questions and evidence of the three levels at which the town functioned are pursued together through chapters which examine different facets of the town's economic life. Thus a particular issue can be central in one or more connections but becomes merely incidental in many others. The first three chapters provide the context for the more limited topics which follow, and they also introduce subjects which are taken up in different ways later on. The fourth chapter makes the transition in two ways: it is concerned with traditional centres of commercial activity in contrast to more recent or new developments in the town. Secondly, it begins to move from analysis of overall situations to a greater emphasis on the significance of individual responses in the process of development. The final chapter brings the principal elements together again.

The aims require attention to be centred on influential and distinctive aspects of the city's economy. The inclusion of others might be thought desirable but that would entail excessive length. Social class is perhaps the most obvious omission, but as this is an economic study the occupational structure is more relevant for that society. Industries could not be dealt with in any detail because there is too little material on which to work. Awareness of religious, social and cultural life is necessary, but not their separate treatment.

Of the many sources used, those recurring most frequently are the Gloucester Journal, the 1851 Census Enumerators' Books for Gloucester and the Corporation records. The Journal was both the oldest and then the leading newspaper once others became established in the city and in Cheltenham. In 1871 on the death of D.M. Walker, its manager and proprietor for 50 years, another paper paid tribute to its 'freedom

from intentional unfairness, misrepresentation or suppression'.

It avoided party rancour even when in times of heightened political tension its moderate Whig-Liberal alignment showed through. The Gloucestershire Chronicle, however, which began publication in 1833, was overtly Tory and generally gives less information than the Journal, which also provides insight into the Corporation's deliberations. Later newspaper references mainly come from J.J. Powell's vast collection of cuttings. He was a barrister and briefly a Liberal M.P. for the city of his birth in which he remained interested until his death in 1891. In accordance with his will, his volumes are in the City Library.

The published Census Abstracts and Directories were used as the basis for comparisons but the full record of the Enumerators' Books was preferred to sampling for work on the town. It was practicable to do this manually for the limited purposes for which information was sought. Attention centres on the employed population, and in some instances, on heads of household only. Though a variety of city records was consulted, extensive use was made of the Corporation's Minutes and those of its main committee which had day to day executive responsibility. The other sources include business records relating to property, banking and the canal. Copies of wills in the diocesan archives, supplemented by the published Calendar for the years after 1857 and probate information at the Public Record Office proved invaluable. Though the results of work on parish records are less evident, they are useful.


CHAPTER I

CITY AND COUNTY

Introduction

Gloucester's regional context is considered first as the town's economic life was embedded in it and there are frequent references to its various features in subsequent chapters. The economic development of most county towns depended more on being the centre of business and commerce for a wide area of country around them than on large scale production for distant markets. The first two parts of this chapter deal with the advantages and limitations of Gloucester's geographical position as they affected the town's economy in the early nineteenth century and the extent of its hinterland. As a town of any size had to secure the benefits of improved road and water transport to maintain its position, the city's main lines of communication are considered first. Not all the improvements made in the county by 1820 were to the city's advantage.

The definition of the town's sphere of influence is approached in several ways: a review of the main physical and economic features of the county is followed by an analysis of the patterns of regular trade between the town and surrounding places, and of migration to the city. As Gloucester was both a county town and a cathedral city, there were other aspects to its centrality arising from administrative and institutional functions, which not only covered the area most obviously connected with the town by trade but also extended well beyond it in some directions.

The experience and attitude of a traveller writing for the *Universal Magazine* in 1794, point to several changes which were affecting the city.

After being exhilarated on surveying the 'grandeur' of the wide view of the Severn Valley and the hills beyond to the west, he preferred to drive on to Gloucester, 'the great object of the vale' as it was not worth getting out of his chaise for the accommodation in Cheltenham. By 1820 he might have made a different decision and thirty years on he would almost certainly have stayed in Cheltenham and made the journey to Gloucester either by bowling along a good road, or by catching a train for a brief visit. This illustrates how fast changes were taking place. He also observed that the city had not grown as quickly as towns better placed for trade and manufacture. By 1820 such changes as had occurred were insufficient to have altered the position at all radically. Fosbroke, writing in 1819, considered that the inhabitants had not made the most of their advantages: he thought that new manufactures only needed energetic promotion to take root and prosper. The most obvious advantages he saw were Gloucester's position as a centre of communications and a relatively prosperous hinterland.

The Main Lines of Communication in the County to 1820

Gloucester's position at the intersection of the principal long distance routes through the county and at the lowest bridging point on the River Severn gave the town economic and strategic importance for many centuries. The London to South Wales road crossed the river by way of the Westgate and Over bridges on the western edge of the town, and it was intersected at the Cross, in the centre of the town, by the road from Bristol and the South West to Worcester and the Midlands. In the early nineteenth century these routes were as important as ever for the town's prosperity. Measures to improve roads in the county had begun before 1750 but further work remained to be done after 1800. Similarly some canal building had

taken place but the problem of navigating the lower reaches of the Severn was still unresolved by 1820.

The map of the county shows that the Severn flows by Gloucester in two channels, the town being situated by the tortuous eastern arm. Half a mile of causeway between the two bridges normally kept the road above flood level. Across the lower part of the town Dockham Ditch, flowing into the river, was all that remained of the main channel used in Roman times. The continuation of Westgate Street beyond the ditch over Foreign Bridge was known as the Island. The town Quay lay below Westgate Bridge on the eastern channel, clear of the shifting sands and strong currents which made the lower Severn particularly hazardous for shipping. Twice monthly spring tides governed sailings below Tewkesbury. Thus these obstacles seriously limited the use of the Severn in the system of inland water transport at a time when economic development in the Midlands could use greatly expanded facilities.

The Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal, opened in 1772, linked the upper Severn to the Trent and Mersey Canal. Then in 1821 barges could go from the river by way of the Birmingham and Worcester Canal into the network of waterways centred on Birmingham and the Grand Junction Canal. Owing to the traffic generated by the Staffordshire and Worcestershire, Stourport grew up where the canal joined the Severn and led the company to back the completion of the Stroudwater and the construction of the Thames Severn Canal, to establish an inland route from the West Midlands to London as an alternative to shipping cargoes by sea from Bristol. One object of the Stroudwater at its inception in 1730 was
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to cut out the need to carry dyers' materials from Gloucester to the industry in the valleys around Stroud. Similarly, the short Coombe Hill Canal of 1796 was intended to supply coal to Cheltenham. However, in the event, the tramway, built in 1811 from there to the Quay in Gloucester made it uneconomic. The same year legislation authorised the construction of the towpath between Worcester and Gloucester. Following the opening of the Birmingham Worcester Canal, Worcester became a more important centre for river shipping than Stourport. Cargo from as far upstream as Bewdley and Stourport went down to Bristol where it was either landed for local use and distribution, or trans-shipped onto coastal or seagoing vessels.

There was also competition nearer at hand. Tewkesbury, 11 miles above Gloucester, at the confluence of the Severn and the Warwickshire Avon, had a considerable stake in the river carrying trade. Both above and below Gloucester small riverside towns and villages engaged in the same business, notably Berkeley, Frampton-on-Severn, Lydney and Gatcombe. Twyning and Upton-on-Severn, above Tewkesbury, Evesham on the Avon, Framilode and Brimscombe on the Stroudwater were others. Chepstow and Newnham could also handle small seagoing ships whereas few reached the Quay at Gloucester or the unfinished dock when it became accessible from the river in 1812. Even the trows, built for the river, got into difficulties in spite of their shallow draught on this part of the Severn. Thus far canal construction had not made enough progress to have had much effect on Gloucester's participation in river trade.

7. Ibid., pp. 126, 149. Porteous, op. cit., p. 100.
8. G.R.O., D4292/1-4, Register of Shipping, passim.
Acts authorising the Gloucester and Hereford Canal were passed in 1791 and 1793, and the Gloucester Berkeley Canal also in 1793. Both remained unfinished in 1820, having been quickly overtaken by exhausted finances and scarcity of funds during long years of war. Well established commercial links between Gloucester and Hereford were expected to become more profitable with easier and cheaper canal transport, especially as the Wye was too shallow to be reliable up to Hereford. The first stage of that canal, between Gloucester and Ledbury by way of Newent, opened in 1798.\textsuperscript{10} The Gloucester and Berkeley was immediately hailed as a remarkable concept with the potential to make the port status conferred on the town in 1580 a reality, as it was to be large enough to take seagoing vessels of more than 300 tons. Work ceased when no more than the dock basin and five miles of canal had been cut and was only resumed after further legislation to make it join the Severn at Sharpness instead of Berkeley. Though its promoters confidently reaffirmed the expectations of ultimate success they were a long way from realising them in 1820.\textsuperscript{11}

By then Gloucester and Cheltenham had come to share a focal position on the main roads of the county, at opposing intersections of four routes, two running east and west and two, north and south. The turnpiking of the last section of the road north from Bath through Stroud and Cheltenham to Evesham was virtually complete. Part of the London to South Wales route joined the two towns. It was extremely busy and in 1809 was so badly maintained that its status as a post road was temporarily withdrawn. Another route from Wiltshire went through


Cirencester and down the steep hill at Birdlip to Gloucester; then across the river, three roads diverged: two went north of the Forest of Dean, the one to Ledbury and Leominster, the other to Ross-on-Wye and Hereford, the third followed the Severn down to Chepstow. One of the new roads across the Forest connected Gloucester and Monmouth more directly. Nearly all this system had been turnpiked before 1800 and an almost new road between Gloucester and Stroud was in progress. Of the 11 roads converging on the city, six were mail coach routes in 1830, as against three out of nine centred on Cheltenham and two out of the 10 at Cirencester. The main roads, especially the two running north and south, were interlinked at many points by a network of local roads serving market towns and villages.\(^\text{12}\)

The early turnpiking was more a recognition of the necessity for better roads than a sign of much progress. Good road stone was not generally available: in the valley waterlogged clay added to travellers' problems and on the Cotswolds the weather broke up the limestone and rain turned it into thick mud. After 1800 conditions were improving on those roads within reach of the river as hard stone was shipped from Bristol to Gloucester.\(^\text{13}\)

Though the roads left much to be desired, conditions were very different from what they had been about 1750 when the 'Flying Machine', the six horse coach on the road between London and Gloucester, needed three days to make the journey. By 1817 light stage coaches took 15 hours and by 1826 that time had been cut by three hours and nearly 100 coaches were leaving the town for different destinations each week.\(^\text{14}\)

Nonetheless the need to finish the canals was undiminished. Their


completion and influence on the town are taken up in later chapters. How far the system of communications which has been outlined was enough to make Gloucester the centre of distribution for the county is considered in the next two sections of this chapter.

An Outline of the County Economy 1800-1850

The main physical characteristics of the county are considered first as they tended to limit the trading advantages which the long distance routes already described gave Gloucester within the county. The varied agricultural, mineral and industrial production is briefly reviewed in relation to the main geographical areas. Finally the strategic siting of the principal markets in the county and of the minor market towns for the purposes of more local trade is outlined.

The county and its main physical features lie on a north-east south-west axis with two very different areas of hill country divided by the wide Severn Valley. The Cotswolds to the east, extend the full length of the county, the oolitic limestone hills are at their highest and steepest at their western edge and slope gently eastwards towards Oxfordshire and Berkshire, north to Warwickshire and more abruptly to Worcestershire. In the west, the area between the Severn and Wye is divided into two distinct parts: the wooded hills of the Forest of Dean dominate the southern half and used to contain considerable deposits of coal and iron while in the northern part undulating lowland rises gradually to the north and the borders of Herefordshire. Near Newent in this area there was another very small coal field. Lias clay predominates in the Severn Valley though there is a variety of better drained land and another coalfield to the north of Bristol.

Sheep and corn husbandry were the mainstay for Cotswold farmers. Knowledgeable observers all agreed that their system of management was comparatively efficient. The area suffered from being relatively

15. J.P. Dodd, 'Gloucestershire Agriculture 1801-1854' in B.G.A.S.,
remote from major markets and convenient water transport, though the far south east of the county had access to the Thames at Lechlade, and in the north it was possible to reach the Avon. The tramway opened in 1826 between Stratford and Moreton-in-Marsh eased the carriage of coal and produce between the river and the north eastern edge of the upland area. However, the Thames Severn Canal had already alleviated the isolation of the central part of the Cotswolds, linking Cirencester with Lechlade and markets in Bristol, if goods were transferred from barges to river boats. Coal which had gone by road from Gloucester then went more directly by canal. After the Gloucester Berkeley Canal came into use barges could go to and fro from the city, a shorter and easier route than the one to Bristol. So by the 1820s access to markets in the Midlands, Bristol and London had improved. The canals of the Stroud valley stimulated development on the other side of the Severn. The Hereford and Gloucester Canal started first; then to give access to the rivers from the centre of the Forest, tramways were built by 1815, to the Wye near Lydbrook and Coleford, and to the Severn at Lydney and Bullo Pill (creek). Three Gloucester bankers were leading promoters and their bank failed partly because one of them invested too heavily in a related venture. Though some Forest coal was on sale in Gloucester, much more went across the river to the Stroud valley. Even so, development in the Forest was hampered by limited and expensive transport to the rivers, keeping the price of coal in Gloucester above that charged for supplies from Staffordshire. Serious rioting in 1831

17. Ibid., p. 331.
resulted from growing friction between free miners, 'foreigners' who bought mining rights, and the Crown trying to protect its timber.

Following the recommendations of a Royal Commission and legislation, mining rights were awarded in 1841 and development went ahead more rapidly. Edward Protheroe of Bristol and William Crawshay of South Wales then dominated the coal and iron industries in the Forest. William Montague, a city iron merchant with a foundry established in 1802, took a large part in developing two major iron works from the 1820s until his death in 1847.

The agricultural district to the north of the Forest remained comparatively backward in 1850: parts badly needed draining, sheep grazed extensive commons and wastes, and much permanent pasture remained. Cattle and sheep were fattened for market, and orchards produced large quantities of cider and perry. On the east side of the Severn improvements were patchy: most tenant farmers did not have the means to invest much in their holdings and as landlords had no difficulty in finding tenants they made little effort to help them. Yet many resident gentry became actively engaged in improving their farms. The mixed farming of this area produced butter, cheese, fat cattle, sheep and pigs, wheat and cider. In some places, especially near the towns and in the Berkeley area, which was famous for its cheese, pasture predominated. Some of the hay grown on rich meadows was shipped up to the mines of Staffordshire to feed horses.

20. Ibid., pp. 228, 272.
Around the larger towns farming had been adapted to supply the urban market. Grassland was in evidence for grazing dairy cows, butchers' animals and horses, and for hay. For instance, a report of 1830 on the effects of falling prices on Lord Sydney's tenant farmers near Gloucester made clear their pastureland economy. It also called attention to the way the locality had been 'literally inundated with (cheap) Irish pigs'. As there is no evidence of animals kept in stalls in the town, the city's milk supplies must have come from the surrounding countryside. Market gardens, known as 'garden grounds' supplied vegetables and soft fruit. Town inns required large quantities of straw, hay and beans for horses' bedding and fodder; soapboilers used straw ash as an alkali. In return the residue of their production and the manure from stables and road sweepings went out onto the fields.

Widely scattered centres of industry were located in an area extending from the western edge of the Cotswolds to the Wye. Major concentrations were to the north of Bristol, in the Forest of Dean and in the valleys from Stroud to Wotton-under-Edge. Well established mining, iron and brass works were associated with Bristol in contrast to the much less developed Forest of Dean. The cloth industry, famous for its high quality products was in the process of change from domestic to factory organisation. It became concentrated near the fast flowing streams from the hills which made Stroud the principal centre, a position reinforced by the canals and then by the railway. However, from the 1830s the industry was contracting as it was not sufficiently adaptable in the face of competition from Yorkshire. The loss of a secure market following the end of the East India Company's monopoly

24. G.C.L., RF 201.2(6), Letter from T. Fulljames to Townsend, 1830.
and the economic depression bit so deeply that cloth making almost disappeared from the area round Dursley and Wotton-under-Edge. The severe unemployment caused enough people to leave in search of work that the population declined in the worst affected places.

Gloucester's direct connection with the industry was slight: about 1820 there was a small spinning mill which failed and woolstapling was in decline. No young men in the four families concerned carried on the business. Finished cloth was marketed through London not Gloucester.

Papermaking, located in some 27 small mills was the most dispersed industry at this time. It had grown up rapidly in the eighteenth century in conjunction with cloth and corn mills and water powered iron works but it too was in decline by 1851 as modern machinery superseded older methods of production. There were also a few scattered mills working metal: close to Gloucester one was used for edge tool making and another for wire drawing which later became a flock mill.

In 1820 the most localised industries were stocking making at Tewkesbury and pin making in Gloucester. Though both were in decline by 1850, stocking making and the minor allied trades of lace making and silk throwing lasted longer than the pin industry. Stocking making was said to employ a quarter of the population in 1830 whereas the proportion then engaged in pin making was far less, at about 1500.

27. J. Tann, Gloucestershire Woollen Mills, 1967, Chapter 4, passim.
28. Ibid., p. 60. Uley population - 2641 in 1831, 1327 in 1851.
both cases the great majority were women and children. The pin industry was introduced into Gloucester about 1626 to provide the poor with employment. It became the one industry of the town supplying distant markets and the main centre of pin making in the eighteenth century. However, partly as a result of losing the American market due to war in 1812 the number of manufacturers fell from 12 in 1802 to three by 1830. The industry lacked enterprise and relied on its London warehouses for distribution so that it lost ground in the face of a growing number of competitors in Bristol, London and elsewhere. The structure of the industry altered as operations were centred in factories. There child labour was negligible among the respective workforces of 150, 130 and 50 though sticking pins into papers was probably still put out and done by children.

Contemporary authorities made little reference to the nature of the trade passing through the main markets at Gloucester, Cirencester and Tewkesbury. The warehousing for corn which became available in Gloucester in the 1830s almost certainly affected the importance of Cirencester's corn market. Prior to that Gloucester was a market for Cotswold barley. By the 1820s the city's cheese market was a vestige of what it had once been, though city merchants handled some of the trade. Similarly the cider trade was in the hands of dealers in Ledbury, Worcester, Bristol and Gloucester. The number of cattle, sheep and pigs sold at weekly and monthly markets, and the city fairs made Gloucester a regional market in addition to meeting local requirements. Animals reared

34. Jones, 'Hall, English and Co', loc. cit., p. 36.
37. Ibid., p. 381.
in other counties were fattened locally and then many were taken to the Midlands or London, and Cotswold farmers bought cattle in the Gloucester market. 38

Just as the principal markets serving the county were located where they had some part in long distance trade, so most other market towns were located where people from nearby hill and valley land could meet easily. Eight were mainly widely spaced near the long eastern edge of the county. Seven others, from Winchcombe in the north to Wotton-under-Edge were either near or below the western edge of the hills, Cheltenham was one of them, and three out of four in the orbit of Bristol were similarly located. Three of the five towns in the valley, including Gloucester and Tewkesbury were by the river and the same pattern obtained near the Forest, where Chepstow, Monmouth and Ross in other counties served people on both sides of the Wye. 39

From this account of agriculture and industry in the county it is apparent that Gloucester's economic importance was affected by geographical factors and the presence of Bristol. Even so, the city was a centre of some significance for trade in the agricultural products of parts of the county and a source of farm animals brought for sale from further afield. However, trade in the goods produced by industries in the county was not channelled through the city and city men do not appear to have interested themselves in those industries, with one exception. Yet very few were prepared to invest to any extent in the Forest of Dean, though the advantage of development there became more obvious in the 1830s. Other aspects of the economic ties between the city and the county are explored in the rest of this chapter.

The General Pattern of Local Trade and Migration Centred on Gloucester

In the earlier eighteenth century Gloucester had a fairly circumscribed hinterland\(^{40}\) and the outline of the county economy has suggested reasons why this was still the case a century later. Within a town's sphere of influence social and economic ties with the urban population were at their strongest in its immediate environs and tailed off until they became weaker than the competing attraction of other centres. The clearest indications of the extent of Gloucester's hinterland are to be found in the area well supplied with carriers' routes and by a high incidence of migration into the town. As most of the carriers went between the city and neighbouring market towns the hinterland covered considerably more than the area which was most integrated into the town's affairs and which provided the bulk of produce on sale in the markets, as it included at least a part of similar weekly market areas centred on those other towns.\(^{41}\)

Map 2, which illustrates the distribution of advertised carriers' routes centred on Gloucester in 1820 does not fully represent the economic activity taking place in the area they covered. In the first place there were omissions from the published list as another for 1822 named carriers going to Newent, an obvious place to have such services, and in two years there was a suspiciously large increase in the number going between Gloucester and Cheltenham.\(^{42}\) The absence of provision for the villages within walking distance of the town can be accounted for by the fact that carriers went through them and villagers' carts must have made the journey fairly frequently. Carriers did not cater

---


42. Pigot, Directory, 1822, p. 60 and p. 50 - carriers linked eight towns with Cheltenham.
for larger consignments of wholesale goods or deliveries to the houses of the gentry.

These services followed the usual rhythm as most were synchronised with Gloucester market days, especially Saturdays. The exceptions were on a few longer distance routes taking more than a day to reach their destinations, or when a daily service could be sustained. The busiest route was between Cheltenham and Gloucester. Carriers went to nearly all the market towns in the more distant parts of the county. The exceptions were the areas covered by Cheltenham to the east and north, and most of that nearest to Bristol in the south. The great majority of carriers going to Cirencester and Stroud went from Gloucester, not Cheltenham, and the other market towns only had services with Gloucester. In addition a market boat went each week between Tewkesbury and the city. Places to the west of the Severn in the area lying between the routes to Ledbury and Chepstow were relatively well served. The district with most carriers was south of Gloucester, extending from the cloth making towns and villages to the Severn and it included one of the two most populous parts of the county outside the towns. South again, there was a fairly sharp transition to a narrow zone where the city's attraction was slight, in a band between Tetbury and Wotton-under-Edge. The routes going further still to Lechlade, Bath and Bristol are an indication of the way people in remote little places along the way needed occasional contacts with distant towns and for whom regular long distance waggon services were inappropriate. Thus Gloucester's influence as a trading centre included much of the most populous part of the county north of the area adjacent to Bristol. It barely extended
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20 miles in any direction and was much reduced to the north and east as Cheltenham was the effective limit.

Long distance heavier goods waggons went out in all directions, and more particularly to Bristol, Bath, Birmingham and London. One firm based in Gloucester had a depot in Cheltenham and its daily services covered both towns. Fortnightly sailings on the Severn augmented goods transport considerably, but the main local firm belonged to Tewkesbury.45

The same map also presents the areas within which people were theoretically most likely to use the markets and shops in Gloucester and Cheltenham respectively in preference to another further away. Though these areas are more limited than the carriers' range they have much the same directional emphasis and Gloucester almost certainly served as many people in a district only a little smaller than that associated with Cheltenham. However, the towns in that part of the county were near enough to each other for a good many people to go where conditions suited them best or to go to more than one, as markets were held on different days of the week.46 It is possible that one town was relatively more attractive than another but some competition between them was unavoidable.

Map 5 shows the pattern of migration into Gloucester from within the county, based on the 1851 census returns47 as this was the first time birthplaces were recorded. However, it must be remembered that some people had moved before they arrived in the city as the data for their children indicates. The rate of migration is related to the birthplaces of all those aged 16 years and over and for the few juveniles with stated occupations. To establish a basis for comparison, the number of migrants has been

45. G.J., 11.8.1817; 31.5.1834.
47. G.R.O., microfilms, 376, 377/1-3.
Migration into Gloucester from within the County, based on the Census Returns 1851.
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expressed as a proportion of the population of their parishes of origin. Thus the numerically large groups from Cheltenham and Stroud do not stand out among smaller populations with equal or higher rates. It would be unwise to conclude that the parishes with relatively high rates lost the majority of them to Gloucester, though this was very probable for villages near the city. The areas on the map indicating negligible movement retained and attracted people either because employment opportunities were growing, as in the Forest of Dean, or alternatively there were other more promising and accessible places to go to, like Cheltenham and Bristol. The areas with average to high rates of migration showed a greater variation from one parish to another than those from which few came.

The highest rates were nearest to the city and distance was one factor affecting their decline. The majority of migrants originated generally in the more populous rural areas having trading connections with the city, the rates for some riverside parishes were particularly high. Movement from most of the market towns conformed to that of their localities. The notable exceptions were those north of the Forest of Dean and two above Stroud where the rates were unusually high, while they were low for Cheltenham and Berkeley. In better times the cloth making parishes had attracted population, but people in the nearby rural areas could no longer expect to find work there.

As migration within the county needs to be set in the wider context Table 1.1 presents the overall distribution of birthplaces on the general basis of distance from Gloucester. This shows that of the 72% born in the county, under half were natives of the city; the latter would have made up a greater proportion if the juvenile population had been taken into account. The other 28% show

48. Within 5 miles, Elmore 14%, Minsterworth 13%; 6-10 miles, Deerhurst 14%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester city and suburbs</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>32.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 5 miles of the city</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a distance of 6-10 miles</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 11-20 &quot;</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 20 miles and over in the county</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified places in the county</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent counties</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other counties and abroad</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Migrants from adjacent counties:**

- Worcestershire: 397
- Herefordshire: 371
- Wiltshire: 298
- Somerset: 182
- Warwickshire: 152
- Monmouthshire: 143
- Oxfordshire: 140
- City and County of Bristol: 322

**Migrants from other counties:**

- London, Westminster and Middlesex: 413
- South Coast: 484
  - Kent: 77
  - Sussex: 62
  - Hants: 75
  - Isle of Wight: 4
  - Dorset: 41
  - Devon: 183
  - Cornwall: 42
- Midlands: 323
  - Salop: 91
  - Staffs.: 84
  - Derby: 22
  - Leicester: 51
  - Northants.: 33
  - Notts.: 17
  - Lincs.: 18
  - Rutland: 7
- Inland Home Counties: 217
  - Beds.: 15
  - Berks.: 88
  - Bucks.: 24
  - Herts.: 20
  - Surrey: 70
- North West: 131
  - Ches.: 20
  - Lancs.: 98
  - Liverpool: 37
  - Cumberland: 9
  - Westmorland: 1
  - Isle of Man: 3
- East Anglia: 109
  - Hunts.: 5
  - Norfolk: 42
  - Essex: 30
  - Suffolk: 28
  - Cambs.: 4
- North East: 106
  - Yorks.: 88
  - Durham: 6
  - Northumberland: 12
- Ireland: 230
  - Wales: 172
  - Scotland: 105
  - Channel Isles: 8
  - Abroad: 80.
several distinctive features. Herefordshire and Worcestershire, in or near the Severn Valley had higher rates and numbers of migrants than other counties. Trade and communications were predisposing influences to judge by the numbers from counties with ports and shipping business. Devon was the outstanding example, with Plymouth, Devonport and Exeter named frequently. More than two thirds of Lancashire migrants came from Liverpool. Chatham was prominent among places in Kent as were Bridgnorth, Abingdon and Reading on the Severn and the Thames. The number from London and the Home Counties contrasts with insignificant movement from East Anglia northwards. People coming from a distance were mainly born in towns. Broadly similar patterns of migration occurred in many parts of the country. 49

Thus the movement of people into Gloucester can be seen to have had a close correspondence with the area covered by local carriers and the main long distance transport services. In later chapters further reference is made to this relationship. Though the city's hinterland was limited by the presence of Cheltenham and Bristol, and was shared to some extent with the nearby larger market towns of Tewkesbury and Stroud, it had a mixed economy and included much of the more populous part of the county, from the Severn valley to the Wye. However, the city had other important ties across the county.

County Town and Cathedral City

The status of county town and cathedral city conferred social and economic advantages. By reason of its parishes, Gloucester was an integral part of the diocese but the town was unusual in having the status of a county in its own right, with the result that two separate magistracies held Quarter Sessions there which came together at the Assizes. These relationships were built into the fabric of society. Richard III

had conferred on the town county and full civic status with a mayor in 1483, and Henry VIII established the bishopric in 1541 following the dissolution of St. Peter's Abbey. ⁵⁰ Though the three authorities had well defined boundaries and jurisdictions they had some common concerns on which they were able to co-operate.

The county and diocese had different territorial limits and in 1836 the diocese underwent major changes. The area between the Severn and the Wye, which had been until then in the diocese of Hereford, was added to Gloucester and the southern Cotswolds as well as the southern-most parishes in the county near Bristol were transferred to that diocese. ⁵¹ These changes tended to confirm the economic orientation of those parts of the county. Any benefits of rationalisation and establishing parishes in the Forest of Dean in 1842, were far outweighed by the unification of the dioceses of Bristol and Gloucester in 1836, especially as the Bishop lived at Stapleton, near Bristol. ⁵² Diocesan affairs were normally conducted in the cathedral and adjacent rooms. Clergy attended meetings, wills were proved, tithe surveys authorised for many parishes and Consistory Court cases required the parties to appear in person. Several local laywers were permanent officials of the diocese. The College School was intimately connected with the cathedral by its foundation charter and by its use of the library as a schoolroom. More than half the boys came from a distance and the rest were sons of leading citizens and gentry, so potentially useful associations could easily grow out of boyhood friendships. ⁵³

⁵³. G.C.L., 17675, The Kings School Register, passim. GDR B4/1 and 3, 150 or more cases 1820 to 1850. Rudder, op. cit., Appendix p. xcix.
From time to time the Bishop and the cathedral had a prominent place in city life. Episcopal example and patronage gave influential support to charitable causes, like Sunday and day schools, by means of sermons. Occasionally the Bishop presided at a meeting on behalf of other socially useful schemes or gave a large and well publicised donation. The cathedral was a matter of local pride and visitors made a point of seeing its medieval glories.54 Formal occasions brought leading dignitaries of the county, city and diocese together for Assize services attended by the judges. Pious loyalty was expressed there on the death of the sovereign and also to mark the coronation of his successor, when all the charity school children went in procession to the service as a demonstration of communal good feeling and unity. County and city subscribers to the Infirmary also processed to their annual service but by far the grandest social event was the Triennial Music Meeting.55

While diocesan affairs were out of the public eye, those of the county were city occasions. The town filled with people from anywhere in the county, among them witnesses, friends, lawyers and magistrates to attend the courts. For instance in 1838 between 35 and 45 of the 85 magistrates were present at any one time. Four of those who attended all four sessions represented the furthest petty sessional divisions. Successive chairmen came from Cirencester and Berkeley, indicating the county leaders' detachment from routine city matters.56 Crowds of spectators joined participants at contested county elections and the throngs watching infrequent executions at the county gaol were even greater.57 A few assiduous clerical county magistrates were familiar

54. G.J., 8.3.1824 on Bishop Ryder; 2, 9.4.1831.
56. G.R.O., Q/JO.1, Qualifying Magistrates, 1837. Q/SM 1/5 Quarter Sessions Minutes, 1838.
57. G.J., 7, 14.5.1831; 22.4.1837.
figures in the town. The Rev. F.E. Witts of Upper Slaughter was one the most active and long serving and his diary is witness to his frequent visits. Convivial dinners after the end of court sittings delayed the magistrates' return home. However, Witts and his wife looked to Cheltenham for town social life. 58

In the later eighteenth century the magistrates had undertaken a complete reform and rebuilding of their prisons. Their county gaol in Gloucester opened in 1791 and was for a time in the van of prison reform. 59 County Quarter Sessions and the Assizes were held not far away in the courts at Shire Hall, an imposing building with a fine classical facade facing Westgate Street. It was built to the design of Robert Smirke and came into use in 1816. The Corporation made an initial contribution to its cost and subsequently paid towards the upkeep. City Quarter Sessions soon moved there and it was used for other official city events occasionally. 60

The county Infirmary in Gloucester was the product of a period when the aristocracy and landed gentry joined with the urban élite in town social life. 61 The Infirmary was a monument to co-operation between county, church and city through a large body of subscribers. The Bishop of the day was their first president. The new building opened in 1761 and demand for its services led to a major extension in 1827 which increased the number of beds to 170. The work of its doctors quickly won a reputation which made it compare favourably with other county hospitals. Poor patients, nominated by subscribers, came

from all parts of the county.\textsuperscript{62} It took much longer to bring to fruition plans for the lunatic asylum similarly supported by the county and city. It finally opened in 1823 and was run on enlightened principles.\textsuperscript{63}

From the eighteenth century the county and the cathedral authorities were associated with the city on one or more statutory bodies. The Corporation of the Poor was the first and it eventually became a powerful institution in the city. An act of 1702 gave it a constitution like that of the Bristol Corporation of the Poor, and later legislation modified its membership and responsibilities. The Bishop, Dean and senior officers of the diocese, the Mayor, five aldermen and thirty one elected representatives for the city parishes were made responsible for administering poor relief, and street lighting was added in 1764.\textsuperscript{64}

The Corporation of the Poor's power to raise compulsory rates gave it great permanence and authority which was exercised by the parish representatives as the ecclesiastical and civic members left management to them. By 1820 the parishes therefore looked upon this constitution as the model for managing any further civic schemes which entailed town rates. Acts of 1777 and 1806 associated the cathedral authorities, local gentry and the city Corporation as trustees to rebuild the causeway and the bridge at Maisemore, which spanned the western arm of the Severn on the Ledbury road, and the Westgate Bridge. Once the work was done their responsibilities lapsed.\textsuperscript{65}

As the centre of leadership for the diocese and the county, Gloucester was in some respects inseparable from the responsibilities

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{63} D. Lindsay Walker, 'Gloucester and the Beginning of the RMPA' in \textit{Journal of Mental Science}, 1961, 107, p. 605.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Rudder, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 198.
\item \textsuperscript{65} 17 Geo. III c.lxiviii, 1777; 46 Geo. III c.45, 1806.
\end{itemize}
of those authorities. In the eighteenth century the city had become a centre for the county in a social sense, in which the urban élite had a place so that mutual understanding grew. These relationships gave rise to several measures which were generally helpful to the economy of the town and the area centred on it. The demand for goods and services meant work and trade for city people and administration required professional services to be on hand. Signs of the attractions of élite society in Gloucester were still apparent in the 1820s, in the seasonal social round and the presence of some resident gentlefolk. 66

Conclusion

This chapter has set out those features of Gloucester's regional position which had a decisive influence on the character of the town's economy. Like other county towns on important long distance routes the city was a junction and staging post, and was also the centre where many short distance journeys from surrounding towns and villages ended. The urban economy depended on both for its trade. In 1820 the age old limitations affecting Gloucester's long distance trade on the Severn had not been overcome, so that Bristol, to the south, with Worcester to the north, dominated the shipment of cargo up and down the river. The town's key position on the London to South Wales road made it a regional centre for the distribution of mail 67 as well as goods. However, the balance of advantage was changing everywhere with improved means of communication. Canal development had enabled Stourport to eclipse Bewdley and had emphasised the weakness of Gloucester's position. It was therefore vital that the Gloucester Berkeley Canal should be completed to redress the balance and open up new prospects.


Gloucester served a limited hinterland where potentially productive agriculture was commonly retarded by inefficient management and most of the once thriving localised industries were in serious decline by 1850. As the city was only directly affected by the failure of its own pin industry the troubles of the others had less obvious effects than might have been expected. However, this was a relatively well populated district bound together by trade and the movement of population. Although it is only possible to quantify migration into the town, evidence for the non-settled poor in 1845 shows that outward movement was largely within a 20 mile radius of the city.68 Within the hinterland migration was differentially affected by the availability of employment, and beyond it, towns and trade routes helped to overcome the problems associated with distance. Gloucester's connections in these respects were with the West of England, the London area and particularly with places for which the River Severn was an important waterway.

The county and diocese had a very visible and influential presence in Gloucester. They also had the effect of extending the city's influence well beyond its more definable hinterland, making it very different from other market towns in the county. They incidentally helped the city to withstand competition from Cheltenham. However, partly because the unpleasant aspects of large towns became more objectionable, the gentry dissociated their social pleasures from their public responsibilities. They gradually turned to Cheltenham for the one, leaving the city as the main centre for the other: it was entirely appropriate for them to co-operate with the Bishop and leading city men in founding the County Magdalen Asylum for the rehabilitation of fallen working women in Gloucester.69

68. G.R.O., G/GL 8a/5 Gloucester Poor Law Guardians Minutes, pp. 246, 207, 246, 272.

CHAPTER II

GLOUCESTER 1820-1850: THE PHYSICAL SETTING

Introduction

'Modern Gloucester is merely a mutilated figure of its antique picturesque glory',¹ so wrote Fosbroke in 1819, thinking of the total or partial destruction of medieval buildings which had taken place at various times after the dissolution of the monasteries. Six of the ten parish churches had disappeared, so had the city's gates and most of its walls, the High Cross and street monuments.² The remains of two friaries and two monasteries were still visible, but the cathedral dwarfed the buildings around it and its beautiful tower was 'like a pharos to the surrounding country'.³ Contemporaries were generally more concerned with modernisation and critical of the poor state in which many old wood-framed buildings were allowed to remain, though on the main streets the decay was often hidden behind fine Georgian facades.⁴

In 1820 the centre of the town had several advantages. The Cross, where the four main roads met, was about 60 feet above sea level and the ground sloped gently down from there on all sides, providing natural drainage into streams which flowed into the Severn. The general layout of the roads was on a grid pattern, a legacy of Aethelflaeda's Saxon burh. The main roads were wide and straight as a result of improvements

made in the eighteenth century and lined with buildings where the administration for the town and county was conducted and city business was transacted in shops, banks, markets and the principal inns. The built-up area had changed little over the preceding century and was fairly compact, but not to the exclusion of gardens. Its maximum extent along the main roads was less than a mile from east to west and about half a mile from north to south.

This chapter is concerned with the general physical development of the town from about 1820 to 1851. It grew and in the process changed considerably. The first part establishes the distinctive economic and social features present in 1820. The emphasis in the second section is on the process of growth associated with economic development, and finally, attention turns to the problems exacerbated by that growth, which came together as the issue of public health.

The City about 1820

So far the city has been considered as part of a wider area. The description of Gloucester in 1820 which follows is a basis for understanding the scale of subsequent changes. A glance at Map 6 will confirm that the lines of the intersecting main roads offer a useful structure for portraying the town's salient features. This map has been chosen for the clarity of its detail. Map 7 defines the sectors by their geographical orientation in relation to the parishes to which it is convenient to make some reference. To provide further clarification, the main details mentioned in this and later chapters are presented on Map 8 as they are either too difficult to distinguish on Map 6 or they were later developments. For this reason no date is given for Map 8.


MAP 7

GLOUCESTER: CITY AND PARISH BOUNDARIES.

Boundaries:
city to 1535 ——
and after
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__Line of main road
———Worcester St.

M.D. Lobel gen. ed.,
Historic Towns, 1,196
Gloucester, map 6.
Causton, Map, 1843.
More than half the urban area was in the two western sectors. Their development was shaped by the river and the large sites occupied by the cathedral, St. Oswald's Priory, Blackfriars and the county gaol where the castle had been. As a result of the trade attracted by shipping and the bridges over the Severn, Westgate Street with the Island was the busiest and longest main street. The cathedral dominated the north western sector and its precinct made a large and attractive enclave. The parish churches of St. Nicholas and St. Mary de Lode to the west, and St. John's on Northgate St. reinforced the ecclesiastical character of the area. The ruins of St. Oswald's cast their shadow across St. Catherine's graveyard. St. Bartholomew's almshouse, rebuilt in 1789, had a large site on the Island and on the northern side there was a private park, a tannery and a spinning factory. All this was in great contrast to the miscellaneous traders along the main streets and the poverty to be found in the side lanes particularly down towards the river.

The south western sector was more compact and secular. Main roads and the river enclosed it on three sides and to the south the county and city gaols and Blackfriars were the limits. Here were the centres of administration: Shire Hall, the Tolsey at the Cross, two gaols, the city workhouse and the Customs house on the Quay. The Independent Chapel and a small almshouse were neighbours to the city gaol. This was also the mercantile area with its warehouses, yards, wharves and the Quay to which there was constricted access through narrow side roads from the main thoroughfares. By 1820 congestion had persuaded most of the leading coal dealers to migrate to the space around the unfinished dock basin, beyond the county gaol. Among the warehouses there was the new gas works, the iron foundry, soap, clay pipe and pin manufactories, the headquarters of the edge tool firm

and the depot of a major long distance carrier. Two of the principal coaching inns almost faced each other on either side of Lower Westgate Street and two more were on Southgate Street as well as many lesser inns and public houses.  

The south east sector was the least built up and was generally quieter with a well-do-do residential element well back from the small business area near the Cross. It was dignified by the fashionable churches of St. Michael and St. Mary de Crypt, and the county Infirmary on the southern outskirts. Just beyond the further end of Eastgate Street, was Barton Street bordered by spacious houses, little groups of cottages and pubs, gardens and fields. Lower Southgate Street was more open but the beginnings of suburban development at the Spa were evident nearby. The business area was important as the larger of the two markets opened off Eastgate Street; the vegetable and butter market was on the other side of Southgate Street. The Corporation had built them in 1786 to remove the sale of goods and provisions from the streets on market days.  

Compared with the rest of the town the north east sector had little to catch the eye except for the classical frontage of the Blue Coat School on Eastgate Street. A large concentration of craftsmen lived here. In the densely packed side streets the old industries of pinmaking and bell founding continued. There were coach and furniture, rope and brush makers among the many tailors and shoemakers. Several maltsters and woolstaplers were some of the more influential inhabitants. The site of the Poor School, refounded in 1813, and the first National School opened in 1816, near the end of Lower Northgate Street were

---

8. Ibid., pp. 101 sqq. G.J., 20.7.1818; 2.7.1821. GDR D936 E12/19, Dean and Chapter Register of Leases.
well chosen for the artisan population in this and the adjacent sector
the other side of Northgate Street. Beyond, along the London Road
which had many of the features to be seen in Barton Street, were the
other two almshouses administered by the city. 11 The mills mentioned
in the previous chapter were in this sector. The one, used in pin
making, was just inside the city boundary, the other a short distance
beyond it. 12

The contrasts were less stark than this brief outline suggests
as the four sectors were interdependent and had some common features,
though in different proportions, especially numerous craft occupations,
affluence and poverty, and the business concentrated in the four main
streets. Though Gloucester depended mainly on commerce it was allied
to the production of a considerable range of goods and materials. The
town had not outgrown its medieval pattern, as the administrative and
ecclesiastical centres and much of the economic activity were in the
western sectors. Some obvious changes had been made, but those taking
place over the next 30 years came more rapidly and were more far reaching.

Physical Changes and Expansion 1820 to 1851
In many ways the physical development of the city was a manifestation
of the urban function. This account establishes the spatial relationship
of developments to which reference is made in later chapters. It also
introduces the city Corporation's interpretation of its responsibilities
as they touched many aspects of the town. The benefits of improved
and newer forms of transport which had already stimulated economic
growth in other towns, came to Gloucester in this period. The working
population also grew and the character, availability and spread of

1843.

housing made a major contribution to the altered shape and appearance of the urban area. Development was immediately apparent around the old town but modification and renewal took place within it.

New transport facilities proved to be the expected key to Gloucester's economic development. Great excited crowds witnessed the opening ceremonies of the Gloucester Berkeley Canal on 26 April 1827. The undertaking had bred unrealistic expectations as it was envisaged that the port could capture much of the Birmingham trade from Bristol and Liverpool. Even so it was the most decisive event for the city in this 30 year period and to find another of comparable importance one has to look back to the siege of 1643. By 1851 docks, wharves, warehouses and yards extended from the edge of the town near the Quay and down the eastern bank of the Canal to occupy about 29 acres. The area was often crowded with vessels which could also tie up along a further mile of the canal bank. They entered the system on any high tide and were towed up to Gloucester. The docks encouraged the construction of other transport facilities. Tramway lines soon served the new quays. Work on the Gloucester Hereford Canal resumed in 1829 but was not finished until 1845, by which time there was convincing proof of the usefulness of a link with the ship canal.

By 1851 Gloucester had become a junction for railways much as it was for roads. The Railway Magazine asserted in 1838 that 'Gloucester is the port whence Birmingham and its densely populated neighbourhood receive their chief supplies' and that the Birmingham and Gloucester railway would link up the West and the North of England through


Birmingham. This line became fully operational in 1840, the Bristol and Gloucester in 1844, the GWR from Swindon to Cheltenham in 1845 and the Gloucester and Dean Forest, associated with the South Wales line, in 1851. The latter finally opened its large coal yards on the west bank of the canal in 1854. After the Midland Railway amalgamated with the Birmingham Gloucester and the Bristol Gloucester companies, it built a branch line into the docks in 1848.

There were problems at the station, the most famous being the practical incompatibility of the narrow and broad gauge lines which converged there. The resulting confusion was celebrated in the *Illustrated London News* as the rivalry for supremacy between the contending Midland and GWR systems was an issue of national interest in 1846. By the time the Royal Commission pronounced in favour of the narrow gauge the Midland had gained control of the broad gauge Bristol Gloucester line that year. Not until many years later did the Midland Railway resolve the inconvenient alignment of its station which obliged trains to go out the way they had come in. Railway installations came to occupy a large area near the north eastern edge of the old town which was almost encircled by lines, with bridges and level crossings over the roads.

Three new roads gave better access to those parts of the town where traffic was most congested. In 1823 Worcester Street replaced Hare Lane as the approach to Northgate Street from the north. It was promoted by several turnpike trustees, led by John Phillpotts, a lawyer who was making his name in the city and saw the opportunity to combine

---


A through road, which had its beginnings in the Corporation's policy of upgrading property in Lower Westgate Street, was opened piecemeal. It linked Westgate Street with the end of Southgate Street by way of the Quay and the docks: first the road was widened at Foreign Bridge and in 1826, a new road from there to the Quay was constructed over the newly culverted Dockham Ditch. Successful negotiations with the county then secured the land between the river and the perimeter wall of the gaol to extend the Quay road to the docks. Finally in 1849 Commercial Road completed the route. The Canal Company had pressed for it and made land available near the docks, the Corporation did likewise with a site at Pie Corner on Southgate Street where slum property had to be demolished. However, without the leadership and co-ordination of a small company formed virtually to give essential funds, nothing would have been achieved as the city Improvement Commissioners would do no more than authorise several small rates when they could ignore influential pressure no longer. Their rooted objection to levying rates had been a main reason for their minimal endeavours. They had been set up under the terms of the Market Act of 1821 which associated elected parish representatives with the Corporation in overseeing improvements in the city and levying rates totalling no more than £500 a year.

The Act proved more useful in other respects. It empowered the Corporation to provide a market place and enforce its use for the sale of livestock in the city, and the magistrates to employ and regulate

---

   Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Turnpike Trust Minutes, n.p., 19.4.1820.

20. GBR, B4/1/3, f. 6v, f. 27, f.48v, f. 56.

watchmen at the city's expense, up to £150 a year, which was too little for an adequate service. The cattle market was urgently needed as people were deterred from coming into the town because the streets were filthy and some were full of animals. Conditions were at their worst when the monthly great markets and the fairs were held. Sheep and pigs were penned along Northgate Street, cattle and horses gathered in St. Mary's Square and nearby streets. The new market place occupied about four acres behind Northgate Street. It was 'a model of its kind' when it came into use in 1823, with a boundary wall and cobbled surface like the streets. In 1826 the Corporation still had unpaid debts incurred mainly for the market and had to raise £8,000 in loans. It could not prevent conditions in the market place deteriorating, especially when heavy waggons, working on railway construction, and then, regular traffic going to and fro from the station used it as a regular thoroughfare.

The Corporation's support for the legislation required for private companies to supply the town with gas and water was essential. The acts of 1819 and 1820 enabled the Corporation of the Poor to meet the cost of lighting the streets with gas. Gloucester was evidently anxious not to be left behind Cheltenham, Bath, Bristol and Worcester in making the change. The first lights were lit at the Cross, the King's Head and a few shops in 1820; by 1831 there were 230 public lamps and in

22. PP 1835 (116) XXIII, _op. cit._, pp. 16, 66.
25. PP 1835 (116) XXIII, _op. cit._, p. 67. G.J., 14.7, 1.9.1817; 23.2.1818; 4.10.1819. 59 Geo. III c.175 '... for enabling the Governors and Guardians of the Poor ... to light the City with Gas ...'. 1. Geo. IV c.10 1820, '... for incorporating the City of Gloucester Gas Light Company'. 
1840 they were lit every night of the year, instead of having fewer in summer. In 1834 further legislation provided for gas lighting in the suburbs. From the 1840s the capacity of the gasworks greatly increased to keep pace with demand. However, difficulties over water supply proved more intractable. As unsatisfied demand for piped water grew and the supply deteriorated for want of maintenance, several prominent men formed a company in 1836 and secured legislation to buy out Lord Sydney and to raise capital to improve and extend the system. Work went ahead in 1837 in those streets where there were customers, and fire plugs were installed at intervals. Ten years later the system was approaching a crisis due to growing demand, which was much increased by measures taken to combat cholera in 1849. Then in 1851 prolonged drought dried up supplies. People with piped water could not do without wells until 1860, when a major expansion of the water undertaking was completed.

House building accounted for most of the town's spread. In 1851 there were about 60 established and 40 new streets, of which about half were laid out after 1841. Table 2.1 and Map 9 set out the changes as they affected the different parishes. Infilling took place in older parts of the town, where land was used intensively for business purposes. The distribution of housing changed radically as between the parishes entirely within the old city boundary and those near or on either side of it. St. Nicholas, once by far the most populous parish was overtaken

26. G.J., 14.2.1820; 4.4.1840. 4 and 5 William IV c.53, ... for lighting ... the suburbs with Gas ... E. Power, Power's Handbook for Visitors to ... Gloucester, 1863, p. 73.

27. G.J., 29.4, 5.8.1837. Blakeway, op. cit., p. 115. 6 William IV c.67 1938, ... for better supplying with water ... (and incorporating) the Gloucester Water Company.

28. G.J., 20.9, 4.10.1851. GBR, Gloucester Poor Law Guardians Minutes, G/GL/8a/5, f. 4; G/GL/81/6, f. 6v. Power, op. cit., p. 102

29. G.C.L., Street lists for 1841 and 1851, from the Census Returns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes:</th>
<th>Number of houses 1801</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>Overall change, and as %</th>
<th>Rank order of % rate</th>
<th>Decade of greatest % rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In city centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Grace</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Crypt</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others within the pre-1835 boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Aldate</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicholas</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Owen (near docks)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John (including much of Kingsholm housing)</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those partially outside the pre-1835 boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Lode (including lesser and later part of Kingsholm housing)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts outside the pre-1835 boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hamlet (Spa and near docks)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1505.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleworth (Brunswick Square)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton St. Mary (partly New Town)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>543.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton St. Michael (partly New Town)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>540.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wotton</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>567.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total houses 1621 2223 4240 2619 161.6

Average number of inhabitants to a house:

5.4 5.3 5.7

Highest averages:

St. Nicholas 6.2 5.7 6.4
St. Mary de Grace 5.7 5.7 6.7
National average 5.7 5.8 5.5²

by St. John's before 1831 and by St. Mary de Lode in respect of housing by 1851.  

Whole new streets of almost identical terraces were gradually built by developers who put up houses often a few at a time. Larger houses continued to dominate the main roads on the edge of the town and an area of high class residences grew up at the Spa and Brunswick Square. A few streets of better terraced houses opened off main roads, or were on the edge of other well-to-do neighbourhoods. They did not communicate directly with the concentrations of poorer dwellings, where two-up, two-down tenements were common. These areas were less immediately visible from the main thoroughfares. The first of them to develop rapidly was to the north, in Kingsholm: between 1821 and 1831 the housing stock in St. John's nearly doubled. By 1841 a more straggling development to the east had become known as New Town. Ten years later the fields separating it from the city were soon to disappear. Two more areas were then appearing, one by the railway not far from New Town and the other to the south of the docks.

The published census data shows that the average number of people to a house was near the national average during this period, but evidence of overcrowding comes from other sources. It was usual to find it largely concentrated in the poorest areas of a town, and this was the case in Gloucester. For instance a fifth of the houses in a street of small houses in Kingsholm registered from eight to 13 people in 1851.

30. Compare maps 6 and 9. Map 9 does not fully represent outer suburban development to 1851 as the map of that year only covers the area of the city. Census Abstracts.


More extreme conditions characterised cheap lodging houses and there were several in St. Nicholas parish. The few back-to-back tenements and built up courtyards were also in this neighbourhood where land for other purposes was at a premium. Though no cellar dwellings were reported, many cellar floors were covered with water and most houses were damp. Shortage of the very poorest sort of accommodation must have given rise to the hovels near the canal in the 1820s and later, others bordered the lane from New Town to the Stroud Road. However, the city did not suffer a shortage of building land as new suburban houses had back yards or small gardens and usually no more than one storey above the ground floor.

The importance the Anglican Church then attached to opening schools and new churches met very positive responses in Gloucester as resources were found to make major repairs and alterations, or virtually rebuild the old city churches, and provide five new ones for the new centres of population. The first of them to be consecrated was for the Spa in 1823 and the last was the Mariners' Chapel in 1849. The non-conformists were equally active. The magnificent new gothic nave of St. Michael's and a new enlarged and no less ornate Independent Chapel became admired landmarks in 1851. Most of this activity occurred after 1840 when church and chapel were also busy setting up schools.

By relating the changes outlined to the geographical sectors

33. Enumerators' Books, 1851, St. John's nos. 93-151; Kingsholm St. Mary nos. 43-54.


already employed, their general effects on the town can be brought into sharper focus. By 1851 they had two new physical features in common. Outer urban expansion ringed them, except where the dangers of flooding near the river inhibited building. Railway lines cut across them with differing results. In the two northern sectors they created major barriers while in the south west they were a necessary part of the infrastructure in the port area. By contrast, in the town centre, established common features were reinforced by localised modernisation and improvements. 36

In the south western sector the centre of mercantile activity shifted from the neighbourhood of the Quay to the much larger area adjacent to the docks and the canal. Industry then took advantage of several sites near the river and later started up near the docks. As compared with the other sectors, new housing occupied very little land. Apart from the usual variety of business and public buildings along the main roads, the south east sector was almost the opposite of the other, as it was made up of two residential areas. New Town was well outside the circuit of the railway and within it, open land and the private park of the Spa helped to maintain the exclusiveness of that neighbourhood. Its influence extended out onto the road leading out of the town.

The once unremarkable north east sector changed radically. The cattle market and extensive railway installations cut its outer area in two. The northern part remained pleasantly uncrowded and residential, backed by open land and unspoiled by three short streets of tenements. The southern part was divided by railway lines; its outer section was still largely open but small houses were going up near the mills and beginning to link New Town with the railway. On the inner side

36. This and the following paragraphs are based on Causton, Map, 1843, and P.H. Map, 1851.
houses had almost filled what space was left and inns, a major carrier
and a skin works had started up near the market and the railway.

A railway viaduct divided the old from the new parts of the north
western sector, both of which were mainly residential, having many
poor inhabitants living close to well defined more affluent neighbour-
hoods. The wide arc of the viaduct firmly transferred Worcester Street
from the outer into the inner area of the town, making it less attractive.
A distillery, two tanneries and a pipe factory nearby emphasised the
change. The town's second foundry was sited beside a compact area
of small tenement housing the other side of the viaduct by 1833. The
area below the cathedral precinct had become more built up and poorer
as Lower Westgate Street and St. Mary's Square deteriorated and
well-to-do inhabitants moved out. The decline can be followed in the
changing tenants and uses of what had once been the Duke of Norfolk's
town house. In 1801 a lawyer succeeded a gentleman, then a school,
an auctioneer, and a cornfactor followed in turn. By 1840 it was a
vinegar works and a cheap inn opened there in 1850.37

Between 1820 and 1851 the town virtually doubled the area it
occupied. The docks and the railway altered its physical character
and gave rise to new economic activity outside the traditional centre.
The docks detached the main mercantile centre from the lower end of
Westgate Street. Though railway lines disfigured the town, few houses
made way for their construction as spaces survived between developing
neighbourhoods and the old town. However, the industrial growth was
too limited to have altered the balance of the urban economy from its
dependence on commerce. Like many other large towns at this time
Gloucester found that public health became a formidable problem as

---

the town grew. At the same time contemporary forms of modernisation went ahead.

Dirty Gloucester

As populations grew and towns became more insanitary public health emerged as one of the main issues of the 1840s. The account of urban growth in Gloucester would be very unbalanced if the conditions in which the population lived were overlooked. The findings of investigative reports exposed progressive deterioration in the state of large towns and became ammunition for those pressing for measures to reverse the trend. By 1850 the essentials required were recognised and legislation enabled localities to secure the authority to act more decisively than had been practicable before, though it was too soon to demonstrate much significant progress. The diverse motives fuelling the public health movement gradually gathered strength and wide support: religion, morality and humanitarianism; the Benthamite case against wasted resources, both human and material; and a belief that applied science could produce results. Cholera frightened people profoundly, especially as medical knowledge was seen to have no remedy, beyond trying to ward off infection by cleanliness and sobriety.

In 1829 Counsel followed earlier writers in asserting that Gloucester was a healthy place, but those claims were soon replaced by a recognition that some very insanitary conditions existed. Shopkeepers were warned that their trade could suffer and an example was given of a well-to-do family settling in Cheltenham because of 'the

unwholesome stenches in this city'. 40 Long-standing nuisances persisted and proved resistant to energetic measures. In 1848 prosecutions did not banish pig styes or the 'fetid effluvia' of slaughtering in their locality. Accumulations of refuse in side streets and large reeking 'depots of filth' on the outskirts of the town remained until farmers removed them. 41 Magistrates' orders had little effect on parish scavengers who would not exert themselves in their duties. Almost half the town was outside the limits of their responsibilities, and that included all the alleys and inhabited courtyards. In 1843 no one was employed to clean part of St. John's parish, and by 1849 the town needed double the manpower then doing the work. 42

The same absence of an overall authority resulted in a patchwork of repairs which emphasised the deficiencies in road maintenance. In 1845 'the streets were wretchedly pitched', there were frequent accidents and people going through the town had to endure rattling over more than a mile of large round pebbles. The Corporation, with responsibility for nearly half the 83,617 yards of the city's roads had difficulty in persuading property owners to co-operate in making repairs and changing over to a macadamised surface, which was an expensive undertaking. 43 By 1849 they had macadamised just over a quarter of the stretches they were trying to maintain. In dry weather it produced clouds of dust which shopkeepers tried to lay by throwing water in front of their premises. The nuisance continued until there was an adequate water supply and a city authority able to fund street watering. Many of the

42. Ibid., no. 15. Cresy, op. cit., p. 41.
new, unadopted roads were even worse. Pedestrians found the irregular pavements and cobbles of the main streets so hazardous that a subscription was raised to pay for a dozen flagged crossings in 1828.44

Various primitive, ineffectual and careless domestic sanitary practices were individually offensive and cumulatively the main cause of the town's predicament. The old town centre relied on the lie of the land to give natural drainage into surrounding streams. This compounded the nastiness of the area below the cathedral where Dockham Ditch was an open sewer. The new suburbs made bad worse, as all the streams became ever more heavily polluted.45 The most notorious, which drained much of Kingsholm, could not be tackled as it was just outside the boundary and the landowner, Brazenose College, would not agree to co-operate effectively. So Gloucester stank 'in the public nostrils as one of the filthiest places in its class in the kingdom'.46

In 1832 cholera carried off 123 of the 366 cases in Gloucester. Worcester suffered less and Cheltenham kept the epidemic out. The Gloucester Journal began by publishing the national statistics each week and then concentrated on the position in the city, Worcester and Bristol. As trade slumped, this publicity was held to have added to people's fear of entering the town and expenditure on the poor shot up.47

The approach of the epidemic temporarily broke the convention of public silence about urban conditions, following the Privy Council's lead. However, the finger was only pointed explicitly at known black

45. Ibid., pp. 12, 29.
spots where vagrants and the criminal classes mingled with the poor, which was a crumb of comfort for other inhabitants. The responsibilities of parish officers and landlords were put in general terms as their co-operation was needed. Unusually, St. Michael's churchyard was attacked as an 'INTOLERABLE NUISANCE, calculated to facilitate the spread of Plague' as it rose six feet above floor level near the Cross. In 1849, when cholera returned, 78 of the 200 cases died. They came from the earlier centres of infection near the river and also from Kingsholm. The outbreak was less severe, at least in part, because attitudes towards the sanitary state of the city had altered considerably in the interim.

Powerful forces were at work nationally. Against a background of anxiety about the danger large industrial populations seemed to pose to political and social order, the Poor Law Commission, the Registrar General and Parliament published reports and data on the life threatening and degrading circumstances in which large sections of society were condemned to live. The Health of Towns Association, formed in 1844, led the campaign in the country for sanitary reform. Legislation in 1847 and 1848 enabled local authorities first to tackle nuisances and then to assume wider powers as local Boards of Health, if they met the requirements of the Public Health Act. Edwin Chadwick's work and ideas underpinned the movement to which the renewed threat of cholera gave added urgency in 1847.

At the local level, surveys, publicity, well informed opinion advocating reform and events all went in the same direction. The local

voluntary Board of Health made the first, but unpublished, sanitary report on Gloucester in 1831. Their findings drove them to conclude that nothing short of a complete sewerage system would remedy the shocking conditions, some 'too revolting to describe', which they had found. 51

The solution was not then feasible in the city: it was too radical to gain acceptance and the Corporation could neither afford the necessary legislation nor raise the funds for construction. However, the knowledge could not be wholly forgotten. In the 1840s reports on Gloucester were published, those of 1845 and 1849 were the results of government investigations. The first was the evidence required by the Royal Commission on the Health of Large Towns and the second was initiated by the city Council as a preliminary to securing the status and powers of a local Board of Health. 52

On both occasions government appointed inspectors made thorough on the spot surveys and H.W. Rumsey, a local doctor also supplied information. The very detailed report of 1849 repeated his meticulous data. 53 He was almost certainly the moving spirit behind the body of local opinion which must have won considerable support, but did not identify itself clearly outside the ranks of city doctors and the Council. If this had not been so, the Gloucester Journal would have been more circumspect about adding editorial support to lengthy factual reports on the city. In 1843 it gave Slaney's findings and in 1848 it carried the report Rumsey made to the Council and followed it by a series of communications in which his conclusions were questioned, and he replied. 54

Rumsey had quoted the Registrar's data on comparative death rates in

51. G.J., 19, 26.11.1831.
different parts of the town and they left no doubt about the gravity of its unhealthiness, especially in the poor suburb of Kingsholm. By 1848 reports of Council meetings were full of public health matters and the newspaper called for action, on one occasion in verses which ended,

'The slums are filled with fatal pests
This MORAL CHOLERA who arrests?
Are our officials quite AU fait,
Inspecting these by night and day?
Wait not enactment by the STATE
These wretched nuisances ABATE
Or make th'attemt at ANY RATE.'

and finally it bluntly stated that the city's objectives should be enough water, sewerage, light and air to meet the needs of the poor.  

The Council was well aware of the town's needs in 1843 as it had been obliged to report appalling conditions but had failed to grasp their implications. It was sufficient to describe the water supply available to the poor as 'very inadequate' and reveal that only 11.4% of houses had piped water. The Council understated the death rate and did not find the incidence of disease a cause for concern. In 1845 it expressed a wish to put in sewers if the funds were available. The deciding factors in favour of action came in 1847 with the prospect of another cholera epidemic and a tide of sick and destitute Irish going through the town.

The Council acted decisively in appointing an Inspector of Nuisances and a Sanitary Committee in 1847. They proceeded energetically with

55. G.J., 18.3.1848; 2.9.1848.
56. PP 1845 (602) XVIII, op. cit., p. 58, nos. 31, 32, 47, 49. GBR, B4/1/6, p. 219.
57. Ibid., p. 220. G.J., 1.8.1846; 8.5.1847; 6, 13.11.1847; 12.2.1848.
58. GBR, B4/6/1 Sanitary Committee Minutes, 5, 10.11.1847.
their Herculean task. The Council also welcomed the Public Health Act and was quick to apply to become a local Board of Health. It was known that the city's high death rate of 24.3 per 1000 enabled the General Board of Health to impose a local board. The average for London in 1841 was 29:1000.59 Through its Inspector, the Board made itself responsible for road repairs, making up new roads and macadamising all of Westgate and Eastgate Streets. It contracted for street cleaning and then street watering. All this became so expensive that it could not maintain momentum or standards and councillors' confidence was shaken by criticism.60

By the end of 1851 the streets and pavements were as bad as ever. The Council knew that the city needed a cemetery and was drawing up regulations to control lodging houses. It had accepted that a sewerage system had to be laid and therefore commissioned the Ordnance Board to make a survey, which resulted in a magnificent map. Severe water shortages forced the Council to consider how to increase the supply, but they clearly shrank from believing Cresy's assessment of the city's requirements. As the streets had to be dug up for the drains, for which no detailed plans had been drawn up by then, decisions over the water supply were delayed. Experience had shown that sanitary reform could not be achieved within what had seemed to be the familiar limits of putting down nuisances and street repairs and cleaning.61

Conditions in Gloucester were not as bad as the worst to be found, but for a town of its size they were deplorable, partly because of its legacy of old crowded property and a compact new suburb, in both of


60. G.J., 9.3, 7.12.1850; 4.1.1851; 8, 15.2.1851.

which poor inhabitants could not avoid living in a filthy environment, and partly because the natural drainage which had earlier been thought tolerable had become a menace. The desire to maintain the city's reputation and protect business and individual interests could not be limited to attending to roads and visible property, and even that seemed to be a losing battle. Ingrained traditional practice and outlook had to be readjusted as sanitary conditions deteriorated. The interpretation of corporate responsibility dramatically widened with the decision that a sewerage system for the whole city and a clean water supply available to all its inhabitants were essential. Gloucester was one of 276 towns which secured the powers offered by the 1848 Public Health Act.

Conclusion
A fine series of contemporary maps of Gloucester builds up a record of the town's growth and main features for the first half of the nineteenth century. Those for 1843 and 1851 are particularly useful as they are large enough to identify individual buildings; the second of the two supplies much additional detail, so that the distribution of such functions as malt-houses, inns, timber yards, privies; floor and street levels can be made out. Unfortunately the earlier map's record of the suburbs is not fully carried forward to 1851 as that map only includes the area within the municipal boundary. This deficiency points to an obstacle in the way of making general improvement schemes for the whole town.

During the period 1820 to 1851 the Corporation soon ceased to make improvements, in the tradition begun in the eighteenth century, as a burden of debt was incurred mainly for the new cattle market and because the Improvement Commissioners proved ineffectual. However, by 1850 it

was finding a new way forward with additional powers conferred by national legislation to tackle challenging problems affecting the whole city. Physical change in the town seems to have been relatively less obvious in the 1830s than in either the preceding or the following decade. During the 1840s activity was particularly marked and it involved a broader cross section of city life. The initiatives came from individuals, public and private groups and companies for equally wide ranging purposes, from modernising shops to church building, public utilities, road, dock and railway construction.

Contrasts between old and new became more arresting, epitomised by the Cathedral and the ranks of large brick warehouses not far away at the docks and, at the other extreme, poor areas of irregular, antiquated property and little red brick terraces. In 1820 the image of Gloucester as a healthy attractive county town with high hopes for its new Spa, was in the ascendent. 63 That was superseded by one of a bustling place with ugly sanitary problems, set out in Cresy's report and long list of recommendations in 1849. These troubles were of the same kind but less extreme than the classic accounts of urban squalor found in much larger towns like Manchester. 64

The contrast between the old port area on the Quay and the new one at the docks was no less significant. Development at the docks was based on advantages similar to those which enabled Hull to succeed. 65 The foundations were an established commercial economy with a mercantile element and a position of regional importance on main lines of

63. Counsel, History, p. 186.
communication. The canal and docks together made the city a junction of waterways and railways which had their main business ties with the West Midlands. Whether the town's physical development was associated with equally far reaching change in the employment of its growing population is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

THE PEOPLE OF GLOUCESTER

Introduction

Thus far the inhabitants of Gloucester have either been taken for granted or subordinated to physical and spatial considerations. This chapter sets out to populate the town. It both complements and completes the more general first part of this study and is the initial stage of what follows as it focuses on the town's human resources, as revealed by its occupational structure. The central issues are the extent to which the town's traditional structure was being modified by the developments already outlined, and whether it was keeping up with contemporary urban changes.

The discussion begins with a general comparison of the rates of population growth in Gloucester with that of a group of county towns of broadly similar size and status. An analysis of the occupational structure of Gloucester follows, emphasising its distribution across the urban area. Finally it is compared with some occupational features in the same group of towns. As the subject of population opens up large questions it is necessary to restrict what is attempted here to the essentials in the context of this thesis. Thus, though the rate at which the population grew is traced, the causes underlying it are not pursued systematically. However, some of them are considered or mentioned in other connections such as migration, demand for labour, and public health.

This chapter is mainly based on the published Census Abstracts for 1841 and the 1851 Census Enumerators' Books relating to Gloucester. They give a detailed picture of the occupational structure for the
town and amplify the information in directories about the distribution of employment. A glance at Maps 10 and 12 illustrates the very different nature of these sources. As the census returns for the earlier years of the period under consideration have not survived, directories have added value. However, their limitations prompted an attempt to establish a wider cross-section of the population from the occupational data in baptismal registers, which will be discussed in due course.

Gloucester had the distinctive functions of a county town. These towns were the hub of the agricultural areas around them, produce and cattle passed through their markets and goods went out to villages and minor market towns. They were well placed to be centres for processing grain and hides, for brush and basket making, using local materials. As centres for administration, commercial and private business, professional services were called for. In addition to such a wide range of characteristic functions, county towns had some distinguishing features and circumstances promoted economic prosperity in some and not others. In the early nineteenth century many were losing once flourishing industries and were not equally successful in finding other directions for their commerce or productive capacity, to avoid relative decline as development passed them by.

Population Growth in Gloucester and some other County Towns

In the first half of the nineteenth century, resorts, industrial towns and ports experienced faster rates of population growth than other towns,

1. Map 10, The Location of Predominant Occupational Categories c. 1850, based on Hunt's Directory, 1849, represents the distribution of business addresses not necessarily a residential pattern, which Map 11 illustrates in very simplified form.


The Location of Predominant Occupational Categories in Gloucester c. 1850, with reference to advertised business addresses.

Key
- Retailers. Scattered small shops.
- Professions and public officials.
- Processing and manufacturing premises.
- Merchants, dealers and their offices, yards and warehouses.
- Crafts - usually scattered
- Boat builders.
- Inns and pubs omitted.
- The areas distinguished for retailers, professions and crafts follow the general line of the principal buildings fronting the streets, outbuildings have been omitted.

Couston, Map, 1843.
P.H. Map, 1851
Hunt, Directory, 1849.
and urban growth generally exceeded that in rural areas. The towns to be compared were selected for the comparability of their populations in 1801 and their similar status. A few of them had populations of more than 10,000 in 1821 and so were among the group of towns which generally grew fastest during the next two decades.\textsuperscript{4} If Gloucester's outer suburbs were taken into account, the city would just have been one of them as, by that date, its limited acreage was effectively reducing the population figures by about a fifth. Though other towns also spread beyond their boundaries, the same degree of distortion is not to be expected from the substantially larger acreages of most of the towns to be compared with Gloucester.\textsuperscript{5} The general comparison is followed by an analysis of the rate at which the population grew in different parts of the town.

Table 3.1 shows that the growth rate within the city boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>England and Wales\textsuperscript{1}</th>
<th>Gloucester within the city boundary\textsuperscript{2}</th>
<th>The city and all suburbs\textsuperscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801-1811</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811-1821</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-1831</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831-1841</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall increase: 101.6</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A. Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town, 1974, p. 77.

only modestly exceeded the national average between 1821 and 1841, but from 1811 outer suburban expansion took the rate ahead and substantially

Table 3.2

The Rate at which Populations Increased 1801-1851 in County Towns with populations in the range 5,000 to 10,000 in 1801 when ranked by size in that year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Population 1801</th>
<th>% increase 1801-51</th>
<th>in rank order in 1801-51</th>
<th>Population 1851</th>
<th>in rank order in 1851</th>
<th>Acreage 1831</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>9,742</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21,456</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14,604</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,398</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>171.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,065</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td>158.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20,801</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>7,668</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>7,530</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>7,398</td>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,536</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>279.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26,657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt;8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>5,826</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13,704</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,176</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>5,775</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,973</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% increase in England and Wales 1801-1851: 101.6


2. The total population and the approximate acreage of the city and all those parts of its parishes outside the boundary. The parish of Hempsted is also included as South Hamlet accounted for most of its population.

3. All these towns except Taunton were municipal and parliamentary boroughs. Taunton was a parliamentary borough.

increased the difference. In comparing Gloucester with other towns the published figures are used, as adjusted data is not available for the rest. Table 3.2 presents their growth rates over 50 years to allow for clear trends to emerge. The figures suggest that the larger towns in 1801 generally tended to grow considerably faster than the rest. In the process, their rank order according to size of population altered noticeably. Northampton's position changed most as it outstripped the others by a wide margin. By 1851 over 6,000 people were employed in shoemaking there, distinguishing that town from the less industrialised
PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN PARISH POPULATIONS 1801-1851 RELATED TO THE BUILT UP AREA IN 1851.

Numerical increase given.

% INCREASE

1-50 of the centre only
50-100
100-250
300-400
500-650
2798

Areas outside the city boundary are incomplete as they are based on Causton's Map, 1843.
PH. Map for the rest.

? Known areas where building was in progress.
economies of the others. Though growth rates in half these towns exceeded the national rate there were many others not listed here growing at similar or faster rates. For instance, the rate for Ipswich was 200% and Bradford was exceptional with over 700%. However, discounting any significant outer suburban growth in other towns in the list under discussion, Gloucester would have been in second place for rate of growth instead of eighth.

Table 3.3 traces what was happening in the city in sufficient detail to identify contrasting growth rates. In the town centre, where the density of population was greatest, the rate of growth was slower than in other areas and almost ceased by 1851. Town maps of the period show that this was not solely due to the absence of building land but also to enlarged commercial premises. Similarly industrial expansion checked population growth in St. Nicholas parish in the 1840s.

The definite beginnings of suburban population are particularly evident in the five outer neighbourhoods from 1821. The enormous growth rate in the South Hamlet was due first to the development of the Spa in fields, then to a sizeable labouring population on the docks' side of the Bristol Road. Though these five districts had very high rates of growth, they did not become very densely populated because the poorer ones were not large compact areas of small houses.

The new suburbs deflect attention from the greatest real change which occurred in the outer ring of parishes lying within the boundary for the most part. The total numerical increase there was much greater than further out. It affected existing parts of the town and spilled

8. Table 3.3 for density of parish populations per acre.
### Table 3.3

**The Growth of Population in Gloucester 1801-1851**

Total population in 1801 and 1851, and decennial percentage changes.1

Fastest rates are indicated *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>1801 total</th>
<th>1801-11 %</th>
<th>1811-21 %</th>
<th>1821-31 %</th>
<th>1831-41 %</th>
<th>1841-51 %</th>
<th>1851 total</th>
<th>Overall increase %</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Centre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Grace</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>24.0*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>25.1*</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-13.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Crypt</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>24.3*</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Aldate</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.3*</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer parishes within the pre-1835 boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>30.9*</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>93.0*</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>341.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicholas</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Owen</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>52.2*</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parishes partly outside the pre-1835 boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>30.7*</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Lode</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>-23.1</td>
<td>67.3*</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas outside the pre-1835 boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hamlet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>651.9*</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>2,798.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleworth</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>159.5*</td>
<td>-30.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>219.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton St. Mary</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>113.0*</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>554.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton St. Michael</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.6*</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>511.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wotton</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>102.5*</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>650.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All City Parishes</td>
<td>7,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,383</td>
<td>8,674</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburbs</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,788</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>636.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2. These figures are distorted by the omission of North Hamlet (Gaol area) from the parish total in 1821 and 1831.

3. Kingsholm St. Mary and St. Catherine are included in their respective parishes as they were not always listed separately.

4. The figures in brackets take account of the large areas of uninhabited meadowland.

5. The figures take no account of the Hamlet of St. Catherine which remained very sparsely populated, or that part of the parish outside the 1835 boundary. No realistic calculation is possible for the three districts outside the boundary.
over into previously unoccupied areas. This was particularly so in St. John's which had the highest growth rate among the parishes. This became the most populous parish, with a density approaching that of the centre of the town. A comparison of Maps 9 and 11 illustrates the close correspondence between the increases in housing and population.

So there is no doubt that Gloucester grew rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth century when compared with other middling sized boroughs. It would appear from the evidence in Chapter I that a net increase due to migration occurred: the shacks on the outskirts of the town, which preceded permanent housing, suggest that some arrived with no certain prospects of employment, as happened at Lincoln. However, the report of 1848 on mortality in the city laid greater stress on the high proportion of young people in the population as the most noticeable explanation. Gloucester experienced trends occurring in other towns at about the same time, notably the change from slow growth to declining populations in town centres which occurred in Gloucester by 1861, and continuing expansion in the suburbs. However, a considerably larger population was living in the old parts of the town in 1851 than there had been in 1801, competing for space with business and industrial premises. Nonetheless, the overall change in the distribution of the population shifted the balance radically: in 1801 nearly eight lived within the old city boundary to one outside it, whereas by 1851 the ratio was two to one. Moreover, as much suburban growth took place within the boundary, at least half the population lived outside the old built up area by 1851. Population change prompts questions about how greater numbers


of people earned a living, either by swelling the ranks in existing occupations, or by going in new directions, and whether growth in the urban economy kept up with the numbers.

**Earning a Living in Gloucester**

To develop a relevant analysis of occupational structure from the welter of detail contained in the Enumerators' Books very definite and limited objectives are required. The starting point is the proportionate numerical strength of broad categories of men's occupations in 1851, which is set out in Table 3.4. Along with that it is convenient to include two similar lists, one relating to the early years of the period, and the other to women's employment in 1851. However, the main thrust of discussion centres on the development of the data on which the first of the three is based. The complex distribution of occupations across the town is a corrective to the generalisation inherent in Table 3.4, and it also emphasises localised differences and their economic implications. Only then is the data of the baptismal registers assessed and the light they throw on the occupational balance considered. Lastly women's occupations sharpen the contrasts in the struggle to earn a living.

From these figures it is clear that over 60% of men had some form of manual work, but by moving on to a comparison of the occupational structure of the parishes and other districts of the town, as set out in Table 3.5 three distinct zones can be discerned: the town centre, six parishes which almost encircle it and the outer districts, which are identified in the same table and in Map 12. Retailing, the professions and business sharply distinguished the centre. High proportions of craftsmen and relatively few labourers characterised the surrounding parishes. However, half of these parishes (B2) had markedly smaller professional and business elements than the others. While the outer districts can be similarly subdivided, the feature they had in common was the great preponderance of manual occupations. In the old parts of the town (C1),
Table 3.4
The occupational Structure of Gloucester expressed as percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational categories</th>
<th>of men in 1851</th>
<th>and Women</th>
<th>Fathers' Registering Births 1813-1830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons of independent means</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labouring</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers</td>
<td>6721</td>
<td>3469</td>
<td>3443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those not included in percentages</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>4878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Appendix 1 for details of these categories.
2. This category does not include any person on board ships in port.

near the river, more than 70% were employed thus, as compared with over 50% in the new suburbs (C2).

This zoning can be tested by examining some of the occupational categories, as most had many subdivisions. The conspicuous features of the central area and their presence elsewhere are considered first. The traditional centre of retailing, which extended into adjacent parishes, was very different from the scattered little shops elsewhere. Hawkers and non-resident shopworkers lived away from the centre. The concentration of professional men in the centre is misleading as lawyers in the town for the Assizes accounted for those in the retailing area, others in the College Precinct mainly served the cathedral and prison officers were present in North Hamlet. In fact, professional and business men, principally lawyers, doctors and merchants, generally lived in pleasant neighbourhoods, close to, but not in the centres of commerce around the Cross and the docks. A few preferred more distant Wotton. They avoided districts with great concentrations of manual
Table 3.5
Parish Occupational Structure for Independent and Employed Males, 1851, as percentages for each parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labouring</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number             | 99    | 224  | 350   | 244 | 63   | 408  | 910 | 42  | 212 | 187 | 1149 | 352  | 450 | 146  | 733  | 473 | 232 | 448  |

Table 3.6
Fathers Registering Baptisms 1813-1830. Occupations Recorded for each parish as percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labouring</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number             | 52    | 126  | 207   | 204 | 24   | 240  | 678 | 86  | 311 | 459 | 347  | 100  | 120| 194  | 105  | 113| 77   |

192 different occupations listed  
26 54 79 53 18 71 109 37 69 102 78 29 45 57 37 44 31

1. The abbreviations used in Tables 3.5-8: My G. = Mary de Grace; H.T. = Holy Trinity; My C. = St. Mary de Crypt; At. = St. Aldate; C.P. = College Precinct; Ml. = St. Michael; Ns. = St. Nicholas; N.H. = North Hamlet; Ow. = St. Owen; Cn. = St. Catherine; Jrn. = St. John; My L. = St. Mary de Lode; S.H. = South Hamlet; Lth. = Littleworth; B My. = Barton St. Mary; B Ml. = Barton St. Michael; Wh. = Wotton; H My/Cn. = Hamlets of St. Mary and St. Catherine.

A = central zone parishes; B = surrounding zone; C = outer areas. Numbers denote subdivisions: see Map 12.

2. This category does not include any person on board ships in port.

3. P15/3 IN 1/3; P15/4 IN 1/4; P15/9 IN 1/7; P15/4/11 IN 1/5; P15/4/12 IN 1/3; P15/4/14 IN 1/5; P15/4 IN 1/5.

4. This category is almost entirely made up of those working on the land.
OCCUPATIONAL ZONES in Gloucester 1851
based on the Census record of men's employment.

Dominant Characteristics.

A1: Retailing professions, business.
A2: Principally professions.
B1: High % B1 also A crafts elements and low % labour. B2 over 40% crafts.
B2: %
C1: Over 50% manual work. C2: More variety (A).

Within the pre-1835 city boundary the zones are based on the parishes, outside it they are related to built up parts of the districts.
workers. Most of the doctors created a distinctive neighbourhood near the outer end of Eastgate Street. The endowed schools, the main boys' private school 11 and their teachers were also near the centre. By contrast, most of the more numerous and poorer men in these categories, policemen, clerks, customs men, some agents and dealers, lived among artisans, further away from the centre.

It is more helpful to turn to the dominant feature of the third zone before considering the more complex distribution of craft employment. In this outer zone lived 74% of the town's labourers, 61% of them outside the city boundary. Since there were also many in St. John's, where crafts were even more numerous, labourers were present in great numbers to the north, east and west of the central areas. Many must have worked at the docks or with builders and for other trades, but few registered their associations. A minor additional element of the outer zone was the miscellaneous category, mainly made up of gardeners and agricultural labourers.

The distribution of craftsmen was the reverse of that for labourers, and they were twice as numerous. Building and related trades dominated craft employment, making up 40% of the total. It was proportionately strongest where labouring predominated and in St. John's. To a lesser extent this was also true for the metal trades which employed 14.5%. Of these 68 blacksmiths constituted the largest group, followed by 59 nailers, then by whitesmiths, pinners and more than 20 other trades, down to a single locksmith. However, shoemaking, with 15.5%, and tailoring, with 8.4%, tended to be concentrated within the city boundary.

Though St. Nicholas' and St. John's did not have the highest proportionate concentrations of men in craft occupations, they were the main centres of craft skills, with more than 50 represented in each, compared with the 20 to 30 in other areas. The former had a greater

variety of metal trades and probably more soap and brick makers, millers and brewers than other parts of the town, and was second to South Hamlet (the docks area) for boat building. St. John's had the most metal workers and was the main area for printers, bookbinders, tanners, curriers, maltsters, corkcutters, cabinet, coach, brush, basket and pipe makers. Two of the six piano makers and several parchment makers also lived in the parish. These trades extended into adjacent parishes, and the outer area of Barton St. Mary showed signs of becoming a centre of craft skills, probably stimulated by railway development.

Though it is not obvious from the figures, the servant and transport categories were related to the economic activity in different parts of the town. The proportion of servants was particularly low where 50% or more were in labouring or craft employment whereas areas containing well-to-do households, business and inns saw a contrary effect. There was a degree of zoning in the transport sector as railwaymen and boatmen generally lived near their work, as did many others, though it was less evident because their work was more dispersed. The distribution of the many porters was generally similar to that of labourers, relating them to their workplaces and to housing. However, many corn porters do not appear to have lived near the docks.

This more detailed approach to occupations has generally tended to uphold the validity of the three broad zones suggested. At the same time the added variety has shown up the limitations of a helpful generalisation. The presence of some strong links between adjacent parts of different zones is a reminder that the use of parish boundaries has been a convenient device. It is also evident that localities could have very distinctive features which general parish structures do not reveal. In addition most of the occupational descriptions registered suggest that most men worked on their own, as outworkers or in very small concerns. The direct evidence is limited as employers, with few
exceptions, did not record the number of their employees unless they lived in. Two manufacturers supplied information: the pin factory employed 132, mostly women, and the principal soap-maker, 39. The employment of a third of the 47 printers was accounted for. Sometimes craftsmen were themselves employers: 10 builders had, severally, from three to 69 men, and seven shoemakers from three to 24. The 1843 and 1851 maps support the view that traditional occupations and organisation of employment were still dominant in 1851.

So far no reference has been made to any changes that may have been taking place in the occupational structure of Gloucester, because there is no sufficiently comparable evidence for the whole town. The baptismal register data, which is set out in Tables 3.4 and 3.6, can only be used very tentatively. Some fathers undoubtedly slipped through the net of registration. To secure enough data the registers for the period 1813 to 1830 were used, so 1821 is the half way mark. The advantage of this length of time is that there is the possibility of including relatively more data and of overcoming a possibly greater tendency for some social groups to delay marriage when adverse economic conditions prevailed. However, it entails some problems which cannot be wholly overcome. Parents who took more than one child for baptism were recorded only once when they could be identified by occupation and their names; this occurred frequently, but sometimes a changed detail made for uncertainty, apart from errors in the original records. Though movement from one part of a large parish to another has been taken into account, names have not been cross checked between the six registers which virtually cover the whole town. To some extent the consequent over-recording may affect the parish profiles less than the overall figures for the town. In spite of that they are suprisingly compatible with those for 1851, which suggests that changes were gradual. The figures

13. Causton, Map, 1843. P.H. Map, 1851
for crafts and labouring may be somewhat inflated by untraced movement from lodging to lodging. 14

Some of the details are indicative of changes which were to occur. The presence of military detachments, which ceased in 1834, 15 was reflected in 135 baptisms. Craft employment in the town centre was evidently to be partly displaced by retailing and business by 1851, but the zone with the highest proportion of craftsmen at the later date was a feature of longstanding. At 39% the proportion employed in building was another similarity, while the 134 pinners who registered baptisms contrast with the 32 of 1851, and reflect the final decline known to have set in in the 1840s. 16 By 1851 other metal workers more than made up for the decline in the pin industry which lingered on where it had been strongest before 1830.

Change took place within an established occupational structure in St. Nicholas and another evolved as South Hamlet developed. Before 1830 St. Nicholas was the only parish where male pinners were outnumbered by other metal workers and by 1851 the pinners had virtually disappeared. In the 1820s over 75% of boatmen seem to have lived there and though the largest concentration was still there in 1851, appreciably more lived in other parts of the city. In the Spa area of South Hamlet business families largely replaced people of independent means, more generally transport became an important source of employment and, within the craft sector, metal work, rope and sail making became established whereas earlier on building had been almost the only kind of work.

15. G.J., 30.7.1821; 1.3.1828; 10.5.1834.
Tables 3.7 and 3.8 are concerned with women's employment. The occupations open to them were relatively few and usually miserably rewarded.\textsuperscript{17} Though more women than men depended on private incomes, the majority were poorly endowed, to judge by the streets where they lived. Teachers and institutional staff made up the professional category. Some of the most fortunate were those able to carry on the family business, among whom was a soap maker, a boat builder, 25 inn and public house keepers and several specialised retailers.\textsuperscript{18}

Of those in craft employment 82\% were in clothing trades, with 507 seamstresses of various kinds, 69 in shoemaking and 37 straw bonnet makers. Of the 100 pinners, 29 were pinstickers living in St. Nicholas. Upholstery, pipe, lace, paper bag and stationers' paper making each employed a few. About a dozen other trades occupied ones and twos. The majority in retailing had little outlying shops or were hawkers and shop assistants. Most of those claiming to be milliners can have had little to do with retailing in practice. With dressmakers they were prone to resort to prostitution as work was largely seasonal. Four women in St. John's were recorded as prostitutes.\textsuperscript{19} Many of the women with no stated occupation must have helped with the family shop or craft, or have done some paid domestic work, which absorbed half the females with recorded employment in the country.

Domestic service employed more women in Gloucester than all other occupations put together. They worked in a variety of tasks and conditions. The most clear cut difference was that between resident and non-resident servants. From a comparison of the figures in Tables 3.7

\textsuperscript{17} W.E. Neff, \textit{Victorian Working Women}, 1929, p. 116.


Table 3.7
Parish Occupational Structure for Independent and Employed Females, 1851, as percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All others of 16 years and over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8
The Distributions of Households with Resident Domestic Servants (female) in each Enumeration District, as percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Census Enumerators' Books for Gloucester, 1851. See footnote to Table 3.5 for the key to the parish abbreviations.
and 3.8 it can be deduced that there was a daily exodus from districts where there were few households with any resident domestic servant, into more affluent neighbourhoods. The numbers involved also suggest that households only employing daily domestics were much more widespread than those with resident servants. The latter, no doubt, also often supplemented their staff by employing others for the roughest work and the washing. Where such households were most numerous they were generally together in one or two streets. As it was quite usual for individual households there to have two or more resident servants, the contrasts between neighbourhoods were even greater. The lot of most servants was hard and the prospects for women who had to depend on their earnings were bleak indeed. 20

The three urban zones suggested earlier have been borne out on closer examination of the balance of occupational categories in Gloucester. From the 1820s limited changes were happening. The characteristic distribution of urban populations was evident in that the most desirable areas for retailing, business, transport services and well-to-do homes were appropriated 21 so that some labourers and others with limited means had to live some distance from the main centres of employment or, like the boatmen in St. Nicholas, put up with particularly evil living conditions. Adjacent streets were often differentiated mainly by their inhabitants' economic circumstances. The numbers reveal predominantly traditional forms of employment, largely made up of building, clothing and shoemaking trades which often entailed poverty and insecurity, as work tended to be seasonal. 22 Some metal work and and other minor crafts had better economic prospects and potential for the town.

20. Treble, op. cit., p. 43.
Occupational Characteristics of County Towns

Gloucester's occupational structure is now to be compared with that of some other county towns, to consider first whether their characteristics display sufficient regularity for them to fall into a number of groups, and then whether this reveals any significant degree of similarity between the city and some of the other towns. This is also an opportunity to take note of two forms of skilled occupations, one traditional the other new, which are outside the scope of later chapters. The subject is approached from two angles. Five occupations are compared in Table 3.9. They have been chosen as their incidence tended to distinguish the occupational structure of county towns from that of industrial towns and from that of the country generally, because they either exceeded or fell short of national averages. The iron industry was selected because it was more widespread in these towns than any other modern manufacturing process. In Table 3.9 five larger towns have added to the list in Table 3.2. They are Worcester and Cheltenham, Gloucester's larger neighbours; the port of Ipswich as it handled much the same tonnage in 1850; Chester, the gateway to North Wales and in the orbit of Liverpool, and York. A. Armstrong's analysis of the occupational structure for that town was a useful starting point for the second comparison, of employed men in four towns according to the broad occupational sectors he used. This is set out in Table 3.10.23

In spite of a considerable range of figures for each occupation in Table 3.9, two groups can be discerned. The correspondence between the proportions of persons with independent means and female domestic servants is strongest in the first group, and to a lesser extent the skilled craft of cabinet making was positively represented. By contrast the iron industry was minimally developed. These figures suggest

Table 3.9

The Occupational Structure of County Towns compared
with reference to the incidence of selected
occupational groups in 1841

Columns: A - Persons of independent means as a % of the total population;
B - Female servants as a % of employed women;
C, D and E - as a % of employed men. C - Ironworkers and founders; D - General labourers; E - Cabinet makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations in '000s</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towns with high figures for A and B, figures mostly above average for E and very low for C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Canterbury</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Cheltenham</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Winchester</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 York</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower figures for B (servants) and higher for D (labourers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hereford</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Salisbury</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Taunton</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns with low figures for A, generally low figures for D and E, and above average for C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Durham</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Northampton</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Wakefield</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Warwick</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Worcester</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The figures for this group generally fall between those of the other two groups and have no obvious pattern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Chester</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Gloucester</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ipswich</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Lancaster</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Lincoln</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Maidstone</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Reading</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean figures for A - 3.8; B - 58.0; C - 0.4; D - 10.4; E - 1.2

that the least industrialised towns could be particularly attractive for people with private incomes. The first four were of more than local importance. The strong presence of the army in Canterbury did not deter them and Winchester was the unrivalled centre for its region. As the country gentry largely withdrew from Preston rather than rub shoulders with the self-made men, the same sort of reaction may have been a factor in the much lower figures for this social group in some of these towns. The contrast between the figures for Gloucester and Cheltenham reflected their social and economic structures, which a high proportion of men in domestic service in the spa town re-emphasised. The neighbouring towns of Warwick and Leamington displayed similar contrasts, and their relationship no doubt partly explains why all but Warwick's figure for persons of independent means would be better placed with Salisbury and Hereford.

All the towns in the second group are in the North and the Midlands, and were very close to areas of heavy industry so that supplies for their iron foundries were accessible and relatively cheap. Glove and china making in Worcester were of minor industrial importance compared with shoemaking in Northampton where 35.5% of men were employed in this trade. The level of general labour there was in the range found in three West Riding industrial towns. In the third group, Lancaster stands out in some respects; it was a minor cotton town and furniture making was becoming an industry for a wider market. Most of the towns with some industry had noticeably low figures for general labourers and there was


26. Armstrong, op. cit., p. 27.
some industrial work for women where the proportion of women servants was low. Without going further it is clear that both urban and regional characteristics affected the balance of the occupational structure in all these towns and gave rise to considerable diversity. Though the figures for Gloucester fall well within the range they tend to be weighted towards labouring and skilled crafts, and away from those of independent means, domestic service and the iron industry: so far, on this limited evidence the balance was most like that in Maidstone.

Cabinet making was chosen as representative of the skilled trades which had a far greater collective significance for the urban economy than the numbers they employed, as they needed extensive markets for their durable quality goods. The craftsmen of Gloucester and Cheltenham were potential competitors in much of their surrounding area. An indication that Gloucester men had a significant share in that market can be seen in the difference between the figures for Cheltenham and York for this craft. Cheltenham would appear to have had a larger internal market than York for more expensive products and a very much larger one than Gloucester. Clock and coach making were comparable trades. In Gloucester they produced a few examples of unusually long family traditions lasting into the nineteenth century. Clock making among the Washbournes was the most notable and it contributed to their status. One clock maker had added nautical instruments to his trade by 1851.


Table 3.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Cheltenham</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Gloucester</th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
<th>Gloucester 1820s</th>
<th>Gloucester 1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern manufacturing, extractive industries</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture etc.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General labour (unspecified)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service, professions, banking, merchants</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manufacture (handicrafts), dealing wholesale and retail</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This table follows Table 2.2 in A. Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town. A Social Study of York 1801-51, 1974, p. 28. Other figures for 1841 are based on the Census Abstracts for that year; the Gloucester figures only cover the municipal borough.

2. Figures for the 1820s are based on the Baptismal Register data used for Table 3.6. Those for 1851 are based on the Enumerators' Books. Both cover the whole town.

3. Pinners are included here and also for 1851 but they are included under handicrafts for the 1820s as the change to factory production on modern machines took place in the intervening years.

4. A. Armstrong makes no mention of merchants. The small numbers involved have been included here in my figures as alternative groupings seem less acceptable.
Iron working, as distinct from metal crafts using wrought iron, was on a small scale in most of these towns. It was developing fast with new methods of production, and foundries were supplying castings for machinery, construction, and especially for railways. They had a market and a source of cheap coal and pig iron in towns with water transport. Ransomes of Ipswich was then known for agricultural machinery, Lincoln was about to become a manufacturing centre for steam engines and engineering was to develop in Gloucester. Its antecedents were present in Montague's foundry which, in the 1820s, produced a large water wheel for his iron works. This firm was one of three machine makers listed in 1847. Water transport was a deciding factor in favour of Gloucester, and the docks and railways expanded the market for iron products and also attracted other foundries.

A comparison of the figures in Table 3.10 with J. Foster's analysis of the occupational structures in three industrial towns and with the conclusion reached on Portsmouth and Southampton illustrates the striking similarities of non-industrial towns. The significantly larger sector made up of professional men and officials, in the latter, can be related to the greater volumes of public, commercial and private businesses centred on them.

The handicraft-commercial grouping requires consideration, as it could include, with building, more than half the urban labour force and


because of its heterogeneous nature. Craft skills could be inseparable from retailing, and many craftsmen retailed some of their products, if only intermittently, and journeymen could advance to become retailers and employers. Excluding building, well over half this group was wholly or predominantly engaged in craft or other small scale production. Retailing, including craftsmen retailers, made up another 29.2% in York, 31% in Ipswich, 36% in Gloucester, and 37% in Cheltenham. Weight of numbers in shoemaking and tailoring largely accounted for the smaller proportion of retailing.

The transport sector was more complex than might be suggested by a superficial comparison of the towns in Table 3.10, as the higher proportions for Gloucester and Ipswich might be simply attributed to activity generated in their ports. However, York had almost as many boatmen as Gloucester and there was no alternative to employment in road transport in Cheltenham: railway employees were too few to affect the situation in 1841. Boatmen and seamen were present in nine other towns in table 3.9. The 360 seamen at Ipswich were not the only ones to outnumber the 120 boatmen at Gloucester, as there were 320 at Worcester and 134 at Maidstone. By 1851 the situation had changed, as the 650 at Gloucester included a sizeable number of seamen and the largest concentration of Severn and canal men on the river from Bristol northwards.

33. Chalklin, loc. cit., p. 280. The figures for Gloucester are distorted as they do not include the urban population outside the municipal boundary. The handicraft figure is particularly affected because a higher proportion lived within the boundary. That for retailing, given below is also inflated.

34. A. Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town, 1974, p. 29.

35. The others were York, 119; Chester, 94; Hereford, 25; Lancaster, 17, Lincoln, 77; Northampton, 34; Reading, 65. See the third group of towns in Table 3.9.

By then, railway work had introduced another source of change. It was already a major form of employment in York with 326 men, double the number at Gloucester. As there were fewer than 40 in Worcester and Cheltenham respectively, Gloucester was the main railway town in the Severn Valley between Birmingham and Bristol. 37

So far, proportionate numbers have been the basis for comparison but the range of occupations in these towns was very important. 38 The Census Abstracts and directories for Cheltenham, Worcester and Gloucester have little to choose between the number of different occupations in their respective lists, which were also very similar in composition. The few differences reflected divergent economic and social traits.

Cheltenham had a very long list of lodging houses, unusual fashionable services, far more inns than Gloucester, but not so many as Worcester, and an impressive list of resident gentry, which were persuasive attractions for the well-to-do who had no compelling reasons to stay in Gloucester. 39 This affected the character of the city, emphasising business preoccupations and rougher activities in transport, taverns, metal work and dealings in cattle and agricultural produce.

The occupational structures characteristic of these county towns distinguished them from several ports and industrial towns, due to the weight of numbers in traditionally organised occupations and to the expansion in professional work. Similar structures could be expected in other county towns as the larger ones added to the initial list, fit into the general pattern. However, within the very broad similarities the differing incidence of particular characteristics made for degrees of individuality, ranging almost imperceptibly from towns where the

38. Chalklin, loc. cit, p. 277.
formative influence of an affluent social élite was particularly strong to Northampton, where a major industrial sector altered the balance in the other direction. Gloucester appears to have been well within the general range, though numerically biased if anything towards labouring and craft occupations, especially those in which very large numbers were usual. Nonetheless, the many and varied occupations necessary to support the normal functions centred on larger county towns were to be found there. The great majority of people were engaged in traditional forms of employment at home, in small workshops and gangs, though iron-workers and railwaymen, more evident in 1851, marked new beginnings. Particular details point to development in the port of Gloucester, a changing balance between Gloucester and Worcester as centres for shipping on the Severn and great social contrasts between Gloucester and Cheltenham.

Conclusion

This comparison of populations and their occupational structures for a number of non-industrial county towns of middling size provides the wider perspective needed for a general assessment of Gloucester. The town was well within the mainstream, to judge by the absence of any exceptional features. The marked differences among the towns, both in their rates of growth and the incidence of particular occupational groups, can be partly attributed to their more individual social and economic characteristics, some of which have been mentioned. In part, they must be related to a town's locality and region, where the agrarian economy and its wage levels were particularly important. 40

In the first half of the nineteenth century Gloucester's population grew fairly rapidly in line with periods of generally marked urban growth.

It spread beyond the old built-up area so that about half the inhabitants were living outside those narrow confines by 1851. The social mix became rather more differentiated as households with comparable economic circumstances tended to be neighbours, distinguishing individual streets and especially some poorer areas. The wide dispersal of the larger occupational groups made for considerable variety in most places. The exceptions were where the retailers on the main streets lived above their shops and some professional and businessmen created small enclaves. Those with jobs centred on the river, the docks and small industries wanted to live near their work. Compared with some of the other towns, the city's population tended to be weighted towards people at risk of chronic poverty. The poorer outlook for women's employment strengthens the impression that under-employment was widespread.

Information on occupations for the period before 1830 and for 1851 points to a considerable degree of continuity and stability in the overall occupational structure as the changes taking place did not affect large numbers directly. Gloucester was one of the established towns which held their own in face of growing competition from a new one, except that it lost much of its appeal for fashionable society. By 1851 it had become the main centre for shipping on the Severn and was emerging as a railway town of regional standing, both of which underpinned the town's commercial functions and stimulated the growth of its population. Contemporaneously, dock and railway construction was altering the prospects of ports on the Humber.

Occupational structures give a general view of the practical, commercial and professional skills available to a community, though


economic strength or potential was not necessarily closely related to occupations with great numerical strength. These advantages were more likely to be found in these towns, among the smaller occupational groups: new and traditional metal working skills had particular potential for development. In Gloucester, foundry work, smithing, coach building and related wood working trades could be adapted for the purpose of engineering and used at the Wagon Works of 1860. However, alongside new skills and new forms of employment, traditional occupations and centres of economic activity often adapted successfully to meet the strains and opportunities of changing circumstances. The next chapter illustrates how important this could be.
CHAPTER IV

MARKETS AND INNS: TRADITIONAL CENTRES OF ECONOMIC LIFE

IN COUNTY TOWNS

Introduction

This chapter makes the transition from the earlier general chapters to more detailed consideration of the most significant sectors in Gloucester's economic structure and of particular occupational groups. Large markets and numerous inns visibly expressed the interdependence of county towns and the regions around them. They were the oldest centres of trade and still very prominent features of economic importance in the nineteenth century. The business of inns was closely associated with the intermittent and varied character of market trade which depended on the attendance of large numbers of people. As markets and a few town inns were usually municipal property, corporations and townsfolk had mutual interests in their profitability, and markets attracted additional business for town shops, inns and offices. In Gloucester, developments which were well advanced by 1850 were affecting the traditional role of the town's markets and of some inns. These common characteristics account for the two subjects being included in one chapter.

Both subjects are developed similarly: after a descriptive analysis, the emphasis is on the various circumstances which ultimately brought about a reorganisation of the town's markets and altered the standing and functions of many inns. Some topics introduced in earlier chapters are developed further, among them the Corporation's interests and performance of its responsibilities, to which the last chapter returns on a broader front.

Gloucester's Markets and Fairs: times and places

Although scattered references in newspapers and city records establish a sound general picture of the city's markets and fairs, there is
surprisingly little information about the volume of trade between 1820 and 1850. The press reported regularly in very general terms on the main livestock sales and quoted prices for corn, onions and animals per pound live weight. Almost as much attention was paid to major fairs elsewhere, while trade in household commodities was taken for granted.

The succession and distribution of market and fair days across the county had an intricate structure in which Gloucester had a key position. In the town itself these weekly and annual events affected the general tempo of trade. No one could be unaware of market and fair days as the town was crowded and noisy with people, carts and animals from early in the morning. The distinct functions of the three market places are outlined as their circumstances and problems differed. The way they were dealt with is the subject of the next section.

The tradition by which the grant of markets and fairs respected existing rights, produced arrangements in the county to the benefit of traders and customers. Wednesdays and Saturdays were market days in Gloucester and Tewkesbury. Cirencester, the only other with two market days, along with all the nearer towns and most of the rest, held them on other weekdays. Similarly, fairs in the county seldom coincided, and each of the main market towns held several during the year. Gloucester had four, the more important being those in April and September which occurred at peak times for fairs in the South West Midlands. Additional cattle sales were held one Monday each month and at Great Markets, one in January, the other in December. By 1820

1. G.J., 29.11.1851.
dealing at Gloucester fairs was virtually reduced to livestock. Only at the Barton Fair in September, the great annual event, did vestiges of past variety survive in small amounts of cheese, great quantities of onions, done up in long 'traces', and amusements. The latter dominated the second day, attracting crowds in holiday mood from considerable distances. Some 'pleasures' enlivened the big Mop Fairs on the following two Mondays. In 1851 the successful revival of monthly cheese markets led to talk of resuming wool sales.

Market days determined the main ebb and flow of town trade. These were by far the busiest days for the Gloucestershire Banking Company which exchanged notes to a weekly value of £20,000. In Gloucester activity reached a climax on Saturdays, the day for selling corn, sheep and pigs, when the markets did not end until 10 p.m. in summer, shops stayed open late into the evening and more people were about. Trade was normally busiest in spring and early autumn, augmented by fairs, Quarter Sessions and the Assizes. It reached greater intensity in September in the years when a Triennial Music Meeting was held in the city. Pre-Christmas trade briefly revived activity. However, adverse economic conditions sometimes upset this rhythm and quite often fairs did not fulfil expectation.

The provision market off Southgate Street was the smaller and least regarded. Market day staples were butter, eggs, fish, poultry and earthenware, but vegetables were sold daily. Most vendors were poor country women who paid 4d. for a stall or 2d. to sell from a basket on

---


6. G.J., 8, 22.3.1851; 12, 26.7.1851; 23.8, 25.10.1851.


8. GBR B4/1/2 f. 112.

9. G.J., General trade advertisements, e.g. 9.9.1826; 20.12.1851; 1.9.1820; 22.9.1823.
The area occupied by stalls in the larger Eastgate Street market had a roof. It was officially open on market days for the sale of provisions, including vegetables and poultry, household wares, corn and skins. Particular areas were allocated to the main commodities, though unoccupied standings could be taken for other goods. While skins were relegated to a far corner, butchers took up most space and the corn market had a separate structure in the most prominent position adjacent to the street where grain was sold, mainly by sample. Though city corn factors and maltsters prospered, no flour was ground in the town until a steam powered mill was established near Westgate Bridge in 1833. This market had regional standing. Customers from outside the town frequented the skin market: Edmund Rudge, the rich and miserly tanner of Tewkesbury, attended each week for 50 years to buy hides.

Much livestock went through the streets each week to market and even more to the major sales which were all held in the new cattle market from 1823. Horses were usually draught animals of mediocre quality at best: several droves of Welsh colts made a very poor showing at Barton Fair in 1848. The enormous numbers of sheep normally brought for sale were greatly exceeded by the 6900 penned on the opening day of Cirencester's new sheep fair in 1823. In 1796 Marshall considered that the pig market was the largest in the kingdom and attracted buyers from far afield. Sometimes in the 1820s and 1830s

10. G.J., 5.8, 11.11.1843. GBR B4/1/2 f. 150v.
14. G.J., 30.6, 4.8, 3.11.1823; 3.10.1840.
prices at fairs fell disastrously because so many came in from Ireland. Cattle were sold in great numbers for fattening, especially those from South Wales, as Gloucester market was on one of their drove routes to London. Fattened animals normally sold well and in 1837 Birmingham dealers were buying up half-fattened animals. The quality and number of animals for sale fluctuated and occasionally sound animals remained unsold. Before 1850 sales by auction were rare events in the market, reserved for a few more valuable animals, though auctioneers took advantage of market days to sell farm equipment and superannuated coach horses.

This brief account shows the pattern of market trade in Gloucester was like that of many other county towns, in the regional significance of dealings in corn and livestock, as compared with other commodities which mainly supplied the town and its environs with provisions and some merchandise drawn from much the same area. With the potential advantages of Gloucester's markets and fairs, in relation to others in the county, a growing population in the town and its hinterland and three purpose built market places quite as adequate as those in most towns, their trade might have been expected to flourish, but the signs suggested that all was not well.


17. G.J., 1.4, 23.9.1843; 24.2.1817; 4.10.1824; 18.11.1837; 28.10.1848; 9.8.1851.


Stagnation in the Markets and Future Prospects

In the nineteenth century major economic changes in the country had differential longterm effects on town markets. Their influence became increasingly apparent after 1850 but was less obviously at work earlier. At the extremes, small markets with very local trading areas dwindled and regional centres in some major towns not only held their own but acquired added significance. The transformation of fairs into livestock markets in Gloucester and other towns was symptomatic of the initial adaptation to developments in wholesale and retail trade, which later affected weekly markets. 20

This consideration of what was happening in Gloucester falls into three main parts. The first identifies indications that market trade was tending to flag. Closely allied were management and maintenance problems. Signs of competition for regular market trade were then emerging. Inability to overcome recurrent dissatisfactions finally combined with other influences to adjust priorities after 1850.

Pointers to problems for market trading were reflected in the municipal revenues derived from the rent for market leases, the lessees and their leases. However, it is not safe to assume that those problems always arose wholly from the general state of market trade. Usually between a quarter and a fifth of the revenue came from leasing tolls. The amount varied mostly within £100 either side of £1400. In the worst year, 1836-1837, it fell below £1200 and in 1844 it approached £1700, but in the late 1840s it was nearer £1300 annually. Of these totals the provision markets, including corn, brought in more than half until the later 1840s when they fell below £600, as compared with over £750 in the 1820s. At best they touched £1000 in the earlier 1830s. Until 1838 the cattle market seldom yielded less than £300 a year. Then after almost a decade of lean years it recovered. The minor tolls were for two

weighing machines, two cranes, wheelage and for animals going to market in the town.  

The Corporation preferred to auction the leases for terms of three years, but they were obliged to settle for one year arrangements as longer contracts broke down or could not be concluded. Failing satisfactory auctions tenders were invited or a price negotiated. It proved harder to secure the reserve set for the provision markets in the 1840s than for the cattle market. Lessees occasionally suffered losses on poor trade great enough to secure small rebates, they also fell into arrears with their rents and one man went bankrupt in 1850. Such difficulties increased the temptation to permit unauthorised use of the market places, giving rise to complaints which the Corporation could not ignore indefinitely, as when shopkeepers protested about frequent auction sales at the Eastgate Market which were altering the customary balance of trade.

It was impracticable for the Corporation to insist that the lessees fulfilled their contracts to the letter, as it would have raised the lessees management expenses, making suitable men harder to find. The Corporation's heavy burden of debt, amounting to £15,180 by 1838, was another compelling reason for poor upkeep; £8000 had been borrowed after the construction of the cattle market. Its leases may well have been expected to bring in enough revenue to begin to repay the capital, whereas it proved insufficient to meet the interest due.

If the rent of the cattle market had reflected its importance for the

21. GBR F10/7 Leases of Southgate and Eastgate Market Tolls, 1814-1835, passim; F4/15-16. City Cash Account, includes annual statements of income; City Rent Roll, uncatalogued; B4/1/3-6 toll contracts recorded August or September annually. G.C.L., NX 12.3 Borough of Gloucester Treasurer's Abstract, 1836-41.

22. GBR F10/7 Leases of Market Tolls, passim; B4/1/6 pp. 155, 311, 366.


city, the threat to its existence from plans for a central station would have been seen as an opportunity to find a better site, one which would end 'the nuisance' of large droves of Welsh cattle going along 'the principal business thoroughfares'. Its real value lay in the general business transacted by marketgoers coming in from near and far. The rent was low, because so many people successfully claimed exemption from tolls. That privilege, enjoyed by inhabitants of the Duchy of Lancaster among others, gave rise to spurious claims from strangers which it was impracticable to challenge effectively.

Marshall had considered that tolls in Gloucester were very high, and year after year the rates went unaltered. As tolls were slowly being ended, piecemeal up and down the country, resistance to them stiffened where their collection continued. In Gloucester a carter fought one of the collectors in 1848. Evasion of tolls was so serious that the provision markets were underused, though this was disguised in Eastgate by great spreads of earthenware. In 1850 part of a lessee's rent was remitted for this reason.

Frequent minor repairs did not prevent the markets from being rather rundown and dirty. The condition of the cattle market, once described as a 'model' of its kind, soon deteriorated, eventually becoming so bad that it deterred people from going there. Its white pebble pitching disappeared under accumulations of dirt which turned to mud in wet weather, aggravated by bad drainage, making the areas for sheep and pig pens look like swamps. Though the Corporation had a policeman living

29. GBR B4/1/4 f. 48, B4/1/5 f. 196v, B4/1/6 f. 415 sqq. G.J., 8.8, 28.11.1846; 18.11.1848.
beside this market they could not prevent it from being open to all and sundry,\textsuperscript{30} and had to come to terms with those encroaching on it. Once busy thoroughfares to the station went across it, the day was lost.\textsuperscript{31} Given the will and the money, the lesser problems at the other markets could have been tackled sooner and more effectively. In 1836 the ravages of wear and tear were extensive at the Eastgate Market.\textsuperscript{32} Most attention was given to the areas for sales of meat and corn. The corn merchants were important enough to insist on more expensive alterations in 1843 to make their premises secure against the 'great nuisances' of which they complained first in 1839. The Corporation had too much to lose if they carried out their threat to remove their stands from the market.\textsuperscript{33} The lessee evidently could not control those frequenting the market as the presence of a policeman was recommended and in 1845 the onus on meat and vegetable sellers to clean up their refuse before 11 p.m. on Saturdays was re-emphasised.\textsuperscript{34} The skin market was the one specified great nuisance. The criticism was accompanied by the recommendation to move or abolish it. By 1848 it was 'our filthy skin market', 'a disgrace to the city' and little used.\textsuperscript{35} Meanwhile the Southgate Street Market received scant attention except in 1844. Then a councillor almost shamed the Corporation into giving it a roof, by contrasting their concern for the wants of influential corn merchants with their neglect of the hardships endured by the poorest traders.\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} GBR B4/1/5 f. 13v.
\item \textsuperscript{33} GBR B4/1/5 f. 134 \textit{sgg.}; B4/1/6 pp. 22, 103.
\item \textsuperscript{34} GBR B4/1/5 f. 134; B4/1/6 p. 201.
\item \textsuperscript{35} G. J., 2.12.1848.
\item \textsuperscript{36} G. J., 5.8, 18.11.1843. GBR B4/1/6 pp. 149, 154.
\end{itemize}
Market trading was meeting competition from various sides. Six new markets and fairs began in the region. The new Cirencester sheep fair had the added attraction of being toll free. In 1843 tolls at all the markets and fairs were abandoned there and at the Monmouth cattle fairs. In Gloucester, customers had an increasing choice of retail outlets. Probably a lesser but more immediately obvious threat came from throngs of produce and fish sellers who provoked outraged protest in 1848 as they were obstructing people in the main streets and annoying shopkeepers. The consequent order to stop unlicensed street selling did not succeed or bring back vendors into the markets. The gradual and imperceptible expansion of regular daily trading was more serious and altered attitudes to the markets. Hawkers plied their wares extensively and in 1851 the census recorded 14 Scots drapers. The number of small general shops increased phenomenally; from being too insignificant to be recognised in the 1822 Directory, there were 67 in 1849. New marketing methods and more down-market stock in some town centre shops were calculated to attract more customers. A few fishmongers' shops appeared and more greengrocers opened, dealing in the perishables which had been the preserve of the market traders.

Other influences began to give an impetus towards improving the markets. The Corporation was persuaded to make minor changes at the cattle market. Once the county Agricultural Association began to hold its annual shows there, it successfully urged the erection of sheds which were later made available for the revived cheese market.

41. GBR B4/1/4 f. 112v; B4/1/5 f. 194v, f.205. G.J. 4, 1.1834; 10.5, 12.8.1851.
Freedom from tolls was conceded for both purposes although a proposal that the minor tolls should be relinquished was postponed sine die.\textsuperscript{42} Representations from the animal welfare movement resulted in repairs to the pumps and the provision of drinking troughs, all the more necessary as livestock were being brought to market by rail and in 1851 South Wales was connected to the network linking Gloucester with London and the Midlands.\textsuperscript{43} In the longer term, improved conditions and increased capacity in the cattle market became imperative. When this was done in 1863 it could accommodate over 5200 animals, more than double the number proposed two years earlier.\textsuperscript{44}

Two small changes in 1849 preceded the redevelopment of the provision markets seven years later. The skin market was transferred to a shed on the edge of the cattle market, bringing long awaited relief to users of the Eastgate Market and a fire engine was installed in part of the Southgate Street site.\textsuperscript{45} Surplus capacity invited ideas about some change of use for these premises. Attention centred on the Southgate Market. The first proposal in 1848, for fine public rooms and a museum, prepared the way for priority to be given to a Corn Exchange which also served as public rooms. With the removal of the old corn and skin markets and a little additional space, the Eastgate market was reorganised for the rest of the trade formerly on both sites, providing for 67 butchers, four fishmongers, 18 miscellaneous trades, 70 places for other perishable provisions, and a central fountain.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{42} GBR B4/1/5 f. 76, f. 173; B3/15, 9.11.1837. G.J., 18.8.1846; 26.4.1851.
\textsuperscript{43} GBR B4/1/6 p. 306. G.J. 20.5,12.8.1848.
Thus, by 1850, the economic prospects of the Gloucester markets were changing. In spite of unsatisfactory conditions in the cattle market the annual rents suggest increasing trade when some livestock was arriving by rail. Meanwhile the role of the provision markets was gradually contracting. Competition and hostility to tolls reduced the number of traders frequenting them and smarter town shops showed up their scruffiness. Influential critics saw that they could both modernise and improve conditions for traders and achieve other civic amenities of more value to themselves and their kind by reorganising the use of the market sites. The separation of the corn market from its humbler neighbours reflected the greater importance of that trade. However, the Corporation stood firm over its rights to tolls and attempted to extend them to freemen and residents of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1863, albeit unsuccessfully.47

Gloucester Inns: their Distribution and Hierarchy

Inns were as essential to urban economies as were the markets. In catering for all ranks of society they fell into a hierarchy which can be divided into broad categories, arising from their functions, their patrons and from the personality and business acumen of their landlords.48 The general applicability of this concept enables inns in one place to be compared with those in another. The differences thrown up, though they may be slight, need to be understood in the light of local economic factors.


This first part of the subject outlines the general circumstances of Gloucester inns. Their distribution across the town was one of the influences affecting their place in the hierarchy. Very similar functions for the most part, performed in different circumstances, produced the features which define the various kinds of inn. In reality the dividing lines were not clear cut. The term 'inn' is used here to cover the range from leading hotels to public houses and also many beerhouses in all probability, as names usually gave little clue to their status. However, Map 13, which is largely based on Hunt's Directory of 1847 takes no account of his list of beerhouses as they could not be located satisfactorily.  

The dominant feature of that map is the great concentration of inns within the city, as compared with the few in the suburbs. If the 57 beerhouses had been added to the 58 inns the picture would be substantially the same. The combined evidence of the 1851 Public Health Map and the Census are conclusive: the one recorded 71 inns and 63 beerhouses for the city and the other 143, including 20 beersellers, for the whole town. Evidently the magistrates held the number of licensed premises at 71 throughout this period. A comparison of directory lists for the 1820s and the 1840s shows that inns were increasing in number but not at the rate suggested by the difference between the figures in the 1847 Directory and the Census. As all 99 inns within the city were inspected by the police one Sunday morning in 1836 the rate of increase was greater there than in the suburbs. Ratios of inns to people for 1851 demonstrate the difference as they were 1:135 for the city and 1:170 for the whole town. These proportions placed Gloucester within the range of figures

THE DISTRIBUTION OF GLOUCESTER INNS c. 1850.
for several other county towns.  

Gloucester inns were more numerous along or close to the three main roads which carried most of the traffic in and out of the town. The old commercial area of the city was marked by distinct clusters near the Cross and the Quay, linked by several more inns on Westgate Street. The inclusion of 13 beerhouses on Lower Westgate Street and the Island would have emphasised the group near the Quay. Others would have doubled the number of drinking places on the map in the poorer neighbourhoods lying back from the main roads. Another group of inns was strategically placed near the dock gates on the main road. Around the cattle market and railway there were several more, including a temperance hotel. Conversely, inns were kept out of better residential areas. The Dean and Chapter used their leases to exclude them from the Cathedral Precinct; in Wotton and from the Spa to Eastgate Street the few were on the main roads. The economic and social forces affecting the location of Gloucester inns produced similar contrasts in London and other towns.

The certainty of placing inns in the hierarchy diminishes down the scale from leading hotels to the great majority, for which evidence is slight. 'Hotel' became the usual designation for the principal inns in Gloucester by 1840. In this period there were five, four old and one new one. The latter was the Spa Hotel, opened in 1818, near the Pump Room and pleasure gardens. Before 1850 it followed the Spa into

53. G.R.O., D936 Dean and Chapter Register of Leases, E12/18 nos. 149, 166; E12/19 nos. 60, 96; D.936, E.242 Estate Papers, 21.11.1836.
decline and after struggling for some years became the Judge's Lodgings in 1853. The other four were the largest inns in the town: the Bell and the Ram were near the Cross on Southgate Street while the King's Head and the Booth Hall on Lower Westgate Street were at the other end of the old business area. The Bell and the King's Head were of equal standing and superior to the other two. They had strong ties with political and social leaders in the city and county, the Bell with the Tories and the other, where the Duchess of Kent and Princess Victoria stayed briefly in 1830, with the Whigs. The royal visitors were welcomed with civic and ecclesiastical formalities and public demonstrations of loyalty. With the decline of the near monopoly of socially exclusive events held by these two hotels, very occasional auctions of works of art or property of an exceptional kind were allowed in their assembly rooms. Inventories for the King's Head and the Spa Hotel contained large supplies of wine instead of the great quantities of beer at lesser inns. The 1851 Census only found visiting gentry attended by their servants at the two leading inns.

The four largest dominated the coaching and posting business of the town, but the Ram and the Booth Hall also served some carriers. It is probable that each one had stabling for about 100 horses as the area of their premises was substantially larger than that of the Horse and Groom which was advertised as having stables for 80. The King's Head

57. P.H. Map, 1851.
58. GBR B3/14 f. 150. G.J., 23.10.1830; 7, 14.5.1831; Reports on political club dinners each January.
59. G.J., 21.6.1834; 21.9.1839. 21, 28.3.1840; 25.3, 1.7.1843; 31.5.1851.
had 31 bedrooms at the height of its fortunes and 41 in 1863. Omitting the tally of working areas, there were 11 dayrooms including a long room. The entertainment for large gatherings of the social élite at the Bell was at least equal to the sumptuous banquets served at the King's Head. 62

The 15 inns of the second rank were also on the main thoroughfares, 12 in the old part of the city, two near the cattle market and one close to the dock gates. For all or some of the years between 1820 and 1850, 10 were carriers' inns and coaching involved a few. These inns were large enough to accommodate visitors comfortably and their stables were vital for their business. The known numbers of their bedrooms ranged from six to 14; the Horse and Groom had 12. 63 Two had five entertaining rooms, the rest fewer. All had long or club rooms, or both, and they could cater for large parties like the 160 friendly society members who sat down together at the Saracen's Head. 64

Some of the 30 or more middle rank inns were designated as pubs. Half were located just off the main roads in the commercial centre and the rest were further out on the main roads. Thirteen served carriers and had rather smaller premises than second rank inns. Probably the largest, the Black Dog, had nine bedrooms and stabling for 12. Fewer in this group accommodated auction sales, possibly for lack of space. 65 Six other inns on the edge or outside the town had gardens to attract their patrons. The most notable, particularly for its fireworks in the 1820s, was Blenheim Gardens which later became the Vauxhall Tea Gardens. 66

63. G.R.O., D2080 nos. 139, 399, 485, 497. G.J., 1.4.1843; 5.1.1850.
64. G.R.O., D2080 nos. 139, 295, 399. G.J., 2.8.1824; 19.5.1827; 21.6.1834; 7.3.1840; 5.1.1850.
66. G.J., 23.6.1827; 11.3, 15.4.1853; 5.8.1843; 20.6.1840; 5.7.1851.
The more numerous lower class inns were mainly located away from the centre of town in poorer areas. Only two had any connection with a carrier and few seem to have had much use for stables. Their facilities were limited by their premises which were hardly more than small houses with little outbuildings. Customers mainly went there to drink and amuse themselves. Some were the regular haunts of petty criminals and prostitutes, who preyed on the unwary; sailors and country folk made easy game.67

The main business of all the Gloucester inns was daily trade; meals and drink were particularly in demand on market days. To build up other regular custom many cultivated close associations with one or another society which met in their club rooms. Provision for leisure pursuits served the same purpose. By 1851 skittle alleys were very common among middle ranking inns.68 Two inns had glee clubs, another opened a rifle shooting gallery, one or two offered billiards and handbells. All this went to establish their identity and hold customers.69 As innkeepers were liable to have soldiers billeted upon them, many kept one or more rooms for that eventuality until 1834 when the irksome duty ceased.70

The Enumerators' Books confirm the importance of the daily trade at inns. Though two of the largest commercial establishments each had more than 20 visitors that night, the largest hotels were far more than half empty.71

70. Ibid., nos. 82, 139, 170, 262, 399, 469. G.J., 10.5.1843.
71. Enumerators' Books: St. Owen no. 12; St. Michael no. 9; St. Mary de Crypt no. 65; St. Nicholas II no. 17.
Various places near the station had a few visitors but elsewhere their presence was insignificant. The number of resident servants was surprisingly low. Forty eight inns had none, 35 one each and a smaller number had two or more. Only four had more than five resident servants. There was not one at the Talbot where 21 people stayed over night. Therefore inns must have relied mainly on daily domestics.  

The economic and social functions of Gloucester inns were those generally to be found. However, when they are compared with those of other towns for somewhat earlier years, it is apparent that they had lost their hold on miscellaneous trading and the frequency of auction sales on their premises was in decline. A comparison with Chester inns reveals differences between the three leading ones there and the two in Gloucester. The latter had fewer rooms and perhaps fewer refinements. Their major part in the hurly burly of coach services was a function of the second rank inns at Chester and Nottingham. As the leading Gloucester inns had to compromise their exclusiveness, downward adjustments also affected the ranks just below them. The main cause for the difference lay not ten miles away in Cheltenham where well-connected visitors found refined accommodation and company in more congenial surroundings. At the opposite end of the hierarchy the lowest group was no worse than those in other towns.

'Publicans are Resilient Creatures',

The hierarchical description of Gloucester inns leaves too static an impression. Though appearances of continuity were kept up, competition

72. Ibid., also St. Mary de Crypt no. 33.
73. Everitt, loc. cit., p. 106.
76. Harrison, loc. cit., p. 163.
made for a changing scene, not only for inns individually but also more
generally as circumstances dictated. To prosper, landlords needed the
ability and character to take advantage of opportunities and to limit
risks, and often some capital was equally essential. This aspect of
the subject, therefore, sets out to correct the imbalance, first in
relation to the effects of changes in transport centred on inns, then by
illustrating less general circumstances affecting the prospects of
particular inns. Finally evidence of innkeepers' resources and the
security of their livelihoods are reviewed so that a comparison can be
made, in the course of the chapters which follow, with the position of
people in other sectors of the town's economy.

The pattern of carrier services centred on Gloucester adapted to
new transport facilities and growing population, but the changes were
insignificant when compared with the effect of railways on coach services.
Railways and canals made the longer distance journeys of carriers to
places like Bristol, Lechlade and Chepstow unnecessary. 77 Local services
to Cheltenham, Cirencester and Stroud either declined or ceased to
increase, unlike those going to Painswick and Mitcheldean, places without
an alternative to road transport. Eighteen canal boats a week replaced
carriers between Gloucester and Frampton. Until the railways began to
draw some business off the roads the number of carts leaving the town each
week gradually increased to 113, then fell to 90, but appears to have
grown again as 136 were listed in 1852. 78

Long distance goods traffic was cut dramatically after a period of
sustained expansion which saw the number of heavy waggons leaving the
town each week grow from about 60 in 1820 to some 200, including fly vans,
in 1839. Demand was such that three inns put on 12 new vans to London in

77. Map 14. Carriers' Routes from Gloucester, 1849. M.J. Freeman,
'The Carrier System of South Hampshire 1775-1851' in The Journal of

CARRIERS' ROUTES FROM GLOUCESTER 1849.

Journeys per week for carrier's carts 1 etc.
and for waggons 3 etc.
Marker boots per week 18

Hunt's Directory, 1849.
1822, though this business was dominated by firms with their own premises near the Quay. By 1847 the only routes unaffected were those going west into Herefordshire and South Wales, areas waiting for rail links. Much of the other freight was taken to be loaded onto railway waggons. Two firms moved to be close to the station.\textsuperscript{79}

More inns seized the opportunity to secure carrier services during the years when their numbers were rising. From the 10 inns in 1820 they increased to 25 by 1841, but then declined to 16 by 1847 in line with the reduction in services. The general distribution of carriers' inns altered slightly but there were more changes in detail. For instance, the Saracen's Head succeeded the Berkeley Arms as the leading carriers' inn between 1847 and 1852. The Bolt and the Old Bear gained while the nearby Swan and Falcon faded out and carriers severed all their ties with inns near the Quay. As the Ram and the Booth Hall were competitors for coaches, the one let its carriers go and the other had sold its waggons to a haulier before 1820.\textsuperscript{80}

Until 1840 coach services expanded rapidly from about 300 to 450 a week, supplemented by up to 80 omnibus journeys to neighbouring towns.\textsuperscript{81} Some of the increase provided direct services on established routes to the South West, the North West and the Midlands, which had previously involved Gloucester passengers in changes in Birmingham and Bristol. Through coaches to Abingdon, Barnstaple, Southampton and Aberystwyth opened up new services.\textsuperscript{82}

In the intensely competitive coaching business a new contender in Gloucester carved out a place second only to that of the Bell Inn,


\textsuperscript{81} L. Bryant, \textit{Directory for the City of Gloucester}, 1841, p. 70.

where the lion's share remained throughout in the hands of the Bell's firm and Heath's, with its office at the Bell. The Ram and the Booth Hall were well entrenched in the 1820s. The Lower George lost its London coaches and any chance of joining the main league. The King's Head entered it so successfully that it seems to have been partly responsible for the Booth Hall's relative decline in the business, and an incoming innkeeper there was probably less capable than his predecessor. Another new coach proprietor was Haines, based at the Paul Pry pub in Southgate Street. He remained an outsider, as the rest excluded his coaches from co-operative arrangements for their vehicles to call at more than one of their inns. 83

Once travel by rail spread, changes in public passenger transport paralleled those in road haulage. Coaches made connections with trains in Birmingham and from 1837 the advance of railway construction towards Gloucester can be followed, as services were modified to link up with the latest section to come into use. 84 Thus by 1847 the only services left were on routes going west across the Severn and the omnibuses which inns sent to meet every train. The Ram and Haines lost all their coaching business, the King's Head and the Booth Hall were left with very little. Most of the services from the Bell, all under Heath's name after the firms merged in 1840, also disappeared. 85 However, with the mail coaches they retained more than the others. Local coaches from carriers' inns were unaffected.

The expansion and contraction of coach services happened sooner or later throughout the country, 86 so it was only a matter of time before


86. Harrison, loc. cit., p. 162.
trains displaced them on routes into Wales. With the coaches went the network of partnerships which ran them and this reduced the differences of outlook and interests between the innkeepers who had been coachmasters and the rest. Cheltenham and Gloucester were affected similarly, as much of the long distance road transport for passengers and goods served both towns.

Innkeepers' enterprise showed itself in the diverse openings which seemed within their reach. The most successful turned some circumstances to their advantage but other able men could not always overcome adverse conditions. Few owned their premises and the contrasting management of the Corporation and the Dean and Chapter illustrates the importance of landlords for their tenants. The relatively high value of inn premises is apparent from the £8670 realised by seven inns in the Corporation's sale of more than 20 properties for £11,425. The Dean and Chapter with five inns in 1820 renewed leases unaltered, allowed dilapidations to go unchecked and lessees to reap the profits by sub-letting. These handicaps may have made it difficult for innkeepers to exploit fully the favourable site and the size of the second rank New Inn.

The fabric of many of the Corporation's 19 inns was also rundown, but they adopted a policy of improvements or realistic returns when leases came up for renewal in the 1820s. Failing satisfactory terms they went over to rack rents. The Booth Hall was one of their two largest and most valuable, but in constant need of repair. The Corporation's support and capable innkeepers could not prevent its decline.


88. GBR B3/15 4.6.1838.

89. G.R.O., D396. Registers of Leases, 12/18 nos. 80, 149, 164, 166; 12/19 no. 45; E242 Estate Papers, November 1836.

90. GBR J4/4/12 Plans of Houses and Lands ... within the City of Gloucester, 1826, passim; B4/1/3 f. 49; B4/1/4 f. 7 sqq, f. 37.
Any loss of business due to the removal of the law courts from the Booth Hall to the Shire Hall had no damaging effects, when goods and passenger transport were expanding, but that loss in the early 1840s, combined with the effect of severe economic recession, resulted in one bankruptcy and several rent reductions. The Corporation had to accept a fall of £45 a year as the rent settled at £105. By replacing the ruinous old Booth Hall with a new dining room they helped to sustain the inn's commercial status. 91

The Spread Eagle was more fortunate. The Corporation bought it with the property for the cattle market. By 1828 they had spent over £3000 on thoroughly renovating it. Once established, the annual rent rose from £100 to £150. Later it fell to £125 and the innkeeper successfully resisted a further increase as he had paid for extensive improvements. 92 The innkeeper's sights were set on the patronage of social groups above that of carriers and by 1841 his inn was a 'family and commercial hotel'. 93 He was a promoter in 1831 of a promising shortlived steam carriage service, which other road interests killed. It ran from the Spread Eagle to Cheltenham, with an idea of extending it to London. He exploited the inn's position by the market and probably benefited from being near the station. The gentlemanly county Agricultural Association, of which he was a founder member, met under his roof and he cultivated the Gloucester Farmers' Club by providing a meeting room free for a year. 94

Ambitious innkeepers could better themselves by moving from one rented property to another. Between 1827 and 1843 Thomas Hyett left a

91. GBR B4/1/5 f. 204; B4/1/6 pp. 79, 98, 285, 305.
92. GBR B4/1/4 f. 25v; B4/1/6 pp. 47, 323; F4/15 Treasurer's Accounts, pp. 671 sqq; F4/16 pp. 33, 131; Hunt, Directory, 1847, p. 64.
93. Bryant, op. cit., p. 61.
94. G.J., 19.3, 11.6, 30.7.1831; 4, 18.1.1834; 7.3.1840.
small inn on Northgate Street and returned when he took over the New Inn. The timing of a move could be critical as it was usual to refurbish the premises and hold a house warming dinner. Two landlords at the Nelson, no doubt anticipating enlarged trade with renewed dock building, went bankrupt in quick succession. By 1840 another man was reaping the expected benefits. Additional sources of income were common, especially in related trades. Three inns had small breweries at various times, at least two innkeepers were also maltsters, two hoteliers began to sell wines and spirits and the two with large coaching interests invested in funeral carriages. In 1846 the innkeeper of the Booth Hall and his sister at the Spread Eagle acquired a livery stable and later he entered his grandfather's trade of auctioneering. Several sold coal or bricks, or were hauliers.

Innkeepers' chances were improved when they had friends, relations and established business connections in the town to vouch for them, to act as trustees and executors and even help with loans. Examples of these close ties occur frequently in wills. A few had relations in more than one inn or innkeeping continued through more than one generation of a family. However, the evidence of discontinuity is stronger.

Inheritances were divided after the widow's death if not immediately. Of the 140 mentioned in advertisements some 15% were cases of insolvency and it is unlikely that almost half the total, with one brief uninformative


reference, prospered. Of those recorded in the 1851 census 77 were not born in the town but mostly in other market towns, 32 of whom came from outside the county. Though some had connections to help them, those who arrived to take over an inn had to cope with the initial difficulties of establishing themselves. About equal numbers announced their arrivals and departures, amounting to 10% of innkeepers named in notices.

The 50 wills and probate valuations found fall far short of the number of innkeepers at any one time. They are concerned with those who succeeded to some extent. When the valuations of their personal property are compared with those of more than 100 shop keepers the median figures were under £450 as compared with under £600. Three times the number of shopkeepers left over £1500 and their highest valuations considerably exceeded those of the richest innkeepers. The proportions for those with under £100 were almost 20% in both groups. Though nearly half the wills refer to real estate, it was usually little more than the inn or a house. Others with no details may well have covered similar property.

The valuations for probate and for other purposes largely refer to the middle rank inns and above, though the amount of personal property left did not correspond exactly with the general status of the individual inn. So some unpretentious hostelries were very profitable. 99

The innkeepers of the two leading inns were in a class of their own, as might be expected. These were no 'vulgar innkeeper(s)' but would have been mistaken for gentlemen, like the man George Borrow admired. 100 The highest probate valuation of £8000 was for Thomas Marsh of the Bell who also owned considerable real estate. This was substantially more than the £6000 for a later innkeeper at the King's Head who had no need to maintain the 51 horses and fleet of coaches necessary in 1834, when

99. Wills, Mason, 7.2.1834 £1500; Bagley, 27.10.1830 £1500; Cowles, 13.4.1847 £600.

they were valued at almost £1700 out of a total near to £5000 for the inn's contents and stock. The next highest inn valuation came to £1207 for the Maidenhead. Marsh's predecessor educated his sons with the gentry at the College School. They went on to be a London merchant, an army officer, a bishop of Exeter and a barrister: the latter, John Phillpotts, joined the corporation at an early age and later served as a city M.P. for 17 years. None of Marsh's children took over the inn. His brothers were coachmakers and a pin manufacturer in Gloucester.

John Dowling rose from being head waiter to manager and owner of the King's Head. His sons also went into the church, the army and the law, and his brother was a leading innkeeper in Cheltenham at the Plough. As soon as he retired a place on the Corporation was found for him.

No other innkeeper achieved comparable standing from 1820 to 1851.

That the stability of inns depended on the ability of their landlords is evident as they had to weather periods of adverse economic conditions and cope with shifts in centres of economic activity in the town. By 1850 railways had permanently undermined the leading inns by depriving them of their coach services. The most seriously affected was the King's Head as most mercantile activity had moved to the docks and the atmosphere in the neighbourhood was polluted by smoke from tall chimneys. Railway transport altered the competitiveness of some carriers' inns also. The cohesion among innkeepers generally evident before 1800 was not particularly strong in Gloucester by this time, probably because there were so many of them with diverse interests and status. Many were

101. Will, Marsh, 27.3.1832, GBR D2080 nos. 461, 139.
103. GDR B4/2 Probate Papers M30, Marsh.
105. Everitt, loc. cit., p. 129
not natives of the city, other connections were as useful, if only to spread the risks and alternative occupations could be more certain avenues to economic security.

Conclusion

To outward appearances the markets and inns in Gloucester retained their traditional place in the economic life of the town in the first half of the nineteenth century, though here and there obvious signs of imminent change were visible; most notably, the days of the great eighteenth century inns were virtually over. The growth of the town, the construction of the canal and the railways, and developments in retailing were forcing these established institutions to adapt or disappear. In the process there were gains and losses.

The declining trade in the provision markets was sufficient to begin a thoroughgoing reappraisal which was soon to result in their reorganisation on one site. The reconstruction of the market hall confirmed its place in the town's retailing sector. By the 1860s newspaper articles were commenting on the sad degeneration of the popular amusements at the Barton Fair, though early signs were there in the 1840s. Building extended along Lower Barton Street, the Fair lost its field and the attractions of the Vauxhall Tea Gardens suffered later; so they, too, went for housing. As the traffic and business of the docks expanded, the Spa's sequestered appeal disappeared and trespassers invaded the gardens. The Spa Hotel followed in its wake and the gardens became a public park as the owners bowed to the inevitable.


108. G.C.L., 18421-2, Spa Minute Books, 12, 22.6.1855, 27.11.1860.
and by the Quay. The frequent use of inns for auction sales declined as auctioneers acquired suitable premises of their own. As tastes changed, fewer and often more serious functions replaced the magnificent dinners and the season of winter assemblies, and critical voices questioned the value of the Mop fairs.109

Whatever the particular losses, the town economy did not suffer comparably, as there were compensations in other respects, and positive gains for two markets and many inns. The important cattle and corn trades continued to grow so that the reconstruction of the cattle market became imperative and an entirely new Corn Exchange was soon to be built, which separated it from the provision markets.110 New commercial inns, near the docks, the cattle market and the station, added to the number of second and middle rank inns which supplied the varied requirements of respectable townsmen and catered for country people whose business brought them to town on market days.

CHAPTER V

SHOPS AND SHOPKEEPERS ON THE MAIN STREETS:

THE EROSION OF TRADITIONAL WAYS

Introduction

From the sixteenth century marketing and distribution were the backbone of Gloucester's economy. With the general growth of the population and its demand for supplies, shops increased in number in competition with inns during the eighteenth century as daily trading became economically more viable. Directories from the later eighteenth century mark that expansion, which has been seen to have affected the provision markets in Gloucester before 1850. The strength of the town's commercial sector was directly connected with the shipping facilities on the Severn and continued growth could be predicted as the means of transport by road, water and then by rail were transformed by mid-century. ¹ By then Cheltenham was the only other town in the region which might limit those advantages for the city.

Since mercantile activity was subordinate to regional distribution through shops in the town centre until after the Gloucester Berkeley Canal was opened, the city's shops are considered first. ² The subject is approached in three ways. The first addresses the question as to whether the number of shops in Gloucester increased in line with comparable development elsewhere, using some of the numerical data available. This approach takes no account of the relative size of shops or the value of the goods sold, matters which are touched on later. An analysis of the shops in the centre of the city follows. Apart from directory and census

2. Ibid., p. 104.
data there is virtually no evidence for the small shops in other parts of the town.\textsuperscript{3} The second section deals with the nature of the shopkeepers' connections with the locality and more distant places because they were in a position to transmit influences from the principal centres of commerce in the country to more remote places. Lastly, the drapers and grocers are compared to examine the circumstances of two very different major and essential trades.

**The Distribution and Variety of the Principal Shops**

Commercial activity was largely concentrated in the area of the principal shops, inns and banks in the centre of towns, either around a large market place as in Nottingham, or along the main streets as in Chester and Gloucester.\textsuperscript{4} These were the more specialised shops and as they increased in number they offered a greater diversity of wares. Although directory lists are not entirely reliable they permit general comparisons over a period between one place and another. Using D. Alexander's tables for retail outlets in York,\textsuperscript{5} a comparison with similar data for Gloucester and Cheltenham provides the basis for an assessment of the vigour of the city's retail sector and the context for considering it in more detail.

Table 5.1 quotes the number of shops in a variety of leading trades for the three towns in 1822. The later figures for Gloucester and Cheltenham are the nearest to 1848 which are available. Table 5.2 relates these shops to their respective populations. However, the scale of their trade which was in part regional cannot be quantified. Two figures are

\begin{itemize}
  \item M.J. Winstanley, *The Shopkeepers' World 1830-1914*, 1983, p. 15.
  \item R.A. Church, *Economic and Social Change in a Midland Town*, 1966, p. 7.
  \item Alexander, op. cit., p. 93.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{3} M. J. Winstanley, *The Shopkeepers' World 1830-1914*, 1983, p. 15.


\textsuperscript{5} Ibid, pp. 253, 263.
### Table 5.1
The Number of Shops for Selected Trades
1822 and 1847-49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>York (municipal boro')</th>
<th>Glo'ster (city/town)</th>
<th>Chelt'm</th>
<th>York and</th>
<th>Glo'ster</th>
<th>Chelt'm for 1847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>121,711</td>
<td>9,444/11,776</td>
<td>13,338</td>
<td>40,359</td>
<td>16,383/24,171</td>
<td>33,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trades</th>
<th>1822</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationers and books</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers and confectioners</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers and tea dealers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot and shoe makers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Pigot, *Directory*, 1822, p. 56
4. Hunt, *Directory*, 1847, p. 64. The population for 1847 has been calculated.
5. Butchers were not included for 1822.
The Ratio of People to Shops based on the figures in Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trades</th>
<th>1822</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Glo'ster</td>
<td>Chelt'm</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>city</td>
<td>town</td>
<td></td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books etc.</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>4446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemists</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>2668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironmongers</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>3335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectioners</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>4446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers etc.</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot makers</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


given for Gloucester as the central shops served the whole town irrespective of the city boundary.

The most striking feature in Table 5.1 is the great increase in the number of shops, especially in Cheltenham, which was on the way to catching up with York before 1850, whereas in 1822 Gloucester had the advantage over Cheltenham in all but three categories which catered for wealth and fashion. Gloucester appears to have been left behind until these numbers are related to town populations, and then the difference between York and Gloucester narrows considerably. By the 1840s Gloucester had a higher proportion of grocers and ironmongers than both York and Cheltenham, and was still ahead locally for supplies of books, a trade closely related to printing. As Gloucester's other trades were holding their own it is clear that shops for essentials increased at much the same rate as those of York and were withstanding the pressure from the growth of a large new fashionable town nearby. However, the differences would be evident...
in comparative figures for minor trades and more expensive goods like china, leather, tobacco, hosiery, gloves and toymaking, some of which were stocked by other shops.  

Between 1820 and 1850 the number of shops in the city rose from approximately 300 to nearly 500, when workshop trades like saddlers, brush and cabinet makers are included. New specialities such as fish and poultry, dairies, news agents, marine stores, musical instrument shops and many small general shops added to the overall range. About 1820 nearly 39% of retail outlets sold food and drink, excluding pubs. Cloth and clothes accounted for a further 27%. The rest covered other household and personal wants. These proportions were like those in other large towns. By 1850, excluding the small general shops, those selling food made up 45% of the total and clothing had risen to 35%. There are several probable explanations: a larger population with higher rates of consumption, more wholesale trading in the hands of some retailers and a shift from market trade. The 20 greengrocers were unusual.  

The concentration of shops largely gave the main streets their character and their distribution underlines the importance traditionally attached to a central position for some trades. These points are demonstrated by relating the 1851 census data to the map of that year in Tables 5.3 and 5.4. The dividing line between the inner and outer sections of the four streets has been drawn at approximately 150 yards from the Cross. No allowance has been made for public buildings and the outer sections were very different in length. 

Table 5.3 shows a higher concentration of shops along the inner parts of all but Southgate Street, as compared with the outer sections, but the variety of trades was rather greater along the latter. The mix

6. Ibid., p. 95. The discrepancy between the figures above and those on p. 92 is related to the different sources used.


Table 5.3

The Concentration of Shops on the Main Streets of Gloucester, 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets</th>
<th>Total inhabited premises</th>
<th>No. of shops</th>
<th>B as a % of A</th>
<th>No. of different trades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4

The Incidence of Shops selling Food and Clothing on the Main Streets, 1851

Column A: the number of shops
Column B: that number as a % of occupied premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets</th>
<th>Drapers</th>
<th>Grocers</th>
<th>Butchers</th>
<th>Bakers/confectioners</th>
<th>Boot/shoe makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Section</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hosiers and includes clothes dealer.

1. Enumerators' Books.
of shops was broadly similar on each street although there was more
variety nearer the Cross on Northgate and Westgate Streets which had
long been the principal shopping streets. There were some large concerns
on outer Westgate Street whereas those on outer Southgate Street were
small. The map and an illustration of the frontages for about 1840 shows
the larger premises lined the inner sections. 9

Major differences existed in the distribution of shops dealing in
food and cloth which made up over 50% of all shops nearer the Cross. The
drapers were almost entirely to be found there and those further down
Northgate Street were just over the 150 yard limit. Almost two thirds
of the equally numerous grocers were in the same area. Outer Westgate
Street was exceptional with the advantage of large premises near the
river. The less capitalised food and footwear trades predominated further
out. The bakers near the Cross were primarily confectioners. By the
1840s bakers and shoe-shops had spread beyond these and the adjacent
streets. 10

Two shops of the same kind seldom occupied adjacent sites and the
minor categories were also fairly evenly distributed. They included
ironmongers, clock and gunmakers, hairdressers, a Berlin work repository,
saddlers and pawnbrokers. Booksellers and wine merchants were, like the
drapers, near the Cross. Chemists divided their forces; one had a
prime corner site opposite the Tolsey 11 and some others were noticeably
further out. Small general and readymade clothes shops, with one
exception, were at a distance from the Cross.

Though Gloucester's main shops for staple supplies increased at
much the same rate as those in York, the effect of Cheltenham on the

9. G.C.L., NR3.2 Historical, Pictorial [sic] and Topographical
Illustrations of the Counties of Gloucester . . ., n.d., L. Bryant,
Directory for the City of Gloucester, 1841, p. 126.


11. Enumerators' Books, St. Mary de Crypt No. 4.
overall rate can be detected, as that fell back from 1:31 for the city, or 1:40 for the whole town, as compared with 1:55 for York in 1822, to 1:34 or 1:49 as against 1:35 in about 1848. Nonetheless, considering York's more extensive regional trade, Gloucester's retailing sector remained strong. Cheltenham certainly limited its range of unusual and fashion goods. While that town had three furriers, several drapers in the city stocked furs seasonally. Nor was there a resident optician, a plumasier or rustic chair and grotto maker. Greater reliance on supplying essentials made for more stable trading conditions than the vagaries of fashion, though Gloucester trades had to keep up with the times.

Local Ties and Outside Influences and Connections

G. Crossick has written of shopkeepers' individualism, diversity, economic instability and anxiety, and their circumscribed outlook, bred of dependence on the local economy as characteristic of the petty bourgeoisie. The subjects in this and the last part of the chapter illustrate his thesis to a considerable extent without setting out to do so. The first question here is concerned with how the main body of retailers in the centre of Gloucester tried to achieve economic stability, which required some to balance potentially opposing advantages conferred by local roots and by a degree of mobility. The indications of their local and more distant connections might also be stated in the terms of the relationship between family and trade. These were particularly important considerations for the leading retailers, many of whom traditionally traded in goods bought in London. Though their stocks were for a local

15. V.C.H. Gloucestershire, IV, p. 104.
or regional market their livelihoods partly depended on their judgment in selecting goods in national markets and on the general state of the economy. Some of these retailers had concerns large enough to employ a few assistants in the shop and more in some workshops. They were therefore liable to be affected by the efforts of employees who tried to improve their conditions through trade unionism, or, later, in the movement to secure earlier shop closing hours.

There is considerable evidence of durable family networks among Gloucester retailers, not so much in continuity in the same trade over several generations, as in more than one trade, achieved through marriages and training. For instance, in 1851 there were four pairs of distinctive surnames in the main shopping area: two adjacent Nibletts were an upholsterer and a bacon factor; one Vick was a saddler, another a vet and druggist, the Gouldars a pawnbroker and a watchmaker and the Washbournes, a wine merchant and a partnership of three drapers. Directories reveal similar clusters of names and some continuity of trade, name and also of premises over the period. On this superficial evidence not more than one in five shops remained in the same name, and continuity over 30 years was deemed worth advertising. It was unusually low among drapers and more evident in trades requiring considerable workshop skills. The Washbournes were diversifying their occupations after 1800.  

The predisposition to keep a shop in the family was often thwarted, because there was either no heir to carry it on, or the interests of heirs required that it should be sold. Occasionally a relation or someone who had proved himself as an apprentice or assistant was taken on. A watchmaker's reached the third generation when a nephew, who had trained there, took over. A grocer took into partnership an ex-assistant who put up

£500 to be a third of the working capital.  

It was common for the family network to extend into the Gloucester region. Wills give as much evidence of this as of family ties with other traders, though the majority are uninformative. Several retailers came of farming stock and connections with nearby market towns were not unusual. Connections with Cheltenham shops were mostly in minor trades and it seems there was no scramble to take the opportunities opening up. A Mrs. Davis opened a second fish shop there and later, the fishmonger, Olive, moved to Cheltenham, leaving his brother at his Gloucester shop.

Pigot's Directory listed three tailors named Dike in Cirencester and one in the city. Members of the Haviland family were spread across the three towns, as wine merchants, a distiller and an innkeeper. As three went bankrupt in rapid succession their affairs were probably linked.

Shopkeepers' birthplaces connected them with towns with which there were trade links, including Stroud and Ledbury. In 1851, all told, 63% of the central retailers were either born in the city or the county; relatively fewer Cheltenham retailers had local roots. Another 13% originated in the counties of Hereford, Monmouth and Worcester. The few from further afield mainly came from the London area, larger towns in the Home Counties, the Midlands and the Bristol region.

Most of the Gloucester retailers bought extensively in the London wholesale markets. At one time or another all except ironmongers, bakers and greengrocers advertised London wares. It was essential for drapers,

17. G.R.O., D.177 Wilton Papers, Box 49. G.J., 1.2.1834.
milliners and tailors to emphasise them. A chemist, two jewellers and
two upholsterers bought in bulk there. A bookseller's creditors were
wholesalers in Queenhythe and Paternoster Row, and a grocer owed £100
to an Aldersgate hop and oil merchant. From 1821 a fishshop sold
London oysters daily and thereafter other fishmongers had oyster rooms.
'Depots' for readymade shoes, bought in London, sold them at prices a
third below those usual in Gloucester, and one introduced rubber clogs.

In addition to buying stock in London some went there to extend
their working experience for a time, or they employed London trained
assistants. One or the other was essential to be at the forefront in
the fashion trades. Several milliners also advertised their Cheltenham
or Bath connections and one had been in Paris. Local drapers valued
their local connections as much as their time in London. Tooby had been
an assistant in the shop where he was to be a partner and had experience
in the London wholesale trade, and another recommended himself somewhat
similarly. Except for Londoners, incoming drapers did not explain
where they came from. The Johnson brothers introduced themselves as
members of the London Vintners' Company. Such connections for others
are suggested by marriage and obituary notices.

There is almost no comparable evidence for trade training elsewhere,
though that does not mean it did not occur. The family ties which have
come to light in Bristol may indicate it. Two partners, one of whom
probably had relations in Gloucester, arrived from Manchester to set up
as drapers. In very few cases retailers selling goods manufactured in

22. G.J., 15.9.1823 Lowe; 29.4.1837 Hughes; 8.9.1838 Mann; 23.5.1840
24. G.J., 21.8.1820 Miles; 10.5.1828 Humpidge; 7.11.1840 Parnell;
30.4.1843 Hacker.
26. G.J., 10.1.1825 Johnson; 2.7.1821 Applin; 3.9.1821 Jew; 19.5.1827
Tooby; 1.10.1831 Bulgin.
the Potteries, Lancashire and Birmingham originated there, but a hatter came from Manchester to sell his firm's felt hats. When he moved to London in 1840 he left a partner in charge of the Gloucester shop.

Most retailers who moved away left no trace of their destinations. Four of the 15 known cases went to London; one was a tailor who had come from London and had a relation there with a substantial tailoring business. Two thirds went to local market towns and four of the 15 were Quakers, all newcomers, who no doubt had the help of their Society.

Retailers in larger towns had to compete, so they adopted different strategies to survive. The most competitive trades, dealing in fashionable goods, tea, ready made clothes and shoes, cut prices and aimed to make profits from higher turnover and others gradually adopted some of their practices. In 1850 a 'London, Birmingham, Sheffield Stores' advertised 'small profits and quick returns'. The progress of this trend is taken up in the next part of the chapter. Others diversified their stock or functions to establish a more individual niche for themselves in the market. Chemists did relatively little more than offer an extra line like trusses, Indian curry, chemical manure. Booksellers found life more difficult. One went over to selling musical instruments; helping social causes like mechanical chimney sweeping and temperance, housing the Savings Bank, printing, providing lending libraries and reading rooms were other ways of attracting custom. High class bookshops with

29. G.J., 10.10.1840 Edmunds; 31.1.1846 Scott; 14.6.1851 Jennings; 5.5.1827 Kimber; 14.6.1834 Bucknall.
31. G.J., 15.6, 20.7.1850 Wells.
32. G.J. 14.1.1843 Rose; 5.4.1834 Fouracre; 1.4.1843 Lovett.
libraries carried a large stock and were particularly at risk of bankruptcy as two went under. Some diversified by proxy, providing temporary accommodation for visiting artists and professional men who had wares to sell. A few shared their premises with a relative in another trade; footwear and millinery were sold at 90 Westgate Street, possibly by a husband and wife.

Although Gloucester was caught up in the general social issues of the day and Chartism had its supporters in the city, they are outside the scope of this survey. At times of heightened trade union activity in the country some retailers' employees attempted combined action and, later, others pressed for earlier shop closing hours when that movement was spreading. The character of employment in Gloucester made effective trade unionism unlikely and advertisements to recruit non-union tailors, building craftsmen and ironfounders for work in London appeared in the newspaper. Agitation elsewhere aroused fears of public disorder in the city. When restiveness involving journeymen shoemakers and tailors occurred, it was given the minimum of publicity. It was at its height in 1825 when five shoemakers rioted and the tailors maintained a general strike long enough to elicit an employer's apology for delay in completing orders. The magistrates had put a stop to the shoemakers' efforts in 1818 by sending three to prison, and again in 1834 they convicted two leaders for assault. The newspaper had just used the occasion of a trade unionist's funeral parade through the town to warn that direct action would be counterproductive. In 1850 some journeymen tailors formed a

34. G.J., 8.3, 12.4.1828 Washbourne; 29.8.1840 Bryant.
36. G.J., 10, 17.5.1834; 6.9.1834.
38. G.J., 27,7, 21.9.1818; 25.1, 3.5.1834.
committee to support their London counterparts in petitioning Parliament against 'the slop, sweating and middleman system' which 'ruined fair tradesmen and demoralised the working man'. They wanted tailoring to be done on employers' premises. 39

The employees of other retailers mostly lived with the family on the premises. In 1851 no one had more than six resident shopmen and, when it was possible, other members of the family were employed. In the smaller concerns there were usually more servants than shopmen. The early closing movement may have begun about the same time in Gloucester and Cheltenham but made more progress in the city. 40 In 1837 the chemists announced that they were closing at 10 p.m., except on Saturdays, to save the cost of gas lighting, but would attend to urgent requests at any time. The desirability of shorter hours was openly advocated by a grocer's assistant under the pseudonym of 'Huit Heures' in 1840. He urged the grocers to follow the drapers' example by closing at 8 p.m. in winter, and called on their assistants to meet, to state their case in a petition. Evidently they had some success as one grocer who had not fallen into line received a threatening letter. 41 The understanding did not affect closing hours in the summer. In 1842 the drapers decided to close at 7 p.m. in winter and the Gloucester Journal recommended other retailers to follow suit. As the advice was repeated in subsequent years, earlier closing was not fully established. 42 The streets were darker and less inviting for late customers once some large shops had closed their shutters. Even so, work went on inside to wind up the day's business.

A further relaxation began in 1842 when it became known that shops

41. G.J., 22.4.1837; 10, 31.10.1840.
42. Done, 'Index', 1.10.1842; 26.10.1844; 1.11.1845. G.J., 28.9, 23.12.1848.
in many other towns were to have a day's holiday to make up for Christmas Day which fell on a Sunday. Some 130 of the 'most respectable' city tradesmen asked the mayor to recommend it with the caveat that this was not to be taken as a precedent. However, in 1845 the drapers took the lead and allowed an extra day, though Christmas fell in the middle of the week. The next year others joined in but avoided closing on a Saturday. They preferred Monday as the quietest weekday. In 1848 the holiday was extended to three days though the grocers hesitated at first. By 1850 these concessions had become annual events as matters of grace and favour on the part of the employers whose trade could not have suffered and who had more to gain by their magnanimity in public standing. They also distanced themselves from the smaller shopkeepers who could not afford the change and catered for a different class of customer.

Economically and socially Gloucester retailers were too diverse to be a close knit body and it will be seen that a small minority belonged to the upper middle class which usually exercised considerable power in town affairs. Their identification with the locality through family networks which extended into the region, was a stronger unifying influence. Wills also show how the ties of friendship associated with neighbourhood, trade, church or chapel were closely linked with the family. If this topic had been pursued to any extent, the importance of these networks would have emerged more strongly as they were characteristic of much provincial society. Newcomers were soon assimilated or were liable to fail, to judge by some new names with extremely shortlived concerns. No doubt the more usual experience was like that of J.J. Powell whose

forebears originated in Wales and Herefordshire. His grandfather established himself in the city as a wheelwright, the son became a cooper and he apprenticed his son to a city draper. 47

Though fathers handed on their shops to their sons to some extent, there were positive advantages in some diversity of trade, especially for those depending on marketing rather than craft skills, as the risks were likely to differ. Gloucester retailers not only dealt in the main markets of the country, they were also influenced by them and, in their turn, disseminated those influences more widely. The timing of the early closing movement may be related to influences from Birmingham where it began in 1825. 48 Its modest progress was more due to the retailers' confidence than to their employees, who petitioned, rather than bargained, for concessions which benefited both sides. The journeymen failed because their interests were in conflict with those of the employers and the law deterred concerted action.

The Trading Conditions and Practices for Grocers and Drapers

In the eighteenth century grocers and mercers were prominent among the wealthiest and most influential citizens of Gloucester. 49 Their numerical strength and strategically central position, already demonstrated, imply their continuing economic importance in the retailing sector. Contrasting trading conditions and changing trade practices can be followed more clearly by restricting the subject to these two major groups, as over the years they gave rise to more newspaper notices than other branches of retailing. Innovations in retailing occurred first in major towns as

47. G.J., 19.9.1891.
competition grew. That exacerbated the effects of destabilising swings in
the economy and lack of expertise on the part of some retailers. 50

An indication of the size of these concerns and the general range
of goods covered here by the terms of grocery and drapery, are given
first. Both trades often included goods or services for which there were
also specialised suppliers. The gradual spread of new trading practices,
which usually appeared first in drapers' shops is outlined. Though the
number of shops was increasing, some were being enlarged considerably.
The relatively few in these leading trades who achieved notable material
and social success was a sign of the insecurity besetting retailers at
this time. 51

Although some of these shops were amongst the largest in Gloucester
it is instructive to compare them with others elsewhere, which can be done
for the drapers. The main ones were small in comparison with the largest
in London and Cheltenham where there were more than 20 assistants. 52 In
1851 three city drapers each had six resident shop employees, the one with
five was a partnership of three brothers. On balance grocers employed
rather fewer assistants. Only one had six; another relied on two
relations and had three servants. 53 The majority were therefore very
small concerns, sometimes with no more than a servant; the tailor and
draper who left his 11 year old daughter to mind the shop one evening
was then probably one of them. 54 Rough estimates can be made for the


51. Ibid., p. 162. G. Crossick, 'Urban Society and the Petty Bourgeoisie
in Nineteenth Century Britain' in D. Fraser and A. Sutcliffe, eds.,

Dull Haunts of Business". A study of retailing in Cheltenham

53. Enumerators' Books, St. Nicholas 1, no. 3; St. Mary de Crypt
nos. 6, 9; St. Michael nos. 13, 29.

54. G.J., 29.2.1840 Jennings.
turnover and profit on drapers' stocks. £10,000 was the highest stock value which came to light prior to a sale before a move. So the annual turnover was likely to have been at least twice that figure, possible producing a profit of about £3000. The turnover of this shop almost certainly increased in subsequent years. Three other leading drapers had stocks valued at about £5000. The picture then makes the Gloucester drapers comparable with large shops in some other regional cities.

The terms 'grocer' and 'draper' are used here to include a broad range of stock. A modest grocer's included in 1851, cheese, bacon, rice, peas, barley, biscuits, raisins, sugar, spices, coffee, cocoa, pickles, oils, candles, soap, cigars, brushes and blacking. Some grocers were variously bakers, soap and candle makers, wine and hop merchants, bacon, cheese and flour dealers. Provided they had a shop selling these commodities they are included in the category of grocer. The grocer and tea dealer group was almost as large as the main group. However, specialist tea dealers and general shopkeepers are excluded, though 'grocer' was used in connection with the separate directory lists for the latter. Similarly, specialist tailors, milliners, hatters and staymakers are excluded here from the category of draper unless one or another was combined with drapery. The leading drapers described themselves as mercers, linen and woollen drapers, haberdashers and hosiers. James Wood's draper's stock was listed in 1840 in 730 lots, valued at £579 for probate. The bewildering variety was largely utilitarian for hard-wearing clothing and household use. It included enormous stocks of cotton handkerchiefs and bedhangings, but lacked the usual silks and


56. G.J., 15.5.1851 Vick.

fashion goods. Diversification was particularly evident in the drapery trade which extended into ready-made clothes, furs, carpets, furnishing fabrics and undertaking services. Outfitters are also counted in this general group.

The deficiencies of the data on which Table 5.5 is based may tend to overemphasise the insecurity of the majority of these retailers. Nonetheless, they suggest that the prevailing economic climate affected these trades unequally. Though the number of drapers' and grocers' shops was similar at any one time, drapers came and went more frequently over the period. Allowing for those whose working lives did not fall entirely within it, possibly 40% failed within five years, and a much smaller proportion of drapers remained more than 15 years. In presenting the main ways in which careers could be ended, Table 5.6 shows more definitely that the grocers had better prospects of avoiding extreme misfortune before they died, whereas insolvency was a major threat for drapers. Several of those selling up could also have been in trouble. Almost without exception those who failed did not re-establish themselves in the city: two drapers became tailors and drapers, and a woman grocer unsuccessfully tried again as a small shopkeeper in Tewkesbury.

Competitive trading practices brought about changes for drapers which barely touched leading grocers before 1850. Drapers had to respond to seasonal demand with new stocks and also to contend with sudden changes in wholesale prices, which could slump as manufacturers desperately cleared their stocks for cash from buyers. This led to price

59. G.J., 7.10.1822 Hutchinson; 25.1.1834, 14.11.1840 Ryder; 29.3.1834 Howson; 14.10.1837 Washbourne.
Table 5.5
The Approximate Duration of their Individual Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years:</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>Over 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grocers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known number of</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number known to have begun or finished outside the period:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number known to have begun or finished outside the period:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6
Known Reasons why their Businesses were Wound Up

| Known number of | Debt No. | % | Selling up No. | % | Retirement No. | % | Death No. | % | Into other trades |
| Grocers |         |   |              |   |               |   |           |   |                   |
| 44      | 8     | (18) | 8            | (18) | 9            | (20) | 19        | (43) | 3 making: soap, brushes, flour |

Drapers

| 52 | 20 | (38) | 10 | (19) | 8 | (15) | 14 | (27) | - |

1. Mainly derived from 20 years of the Gloucester Journal which were examined in detail and supplemented in some cases by reference to Pigot, Directory, 1822, Hunt, Directory, 1847, and the Enumerators' Books, 1851.
cutting and sometimes end of season sales: one reduction of 40% was offered in 1831.\(^\text{61}\) So major shop alterations, planned closures and moves to other premises, which all entailed stock clearance, usually took place just after the end of season sales, thus trading resumed with the new season's stock.

Drapers were more ambitious to secure larger or more central premises.\(^\text{62}\) Fourteen of their shops were identified with pretentious names which often referred to the sources of their supplies or personal origins, like London, Manchester and Scotland. Other names had patriotic or topical connotations like Waterloo, Victoria and California.\(^\text{63}\)

Unstable market conditions led to cash transactions in local wholesale and retail trade, or to efforts to limit credit and to price ticketing. Lower prices and profit margins, due to intense competition, made rapid turnover essential. In Gloucester, country shopkeepers were first asked to pay cash in 1818 and other customers in 1819 by Hutchinson. He arrived in 1818 and became the most successful draper before his retirement in 1837. On the occasion of a move to larger central premises he ruled out credit or reductions on sale prices.\(^\text{64}\)

By 1825 the 'Ready Money' or 'Cheap System' was well established although 'puffing' by listing prices was criticised initially and some did not change completely, preferring to offer discounts for prompt payment or to limit credit to six months.\(^\text{65}\) A few emphasised the attraction

\(^\text{61}\) G.J., 16.9.1827 Ryder; 16.7.1831 Cornish; 30.7.1831 Watson; 22.2.1834, Smith; 27.5.1837, Stone; 20.5.1837 Hutchinson.

\(^\text{62}\) G.J., 18.1.1834, 23.9.1834, 20.4.1850 Jennings; 10.8.1850 Martin; 4.1, 1.2.1851 Fluck.

\(^\text{63}\) G.J., 18.5.1818 Allsop; 4.10.1819 Hutchinson; 5.9.1825 Kendall; 25.11.1837, 11.5.1839 Scott; 5, 27.4.1839 Hughes; 21.11.1850 Flower.

\(^\text{64}\) G.J., 11.6.1818; 29.3.1819; 15.5.1820; 28.11.1825. Alexander, op. cit., pp. 107, 136.

\(^\text{65}\) G.J., 7.10.1822 Kendall; 30.4.1821 Grimes; 4.6.1821, 3.10.1825 Wheeler; 18.6.1821 Burrows; 2.2.1824 Thomas.
of their wares, as high class customers could still command long credit. The Washbournes were the most exclusive, relying on their family name and 'articles of splendour'. The men's mercer of highest standing maintained a discreet silence throughout. Though some advertising was generally considered necessary, it occasionally became intense.

Normally it ranged from listing prices and emphasising cheapness to dignified announcements of a draper's return from the London and other markets with a date for the presentation of his new stock. Leading grocers limited their notices to the occasions when they moved to other premises, extended their range of stock or when a business changed hands. Unusually a newcomer quoted prices and offered credit for wholesale trade and to the nobility in 1843. However, those depending more on tea dealing advertised more overtly, especially from the 1830s when they were perhaps affected by a bout of hostilities between two tea dealers. They generally went over to price listing and cash sales and had greater difficulty in establishing themselves.

Leading drapers were more obviously active in developing their concerns in various ways which were risky, if they had insufficient capital in reserve. They bought up entire shop stocks for resale at reduced rates. A move to larger premises was more common than enlarging an established shop. Hutchinson did both and his successor Barrell incorporated a second shop into his establishment. A few partnerships


67. C.J. March-April 1843; 15.5.1843 Parry; 4.11.1843 Workman; 28.11.1848 Moses.

68. G.J. 28.4.1827 Dowell; 18.11.1843 Hodges; 26.8.1837 Roberts.


in both trades were dissolved, to enable both parties to establish themselves independently, as did the Barrell brothers who also had a shop in Cheltenham. Probably fewer tried having second shops and they did not persist. Hutchinson sold his Monmouth establishment just before his move in Gloucester. A grocer had another shop in the city and later an outfitter had one in Monmouth and connections with a glove manufactory in Worcester.

Wholesale dealing was the principal and safest method of enlarging business. It was usual for the leading drapers to aspire to it as they referred to their shops as warehouses or houses. Unfortunately positive evidence is negligible. Barrell travelled frequently on this account. A city draper and grocer were the main creditors of a Westbury on Severn shopkeeper. They supplied minor drapers and tailors in the town and probably the shopkeeper whose stock included calicoes, silk tapes and threads. Clearance sales offered bargain prices for town and country shopkeepers and hawkers; James Wood's stock was of this kind. Similarly leading grocers were also wholesalers. One was an assignee for a Tewkesbury grocer. Another supplied a suburban shop with butter. Several were importers or dealers on a larger scale, though by 1850 a few merchants, centred more on the port, largely dominated the provision trade. Bakers rather than grocers had major dealings in corn and flour; one gave up grocery to concentrate on baking and milling.


73. Davies, op. cit., p. 257. G.J., 22.1.1831 Tooby; and shop names.


Several tailors and tea dealers had ambitions to expand their concerns. A few tailors stayed in the higher class market with the addition of drapery. One was so successful that he left to develop his wholesale business in London. From the 1820s cheap ready made clothes was a growing and easier field to move into. By 1840 one catered for sailors and in 1851 another had a shop close to the Cross. Most tea dealers invited wholesale trade, one had travelling agents and a few also tried grocery. One of them went bankrupt but two succeeded, the more successful becoming an importer of provisions.

Probate valuations supply evidence of the prominence of drapers and grocers among the leading city retailers. Table 5.7 sets out all the valuations found for these two trades and those at £450 and above for other retailers. The many names which appeared in trade notices seem inconsistent with the few wills and valuations traced. However, an unknown number left the city and some, like Barrell, had been successful. Many of those who failed can have had nothing to bequeath to posterity. The general level of personal wealth left by successful drapers may have been somewhat greater than that of the grocers and the more prosperous half of the other retailers. If somewhat earlier valuations are anything to go by, they were at least as prosperous as their opposite numbers in Chester.

Prosperous retailers were still men of some public standing in the city. Some came of well-to-do established families and had other city connections which were open to newcomers. The nine drapers and five grocers who joined the city Council after 1835 yielded ten of the

76. G.J., 18.1.1834, 23.9.1843, 14.6.1851 Jennings; 9.5.1840 Hudson. Enumerators' Books, St. Michael no. 16.


### Table 5.7

#### Probate Valuations for Gloucester Retailers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£5s in 200s</th>
<th>Drapers</th>
<th>Grocers</th>
<th>Others over £400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 2 for references.
valuations found. Six of the seven Liberal drapers were non-conformists and all five grocers were Tories. 79

On the evidence of their prosperity and numerical strength, successful grocers and drapers collectively retained their dominant position in the growing retail sector. Rising demand for necessities from the growing population favoured them in the longer term, though the trade cycle had its casualties. The grocers were most at risk of insolvency before 1826 when farmers were in difficulty, while the textile manufacturing sector and the general state of trade affected drapers then and later. They suffered nearly as many failures in three of the years from 1837 to 1843 as before 1826. 80

Evidence of adaptation to the popular market was most apparent in drapery. This trade became less exclusive, either broadening its appeal by increasing the range of stock and adopting some competitive strategies, or by targeting the market for cheap goods and clothes with price tickets, a method less affected by fashion, which facilitated insistence on cash payments. These competitive methods were spreading generally in the 1820s and 1830s. 81 Though tea dealing was similarly affected, the leading grocers seem to have largely avoided such innovations before 1850. Their success in the more popular market was no doubt a factor in the decline of the Gloucester provision markets and their awareness of it and of changing fashion may have encouraged the introduction of spirits into a few grocers' stocks. For both trades the establishment of wholesale


business was a key to success. 82

Conclusion

The whole emphasis here has been on the principal retailers who dominated the centre of Gloucester, where nearly all the largest shops were to be found on the main streets. They were progressively modernised with gas lighting, large, sometimes plate glass windows, and in some instances enlarged. The capital resources and experience required to take over and manage such concerns put them out of the reach of most retailers. Probate valuations bear this out though their evidence is patchy and far from complete. While the median valuation for these retailers' personal estates was about £1000, the general average was below £600 and it has to be remembered that a higher proportion of those in the generally more poorly rewarded trades left nothing of value. Only four were found with an average value of £120 for the numerous small shopkeepers. 83

The resources required for larger shops gave some newcomers an opening. Several came from London. The great majority, wherever they came from, bought supplies in the wholesale markets of the capital and the retailing methods in the trades competing for the popular market were altered very considerably by the innovations introduced into the town which were also encountered in London and other large towns. However, trade unionism failed in the city, though not far away the cloth workers were organised and militant, but the early closing movement made some headway. 84

Though origins of the majority of leading retailers in 1851 were local, more distant family connections were not unusual. Many appear to

82. Davies, op. cit., p. 257. G.J., 9.2.1824 Mountain; 11.10.1828 Taylor; 5.4.1834 Green.


have had a background in trade, a few in farming, with the likelihood of some family support in making a start. Newcomers without credentials and capital had little hope of establishing themselves. A well founded business and respected local connections favoured those seeking formal public recognition at Council elections. Those retailers with enough assistants to keep their businesses going during their absence had an advantage over the rest. The grocers and drapers may have made up the largest contingent of retailers on the Council over the years but there were others. Similarly, though they handled much of the wholesale trade stationers, ironmongers and wine merchants were also involved. The larger market towns in the region made competition for wholesale trade unavoidable but it is possible that Cheltenham had less effect on that side than on the development of fashionable trades in the city. The advantage of port facilities which enabled several grocers to be importers also benefited the ironmongers and the wine merchants, for some of whom importing was a major part of their business. Once shipping was no longer subject to the navigational problems of the Severn the economic importance of the city centre retailers was liable to be overshadowed by the merchants, at the time when retailing was declining in social standing.


86. G.J., 20.6.1840 Stephens; 23.12.1848 Wells; 22.3.1851 Bretherton; 19.3.1820 Quarrington; 3.7.1820 Haviland; 3.4.1840 Saunders.

87. Davies op. cit., p. 252.
CHAPTER VI

PORT TRADE AND PEOPLE: NEW AND OLD AT THE

DOCKS AND THE QUAY

Introduction

Earlier chapters have referred to the formative influence of the Gloucester Berkeley Canal and its docks on the physical expansion of the city and on the growth of its population. When the canal opened in 1827 and altered the rhythm of sailings going up and down to the sea or to Bristol, the traditional pattern of movement on the Severn and the economic activity centred on the Quay did not come to an end. Nonetheless, the importance of the canal makes it the principal subject of this chapter.

The canal’s promoters envisaged greatly increased trade going through Gloucester along a waterway large enough to take ships of more than 300 tons. Enthusiasm for the unfinished project had revived by 1816 and an extravagently confident prospectus announced that Gloucester had the makings of a port of ‘first rate consequence’ and might become the fifth port of the country, because it was so much further inland than other ports supplying Birmingham. A rather less inflated view published in 1829 suggests that the idea had some currency among the canal’s advocates. Confidence was also evident in 1822, once work had been resumed, as the depth was increased to 18 feet, which enabled ships of 600 tons to enter the dock basin before 1850.1 The scale of the undertaking entailed an unusually heavy financial commitment for an area outside the main commercial and industrial regions and one which could not
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be met in the normal way.2

Published accounts centre on the physical development of the canal and the docks,3 but a consideration of the issues and the men whose determined leadership affected their outcome reveals the achievement. Conflicting interests were common dangers for canals; the Exeter, and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canals suffered in different ways. Hadfield's conclusion that 'the shareholders did much for Gloucester but less well for themselves' can be usefully examined in more detail.4

To establish the context in which the Company's business developed, the parties concerned with the principal issues affecting its viability are considered first. The build up of trade and measures to promote it follow. However, the related industrial development is treated very briefly as it has been outlined already in published works.5 The section on shippers and shipping recognises the relationship between the river and the canal, and the different interests and circumstances of the main groups based at the docks and by the Quay.

Canal Company Politics

Before 1850 the two most threatening issues for the Gloucester Berkeley Canal Company were its financial relationship with the Exchequer Loan Commissioners and proposals for improving navigation on the Severn above Gloucester. As other problems proved more manageable, hindsight makes them appear less significant than they were at the time. Common interests were a basis for mutual understanding between the Company and the city which benefited both. Throughout, the directors' belief in the Company

for which they were responsible was expressed in their unswerving commitment to resolving financial crises and to finding ways of developing their undertaking's potential.

The Exchequer Loan Commissioners ensured the canal's completion and sound start, but soon stood in the way of its success and their own objective. Between 1818 and 1824 they provided loans amounting to £160,000 which mortgaged the Company to the Exchequer. They had initially required that Thomas Telford should be employed as consulting engineer, but further trouble led them to threaten foreclosure in 1821. Later, Captain Clegram was appointed engineer in charge of the docks and the canal on the advice of a commissioner. Then in 1831 they brought about the first of three financial crises by demanding repayment of their loans. The company had added interest of £50,630 to the debt, as it had only just begun to make modest operating profits. There were also bills and other interest owing on shares back to 1793. The Commissioners' policy suggests that they did not believe the Company could become solvent because they again threatened to foreclose and sell off the assets. They only allowed a reprieve on terms which made a satisfactory outcome more remote. New capital had to be raised from shareholders to make a large repayment but no interest was to be paid on shares until the debt was cleared. Their tight hold over management prevented or delayed necessary repairs and improvements.

Because the agreement proved impossible to fulfil, the Commissioners renewed their threats in 1839 and may have done so in 1835 when further harsh terms were exacted and also failed because the Company could not


8. Ibid., 829/6 pp. 395, 426, 518; 829/7 p. 77. 2 and 3 William IV c.111, for consolidating the several shares of the ... Canal Company.
persuade shareholders and others to subscribe the capital required.9

More realistic terms were agreed in 1840 when the Commissioners modified their position by allowing limited interest for shareholders, after all other obligations had been met, and by a more manageable repayment scheme. By then the Exchequer was receiving larger revenue for the customs dues collected in Gloucester, which greatly exceeded the Company's operating profits. The Commissioners' control loosened a little with the new terms and there were better prospects of raising share capital, especially after interest payments began at the end of 1845.10 The Company paid off the outstanding debt in 1850 as it reached better terms with the Pelican Life Insurance Company.11

In the 1830s the restrictions meant that the Company had to lease land for warehouse building and lost business for a time because some shippers would not charter vessels to Gloucester because graving-dock facilities were seriously deficient, preventing or delaying repairs. Another larger graving dock would have been a good investment.12 The Company's greater freedom in the 1840s was apparent in their decision to undertake new dock construction and not rely on a railway company, as railways were slow to grasp the opportunities for them at the docks. Existing facilities were already sometimes very crowded and larger imports following the repeal of the Corn Laws were foreseen.13

The Company weathered the crises as well as it did, because the directors applied their experience as successful merchants, solicitors and bankers, to the task of persuading the Commissioners to consider

9. P.R.O., RAIL 829/2 p. 454. G.J., 7.9.1839 - outstanding debt then £163,617. Graph 1, Canal Company and Customs Revenues.
10. G.J., 1.2.1840; 4, 11.10.1845.
12. P.R.O., RAIL 829.6 pp. 96, 118, 123, 436; 829/7 p. 56.
their proposed solutions and the shareholders to make further investments. One was George Nicholls, the manager of the Birmingham branch of the Bank of England who had become the permanent chairman of the Company in 1822.14 However, John Gladstone, a national figure in mercantile circles and an M.P. had the decisive influence. When negotiations were breaking down in 1831 he was a member of a deputation to the Commissioners.15 Other M.Ps with shares in the Company were mobilised to see legislation through Parliament. In 1835 the city M.Ps petitioned the Treasury on behalf of the Company. Another deputation included four M.Ps and Samuel Baker who had quickly become an influential director after he came to Gloucester.16 He represented the Company in London on various occasions. Pearman, a Coventry solicitor and a director of long standing worked tirelessly to find solutions to the crises. Through a relative he enlisted the good offices of Lord Grey in 1831.17

Policy decisions required shareholders' approval and their interests differed. For many, dividends and market values mattered most and those who had subscribed for shares saw them become almost worthless. £100 shares selling at £25 in 1816 fell to £15 in 1839 and £7 in 1844. The prices quoted for the Kennet and Avon Canal were marginally better when some canal and railway shares were at a premium.18 The distribution of shareholders suggests where this group was strongest. Initially the great majority were in the Severn Valley, but by 1820 55% were elsewhere, a third of them in the London area, and in 1851 with 48%, it was still a

force to take into account. For those years the figures for Gloucester were 24% and 18% respectively and the number for the Severn Valley counties almost doubled to 31%. However, it was noticeable that no-one in Worcester was listed and just one in Bristol. Some shareholders in the region and in Birmingham had interests in business generated by the canal. 19

Gloucester shareholders were suspected of exerting undue influence in the Company for the benefit of merchants and the city. Most had very few shares and newcomers with port interests were buying in. Though local men probably were in the majority at meetings there were safeguards. A balance was maintained among the directors and for those from a distance travelling expenses were paid. Shareholders could vote by proxy and each share counted when voting took place. 20

Once there were operating profits, conflicting priorities came to the surface. In 1838 Pearman accused the Company of betraying its commitments to shareholders by reducing its tariffs. A similar view was expressed in 1845 and six years later tariffs were causing tension again. Personal differences no doubt exacerbated Pearman's anger in 1845 over the directors' decision to make a presentation to Clegram, when they could not reimburse some expenses he had incurred voluntarily on Company affairs. 21 This pressure did not have enough support to deflect policy from some capital investment to keep the Company profitable in increasingly competitive conditions. Other ports were being enlarged, Bristol port dues were lower and railways were carrying freight by 1850; so expenditure to keep their installations in full working order was


20. P.R.O., RAIL 829/2 pp. 11, 301, 358.

essential. 22

There were few matters on which the Company had formal dealings with the city, but they had enough channels to keep them in touch. These links and the generally harmonious relationship between the Company and the Corporation, which were to their mutual advantage, no doubt tended to confirm shareholders' suspicions. Several members of the Corporation were merchants and shareholders, a few belonged to the Chamber of Commerce and more probably frequented the Commercial Rooms, which merchants started in 1831, to have a meeting place where they could read the newspapers. The preparatory meetings were held in the Canal Company committee room, but they soon moved to more neutral premises. 23 Membership was open to anyone on payment of a small subscription. In 1848 the Gloucester Journal encouraged more to join what it considered to be an essential organisation for port business. 24

The Chamber of Commerce grew out of those more informal meetings in 1839, to give a corporate voice to mercantile interests. Almost half the first 52 subscribers were merchants; shippers, wharfingers, manufacturers, solicitors and bankers accounted for the rest. Samuel Baker was briefly their first chairman until a city M.P. agreed to serve. Thereafter it was usual for a city M.P. to be associated with the organisation in that capacity, giving it access to an advocate with the government or in Parliament. 25 Sometimes it joined other chambers of commerce to press for changes of policy, like ending the East India


24. G.J., 11.11.1848.

Company's monopoly of the salt trade in India. Most of its efforts were devoted to local improvements. They succeeded in having Gloucester authorised for bonded tobacco but failed to persuade the railway to allow brine pipes to be laid beside its track to increase salt exports from the port. 26 Postal services, both the mails and the Post Office in the city, were a long running issue. The merchants wanted the Post Office in a more central position and suggested the Tolsey. After several years' delay and a memorial signed by 130 people, part of the basement was made over to it. As that was unsatisfactory and cramped, additional space was provided five years later, rather than see it moved to the new road near the docks to suit the merchants. 27

The Canal Company and the city came to work together, when their interests coincided in opposition to the Severn Navigation Company's proposals of 1836 for increasing the depth of the river between Gloucester and Worcester to 12 feet, and to six feet from there to Stourport. This was to entail the imposition of tolls on shipping. As existing shipping drew less than five feet of water, this was more than a matter of ending the low water levels which impeded movement for three or four months each year. The aim to enable seagoing vessels of over 200 tons to go up to Worcester would take some business from the Gloucester docks. 28 A proposed canal from Gloucester to Worcester had won general support in 1825 but came to nothing, following the financial crisis that year. 29

27. G.J., 7, 14.10.1843; 5.2.1848. GBR, B4/1/5 f. 144v; B4/1/6 p. 324.
29. G.J., 3.1.1825; 1.3.1828.
latter, along with Gloucester and the local Canal Company. Rival groups of ironmasters lined up on either side and others with riverside interests were enlisted. 30 The city was convinced that its prosperity was at stake if shipping was in any way disrupted and objected to the river, on which shipping was free, falling into the clutches of a private company. The Canal Company foresaw the loss of trade in the Birmingham region. As it was, it could only compete with Liverpool and Hull in certain commodities. Tolls with the extra cost of maintaining the depth of water in the canal and the inconvenience which dams and locks at Gloucester would cause, would send ships to other ports. 31

Long newspaper reports from 1837 kept the public informed and mobilised support. The Corporation began with a public meeting to initiate a petition to Parliament and the Company mounted its own and a memorial to the Exchequer. Early in 1838 they agreed to joint action. Samuel Baker was deputed to co-ordinate the opposition in Parliament and after his interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the matter was referred to the Admiralty, the Board of Trade and the Loan Commissioners. Their adverse reports ensured that any further proposals would have to be a compromise. 32 The act of 1842 went a long way, but did not persuade Gloucester opinion that the results would be satisfactory or justify the tolls. However, a commission representing the interests concerned was put in charge, and dredging was to be the only means used to achieve a depth of at least six feet in the river below Worcester. Only when that could be certified were tolls to be levied. They began in 1847. By 1848


there were complaints, especially about the shallowness of the eastern channel at Gloucester, because the water was draining away more quickly.\textsuperscript{33} When the Commission applied for additional finance a second time and for authority to increase toll rates, the Company and the Corporation renewed their opposition. After a report, commissioned by the Admiralty, confirmed that the work had been wasteful and damaging, the matter was dropped for some years. The report recommended a canal rather than locks on the river.\textsuperscript{34}

The Company and the Corporation had occasion to collaborate again in 1845 in opposing the South Wales Railway Company's proposal to bridge the Severn below Gloucester. They were also in touch through committees monitoring other railway schemes.\textsuperscript{35} Local business interests, particularly those connected with commerce, were actively involved in railway companies. Almost simultaneous initiatives in Birmingham and Gloucester prepared the way for the line to link the two places. Samuel Baker was its first chairman and some members of the Chamber of Commerce were shareholders. No comparable interest was shown in the lines to Swindon and Bristol.\textsuperscript{36}

In 1845 the Chamber of Commerce made overtures to three railway companies to interest them in giving financial support for dock development and for the replacement of the 'miserable abortion of a horse track' with railway lines to carry salt to the quays. The Midland took up the second idea but was slow to act upon it.\textsuperscript{37} Meanwhile, in 1843, merchants

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} G.J., 21.11, 19.12.1846. 5 and 6 Victoria c.24, for improving the Navigation of the Severn from the Entrance Lock of the Gloucester Berkeley Canal . . . to Whitehouse Brook . . .
\item \textsuperscript{35} G.J., 4.11.1845; 11.4.1846. GBR. B4/1/6 pp. 208 sqq.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Dyos and Aldcroft, op. cit., p. 95. P.R.O. RAIL 37/10 Gloucester Minutes of the Provisional Committee of the Birmingham and Gloucester Railway Company, 1835, n.p. G.J., 25.1.1834.
\item \textsuperscript{37} G.J., 21, 28.1.1843; 25.10.1845, 10.1, 17.10.1846.
\end{itemize}
and the principal Forest of Dean coal owner had begun to promote what was to be the Gloucester and Forest of Dean railway. Baker became its first chairman and Gloucester was heavily represented on the committee. As the port needed Forest coal for export the Gloucester Journal urged the local people to 'throw off their lethargy' and overcautious ways, to invest in their city's prosperity as the rest of the world was doing elsewhere. Many responded, but few risked more than £200 and by 1846 the Company's plans were being co-ordinated with those of the South Wales Railway. 38

The Canal Company was more intimately bound up with the city than the railway companies, because it was grafted on to a traditional sector of the local economy and employed so many inhabitants. There were ample means of communication between the Company and the Corporation, on which to build more formal co-operation in defence of their common interests. Both benefited from a relationship which some shareholders distrusted. Hadfield overlooked the fact that those who bought shares at a discount and kept them long enough did not lose. The draper W.H. Hughes was probably one of them; he had the second largest holding in 1851. Longstanding shareholders who had subscribed to shares could offset their losses if they traded through the port, but those who depended on dividends lost heavily. Hadfield also overlooked the revenue flowing into the Exchequer from the operations of a well run company labouring under the restrictions its Loan Commissioners had imposed upon it. 39


Developing Trade

The surviving data on the trade passing through the port of Gloucester during the first half of the nineteenth century is voluminous but far from complete. The newspaper's weekly shipping reports supply a continuous and detailed record of sailings to and from other ports, but take no account of those within the port area, which included all the inlets on the Severn above the mouth of the River Wye. These reports do not lend themselves to the formulation of annual tonnages for commodities or shipping. Newspaper articles provide valuable additional but unsystematic information. The Canal Company did not make a point of publishing figures and what there are can seldom be related to others directly. So the graphs are largely based on other sources.

Import and export trade is considered separately, with the imports subdivided into coastal, Irish and foreign trade, the better to trace their development. Exports presented a problem and do not call for the same subdivision. Unfolding reality soon showed the early claims about the canal's potential were pipe dreams, but some solid gains concentrated attention on immediate practicalities.

The number of ships going in and out of the port and their overall tonnage were increasing before 1820. That year 1999 movements were cleared, largely for coastal vessels, of which more than 200 were registered for the port. The same year the canal gave better access to the docks as it linked up with the Stroudwater Canal, and more than 20 vessels entered it on the first day, many carrying coal.\(^{40}\)

The first obvious effect of the canal was a marked increase in traffic and the diversion of some seagoing vessels with cargoes which had previously been taken up the Severn from Bristol. Bristol acknowledged the change in 1831.\(^{41}\) In 1828, the first full year of

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 829/1 p.245 supplied by H. Conway-Jones. G.J., 6.3.1820.

\(^{41}\) G.J., 5.2.1831.
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its operations, twice the expected tonnage was recorded and the 3256 vessels of all sorts was a third up on the total for the whole port area in 1824. Not every boat went up to Gloucester, as there were wharves at Cambridge and it was possible to turn into the Stroudwater Canal. Of that number 248 entered the docks from other ports, nearly 70% of which was coastal shipping, 17% came from Ireland and 14.5% from foreign ports. A further breakdown shows that 22% of coastal vessels came from South Wales ports, 15% from West Wales bringing slate, 11% from Bridgwater and 10.5% from London.\footnote{G.J., 26.4.1828. Figures taken from the weekly shipping lists. Subsequent details are also from those lists.} Graph 2 shows that total tonnage grew irregularly.

The continuity of the rising trend of coastal traffic was important as other trade was affected by sudden changes. In 1828 the maximum number of coastal ships arriving in a week was 8; by 1831 that number was quite usual. During 1837 and 1851 the weekly total was normally more than 10 and could be nearer 40 in 1851. Nonetheless a material decrease had occurred by the later date as goods were being sent by rail. The steepness of the decline was alarming because further losses were expected to the South Wales Railway. In two years from 1848 the 65,000 tons of imports from this source fell by 44%.\footnote{G.J., 27.9.1828; 1.10.1837; 8.3, 9.4.1851; 2.8.1851. 10.7, 25.10.1834 - regular sailing to Liverpool and Plymouth.}

By then, usually more than 10 ships arrived from South Wales and one or two from Bridgwater each week, with a very few from other places. The regular sailings begun between London and Gloucester in 1827 had ceased. Only the occasional ship came in from Plymouth, Liverpool and Glasgow, as reminders of more regular contacts. However, railways had not brought to an end the infrequent arrivals from harbours in the South West, from the south coast and the ports of Ulverston, Newcastle and Yarmouth.
The cargoes were almost as predictable as the ports of origin: pipe clay from Teignmouth; pig iron, copper, coal, oysters, some grain and general cargo from South Wales. Consignments of wool from Bridgwater gave way to general goods, bricks and ballast. The slate trade predated the canal and shipments increased when it opened, to nearly one a week in 1828 and the trade continued on a fairly large scale.

In the 1830s the country began to import enormous quantities of grain, though the sliding scale of the 1815 Corn Law and its later modifications were intended to protect home producers from unrestricted foreign competition until repeal in 1846. The character of the local market changed as the balance of the grain trade altered. The pattern of Irish imports into Gloucester can almost be described in the terms of the grain trade, as other commodities were relatively insignificant, though the consumers of Irish porter would not have thought so. The Corn Circulars published by Messrs. Sturge recorded annual figures for imports into Gloucester and national totals. The 17% of ships from Ireland in 1828 brought little grain compared with what was to come. Pigs and butter then in evidence later disappeared from cargo lists. Principally oats and secondly barley arrived in far greater quantities than wheat and continued to be imported as supplies of wheat fell off and ended in 1851. Between 1831 and 1838 over 100,000 qrs. came in annually and after falling back, they reached even higher levels in 1844, 1845 and 1848. They were at their maximum of over 215,000 qrs. in 1845. Even in those years wheat did not account for a third of the total. The decline had set in when the Chamber of Commerce reviewed the port's trade in 1851. Over the three previous years Irish imports had fallen by half and that year no more than one ship a week arrived from Ireland.

44. G.C.L., D12199 J. and C. Sturge, Corn Circulars, 1831-1852. This source supplies much of what follows on the corn trade.

45. G.J., July 1831, 1834; 8.3.1851.
Gloucester became of some national importance in the grain trade. In 1843 its share of the country's imports stood at 3% and rose to 4% in 1849. It was the fourth most important destination behind London, Glasgow and Liverpool, for the cargoes of a major Mediterranean and Black Sea shipper in 1851. Extensive warehouses, put up in the 1830s and 1840s, could hold large stocks until they were required. In March 1851 the supply built up to 97,630 quarters and yet more shipments were on their way. Graph 2 plots the annual grain imports for Gloucester and the United Kingdom. For the most part they went in parallel, though Gloucester was out of line between 1843 and 1846 when extra warehouse capacity may have encouraged excessive stocks.

Local merchants did not enter the foreign market until 1830 and for the following eight years they bought more in Ireland. However, in the 1840s the balance changed. The main markets for foreign grain in the 1830s were in western and northern Europe, but when additional supplies were required, greater quantities came from Egypt and, through Black Sea ports, from Poland and Russia. The failure of the potato crop, which devastated Ireland and affected England, resulted in substantially higher imports in the later 1840s. By March 1851 more than 180 ships had arrived in Gloucester from the eastern Mediterranean and more were expected.47

Harvests and seasonal factors made the trade unpredictable and the sliding scales governing duties on foreign corn added to the uncertainties until their repeal in 1846. After that anxiety about competition affected it. At the end of 1848 the home market appeared to be threatened as the docks were full of little French ships unloading grain. Three years later the only profitable foreign supplies were from America but

47. G.J., 15.3.1851.
corn exports to the continent were rising. It is not surprising that two merchants went bankrupt. 48

An inter-regional trade in timber existed before the grain trade became important. In 1844 approximately 2.3% of timber imported nationally passed through Gloucester docks. 49 Periods of extra demand from the building industry and for railway construction pushed up imports generally and the Gloucester trade responded sharply to railway building in the region. More than twice the annual average for the 1830s arrived in 1849, when imports were at their lowest in that decade. Like the grain trade, foreign timber was subject to high duties and, though they were substantially reduced in 1846, colonial produce continued to have a preferential tariff. 50 The way that Customs revenue in Gloucester fluctuated, reflected its considerable dependence on these two commodities and the reduced duties.

Before 1827 timber was towed up the Severn, mostly from Bristol to the Midlands, in barges or as log rafts, so Gloucester traders had a more local trade. Very occasionally then, ships with Baltic timber went directly to the Quay, but the trade opened up the year the canal came fully into use. Compared with the two ships of 1818, 28 arrived in 1828, of which seven were from Canada and the rest from the Baltic area. 51 Before 1851 most imported timber came from Canada in larger ships. Foreign hardwood appears to have generally been supplied through other ports in this country. As the soft wood trade was very seasonal the docks, and the canal by the timber yards, became particularly


50. Ibid., pp. 478, 498.

crowded with ships in the autumn and logs floating in the water got in the way. 

Prior to 1827 Gloucester did not depend entirely on Bristol for wine, spirits, cork and barilla for soap making, as four or five ships usually arrived each year from the Iberian Peninsula and the south of France. It was confidently expected that this trade would develop on a regular basis and new trade links would open up with France and the West Indies. The signs are that the wine trade grew moderately. The number of its bonded warehouses rose from 11 in 1826 to 21, out of a total of 60 bonded premises in 1834; the rest were mainly held by corn and timber merchants. However, the trade went on receiving shipments from London and Bristol. Gloucester wine merchants sometimes joined with others in the region to charter a ship, and a bankrupt merchant of Leominster had imported wine in bond in Gloucester.

Concern was expressed that new trade routes were not materialising and several unsuccessful attempts were made. The first brought Samuel Baker to the city with his partner Thomas Phillpotts to establish trade with the West Indies where they already had established connections. Though a number of ships went out between 1832 and 1834 and two others to Cuba in the early 1840s, the venture came at a bad time, as the sugar trade was so disrupted by the emancipation of the slaves that Bristol's trade in that area did not recover. The Gloucester scheme provoked hostility there.

52. P.R.O., RAIL 829/7 pp. 21, 75, 87. G.J., week of 2.8.1850 - 19 out of 41 ships.
Two Worcester men initiated regular sailings to Hamburg in 1836. There was too little business to sustain it, but occasional ships went to, or arrived from, north German ports in the 1840s. A monthly packet service to Antwerp advertised in 1846 suffered a similar fate. At the end of that year there was talk of exporting salt to Belgium and the U.S.A., and in 1846 plans were afoot to begin monthly shipments of salt to Calcutta and bring back sugar. More than one ship sailed with 500 or 600 tons but the scheme failed, because duties were payable immediately on arrival and because there was not enough salt.

A serious imbalance between imports and exports developed, once large quantities of foreign grain and timber were arriving in Gloucester. The shipping lists generally reported substantially more arrivals than departures with cargo. The position worsened rapidly in the 1840s. In 1843 import tonnage was almost double that of exports. From 1844 to 1847 imports were 2.7 times greater and the difference widened to 3.5 times in the years 1848 to 1850.

Salt was the main export. In 1827 the Canal Company responded to the Droitwich Salt Company's overtures for assistance in promoting the trade and made land available for a warehouse by the canal. A second company followed in 1835. Though new salt works began at Stoke Prior and production greatly increased, there was so little cargo that the operations of the grain and large timber ships using Gloucester were becoming more expensive than those at Liverpool, because they usually had to obtain exports in other ports. The imbalance was less acute for coastal and Irish shipping which also took out bricks, iron, grain and general cargo. In 1850 total imports were 148,585 tons as compared

56. G.J., 4.3.1843; 7.2.1846 - Hamburg and Antwerp.
57. G.J., 25.10.1845; 3, 10.1.1846; 30.5, 1.8.1846; 6.2.1847.
58. G.J., 4.7.1846; 22.7.1848; 8.3.1851.
59. P.R.O., RAIL 829/2 p. 179; 829/6 pp. 475, 504.
with exports of 34,219 tons. 60

The idea of brine pipes to increase the supply of salt at Gloucester came to nothing. As coal had become a major export for ports with access to coalfields the railway link with the Forest of Dean was promoted. Its construction was frustratingly slow and in the end it did not solve the problem. 61 Many timber ships, especially those from Liverpool, were carrying emigrants as return cargo to North America, but with few exceptions those leaving Gloucester had to go to Ireland for them. Probably the first emigrant ship left the docks in 1837. Then from 1843 local agents organised sailings each spring, using two Gloucester owned ships. They could compete successfully for local passengers with Bristol and more distant ports. 62 As 10 timber ships could arrive in a week at the height of the season, emigrants offered no answer to the problem.

Dock development and trade created new demand for goods and services, and abundant imported raw materials stimulated other industries. There was more call for rope and sail making, blocks and tackle and bricks.

In 1851 the third foundry had just been established close to the dock area. Shipyards were essential for maintenance work; two were by the river and two by the canal. It was easier to bring in supplies for the production of soap, clay pipes and corks. A cork cutter's orders came from as far afield as Oxford, South Wales and Kidderminster. 63 The new industries were distilling, vinegar making, enamelling slate, soda, millstone making and wood preservation. Steam power was applied in the large new undertakings, including the brewery on Lower Westgate Street,

60. G.J., 10.10.1825; 1.1.1831; 24.11.1838; 17.10.1846; 6.2.1847; 8.3.1851. Powell, Extracts, 1 p. 177.


62. G.J., 4.2.1847; 14.1, 8.4.1843; 30.3.1850; 26.4, 24.5.1851.

the nearby flour mill and the second one built in 1850 at the docks, where there were already two steam powered saw mills.

Trade passing through Gloucester's docks grew as quickly as it did, because they came into full use at a time when coastal shipping was increasing and just before a general and sustained rise in grain and timber imports. It fulfilled the need to increase the flow of goods up the Severn to the Midlands, which depended on water transport for access to the major ports. In this respect Gloucester was like the ports on the Humber, which served the East Midlands and Yorkshire, but the essential difference was Gloucester's lack of coal for export. A shortage of exports was characteristic of other minor ports: that imbalance was also increasing in the Sussex ports by 1850. The essential difference, here, was that they handled much less cargo and did not help to supply a great industrial region. Gloucester was a very busy regional port, increasingly dependent on its inter-regional function. So it had to attract shipping which would otherwise go to Liverpool or Hull. Development at the port had to keep up. The problem of some ships being too large to go up the canal was looming by 1850. Loss of trade to Gloucester did no harm to Bristol, as that port's trade was also increasing, but its dominance of shipping on the Severn was affected. Development at Gloucester benefited riverside towns upstream, though Worcester's strategic position was overshadowed by it.

---

Ships and Shipping on the River and the Canal

Though the Gloucester Berkeley Canal and its docks depended on the River Severn and there was necessarily much interchange between them, the contrasts between the traditional business of the Quay and that of the docks nearby, begin to take shape when their shipping is considered.

Some ships bound for Gloucester had to go up the canal but there was still a choice for many others. In addition, Gloucester was not the main port of call for boats working between places like Lydney and Brimscombe, near Stroud. The delay in bringing steam ships into service to replace the uncertainties of sail and towing from the river bank ought not to be passed over, especially as so much energy was applied to developing the port and mercantile interests.

While some trows were diverted onto the canal to avoid the Lower Severn, there were good reasons why it did not happen invariably. The dues to be paid and frequent delays in waiting for officials or for entry to locks could cancel out the advantages of the canal. On a flood tide with a good wind boats made rapid progress upstream. In 1847 canal charges were reduced sufficiently to attract the business of a major carrier whose boats had been going up and down to Bristol on the river. An estimate of 24,000 tons was made in 1848 for the amount of shipping using this part of the Severn annually. A further 205,000 tons left the estuary for the canal and 121,000 more went into the Stroudwater Canal. 67

However, once the canal opened, much the busiest part of the river was between Gloucester and Worcester. It was said in 1793 and again in 1825 that it carried 22,445 tons of merchandise and 34,060 tons of coal downstream annually and there was no shortage of return freight.

By 1834 the volume had increased to 60,400 tons. Figures for 1838 and 1844 quoted around 550,000 as the combined shipping tonnage from the river and the canal going up from Gloucester, involving 4366 vessels, of which 3412 were canal boats.\(^{68}\) Sometimes this traffic went half laden or was held up by low water levels. In 1840 heavy rain enabled 700 boatmen to resume their passage downstream.\(^{69}\)

Several senior members of shipping firms moved to Gloucester from Stourport, Evesham and Worcester and the canal encouraged shippers to put on new services.\(^{70}\) A Saturday packet boat to Stroud began in 1828; later another went along the canal twice a week to Sharpness and could be hired on other days. Daily fly boats between Gloucester and London were advertised in 1834.\(^{71}\) As steam ships were proving themselves on rivers and as steam packets plied between England and Ireland, various attempts were made to bring them into use on the Severn. The first in this period was a passenger boat with two hulls to cope with periodic shallows, as it was intended for service between Stourport and Gloucester. It blew up in the docks after an initial journey and that attempt was abandoned. For a few years the carrier, Humphrey Brown, used his paddle steamer, Sabrina, for towing.\(^{72}\) Then the initiative passed to those concerned with the ships which were having to wait up to 10 days to enter the canal, a problem which could be eased by tugs on the estuary. A

---

\(^{68}\) G.C.L., J. Walker, Report to the Committee of the Gloucester and Berkeley Canal Company on the Bill for the Improvement of the River Severn, 1841.

\(^{69}\) G.J., 16.5.1840.

\(^{70}\) G.J., 24.5.1834 Ames; 21.6.1834 Southan; 7.6.1851 Rice. Also see G.R.O., D4292/1-5, Register of Shipping.


company, independent of the Canal Company, with its office in Gloucester, formed to supply the service. The Canal Company did not experiment with steam towing until 1836 and decided against it because the turbulence created by the paddles threatened the canal banks. Though more satisfied with another experiment in 1850, using a tug which used an iron band along the bed of the canal, it was not adopted. 73

However, a steam dredger was at work on the canal in 1847 and a steam packet service between Gloucester and the South Wales ports was proving successful after an unsatisfactory trial in 1838. The problems associated with paddles were avoided by the purchase of iron screw driven ships in 1845 and 1846, at which time that form of propulsion had not won general acceptance. 74 Other initiatives for using steamships came from Worcester, with a scheme for a packet boat between there and Gloucester in 1846, and four years later the City of Worcester went into service for trade with Irish and Western European ports. 75 This ship also had screw propulsion as its access to the sea was by way of the canal.

The Register of Shipping shows that the tonnage of barges and trows built for use on the Severn was much the same as that of many of the sloops and brigs which went further along the coast. All these craft were to be found on the canal, or in the docks, with ships from more distant ports. The Canal Company's annual tally of shipping for the years 1833 to 1844 also classified vessels by their tonnage and approximately half were of less than 50 tons, with another quarter under 100 tons. During those years the annual total of ships over 300 tons touched 37 once, in 1839. 76 However, the number and size of ships from foreign

76. P.R.O., RAIL 829/31 Pt. 1, General Information on Traffics 1833-1861, p. 95.
ports rose significantly. In 1850 and 1851, 268 and 349 arrived, and one of 741 tons came in with Canadian timber in 1847.77 These ships were often over 400 tons and their arrivals marked the general peak of activity in the docks, normally in August and September and again in November.78 The large ships were symbolic of the contrast between the Quay and the docks.

The characteristics of shipbuilding and ownership on the Severn also emerge from the Register. Many of the vessels registered in the port were built in the yards along the river from Chepstow to Stourport. From being a very minor centre in the 1820s Gloucester became the most productive by the 1840s, though ship repairs must have taken precedence. One of the yards there distinguished itself by building four ships of more than 100 tons for overseas trade, before relatively cheaper American and Canadian ships captured the market.79 The Hebe of 136 tons, almost the largest, was valued at £1520 in 1837. It was in a similar class to the 190 ton brig with a value of £1750 in 1835, in contrast to the barges and trows which were assessed at the same time for less than £200 each.80 Because the capital invested in these small vessels and their cargoes was, individually, relatively limited, the major carriers owned small fleets. Henry Southan had the longest list, of 16 ships, which included the South Wales steamers. However, the loss of a cargo or boat for the owner who worked his one or two craft could be ruinous.81

That kind of individual ownership was very different from the

77. G.J., 30.10.1847 - the Lesmahago; 13.9.1851.
78. P.R.O., RAIL 829/31 Pt 1, op. cit., pp. 95 sqq. G.J., shipping lists 1828 and 1851.
81. G.R.O. D4292/2-4 op. cit., passim.
arrangements for larger vessels. The merchants did not generally own the ships which carried their goods but chartered them. If they involved themselves it was usually as one of several shareholders. Six had shares in the Hebe and ten in her sister ship, prominent among whom were wine merchants. 82 Similarly, partnerships owned two thirds of the 20 Canadian built timber ships registered between 1834 and 1853. These shareholders were timber merchants, two ship chandlers, a fishmonger and a sailmaker. The merchants used their experience and contacts in shipping to invest in sound ships which often brought their timber into Gloucester. Their success probably encouraged others to underestimate the risks and their own inexperience. Between 1846 and 1854 the fishmonger bought five large ships, lost two at sea and sold the rest. The sailmaker lost one soon after he bought it and one of the two coastal vessels, in which a cork cutter invested, sank on its first voyage. 83

The majority of the 126 miscellaneous investors took small shares in coastal shipping and seldom held them for long. Corn merchants were evidently reluctant to invest in ships. The one exception bought four of under 100 tons, which did him no good as he went bankrupt the next year. 84 In some instances shares in vessels were bought with borrowed money, or were mortgaged later. Twenty ships were wholly mortgaged to the Gloucestershire Banking Company which sold them off.

This attempt to strike a balance between river and canal shipping was needed, as general interest has naturally focused on large ships from distant ports and new developments. The details of canal shipping supply a corrective by demonstrating that most of the ships were very small. The other obstacle to balance is that river carriers' business, unconnected with the canal trade, was not recorded systematically and

82. Ibid., 2, pp. 162, 176.

83. G.R.O., D4292/4-5 passim.

84. Ibid., 3, p. 66; 4, pp. 199, 201; 5, p. 2 G.J., 9.8.1851 Barrett.
might almost be overlooked if it were not for directory lists.

It is clear that canal boats outnumbered traditional river craft in the greater volume of traffic going between Gloucester and Worcester from 1827, but by how much is less certain than the figures state. That part of the river must have become very crowded, intensifying both frustrating delays due to natural difficulties in navigating the Severn and demands for their removal. The canal also had the effect of reducing the number of boats on the Severn below Gloucester, mainly by eliminating transhipment in Bristol. Carriers were understandably reluctant to use the canal when conditions on the river were reasonably favourable.

Though river and canal shipping were to some extent interchangeable, there were differences which went beyond the range of their movements. The small ships were largely financed and run by individual owners or family firms, whereas the merchants operated within national arrangements for insuring and chartering vessels. It was not essential for them to invest in shipping, but when they did they followed the general practice of sharing the risks and of buying large ships from Canada or through Liverpool. 85

People of the Port

In 1820 shipping tied up at the Quay and the dockside, but the canal banks were yet to be developed. It was in the Canal Company's interest to secure tenants and both local men and newcomers responded to the opportunities. While rapid development was taking place there was considerable occupational flexibility as between jobs and many performed several functions. However, most people working about the port fall into one of three groups. They were the merchants, with the shippers and senior port and dock officials, manual and other low paid employees

and those associated with the traditional river trade. The present purpose is to explore these differences, with reference to their places of origin and connections outside the town, the extent to which local men were at the forefront of development and lastly their different material prospects.

The 1851 Census Returns provide the main source for men's origins but other information modifies the picture they present in several respects. In the first group only heads of household normally qualified for inclusion whereas the other two naturally included junior members of families. As rather more of the latter were born in the town than heads of household there is an unavoidable difference between the merchants' group and the others, in which the additional numbers are an advantage. The figures for watermen and labourers are taken from the districts near the river, the docks and the canal, as that was where almost all associated with river transport lived and labourers generally lived near their workplaces. All except the labourers in jobs specifically unconnected with the port have been included, as so few dock labourers were identified. The group is taken as generally representative of manual workers.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>(totals)</th>
<th>Birthplace areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloucester and environs</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants Shippers etc.</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermen, Boat owners, River Carriers†</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers†</td>
<td>(535)</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures for the parishes of St. Nicholas and St. Mary de Lode and the districts of Littleworth and South Hamlet.
The groups engaged in river transport and labouring are considered first. The returns show that over 50% of both groups were born outside the town but the county and town together accounted for a slightly higher proportion. However, that is where the similarity ended. Whether the watermen were born in the county or in an adjacent one, riverside placenames figured very prominently, from Lydney, north to Tewkesbury and on into Worcestershire; some also came from Shropshire. This concentration was directly related to their movements in the course of their work.

The returns understate boat owners, giving 11 for the whole town. There seems to be no reliable way of correcting this. Hadfield gave a figure of 230 ships at Gloucester in 1828 but that could be the number registered for the whole port. 86 The Register of Shipping shows that boats were essential for coal dealers as well as the river carriers. In fact, carrying coal seems to have underpinned the livelihood of minor carriers. At least seven of the 16 whose names appeared in a trade notice of 1837 were also coal dealers. 87 Innkeepers near the Quay owned boats and retailed coal; one was also a carrier. 88 Coal dealers' birthplaces were almost equally divided between the city and places associated with coal production and shipping. The Register also strongly suggests family and business connections among boat owners along the river and by the canals in the Stroud valley. For instance, John George, coal dealer and boat owner, had business in Gloucester and in several places near Stroud, and Samuel George was a city innkeeper and coal dealer. 89 The master ship builders' riverside connections were even

86. Hadfield, Canals of the West Midlands, p. 117.
88. G.J., 5, 26.5.1827 Beard. 3.7.1820; 23.12.1826 Pugh. Wills, Halling 6.6.1835.
stronger: the Hipwood and Bird families originated in Stourport, Hunt in Broad Oak, near Newnham and the fourth, though city born, was trained by Bird.

Port expansion favoured local carriers. At least two enlarged their business operations, but not to the point of joining the ranks of the leading firms on the Severn. Both advertised regular sailings to Bristol. One began as a master mariner and then acquired his own boats and warehouses on the Quay. However, the watermen, some of whom owned or partly owned boats, were a 'demoralised class' of rough unkempt social outcasts, who plied their vessels whenever they could get work, Sundays included. About 20 were absent on the night of the census.

The most successful men in the group were carriers in the coal trade, but none was rich by local standards. Two working between 1820 and 1850 had probate valuations of under £1500 and £1000 respectively. Two carriers were put at £600 each; a master mariner, two publicans, one selling coal, the other a carrier, and another carrier were valued at £450. The £200 left by five watermen indicates their prospects were at best limited.

Labourers had no strong connections with the riverside, but with the towns and villages linked with the city by carriers' carts, so they probably arrived on foot. Their pattern of migration was similar to that of the town as a whole. Details of their employment are scanty,

93. Wills, Curtis 25.6.1846; Harding 8.5.1835; Beard 13.6.1827; Oakley 5.8.1852; Halling 19.5.1835; Beard 20.6.1846; Partridge 28.2.1850; Jones 2.2.1849; Purser 22.10.1831; Withers 29.6.1850; Stephens 9.9.1843; Young 29.5.1852.
but various timber firms in the vicinity of the docks certainly employed relatively large numbers from time to time. In 1837 Price Washbourne had ships disgorging 93 loads of timber daily. In 1840 they had 100 or more men at work and in 1851 they had 75 pairs of sawyers and were likely to take on 40 more. It was thought that work for this and other firms was going to employ up to 700 working round the clock in shifts.94

Conditions of employment varied; men at the saw mill in 1839 tended to be insolent and ill-disciplined, though they were relatively well paid, while Messrs. Sturge showed positive concern for the welfare of their 70 to 80 men and their families. When Joseph Sturge died, 58 of the men described him as 'a dear friend'. The one labourer's valuation leads to the conclusion that, as a group, labourers left virtually nothing.95 The circumstances of the many sailors who passed through the dock annually were different again. British or foreign, they were strangers on the streets where they were prey for the town's underworld and an expense for the authorities when they deserted ship. In 1849 the needs of sailors, watermen and others working about the docks became the concern of the chaplain to the Mariner's Chapel.96

The distribution of the birthplaces of the merchants, shippers, ship brokers, wharfingers and senior port and dock officials was almost the opposite of that of the labourers. More than half came from outside the county. Ties with the Midlands, South West, London and the Home Counties were unusually noticeable, and they had no strong connections with the Severn Valley. However, as the places where they had business interests were more immediately important, their origins and trades are considered together.

Local men had a greater share in established trades which met demand in the region. The wine trade is the best example. In 1851 three men were city born, four came from towns in the region and two from London. When shipments arrived, Gloucester wine merchants were always prominent participants. For one in 1846, they were joined by others from Worcester, Birmingham, Cheltenham, Hereford and Tewkesbury. Though not similarly organised, local men handled trade in provisions, and wool. At first this was so for metals, but newcomers became prominent merchants.

Newcomers were most in evidence in trades which had prospects of rapid growth, namely corn, timber, slate and salt. Though the census recorded as many corn traders belonging to the immediate vicinity as came from outside the county, local men were primarily corn dealers and millers while the others were importers. By 1830 three leading firms had arrived: Lucy of Evesham, Sturge of Birmingham and Wait James of Bristol. Before 1840 they were joined by Fox of Plymouth, Vinings of Bristol and Phillpotts, who joined the Lloyds after his partnership with Samuel Baker ended. J. and W.R. Lloyd came from Devonshire and left for Birmingham, J. Lloyd to head Lloyd's Bank. Kimberley of Bristol who was manager initially for Wait James, and Robinson from Worcestershire were to become leaders in the trade after 1850. The early firms had their headquarters elsewhere.

97. G.J., 10.1.1846. Enumerators' Books, St. Nicholas 1 no. 204; 2, no. 18; St. Michael nos. 26, 51, 247; Wotton no. 75; St. John no. 84; St. Mary de Crypt nos. 55, 153.

98. Ibid., Barton St. Michael no. 40; St. Aldate nos. 94, 76; St. Michael no. 152; South Hamlet no. 167.

99. P.R.O., RAIL 829/6 pp. 1, 96, 143.


The timber trade was also handled by several groups. No more than six merchants at any one time dominated the import side. Lesser participants dealt in other commodities or did not trade for long. Dealers were usually local men. This trade differed from that in corn as it was run from Gloucester and Gloucester men had a large share in it. A firm which began in the eighteenth century retained its leading position under W. Price, who was succeeded by his son W.P. Price and their partners. The first newcomer to join the management was Richard Potter, a Mancunian. Two other Gloucester men were able, as wharfingers on the Quay, to become successful merchants. The first three newcomers from Birmingham took up tenancies at the docks in 1826 and 1827. One was born in Bristol. The Tripp brothers, who were the principal slate importers for 10 years were born near Bristol but may have worked in Plymouth. Those from further afield included a Hull firm which opened a branch in Gloucester and Eassie, a Scottish railway contractor from Lancashire.

Wharfingers, shipping agents and major carriers found timber, slate and coal useful commodities, as they built up their own trade as general merchants. Gloucester was strategically placed for them as a business centre. Humphrey Brown of Tewkesbury was the first to take a site at the docks. When he went bankrupt in 1834 his Gloucester premises were valued at £979, more highly than his others in Birmingham, Worcester

103. G. Meinertzhagen, From Ploughshare to Parliament, 1896, p. 64.
and Tewkesbury. Partridge, a Birmingham fly boat carrier, became an iron merchant. The most outstanding was Henry Southan from Worcester, who, with a partner in Bristol, operated between Birmingham and the South Wales ports.

Several of the Quaker merchants were in the corn trade. Two others illustrate how the port gave scope for occupational diversification. Both were newcomers, one from Witney, the other from Southwark. After seven years Sessions sold up his china shop and became a brick and tile manufacturer and merchant. Then, through the other, he bought a coal and porter business and became an importer. Later he added a partnership in an ironmonger's shop. The other, from being a wharfinger and shipping agent became the principal salt exporter, probably helped by Quaker connections in Droitwich.

Senior port and Canal officials were either city men or came from a distance, among them six half-pay naval officers. The son of Captain Clegram of Shoreham, the superintending engineer to the Canal Company, succeeded a local man as company secretary. The first dockmaster under Clegram came from Folkestone. His successor was a naval lieutenant whose son developed a shipbroker's business and succeeded his father as Lloyd's agent at the port.

Not all who came to trade had homes in the town for any length of time, or put down local roots. Most major carriers were absentees.


110. P.R.O., RAIL 829/2 pp. 150, 292.

Table 6.2

Mercantile Wealth in Gloucester

Probate Valuations and Business Interests

Interpretation:
Each column represents one person's business interests, thus:
date of probate, at £16,000.
salt merchant wharfinger.

See Appendix 2 for references.
in 1851. Some chose to live in country houses, like W.P. Price, Samuel Baker, Richard Potter and Shipton, another timber merchant. Others found it convenient to live just outside the town. Members of this group were more likely to become rich, especially those who diversified their interests and had the means to promote railways and banks. They were less at risk of bankruptcy than others and it did not always put them out of business. The range of the probate valuations found for the merchant group is set out in Table 6.2 It gives telling proof of the gulf between their relatively small numbers and the much larger groups so far considered.

The contrasts between the people most characteristic of the Quay and the docks paralleled their shipping. They reflected two distinct but inter-related economic systems. River carriers, merchants and others responded to the new potential of the docks. As some of the leading merchants came from the main ports and commercial centres of the country, they brought their different experience and outlook to bear, in what had been a minor riverside port and provincial city. They were relatively young men, as their generation not only dominated the period to 1851 but a surprising number had many more active years in which to build up their fortunes.

Conclusion
The Gloucester Berkeley Canal came into full use two years after the Stockton Darlington Railway, because its construction had suffered setbacks and interruptions. The Company was fortunate that it was no later, as within 10 years railway building took off. In addition, its trading prospects were aided by Bristol's high port dues which had come down by 1850. The 1830s were a watershed for the Company in several

respects. Whereas the initial growth had been in coastal and Irish shipping, by the end of the 1830s the breakthrough into the foreign timber and grain trade had begun, on which the port became more dependent as the other trades declined. This success contributed to a persistent shortfall in export cargoes. By then the number of ships which were too large to go up the canal was on the verge of being a problem.

Instead of being dependent on Bristol for supplies brought in by sea as before, Gloucester was able to receive the bulk of them directly and to become a supplier of grain and timber, in particular, to Birmingham and the Midlands, which gave the port an inter-regional significance. The Bristol firms in Gloucester were taking advantage of the new situation. Other connections with Birmingham confirmed the change, which Birmingham merchants and interests in the Canal Company helped to bring about: the Birmingham Gloucester Railway was jointly promoted and banking in Gloucester received some assistance from that quarter, as will be explained. Gloucester's standing in the hierarchy of towns along the Severn rose at Worcester's expense. That town's ambition to have deep sea ships tie up at its quays can be seen as a way of recovering the loss, and Gloucester's well founded fears about the possible effects of river improvements on its own economy were sharpened by the prospect of sharing trade with Worcester.

The canal was unusual in several respects, not least that it carried sea going ships. Its construction had proved particularly costly as about £450,000 had been spent by 1827. It was one of a number of undertakings assisted by the Exchequer Loan Commissioners. For 20 years there was not only no prospect of being able to redeem the mortgage, but the threat of ruin hung over some shareholders, should the Commissioners have carried out their intention to foreclose. The Company's operational success no doubt made the directors the more tenacious, but they were fortunate to avoid disaster which would have had damaging
repercussions in the town. It was also unusual among canal companies in actively encouraging railway development in the area, as being advantageous on balance for its own business.

The characteristics of the people of the port were probably those generally found in similar circumstances. The traditional occupations of the watermen produced economic and social relationships very like those of the canal folk of Oxford. The tendency for Quakers to be particularly well represented in the corn and allied trades was to some extent true of Gloucester at this time. The Sturges' paternalism was given expression elsewhere and carried over into wider humanitarian causes. The pattern of wealth found in the Gloucester merchant group conformed to that found nationally, though none was rich in that context. However, when compared with others in the locality to which they had moved, some of them were very rich, but it will be seen that they were not entirely alone in this.

CHAPTER VII

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ESTABLISHED AND NEW PROFESSIONS

IN GLOUCESTER

Introduction

At the time that the merchants were rising to new prominence in numbers and economic power, the professions were well established in Gloucester. A comparatively vigorous professional sector has been seen already as one of the characteristics of county towns. Demand for its services in the nineteenth century was such that the professions were proliferating as their expertise and sense of corporate identity and status developed. The professions to be examined here in some detail are those which made decisive contributions to the city's economy and standing. They are law, medicine and banking. Law already had professional status, medicine, though recognised, was less secure partly due to unresolved divisions within its own ranks, and banking was not recognised as a profession by mid-century although accountancy was accepted. Nonetheless, banking in Gloucester was displaying professional characteristics from the 1820s. Members of all three professions were earning a living in a competitive environment. However, the chapter beings with the distribution of professional men in the region to indicate differences between rural and urban areas.

Recognisable and evolving professions were then acquiring distinctive common features, but as occupational origins and skills were so various, professional status was not dependent on developing them all. By the

early eighteenth century lawyers and some medical men were already becoming more aware of factors which enabled them to distance themselves from manual and commercial trades. Their specialised vocational training was frequently long and later became very expensive, but not academic in many cases. The common principles gaining ground were an aversion to overt competition, a sense of responsibility to the public and to clients, whose interests came before their own, and confidentiality in professional matters. An act of 1729 regulating attorneys and solicitors helped them to develop a sense of corporate identity, whereas the doctors were at a disadvantage until 1858. After 1800 the need to raise standards of practice and fend off impostors, gradually led to the inclusion of systematic theoretical studies in training programmes, with formal examinations required for publicly recognised qualifications, under the control of a university or the profession concerned which also kept the register of its members. Honourable status was increasingly accorded to professional men as sons of the gentry looked to these occupations, to the church and to the state for offices and commissions as avenues to a career.

Several equally established professions have only been included in the first part of the chapter for a number of reasons. Secure incomes partly or wholly freed them from the necessity of competing for their livelihood; the small number of commissioned officers in Gloucester held civil appointments, some as port officials, in which connection they have been mentioned; the influence of the more numerous clergy on the economic life of the town was indirect. Other occupations also included in the first section were then not fully dissociated from the ethos of commerce or skilled crafts by 1850, though the professional


attributes of a minority of men set them apart.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{A General Survey of Professional Groups in Gloucester}

In 1857 it was said that the professional classes had power and influence in society 'out of all proportion to their numbers'.\textsuperscript{6} Their numbers are useful indicators of the availability of their specialised services and their distribution in the region had a bearing on the extent to which Gloucester may have been called upon to supply them. Several trends were apparent, leading to a clearer position in 1851. Directory lists reflected professional growth and differentiation and, taken with the census data, show how salaried professional employment had become numerically more significant.

The salient feature of the lists in Table 7.1 is that the districts with large urban populations had a higher proportion and a greater variety of professional men than were to be found in predominantly rural areas, a feature replicated across the country. The proportional differences would have been greater if the clergy had been omitted as they constituted the main body of the professions outside the towns. Parish school teachers had neither income nor education to command recognition. The exceptional number of commissioned officers, clergy, doctors and teachers in Cheltenham obscures the strength of professional services available in Gloucester. They were orientated towards secular and business affairs, with substantially more lawyers than doctors. Most of the barristers in both towns were present for the Assizes.\textsuperscript{7}

The directory lists point to substantial growth in legal and medical services and to several other avocations becoming sufficiently established to have more specialised identities. Taken with the data in the other

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., pp. 148 sqq. Carr Saunders and Wilson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{6} Reader, \textit{op cit.}, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{7} Hunt, \textit{Directory}, 1847, p. 65.
Table 7.1

Professional Occupations of Men aged 20 and over in
Poor Law Union Districts, 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts:</th>
<th>Gloucester</th>
<th>Cheltenham</th>
<th>Stroud</th>
<th>Tewkesbury</th>
<th>Dursley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total men:</td>
<td>9075</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>9348</td>
<td>4026</td>
<td>3986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers: army, navy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitors</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as %</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts:</th>
<th>Winchcombe</th>
<th>Westbury on Severn</th>
<th>Newent</th>
<th>Wheatenhurst</th>
<th>Stow-on-the-Wold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total men:</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>4910</td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers: army, navy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as %</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Senior civil servants cannot be distinguished from the rank and file.
tables it is clear that the great majority of these people lived in the
town itself. The differences between the figures derived from the
directories and the census returns are due to the inclusion in the latter
of all those pursuing or training for a profession, salaried men,
articled clerks or pupils. The very marked increase in the number of
surgeons and solicitors was part of a general trend, just as the static
number of barristers and physicians was usual, since the great majority
were normally resident in London. The three dentists and two veterinary
surgeons in Gloucester by 1851, included in the medical group in Table
7.3 were evidence of new professions developing. Financial services
became more diverse and employed relatively more people. Though the
figures for banking and accountancy have puzzling features, the reorgan-
isation of banking was partly responsible for the one and most of the
30 accountants of 1851 were salaried men, whose specialised work was
related to the needs of business. Once the Savings Bank began to handle
annuity business, the agent in charge changed his designation to actuary,
and the stock broker had settled in the city by 1846. The proliferating
insurance agencies were omitted from Table 7.2 because they were sidelines
to other professional and commercial occupations.

Undoubtedly a few engineers were present in the 1820s, though none
was listed; the manager of the gasworks was one. The narrow dividing
line between millwright and engineer persisted beyond 1849 and contem-
poraries would have regarded nearly all of them as craftsmen. However,
in 1851 some of the civil engineers and surveyors of the Ordnance
Department were in the city preparing for the city's Public Health map.
Provincial architects and surveyors were more clearly differentiated from
builders and to some extent from each other by then. Even so, one man

Minute Book, n.p. 5.2.1834; 18.11.35.
### Table 7.2

**Directory Evidence for the growth of Professional Services in Gloucester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1820s</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitors/Attorneys</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barristers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeons</td>
<td>8 or 9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 + 1 actuary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Banks: 3 private, 1 savings; 3 joint stock, 1 savings)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Brokers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects and Surveyors of buildings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors and land agents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers: civil and millwright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneers and furniture trades</td>
<td>7 or 8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - endowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- charity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- private</td>
<td>none listed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


---

gave his occupation the traditional description of architect and statuary and four registered as architect and surveyor. 

Renewed building activity in the 1840s brought three trained architects to the city, so that men were soon to be trained locally. Though there were no apparent connections

---

Table 7.3
The Birthplaces of Gloucester Professional Men, 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glo'ster</th>
<th>Glos. county</th>
<th>Next counties</th>
<th>Midlands</th>
<th>London Home Counties</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneering</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>27 men</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as %</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting lawyers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as %</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

including the last group.

1. Enumerators' Books.

between surveying and auctioneering in the 1851 returns, three instances were found in trade advertisements. In 1820 auctioneering was already a well established trade, often combined with furniture broking, or less frequently with innkeeping. Differentiation proceeded gradually,


distinguishing the most competent and reputable from the generality, helped by their responsibility for major sales, valuations and estate agency. The high incidence of bankruptcy among the rest was more characteristic of shopkeepers who lacked training.  

The distribution of professional men's birthplaces set out in Table 7.3 was generally similar to that of the leading shopkeepers and had much to do with a form of apprenticeship being the usual preparation for both sectors. However, more professional men had London origins and relatively fewer came from the Severn Valley and the Midlands. Local birthplaces were particularly evident among the lawyers and auctioneers in marked contrast with the clergy and engineers. Opportunities in engineering were opening up fairly rapidly in Gloucester. Few church livings were in the gift of local families and nearly all the Catholic and Dissenting clergy came from a considerable distance.  

This brief survey supplies a context for a more detailed consideration of the most influential professional groups in Gloucester. It has made the point that the number of professional men in the population was very small, though the opportunities for such employment were increasing numerically and in their variety. Even so, in 1851 most professional men were clergy, lawyers and doctors. Probably openings in salaried financial work became more readily accessible than other professional work in Gloucester, though the smallest groups were also growing relatively more rapidly than the largest. The professions generally recruited people from the locality at much the same rate as the retail trade, but it remains to be seen how important this was in reality for the three largest groups.  

Professions of Longstanding: Law and Medicine

The legal and medical professions in Gloucester are being taken together as they had much in common, though their professional circumstances were very different. The subject is also concerned with the ways in which they contributed to the town's business and related affairs. As personal relationships and confidentiality were influential factors in professional services, social considerations could be major factors in commercial transactions. Just over half the provincial lawyers and doctors were likely to be accepted members of upper middle class society. Both professions were then developing tests of competence through systems of written examinations, though lawyers had already achieved recognised forms of qualification and social standing. The roles of attorneys and solicitors, on the one hand, and barristers, on the other, were well defined. However, as apothecaries were by tradition allied to retail trade and surgery was a skill rather than a learned profession, physicians clung to their superiority and delayed agreed improvements and their official recognition. The changed regulations for apothecaries of 1815, which helped the emergence of the general practitioner by breaking down demarcations in practice, higher public expectations and competitive pressures within an overstocked profession were forces advancing the adoption of reforms.

These professions had a common social background. Ambitious well-to-do townspeople who gave their sons a classical education could steer


them to lengthy and expensive preparation for the law, medicine and sometimes the church. Entry also depended on personal connections. Reputable trading families secured apprenticeships for their sons, which could in turn lead to partnerships, to which signatures on wills bore witness. In 1851 there were two instances of fathers training their sons. Common tendencies which have come to light were for sons to follow in their fathers' footsteps; for several members of a family clan to be practising in law and medicine at the same time and for movement out of trade into the professions. The Wiltons left pin-making in the 1780s, the Washbournes made the change more gradually and the trend was probably gaining momentum. Dr. Charleton's father began as a grocer and after service as a militia officer he became secretary to the Canal Company. His means barely supplied the minimum to meet his son's expenses for medical training in London. Marriages reinforced occupational traditions, linking compatible families and also provided entry for suitable outsiders. Without family or other social bridgehead it was difficult to become established. Dr. Jenner gave his friend and collaborator, Dr. Baron, the essential introduction and a lawyer arrived in the wake of Bishop Monk.

A highly respected and prominent place in society was a great


professional asset. Some became confidential advisors: Dr. Rumsey's patients 'looked to him as a personal friend' and three lawyers were political agents to City M.Ps. Robert Wilton acted in that capacity for Admiral Berkeley and also as the family's legal advisor. The most distinguished were on an equal footing with the county gentry acting as stewards for the winter assemblies. More took the opportunity to be noticed as supporters of charitable and other good causes. As subscribers to the county Infirmary they associated themselves with county society and leading citizens. They found in the Literary and Scientific Association, which became the focus of social and intellectual society in the winter months, more intimately congenial surroundings in which to share their cultivated tastes and learning. The popularity of scientific subjects gave some doctors the opportunity to enhance their standing.

The circumstances of doctors' and lawyers' work were in marked contrast to their common background. The regularity of the Gloucestershire Law Association's twice yearly meetings, held in the city, spoke of their professional self-confidence, when compared with the doctors' slow and uncertain moves towards professional association. The localised groups which formed seem to have been out of touch with each other. An unattributed letter to the newspaper in 1837 urged them to support the


National Medical and Surgical Association as a protection against exploitation. The Gloucester association published a notice in 1840, but it had a shadowy existence if it continued, as it was not openly connected with the doctors' report to the Corporation on the insanitary state of the city at the end of 1847. Intense competition for appointments at the Infirmary may have stood in the way of professional organisation.

Doctors tended to have more difficulty in establishing themselves professionally than lawyers. Once a young solicitor was taken into a partnership, work would come his way, whereas many more doctors had to build up practices independently. The seven public appointments open to them in Gloucester offered experience and an income. However, they conferred no status as they related to the poor and were badly paid. Even though there was no salary scale or social tradition to support them there was no shortage of applicants. They also occupied a disproportionate amount of time. The Gloucester Poor Law Guardians made an unsuccessful attempt to reduce their doctors' salaries from £150 a year, a rate about average for the job. That included midwifery, medicines and the upkeep of the two horses needed to travel round their districts.

Doctors resigned as soon as they had enough other work. Gaol surgeons were relatively rather better paid. Benefit society surgeons were also commonly exploited, as their rates of payment were unrealistically low and members could generally afford to pay more fairly.

To become known and to raise their status, doctors gave voluntary

29. G.R.O., Gloucester Guardians Minutes, G/G1/8a/1, pp. 7, 373; 3, pp. 208, 335.
service to charitable foundations. Eleven applied to the new dispensary in 1831 but, as generally happened, they did not benefit from the connection. Thus they became disillusioned and left the paid man to run it. 31 The most highly sought after appointments were at the Infirmary. The salaried house surgeon's post attracted well qualified men, though they had to be unmarried, remain on the premises almost without a break and have no private practice. 32 The honorary appointments went to established men and carried both status and the prospect of additional income from pupils who were attracted by the hospital, and from more extended practice. Doctors routinely went distances of 10 miles to visit patients and the most celebrated went much further. The consulting surgeon, Ralph Fletcher, had an almost unrivalled practice extending across South Wales and into Bristol. 33

The Infirmary had a fine reputation, built up from the eighteenth century by several doctors distinguished for their learning and their skill, among whom was Edward Jenner. 34 The variety of cases treated and the operations performed in Gloucester in this period were comparable with the work at the Radcliffe in Oxford and it was recognised by London teaching hospitals as one of the 15 county infirmaries competent to participate in training students, thus reducing their time in London. 35

Its standing remained high, but Gloucester was not large enough to develop a teaching hospital, once the London hospitals absorbed the work of private anatomy schools and provided systematic teaching. 36

The doctors who openly took a stand over public health before 1847 did so from conviction and a sense of public responsibility, as self-interest dictated circumspection to avoid the risk of offending those they attended. 37 The doctor who looked after the sick at the cholera hospital was ruined, as his usual patients deserted him. Their own health could also be at risk. Devotion to duty during the epidemics of 1832 and 1849 permanently undermined the constitutions first of Dr. Baron and later of Dr. Rumsey who both left Gloucester for Cheltenham. 38

In spite of the initial difficulties, well-to-do families perceived sufficient prospect of material success and social advantage to support their sons in becoming doctors as well as lawyers. To achieve both, medical men had to build an extensive and profitable rural practice on a sound urban base. Dr. Baron's eminence as a physician and a scientist drawing patients like the Gladstones to the Spa for his advice, must have influenced local attitudes favourably. 39

Many avenues were open to Gloucester lawyers in administration and business, in addition to private work. There were more than two dozen posts altogether for the county, the diocese and the city of Gloucester, making the largest concentration in the county. 40 Local men had most

of these prizes, which also brought them private work. Coroners' elections were as hotly contested as those for Infirmary doctors. 41 Two lawyers resigned from the Corporation to be eligible for two of the city's principal appointments. Some carried a minimal work load: the county and insolvent debtors' courts together entailed three days attendance a month for the judge who, having begun his career in the Wilton's office, built up a barrister's practice in Cheltenham. 42

A remarkable number of these posts were held by the Wilton firm over three generations. Most of the city's business and some of the county's went through their office. H.H. Wilton was Town Clerk, Clerk of the Peace, Clerk and Treasurer for the Charity Trustees, County Treasurer and Clerk to the Improvement Commissioners and the Board of Health. A similar monopoly existed in Leicester. 43 In addition, the firm acted for turnpike trustees, the Canal Company, the Gloucestershire Banking Company and an extensive and influential private practice in the county. Though H.H. Wilton relinquished the Treasurership in 1835, four men succeeded to his posts when he retired in 1851. 44 Though the Corporation reduced administrative salaries in 1837, the magistrates failed in their attempt to refuse the legal fees for their clerk's police cases. Lawyers were largely protected from the pressures on the doctors by officially recognised fees and because they had to be employed for some purposes. 45

41. G.J., 20.10.1817; 17.3.1823; 4.6.1831.
Lawyers had expanding opportunities in business and private property transactions, whether in connection with wills, on behalf of business and transport undertakings or for house building. For instance, a dozen transactions from 1823 to 1841 related to the purchase of a small plot for two tenements, four subsequent mortgages, other debts and their final settlement. Almost everyone concerned, except the original landowner and the lawyers, were the losers. Several engaged in financial business; before 1825 three were bankers, others acted as scriveners as four went bankrupt in 1840. Though they arranged loans, lawyers generally avoided lending their own money for housing projects, but those in a position to do so sold land for development. The most notable examples were G.W. Counsel, who bought up and sold off many acres in Kingsholm in small plots from the early 1820s and John Phillpotts, who, with Dr. Baron, enabled the Spa Company to acquire the land for development. Several bought country property as an investment or for their own use.

It seems safe to conclude that more than half the doctors and a higher proportion of the lawyers at any one time had secure and busy lives, though the evidence is mainly for the more successful. Even so, signs suggest that the doctors had more of a struggle. Of the 87 lawyers and 50 doctors mentioned in the newspaper five doctors died young, as compared with two lawyers, more left the city before establishing themselves and relatively more were unmarried over the age of 30 at the time of the 1851 census. The way they registered full details of their

46. G.R.O., D3117, City Deeds, nos. 893-904.

47. G.J., 8.2.1840 Bonnor; 11.7.1840 Dowling and Smith; 25.7.1840 Coley. Hannam Clark's papers are in part typescript, as for an account of bankers origins, and in many scraps. His references are incomplete. G.C.L., N26.15 Universal British Directory, 1791, p. 189.

qualifications showed sensitivity about their professional identity. Those who included G.P. denoted a claim to a competence and status which was replacing the older forms. 49

These men had to establish themselves professionally before they could afford to take an active part in public life. To judge by the probate valuations which have been found and set out in Table 7.4, though generally less prosperous than the lawyers who moved in the business world, some of the doctors were more than well-to-do by Gloucester standards. Some of the highest valuations included inherited wealth and a few of the lowest were for men who died prematurely. 50 These professions and the merchant group had generally comparable prospects.

The general circumstances of doctors' and lawyers' lives in Gloucester displayed the features described in general accounts of these professions, though they necessarily give most attention to developments in London, because they affected the rest of the country. Younger doctors and some lawyers were partly trained there. 51 So men moved in and out, and families acquired distant connections. Though few of these men came of local country families their influence extended into the county and was an essential aspect of the county town's identity. The lawyers' numerical strength and greater wealth was related to the economic importance of the city as a centre of administration and business. The reputation of the Infirmary reflected well on the county and the city, and attracted some able men to it. Social factors affected the degree of local recognition.

49. Loudon, loc. cit., p. 4. Enumerators' Books, College Precinct no. 6; Hamlet, Barton St. Michael no. 52; St. John 2, no. 155; St. Michael no. 183.


Probate Valuations for Professional Men and Merchants.

See Appendix 2 for references.
accorded. Dr. Rumsey, who was already an authority on the use of resources
in general health care when he arrived, won official respect rather than
appreciation locally. The government finally acknowledged his work on
the recommendation of the B.M.A. and the Social Science Association. 52

Banks and Bankers
The case for opening a branch of the Bank of England in Gloucester and
its establishment in 1826 were evidence of the city being a regional
banking centre in the early nineteenth century. 53 Between 1820 and
1850 banking in Gloucester went through two main phases and the opening
of the Gloucestershire Banking Company in 1831 signalled the start of
the second. The 1825 financial crisis had very severe effects locally
and made the situation particularly complex during the latter part of
the first phase. The greater measure of stability, later on, can be
related to changes which were associated with some new bankers who had
wider commercial and banking experience and less localised perspectives.
The pattern of banking in the county has to be taken into account, as
that too was affected by the general expansion of banking services and
by the restructuring which was taking place. Developments in local
banking were in response to local, regional and national conditions, as
well as government and Bank of England policies. In particular, the
Bank's return to cash payments in 1821 aggravated agricultural recession
and legislation in 1826 permitted the formation of large provincial joint
stock banks.

The distribution and organisation of banking in the county altered
radically in little more than 20 years from 1820. Directories listed

52. B.M.J., 11.11.1876, p. 638. Table 7.4, Probate Valuations.
P.H. Lindert and J.G. Williamson, 'English Workers' Living Standards
During the Industrial Revolution. A New Look' in J. Mokyr, ed.,

G.J., 26.6.1826.
seven towns with private banks in the early 1820s. They were the leading market centres of Gloucester, Tewkesbury and Cirencester, with two or more banks in each, and Cheltenham, where one of the two was a branch of the leading Gloucester bank. The three textile towns of Stroud, Dursley and Tetbury had one each. Before 1830 new banks in the city and Cheltenham almost completely replaced the earlier ones. The latter then had branches of Tewkesbury and Cirencester banks. Elsewhere the banks continued and services were extended to Stow-on-the-Wold, Thornbury and Winchcombe.\textsuperscript{54} Ten years later more radical changes had taken place as 16 market towns were listed as having banks and everywhere, except at Thornbury, the old names had been replaced by those of joint stock companies.\textsuperscript{55}

In 1820 there were three banks in Gloucester. James Wood's bank was founded in 1716 by his grandfather and was wound up following his death in 1836.\textsuperscript{56} The firm of Turner, Turner and Morris was the only one left of three which originated in the last 20 years of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{57} The failures of the other two in 1815 and then reviving trade, created an opening for Washbourn, Wilton and Russell who probably formed their partnership in 1819. This firm became Russell and Skey by 1826 after the death of the other partners. It joined the Gloucestershire Banking Company in 1832.\textsuperscript{58}

Between 1834 and 1836 four new banks opened but only two survived.


\textsuperscript{55} Pigot, \textit{Directory}, 1842.


\textsuperscript{57} G.J., 11.12.1815; 15.5.1815.

\textsuperscript{58} G.J., 29.5.1826. Add. MSS 44992-45022, the Russell Papers, at the British Library do not include the bank details which Hannam Clark noted.
The survivors were the first branch of the National Provincial Bank established in 1834 and the County of Gloucester Bank, of 1836, which absorbed the shortlived County and City Bank. As the Manchester based Commercial Bank of England failed in 1840 its Gloucester branch closed. The branch of the Bank of England also closed when its business was transferred to Bristol in 1849. So there were three joint stock banks in the city in 1850. Together the two local ones largely dominated the county through their branches, as private banks had joined them. Both had banks in Gloucester, Cheltenham, Stroud and Cirencester. The Gloucestershire Banking Company held its meetings at its Gloucester premises and had branches in Evesham, Tewkesbury, Newnham and Stow-on-the-Wold. The County of Gloucester was based on Cheltenham and had other branches more in the south in Dursley, Burford, Tetbury and three in Wiltshire. The National Provincial's five branches were in Gloucester, Cheltenham, Wotton-under-Edge, Marshfield and Chipping Sodbury. The Stourbridge and Kidderminster Banking Company had an outpost at Morton-in-Marsh.

Until Turner, Turner and Morris failed at the end of 1825, it was the principal bank in Gloucester, as James Wood, a 'sly meanminded man' stood on the sidelines. He had few commercial and mercantile customers. His main business was in speculation in government stocks, property deals for himself, transmitting Excise money to London and in managing deposit accounts. The reliability of his notes at all times was his contribution.


to the local economy. He did nothing, though he had the resources, to mitigate the hardship following Turners' failure, or he could possibly have prevented it. Similarly he refused a loan to the Canal Company in 1835 which would have made a decisive step towards its longterm security.64 Other bankers had shown their commitment to the locality by investing in that company, and in local services and charities, all of which Wood generally avoided.65

Turners' dominance of local banking is apparent from a comparison of their assets early in 1826 with those of Wilton and Co. in 1824 and of Russell and Skey in 1831. Turners had a branch in Cheltenham and their notes circulated widely in South Wales. Excluding valuable property, their assets were £282,261 which appeared to leave them a surplus of £16,103.66 Wilton's stock was at its maximum of £70,000 and their successors' came to £130,904 in 1831. The scale of their business was altered dramatically by Turners' failure: by 1827 the number of their customers' accounts had shot up from 114 to 432, compared with Wood in 1836 who had 250.67 Russell and Skey were reported to have been the 'most powerful and influential banking establishment in the county' when they joined the Gloucestershire Banking Company.68

Turners fell victim to the panic in London in the week that six banks in the capital suspended payment, as its London agent refused to accept its bills. Of more than 50 country banks which closed permanently, this was the only one in the area to suffer that fate. Its suspension of

66. G.J., 2.1.1826.
68. G.J., 14.1.1843.
business caused a very severe run on Russell and Skey and on three banks in Ross-on-Wye. No doubt it also aggravated the serious difficulties of other banks in the area and in Monmouthshire. 69

The economic effects locally were immediate and prolonged. Business virtually came to a standstill and poorer people suffered most. There was a 'great mass of [Turners'] negotiable paper . . . ' which had suddenly become worthless. Trade remained nearly paralysed through 1826 and 1827 for want of money and widespread losses, as in the end it would seem that the bank could only pay 9/9d. in the £. 70 The Turners' assets and private property were sold at a substantial loss. Hatherley Court went to James Wood at a knockdown price and the Bank of England bought the bank premises for £4200.

As soon as the trouble broke, leading local figures came together to mitigate the danger of unrestrained panic making matters even worse. They pledged £56,000 as security to tide the bank over and plans were made for a reconstituted partnership to support the Turners. 71 However, it collapsed because John Gladstone pulled out, as the scheme was announced without his prior approval. It had depended on his share of the capital and on the security of his private fortune. The other new partners were to have been William Montague, the iron master, and George Nicholls, recently of the Canal Company and soon to head the branch of the Bank of England in Birmingham. 72

Thus the situation called urgently for another bank as the other two were on too limited a scale and there was no sign that Wood was

71. G.J., 2.1.1826.
interested. Though branches of two Cirencester banks appeared in Cheltenham no bankers in the county attempted to move into Gloucester. So those seeking to fill the vacuum pressed for a branch of the Bank of England to be opened in Gloucester, as legislation had just made it possible. George Nicholls may well have had a hand in drawing up the case for it. The Bank's Deputy Governor probably supported them as he came of the Gloucester Raikes family. Great stress was laid on the city's commercial potential and its general accessibility from the Thames Valley to Wales, and from the South West to the Midlands. The Gloucester branch was the first to open because the right local prerequisites happened to come together first: positively favourable local opinion, suitable managers and promising commercial and banking prospects. The Bank urgently needed to rebuild its own business and was aiming to control the country's currency through its branches in key commercial areas. Nicholls declined the post of Agent to the Gloucester branch, but arranged for the son of the Cirencester banker, Cripps, to take it. Cripps also agreed to forego his own note issue at his bank in favour of Bank of England notes.

By 1833 when economic conditions were more normal, the branch of the Bank was not fulfilling expectations. Even so, it did better than the one in Bristol until the mid-1840s. Poor performance proved to be general among the Bank of England's branches in the South West. It was not only there that country bankers saw them as dangerous competitors. Local banks drew on the Gloucester branch for gold, but were not generally interested in using its notes in return for preferential


74. Clapham, op. cit., pp 104 sqq.

discount rates and country tradesmen much preferred local bankers and the notes they issued. A change of policy on the part of the Gloucestershire Banking Company was a factor leading to its closure. That bank made a sound start under the management of Joseph Gibbins of the eminent Birmingham banking family. He had been approached by Gloucester men to direct the formation of a new bank. No Gloucester bankers were signatories to the deed of settlement in 1831 but in 1836 four of the six directors were Gloucester merchants. Having achieved his purpose Gibbins withdrew. Russell and Skey had taken large shareholdings in 1831 which strongly suggests that they were considering the amalgamation of their bank with the new one. The terms were settled in 1832 and, as most of their customers went with them, the joint stock bank's base in the city was greatly strengthened. Many of Wood's customers followed, after his death. This dominant position made it necessary for other new banks to have their principal strength elsewhere. Almost all the County of Gloucester Banks's shareholders and most of its business were in Cheltenham and places where the two were more evenly represented, or where the other had few or no connections.

Gibbins adopted the policy he had employed in 1829 to launch the Birmingham Banking Company, by making terms with the Bank of England to give proof of the new bank's soundness. It gained the preferential discount rate but could not issue its own notes. However, as financial conditions dictated the Gloucester bank's policy, the agreement ended after


80. County Bank, A29/4, Deed of Settlement, 1836. G.J., 15.2.1851.
15 months to be free to trade surplus funds more profitably on the London money market. The terms were renegotiated in 1836, in spite of opposition from Evesham, as the directors sensed a sudden change in the economy was imminent. They aimed to limit the losses a sudden reduction in the money supply could cause. Their decision was justified and had the desired effect. They would have continued the arrangement beyond 1842 if the Bank of England's revised terms had not been positively disadvantageous. After the long recession which ended in 1843, and after the financial crisis of 1847, the directors reported that the bank's business had continued to grow and the losses had been made good.

Early formative influences came from competition with other banks and economic recession. The Gloucester based bank kept pace with its newer rivals which began with several branches. Its branches were also mainly the result of amalgamations. The Hartlands' banks in Tewkesbury, Cheltenham and Evesham, with its agency in Alcester, joined in 1834. The directors' doubts about having such a distant branch were set aside because the company would gain the services of an outstanding banker in Nathaniel Hartland. The Stroud branch also opened that year. Gloucester had an agency in Newnham which became a branch bank, and later had an agent in Chipping Campden. A request from Coleford for a bank was refused in 1840 but the next year the Cripps' offer to sell their Cirencester and Stow-on-the-Wold banks was accepted. The acquisition brought in an agricultural area as a counterbalance to the
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commercial and industrial business of several other branches. It ultimately proved necessary for the directors to intervene to put the Cirencester bank on to a sound footing, as already excessive overdrafts increased further. This entailed unavoidable personal losses for the Cripps. It was not the only bank to have immobilised capital in very large loans to railway companies. The bank had a strict policy of limited loans covered by securities which could be realised easily. A railway company's application for £52,000 was too large and its security of a call on shareholders in 1841 was too uncertain.

This bank was suspected of attracting customers away from the Bank of England's branch and of being prepared to collect and issue the notes of its main rival, rather than resort to Bank notes if its own note issue exceeded the permitted maximum under the 1844 Bank Charter Act. It was also less willing than the other to agree on paying the same rate of interest to customers.

Since 'all the mercantile business of Gloucester with much of that in the neighbourhood centred on' the Gloucestershire Banking Company, it was severely tested during the economic recession from 1837. Without prudent and steady management, economic hardship would have spread and intensified, while the bank would have lost public confidence. A dangerous rumour was quickly denied after Edward Protheroe's Park End Coal Company went bankrupt with a debt of £22,624. Several other large
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firms had already gone down, and with others in trouble, the bank sustained heavy losses in Stroud and Gloucester, while there were lesser bad debts in Tewkesbury and Newnham. Up to £20,000 was written off for Stroud. The County of Gloucester bank's problems were minor in comparison, as were those caused by the failures of Redditch needlemakers in 1849. By then, free trade in corn had introduced a new uncertainty, as the bank had regarded farming as the stable part of its otherwise less predictable business. Cheltenham needed 'prudent' management as it was a 'hazardous place'.

Expansion and economic problems brought about centralised management. The work of each branch was regularly reviewed and staff deployed. Each week overdue debts were scrutinised and the management took charge of the largest. This policy made it necessary to insist on providing the 'inviolable confidentiality' of private banking. Changing conditions made additional paid-up capital necessary in 1841, and existing shareholders took the shares at a premium. This assisted the profits which were used to increase the Guaranteed Fund to cover losses and to pay dividends, which were higher than those of the County of Gloucester bank. It was felt better for business to identify the bank with the region rather than with Gloucester and neither of the two managers in overall charge lived in or near the city.

Few direct comparisons can be made, as the data available is incompatible. It is clear that the two county joint stock banks were evenly
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matched, though their total assets and liabilities grew at different rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gloucestershire Bank</th>
<th>County of Gloucester Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>£779,296</td>
<td>£537,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>£1.3m.</td>
<td>£1.39 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>£1.36m.</td>
<td>£1.07m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£1.3m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gloucester share of their respective assets was very different. In 1836 it was £49,273 for the County bank and it did not pay its way in 1840, whereas for the Gloucestershire bank it was £473,886, over a third of the total in 1845. Though these were large institutions, the National Provincial and Stuckey's of Bristol were much larger banks.

The experience and reputation of local men were too valuable to be passed over. Thomas Turner became manager of the National Provincial and a local accountant managed the County and City Bank. The Bank of England employed Morris elsewhere, though all its staff except the agent in charge were sent from London. The county joint stock banks employed at their branches the bankers who had owned them. At a lower level, a career structure developed as men moved from one branch to another and managers were found within the company. Another gained promotion in a move from the main Gloucester bank to be manager of the other company's Cirencester branch. Local families sought positions for sons who would otherwise enter the professions or commerce.

Changes among the bankers accompanied the altered structure of banking. To 1825 they were with one exception local men, who included


three solicitors and three mercers, a trade associated with early banking. Thereafter, merchants took a leading role in restoring banking in Gloucester. Some were already bankers like Russell and Skey of Upton on Severn, but merchants with city origins were in a minority. Samuel Baker who became Chairman of the Gloucestershire Banking Company in 1836, and Hartland whose Tewkesbury background was in tanning, were the architects of that bank's success.

Dissenting influences were in evidence. Washbourn, a druggist, and Russell were Unitarians, in partnership with R.P. Wilton the Town Clerk and Treasurer; and W. Price, also a Unitarian, was a founder director of the bank opened in 1831. Quaker influence in that bank was at least as strong through Gibbins, Hartland, Samuel Bowly, a provision merchant from Cirencester, and a number of major shareholders. However, this bank avoided being identified with any political or sectarian interest.

The private bankers were related by marriage with local business and professional families. The Russells and Skeys had intermarried several times and W.R. Skey married R.P. Wilton's daughter. This nexus was weakened as many bank directors were newcomers. Probate valuations place bank proprietors and managers in the same bracket as the most prosperous occupational groups.


The almost total change in the county from private to joint stock banking between 1820 and 1850 was unusual, as private banks generally lost ground more slowly. In 1825 Turners, the leading bank, had more than twice the assets of a major Bedford bank in 1836 and they exceeded Gillett's of Banbury by an even greater margin. Turners' failure and the want of an immediate successor brought new men forward to promote a bank in which the risks were shared more widely. Though larger than Turners, this was small compared with a Liverpool bank in 1836, a reflection of the different scale of business in one of the principal commercial centres of the country. Bank of England branches contributed to economic revival directly and through those banks which used their services, though few were viable for any length of time. From 1836 banking in the county largely centred on the two banks with their main branches in Gloucester and Cheltenham respectively. These towns were then integrated more fully into the regional economy as banking business expanded. Gloucester mainly owed the Gloucestershire Banking Company to its growing mercantile sector and the greater stability of the joint stock banks assisted economic development more generally.

Conclusion

Gloucester was a second rank town by size of population, but had some features more usually found in much larger regional cities. When compared with Exeter, Gloucester's lawyers and bankers were as prosperous and the lawyers relatively more numerous. Medical practice at
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the Infirmary was of a higher order than in most similar county foundations. Both Gloucester and Exeter were chosen as promising centres for one of the branches of the Bank of England on the strength of their regional commerce and communications and also on the prospect of profitable banking. The Exeter branch closed even earlier than that at Gloucester. Local preferences and prejudices were generally against the branches though those in Liverpool and Birmingham had more success. 107

It is pertinent to consider whether the learned professions and the bankers helped to prevent Gloucester from moving towards a more subordinate relationship with Cheltenham, as that town had a higher proportion of prosperous inhabitants in a much larger population. The smaller town clearly had the advantage of being the administrative centre for the county and the diocese, and the Infirmary belonged to that tradition, though Cheltenham opened its own hospital. 108 However, it took so little time to travel between the two places by 1850 that Cheltenham could have become dominant for most services. Economic considerations and social attitudes were underlying factors. The failure of bankers from other towns to open a branch in Gloucester in 1826 or 1827, when they moved into Cheltenham, can only be explained in that light. The balance of business in those country banks was rather different from Gloucester's needs. The city had its own limited industrial sector, but undertakings in the Forest of Dean, mercantile activity and the Canal Company needed banking services and their requirements had every prospect of growing quickly. What was needed was beyond the capacity of a private bank like Russell and Skey, though the partners had the appropriate background. Their support for the


Gloucestershire Banking Company favours this contention. The Gloucester merchants found they had to take steps to supply the services they urgently needed. Their bank's success encouraged the formation of other joint stock banks locally, but reservations about mercantile connections ensured that its main rival, the County Bank, had its headquarters in Cheltenham.

As both banks became regional institutions, underlying differences became less obvious. However, why should two county banks join the Gloucester based company? It was successful, joint stock banking was gaining ground and there were local factors. The Hartlands had Quaker connections and were familiar with the economic circumstances in Tewkesbury industry and river shipping. The Cripps had had a personal link with the Bank of England for a time, they had problems and the other Cirencester bank had joined the County Bank. By 1881 the Gloucestershire Banking Company's regional position was even more defined. It had 17 branches, mostly in areas which traditionally had business ties with the city; Berkeley and Upton-on-Severn in the Severn Valley, and westwards into Monmouthshire and Herefordshire. However, without the intervention of the mercantile sector and its other economic influences in Gloucester, the professions would not have prevented the city from being of secondary importance to Cheltenham.

Many of the richest and individually most influential men in the town were in these professions, though entry to them was no guarantee of future wealth. They and successful men in other professional occupations drew their clients from a wide area beyond the town, but many lived within its limits and needed to be well known there. It was particularly advantageous for doctors and lawyers to move in influential circles, so they participated in town affairs, usually in ways generally approved by their social equals. This could include membership of the Corporation which had the power to affect the urban economy in some respects.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CORPORATION: THE RESILIENCE OF TRADITION

Introduction

The subjects considered so far have mainly been those in which the impetus for changes in the town's economic life was most pronounced, ranging from the gradual and piecemeal to innovation on a more thorough-going scale. This chapter brings together some members of the occupational groups which were instrumental in developing the city's business, in the corporate direction of the town's affairs. In this sphere long established traditions were strong and other limits were set by the entrenched attitudes in society at large. As some of the Corporation's major responsibilities were discussed in other connections, they also need to be drawn together by considering the extent to which it was generally active in the public interest, and whether there were signs of changing priorities.

The first part of the chapter is concerned with the extent to which the occupational groups already considered, dominated the official structures of the city, to give them a controlling influence in some public matters, if they were in general agreement. Official bodies were fairly closely linked at the personal level with many of the voluntary secular and religious organisations which were also active in their chosen spheres of public concern. However, it is sufficient for the present purpose to recognise that opinion generated in that wider, unco-ordinated network was heard clearly in official circles. The rest of the chapter examines the influence of ratepayers and of traditional thinking and practice on the Corporation's handling of public issues.

The Composition of the Corporation 1820 to 1835, the Council 1836 to 1851 and of other Official Bodies

The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 introduced a new phase of municipal government. One important requirement of the new constitutional arrangement was that councillors should be elected by ratepayers. This opened the way for the councils which followed the unreformed corporations in 1836 to develop a different occupational balance. So these structures are compared for possible changes in their relationship with the urban economy. Councillors' occupational interests could affect their interpretation of corporate responsibility, and their connections with other institutions of local government in the city could also influence their effectiveness.

As there was no compulsion to hold office, a measure of self-interest was a consideration for probably the majority of councillors. The advantages could be social, economic and political. To be a councillor conferred or confirmed individual status. There were opportunities to influence civic patronage, leases and commercial orders to be settled and wider contacts could mean profitable additional business. Those whose livelihoods largely depended on the local economy were bound to have opinions, if not an active interest in the management of corporation affairs. However, self-interest was not the sole or necessarily the main incentive as local loyalties and ideals of public service could be uppermost. The heavy demands on councillors' time, especially when they served as aldermen, mayor, and more generally after 1835, deterred some men. They needed to be men of some means who were not constantly tied to their work.

Corporations depended on having members of standing, ability and

2. Ibid., p. 33.

experience to uphold their authority and oversee their affairs. Before the 1835 act established property qualifications for voters and annual elections, most corporations were like exclusive clubs. Gloucester Corporation was no exception: its Tory critics displayed their resentment by referring to it as the 'Corner Shop', as its members' political leanings had to be in accord with those of the whole body, which aligned itself with the Whigs. After 1835 political machinations in the wards could swing the result either way. Other credentials were personal acceptability, respected local family connections and considerable business or professional expertise.

Professor Clark observed that the Corporation, at the end of the eighteenth century, was largely made up of gentry, the professions and distributive trades; manufacturers were a minority group. Table 8.1

5. G.J., 4.11.1837.
shows that the professions gained ground at the expense of the retailers after that. A high degree of stability is the main feature of the situation after 1820, in which 50% of members were professional men, who with the gentry, were in an unassailable position, making adjustments among the minority groups even less significant. Before 1800 the status of Gloucester lawyers was rising and they increasingly made up the professional presence as no doctors were recruited after 1819 to their already smaller number. This generally reflected the advances the professions were making in the country at large.

Several minor elements reinforced the main features. The few retailers can perhaps be attributed to a greater emphasis on social distinctions. The insecurity of the pin industry was apparent as no manufacturer was a member after 1817, but the smaller brush and rope industries were represented. The exclusion of Tories of the distinction of Montague, the iron master, and all the partners of Turners Bank, as well as any one from malting and woolstapling, weakened the Corporation's authority and caused understandable resentment. Probably the more so, as Russell and Skey, valued newcomers, were enlisted with the minimum delay, and there was no bar to respected Unitarians.

The order in Table 8/2 has been altered from that of the previous table to draw attention to the changes which followed the selection of councillors by a restricted electorate. It is clear that ideas about eligibility for office did not change quickly. Even so the social mix was to alter. The two sitting M.Ps and most of the gentry, as county men, ceased to be eligible under the new statutory residential provisions. Their disappearance encouraged greater representation of trade and removed an avenue of informal association between city and


The Occupational Structure of the Council 1836-1851

Table 8.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational groups:</th>
<th>Total number:</th>
<th>1836-51</th>
<th>1836-37</th>
<th>1850-51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, dealers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers, processors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper proprietors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1836-51</th>
<th>1836-37</th>
<th>1850-51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(law)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, dealers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers, processors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper proprietors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. GBR B3/15-17, Council minutes, lists each November. Occupations are from the same sources as Table 8.1.

2. A councillor died and another was elected in 1836, but there were 24 at any one time.

county, at a time when the city was less socially important for the gentry. The one gentleman withdrew after two years. The professions were as strong as ever in 1836, but came to be almost entirely made up of lawyers. The attempt to bring back Russell as an alderman failed. All but one of the doctors elected had gone before 1841 and unlike their predecessors they had yet to make their name. At any one time the merchants and manufacturers were no more numerous than earlier, though more merchants held seats for a short time. The Tory newspaper proprietor joined his longserving counterpart, D.M. Walker of the Gloucester Journal, in 1848. Similarly, of the house agent, the surveyor and three builders, only one served any length of time. By 1850 the retailers outnumbered the professional men.

The Corporation differed from its successor in two other respects. It was more close-knit by family ties. Seven different families had more than one member: there were five Wiltons, three Washbournes, Walkers and Jones. While the Council included five Washbournes, there were no more than two other pairs. Though the probate data is incomplete, it appears from 31 valuations that the Corporation was substantially richer as a body than the Council with a median figure of under £12,000, as against under £7,000 for the councillors' valuations. Of the latter, retailers and builders made up the majority of the lower half. Without the lawyers, the difference would have been even greater. Bristol Corporation was made up of merchants and manufacturers, both before and after 1835, and they were on average very much richer than their Gloucester counterparts.

More than the composition of the Council changed. 'party warfare' broke out in 1835 over the names on the lists of voters, and each year there was an election in all three wards until 1840, when it became more usual for fewer to be contested. Mayoral elections and the appointment of officials were party issues. In 1835 political control of most municipalities changed hands and Gloucester was no exception. Thus a high turnover of members began, first with the disappearance of all but three of the old Corporation and only four others were returned later. By 1841 the Tories had lost all but four councillors' seats, so they went on to lose their aldermen. As losers did not stand again, yet more new men appeared.

The turnover of Council members was more than double that of the Corporation for roughly comparable periods of time. The majority of Council members served five years or less, and only five saw out the full 16 years. Eleven years was average for their predecessors and 16 completed 15 years. The contrast would have been greater if their entire length of service had been compared. Some eligible men did not stand and though Samuel Bowly was persuaded to do so in 1847 he refused to canvass. Corrupt practices made elections even more distasteful.

Newspaper reports kept long, frequent and unproductive Council meetings in the public eye. There were doubts about the men being elected, as on occasion, the Journal urged voters to elect men of calibre and went so far as to recommend several who had proved their worth. By 1847 a feeling that municipal reform had failed made the idea of setting party divisions aside attractive. Thus a highly respected Tory mayor was elected for 1848 with support from both sides, but no more than a Liberal alderman followed in 1851.

Nonetheless there were stabilising influences on the Council. Five very longserving aldermen and five councillors were in a position to be effective leaders. Three had first hand experience of the traditions of the Corporation. The most respected were moderate men who worked hard and had the town's interests at heart. The tradition of the mayor being ex-officio chairman of committees usually resulted in the tasks being shared on an ad-hoc basis, and day to day business was not usually a matter of party rivalry. The guiding hand of the Wiltons was on the side of continuity. No groups of political radicals or minor

13. G.J., 13.11.1847; 4.11.1843; 8.11.1845; 6.11.1847.
retailers emerged to challenge the leadership, which was mainly made up of leading retailers and lawyers whose business interests extended well beyond the town, but who shared a common concern for the town's prosperity.\textsuperscript{17}

Councillors' membership of other authorities in the town could tend to isolate, or integrate the Corporation into some sections of the economic and social fabric. The parishes had responsibilities which limited the Corporation's authority. Parish officers assessed, collected and partly spent the rates, with the magistrates', and later the Council's authorisation. So they were a natural sounding board for popular opinion. However, the vestrymen were decidedly prosperous in comparison with the generality of ratepayers who were poor, to judge by the rating lists. The former were made up of retailers, lawyers, innkeepers, maltsters, woolstaplers and a smattering of craftsmen. The others were largely artisans and labourers who made up the greater part of the population. The honourable parish offices of churchwarden, improvement commissioner and poor law guardian were held by some of the most substantial ratepayers. There was no political bar to Tories being vestrymen or holding office. Prior to 1836 members of the Corporation held aloof from parish office, though some of those then holding honourable offices went on to be elected to the Council after 1835. This signalled a narrowing of the social distinction between the Council and the vestries. A few held parish office and sat as councillors concurrently. This went some way to ensuring the re-election of a grocer and a lawyer, who were two of the most highly respected and longserving Tory councillors.\textsuperscript{18} Two dissenting councillors revealed

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} P. Hills, 'Division and Cohesion in the Nineteenth Century Middle Class: the case of Ipswich 1830-1870' in \textit{Urban History Year Book}, 1987, p. 48.
\item \textsuperscript{18} G.R.O., P164/9 VE 2/2 1829, Andrews - churchwarden to 1837; P154/12 VE 2/1 6.6.1833, Burrup elected annually thereafter. Fraser, \textit{Urban Politics}, p. 28. Trainor, \textit{loc. cit.}, p. 8
\end{itemize}
their constituency in a parish dispute over church rates, by defending the interests of poorer ratepayers. At the same time, one had avoided any accusation of undermining legal authority by having voluntarily contributed three times his due. 19

The vestries had a collective hold over other city institutions through their representatives. The occupational structure of the Corporation of the Poor and of the Poor Law Union illustrates the greater similarity between the standing of senior vestrymen and the Corporation after 1835.

Table 8.3

The Occupational Structure of the Corporation of the Poor and the Gloucester Poor Law Union, 1824 and 1848

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1824 (total 31)</th>
<th>1848 (total 28 - town members)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
<td>9 (law 6) (20)²</td>
<td>4 (law 3) (8)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, manufacturers, newspaper proprietors</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master craftsmen</td>
<td>1 (-)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders, allied trades</td>
<td>2 (-)</td>
<td>4 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gents.</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
<td>5 (-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Figures taken from Table 8.1 for 1820-21.
3. Figures taken from Table 8.2 for 1850-51.

The high proportion of retailers in 1824 made the poor law authority very different from the city Corporation. It was the change in the Council which made them more alike later. Some of the 'gents' in 1848 were almost certainly retired men whose occupations have not been traced. The mass of ratepayers was excluded from membership. The authority 19. G.J., 19, 26.8.1837.
wielded by the chairman and his deputy on these bodies no doubt gave them status to begin with, and a useful source of influence outside the city as the Union included the surrounding parishes. The lawyer who was chairman in 1824, succeeded to the position in the Union and with his deputy from 1835, also a lawyer, was still there in 1848. Both were members of the Council and both served as mayor. 20

Studies have shown that the occupational composition of municipal corporations was weighted towards the most powerful local economic and social groups, whether they were cloth merchants and manufacturers in Leeds, hosiers in Leicester, or before 1835, the professions and the gentry in Exeter and Gloucester. 21 The most usual changes after that date were the displacement of the previous councillors and some gradual alteration in the occupational balance, resulting in greater representation for retailers and lawyers, with many individual variations in detail. 22

Before 1835 the importance of the professions in Gloucester was probably inflated by their social pretensions, coupled with the value attached to associations with the gentry while merchants and manufacturers were fewer and more diverse. Thereafter retailers gradually became the most numerous group; a greater range of business, dependent on the town and its immediate region, became dominant while essentially regional interests either preferred or could afford to leave town affairs to others. D.M. Walker, of the Gloucester Journal, the unchallenged 'King David' of the Liberals in the city, looking back on


his 40 years as a member of the Corporation and then the Council, had not wavered from his belief in the principles of municipal reform, but considered that the Council lacked the cultured men with leading positions in the city, who had been attracted to serve the Corporation.

The Council was rarely paralysed by political rivalry and was not disturbed by more extreme elements, from which some towns suffered. The affinity between the members of the Corporation, the vestries and their representatives was probably partly responsible for this. These were therefore comparatively moderate changes, but much depended on how readily the new men fell in with accepted ideas of corporate responsibility.

The Corporation's Interpretation of its Public Responsibilities

Municipal corporations were a by-word for corruption and incompetence in the performance of their limited public responsibilities in the early nineteenth century. To overcome their shortcomings most towns of any size had improvement commissioners with defined statutory powers, but they too usually failed as urban conditions deteriorated. As disease and crime could not be confined, the danger to life and livelihood increased. Gloucester, as has been seen, was one of the towns envisaging major improvement schemes by 1850. This was perhaps partly due to the example of corporate measures set before 1800, and followed later by investment in urban improvements in the cattle market and by maintaining methodical accounts and property management. The Commissioners enquiring into municipal corporations in 1833 did not hold the Corporation responsible for the matters which deserved criticism and found no

evidence of corrupt practices, though Tory critics did their best to prove the misappropriation of charity funds. 26 There has also been some evidence of the Corporation taking a determined stand to protect city interests when they were threatened from other quarters. So, were these contributions to the city's welfare no more than responses to crises, and was there any awareness that traditional interpretations of its public obligations might be changing? What could be attempted was conditioned by the way traditional privileges and responsibilities had been interpreted in the past, by prevailing perceptions of contemporary conditions, by the presence of other authorities in the town, and finally, by greater intervention on the part of central government in matters which were the preserve of local authorities.

From the 1820s there were additional financial limits on what the Corporation could do. There was no precedent for levying rates for general purposes and the annual amounts permitted under the Market (Improvement) Act were very small. In addition it had incurred a large debt, and after that was cleared there were heavy expenses due to litigation. 27 It could not go over the head of the vestries when they failed to carry out town bye-laws, and in turn, the vestries quickly became obstructive when they suspected their rights might be infringed. St. Michael's ignored a request to repair Dog Lane until threatened with prosecution, and St. Mary de Lode opposed lighting the town by gas and the construction of the cattle market, because of the expense. 28 For the same reason the Improvement Commissioners soon stopped operations and only the greatest pressure persuaded them to co-operate

27. GBR B4/1/6, p. 285.
years later in opening up Commercial Road. 29

The generality of ratepayers evidently preferred to put up with an offensively dirty environment, partly because economic and social pressures bore heavily upon them. People were judged by their respectability in business and family life so they made great efforts to keep up appearances at all times. 30 They therefore scraped savings together, which were often invested in houses. Most of the detailed dispositions in wills show how they bought the freehold or the lease of their homes, if they had not inherited them, and added other small properties if they could. Property was often mortgaged at the time the wills were drawn up, suggesting that the capital available had been insufficient for an outright purchase, or the mortgage had raised funds for other purposes. The testators' overriding responsibility was to provide for their dependents. Respectable women were particularly vulnerable to higher rates if they depended on rents rather than other investments. 31

A pargiter's will illustrates these obligations very neatly. He was relatively prosperous as his probate valuation was up to £800. He left three freehold houses and the lease on his home, all were mortgaged. To provide for his three daughters, he paired each one with a different brother. The three men each received a freehold house with the obligation to endow his sister with £400. A fourth son received the leasehold property. The mortages were to be cleared by the sale of other premises and land. Such men's views were heard occasionally in


collective representations on limited issues which were unlikely to cause extra parish expenditure. 32

The Corporation therefore avoided provoking opposition but exceptionally sought co-operation by means of a town meeting. This was the strategy employed from time to time, to promulgate measures considered to be of general interest or to voice common loyalties on matters of national concern. They signified the good feeling which was held to bind society together and were a recognised public ritual. Meetings were ostensibly initiated, not by members of the Corporation, but by respected citizens who drew up and signed a resolution for presentation to the mayor, and he complied if he thought fit. The proceedings and the resolutions to be agreed must have been well planned, and the latter were published afterwards. 33 The subjects of the most successful meetings were uncontroversial or had overwhelming local support, like parliamentary reform in 1831, the repeal of the Corn Laws in the 1840s and outrage over 'papal aggression' in 1850. 34 However, when proposals requiring funds were made, co-operation was not forthcoming. As a result the town did not get a clock or have its streets watered until it was taken in hand and paid for by the Board of Health which had its own rates. In 1840 all had agreed that street watering was necessary, but not the way to pay for it. There was considerable opposition to the Mayor's proposal that it should be financed through the town rates, as many suspected only the main streets would be watered, but all would have to pay. Nothing was organised as it was feared the opposition would challenge its legality, and a voluntary

32. Wills, Cooke 10.9.1824.
34. G.J., 31.7, 14.8.1820; 5.3.1831; 18.3.1843; 16.11.1850.
scheme had been tried and failed. By 1851 town meetings were falling into abeyance, not because they were impracticable - the largest attendance was said to have been 2500, since the populace was not expected to be present - but because the main issues were too complex and the Council had secured additional powers.

Town meetings were used, to little effect, to enlist support, or at least to mitigate the antagonism of the parishes during the cholera epidemic of 1832. On this occasion the Corporation and other leading citizens were not prepared to give way in the face of determined opposition. A large town meeting, attended by the clergy, doctors and leading inhabitants, authorised the first local Board of Health to take the precautions recommended by the Privy Council. It published its plans at another meeting and called for everyone to co-operate. It antagonised the parishes immediately by dividing the city into districts, by issuing orders to their surveyors and proposing they should join in a scheme for a town cemetery which they would not hear of. Unrest must have been one reason why the Privy Council ordered that another Board be constituted. This included some of the outgoing members; the Mayor and four aldermen were some of the new ones. Parish opposition continued as they were not consulted about heavy expenditure and people believed that city trade was suffering from the publicity given to the tally of cases by the newspaper. As the Board refused to co-opt parish representatives, the parishes demanded that it should work through the Corporation of the Poor, on which they were represented and through which they were rated. At this juncture a third town meeting tried to


36. *G.J.*, 5.2.1848.


restore public confidence. The parishes were so incensed, that the
deputation they had planned would have been sent to the Privy Council
if the epidemic had not been almost over. 39

The first Board of Health must have been formed with the approval
of the Corporation, though it had no official civic members, possibly
as a way of allaying parish fears. During the epidemic of 1849 the
parishes could not complain because the Poor Law Union took charge of
cases and the Council's statutory powers subordinated them to the
Inspector of Nuisances and the local Board of Health. The additional
authority, which included rating, also removed the incentive for the
well-to-do to raise subscriptions to pay for minor improvements and
prepared the way for the city to take over, in due course, the water
company which they had financed. 40 The Corporation had not only been
frustrated for many years by parish and individual obstructiveness in
the matter of the bye-laws, but also over the town watch which was
seriously undermanned until 1836. 41 Then councils were required to
establish police forces under the terms of the Municipal Corporations
Act. Gloucester took the opportunity and set up a relatively efficient
force, unlike the half measures adopted in some towns. 42 This was the
occasion when regular town rates began.

By altering two elements involved in the Westgate Bridge riot of
1827, the 1835 act made it very unlikely that an eventuality of that
kind would happen again. They were the new police and the Council

2/2 6, 14.9.1832; P154/15 VE 2/1 23.9.1832.

40. V.C.H. Gloucestershire, IV, P. 263.

41. Rept. on Municipal Corporations, PP 1835 (115) XXIII, p. 63.

42. B.C. Jerrard, 'The Gloucestershire Police in the Nineteenth
G. Bush, Bristol and its Municipal Government 1820-1851, 1976,
Revolution, 1974, p. 42.
itself which contained, rather than excluded, the political opposition and a few members who spoke up for the poor. The crux of the matter was that the Westgate Bridge Act provided that the collection of tolls should cease once the cost of construction had been covered, but the Corporation as the principal bridge trustee allowed them to continue and had earlier added the cost of replacing the causeway to the bridge account. The authorities were unaware of the extent of public dissatisfaction and the opening they were giving to their influential critics. The occasion for the riot arose when men employed on building Over Bridge violently refused to pay tolls as they went between their lodgings in the town and their work. Once 'immense crowds assembled' and became a destructive mob, regular troops had to be called in to disperse them. Soldiers were again on the streets to prevent the mob from rescuing two ringleaders, who had been arrested. Unidentified influential people must then have challenged the magistrates' refusal of bail, in the King's Bench. That added to the authorities' discomfiture; as the judge advised bail should be accepted on the rioters' behalf a substantial sum was paid. The bridge trustees thought better of reimposing tolls; those for pedestrians ended almost immediately and the rest soon afterwards.

The Council's policing and public health policies give a misleading impression of readiness to set aside traditional rights for the public good. It was one thing to extend authority to overcome perennial problems, but another when it came to surrendering rights to the same end. Charities which had been administered by corporations had to be transferred to trustees independent of the new councils. Valuable

43. 46 Geo. III c.45 1806, ... for taking down and rebuilding the Bridge Across the River Severn at Gloucester, ... G.J., 29.9.1827. G.C.L., N12.5 Statement of the Circumstances connected with the Destruction of the Toll House ..., 24.9.1827.

44. G.J., 6.10.1827; 3, 17.11.1827.
patronage was not given up willingly. In Gloucester the Council held on to the Dame Cooke endowment which principally funded the Crypt Grammar School. Nor did it respond to the memorial from well-to-do citizens who asked that the founders' intentions should be revived, because the schoolmaster made up his income by taking fee paying pupils instead of educating freemen's sons without charge. By the time the Trustees initiated litigation in 1844 agitation of a similar kind was becoming widespread. They won their case in 1860, three years after Cheltenham's forty year dispute to regain the use of the Pate's foundation ended successfully.

There was no shadow of doubt about the obligation to retain the city's county status with its separate magistracy, which was made conditional on extensive improvements in the city gaol, subject to Home Office approval and inspection. It was quickly realised that only a new building would meet the required standards. Temporary measures and finding a site were frequent causes of anxiety. It was fortunate that the problem resolved itself in 1858: the arrangement whereby city prisoners went to the county gaol was made permanent, and the city gaol closed for good without the loss of the city magistracy. However, there was considerable hostility to merging the city police with the county force about the same time under the Police Act of 1856. The financial burden a new gaol would have entailed appears to have been brushed aside

47. GBR B3/15 5.5.1836; B4/1/5 f. 23v., f. 57, f. 79, f. 121. E.P. Hennock, Fit and Proper Persons, 1973, p. 187, Leeds had the same problem.
for some years, but may have made the inactivity, which set in after 1843 increasingly expedient as heavy expenditure on public health measures was in prospect.

In contrast the Council was too careful in small financial matters: it tended to fall in with the current climate of opinion by cutting official salaries, it delayed repairs and continued the practice of carrying a deficit from one year to the next, in spite of being urged to achieve a balance. The Council found it expedient to support warmly the proposal to establish a city museum and to co-operate in the search for premises, but probably partly because this was an amenity, not a business matter, it was allowed to drop. However, it spent £8000 on the celebrated legal case over the disputed codicil to James Wood's will, which after 10 years ended in the House of Lords. Though finally, it went in the city's favour, the city was debarred from receiving the legacy of £200,000. At no time did the Council seriously pursue an out of court settlement which suggests a sense of freedom from accountability more to be expected in the years before 1835.

The Council was called upon to defend the city's interests more frequently and urgently than the Corporation, and used the well established procedures generally employed. The conflict over the improvement of the Severn, in which the opening shot was fired at the end of 1836, was on a different scale both in the intensity with which it was prosecuted and the length of time it had to be sustained, compared with the challenge to the city in 1827 from almost simultaneous proposals, on the part of Hereford and Stroud, for the main mail routes.

to be diverted away from Gloucester to their advantage. During the later long conflict the Council also had to be vigilant in watching proposals from railway companies, usually several at once. That pressure was at its height in 1845.

When a threat to city interests appeared serious, publicly mobilised support reinforced the negotiations with government departments or in parliament. In the case of the mail routes leading business men, local gentry, and the towns of Abergavenny and Monmouth backed the city. In 1846 the Council found it politic to orchestrate renewed opposition to the Gloucester and Forest of Dean railway as its plans did not satisfy city interests in the matter of coal freight rates and a rail link with the town. A public petition was prepared should it have appeared necessary to strengthen its case when the bill was before parliament. Without going to those lengths, persistence was necessary to achieve minor, but locally important modifications to railway schemes, like having a level crossing at Barton Street, rather than a raised track seven feet above the ground.

To cope with the extra burden of responsibility the Council set up ad hoc committees for the railway bills. To the Committee of Inquiry, the one standing committee which had been sufficient before 1836, others had been added to manage the police and the gaol.

As some of the most troublesome conflicts of interest for towns were with other local bodies or individuals, Gloucester was fortunate for the most part, and escaped disputes over water supplies.

53. GBR B4/1/6 pp. 207 sqq.
54. Ibid., pp. 235 sqq.
55. Ibid., p. 282.
Relations with the county were businesslike and helpful. The one real issue arose with the Poor Law Union. Whereas before 1835 policy was decided by a city authority, after that the Poor Law Commission and the country guardians were involved. By 1847 the rudimentary arrangements provided in the town could not cope with the problems created by the enormously increased numbers of vagrants, largely from Ireland, who were going through. Many were sick and starving, so the spectre loomed of infection spreading from unwholesome and crowded lodgings, and the public was outraged by a few examples of gross neglect which came to light. Urgent representations from the Council failed to persuade the country guardians to agree to set up a refuge for vagrants in the town.57 It was powerless to take independent action; the most that could be done was to regulate the lodging houses once the Council had the powers of a Board of Health.58

Municipal corporations have been shown to have differed considerably in the extent to which they endeavoured to promote the interests of their towns.59 Gloucester Corporation's record shows it had that intention. Apart from managing city property fairly competently it could do little inside the city without the co-operation of ratepayers and vestries because they had statutory responsibilities. The strong negative influence they exercised, like that of improvement commissioners elsewhere, was evident in Gloucester.60 They also ensured that their own Improvement Commissioners were particularly impotent.

That the Corporation's frustrated constructiveness was shared by


58. G.J., 4.10, 8.11.1851.

59. D. Fraser, Power and Authority in the Victorian City, 1979, passim.

60. Ibid., pp. 90, 139.
many with most to lose is apparent in the Council's willingness to use statutory powers, when they were available, to tackle the main problems they perceived. Rates were levied to pay the police, whereas Exeter avoided both until they could be postponed no longer. Corporate objectives, and usually the methods used to attempt them, before and after 1835, were similar. The circumstances differed as problems increased in scale and frequency. Measures were taken in response to them, but the intention to water and sewer the town was a move towards policy making. The implications of the Municipal Corporations Act were not thought out as the Council both opposed its spirit by obstructing the reform of municipal charities but also used it to raise rates, while being uncertain of how much discretion it had in spending them. By 1850 a new relationship between councillors and ratepayers was evident. The former, having assumed wider public responsibilities, were uneasy and the latter, with higher expectations, complained about higher rates and the Council's inability to deliver the services intended. The old mixture of civic paternalism and a few limited duties was gone.

Conclusion

The first Council elected under the terms of the Municipal Corporations Act reviewed the functions performed by its predecessor and decided to continue to outward appearances as before, except for gifts of lamprey pies for the judges; and civic banquets fell into abeyance. However, it could not continue the leisurely, more social ways of the past, as a proportion of its membership was to change each year and, once elected more demands were made on all its members. In taking office before or after 1835 councillors moved into a sphere of activity hedged about by traditional forms, where they had limited authority, a few public

63. GBR B3/15, 11.1, 15.3.1836.
obligations and the discretion to help the town by other measures if they had the funds and saw fit.

The usual features of municipal development at that time were evident in Gloucester. The Corporation was in the mainstream as it gradually modified the scope of its traditional responsibilities to cope with the sanitary problems arising from the rapid growth of its population, by envisaging large scale long term solutions. Its difficulties were those which most often stood in the way of corporate action, namely debt and obstructiveness on the part of other institutions with some statutory authority in the town. Similarly the Corporation reflected the common concern to protect property and maintain law and order in its promptitude in setting up an efficient police force. Likewise its membership followed the general pattern: after 1835 it became less exclusive as the social mix increased, but it still carried considerable status. The council chamber became a meeting place for differing political persuasions, but religious diversity and other causes which commanded a following were nothing new. 64

However, accounts of the course of events in other towns show differences which were often more than incidental. The Gloucester experience differed from that of large industrial towns and also from that of the county towns of Exeter and Lincoln where the Corporations were notably inactive and self-centred. 65 In contrast there were considerable parallels with the situation in Ipswich. In both towns there was little likelihood that the control of the dominant social and economic groups would be positively challenged from below, because the social structure militated against it, maintaining deferential attitudes. Though

politically divided, the Councillors' concern for their towns' prosperity took precedence. In Gloucester disagreement was not noticeably along party lines in day to day affairs. It was important to uphold the city's status and reputation. The mercantile sectors in both towns strengthened the similarities between their business connections. Likewise ties of kinship among councillors were not unusual. Though newcomers were elected in Gloucester, only two became mayor in 30 years, but that position was soon to change. The most obvious difference was the absence of serious sectarian divisions in Gloucester. 66

The Gloucester Corporation generally used its traditions constructively, but found adjusting to greater public accountability difficult when it entailed loss of status. Councillors' personal interests were bound up with the town's prosperity and kept them alert to developments which might affect it. The standing, experience and numerical strength of the lawyers tended towards a broad rather than a narrowly sectional view of the town's interests. They also had the expertise to oversee much of the Corporation's business. The Council's sense of continuity, moderation and pragmatism concentrated its attention on immediate practical matters: it had no inclination to build a town hall though the Tolsey was inconveniently small and very noisy with passing traffic. 67

Its sensitivity to views held more widely in the town and to the need for considerable support before extending its responsibilities, made for stability. Nonetheless it was ready to exploit those measures, with statutory backing, which it saw as necessary. Councillors showed the uneasiness they shared with the ratepayers they represented, when they absented themselves from meetings rather than pass unpopular rates. 68


67. G.J., 11.11.1848.

Occasionally the Corporation intervened decisively, it safeguarded city interests when they were threatened, or could be promoted by negotiating with parties outside the town, it promoted or supported several improvement schemes but could not keep pace with the need. In 1851 it was called upon to perform a traditional role when the Gloucestershire Agricultural Association proposed it should initiate moves to hold the Royal Agricultural Show in the city in 1853. It was an opportunity not to be missed to bring trade to the town, which would immediately become the focus for preparations in the county and lead to some national interest. A competitive edge was added as Worcester had already begun to plan for the same show. The event was held in Gloucester after all. 69

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

'... a combination of an ordinary agricultural capital, a cathedral town, till you happen to see a man in complete maritime costume turning down an obscure lane which apparently ends in the county gaol. ... You will see, suddenly appearing as in a dream long ranges of warehouses with cranes attached, endless intricacies of dock, miles of tram road, wildernesses of timber in stacks, and huge three masted ships wedged into little canals. ... [A] great crowd of young country girls and lads assembled at ... the Cross ... a sort of Forum where most of the business and a great deal of the gossip of the place are discussed. ... It was the Mop ... for hiring farm servants.'

The combination of features singled out by the reporter to describe Gloucester reflects the three levels at which the town functioned, namely: that of the town itself, the town in its region and the connections integrating it into the wider world. They provide the framework within which the questions raised in the introduction are now to be considered on the basis of the evidence contained in this study.

The town itself experienced more rapid physical growth during the 1820s which continued with no more than temporary checks in periods of economic difficulty. Congratulatory reviews of the great changes which had altered the face of the city were made in 1848 and again in 1863, equating modern improvements with progress. However, old attitudes and practice were not so quickly laid to rest. The questions concerned with the town itself relate to the extent to which its occupational structure reflected the urban economy and, secondly, to the correspondence between economic power and leadership, in association with authority, and whether that authority was used in the general interest.

The occupational structure has been shown to have given an imperfect

1. Quotation from C. Dickens, All the Year Round, 2.11.1859 in Powell, Extracts, I, p. 23.
guide to the urban economy, although it offers other insights. Its numerical basis emphasises features dominant in the eighteenth century, in the heavy weighting on craft employment and tends to conceal those associated with changing conditions and economic growth. That happens because the great expansion of trade and related business was the work of relatively few people. Its effects on the occupational structure were dispersed across other sectors. When compared with the evidence for the 1820s, signs of economic advance appear in the growth of the professions, public service, trade and transport, and some decline in crafts.

The hierarchy of wealth evident in probate valuations gives conclusive evidence of economic power being principally in the hands of a few merchants, bankers, lawyers and doctors. It existed both between occupational groups, some of which were barely represented at the lowest level, and also within groups. Great wealth was particularly characteristic of the Corporation before 1835, as the tradesmen who stood for election later on were unable to make such large profits from the capital invested in their concerns. Substantial inherited wealth contributed to some of the largest fortunes.

By highlighting continuity with the past, the occupational structure also suggests social stability and other evidence confirms this impression. The craft sector was ill-fitted to mount effective social protest in the form of trade unionism, though there was ample cause to try to mitigate the uncertainties and poverty of their working lives. The factory workmen in the pin industry passively accepted its disappearance. The well-to-do had a vested interest in stability, which they supported by a paternal sense of responsibility for the less fortunate and for the general benefit. Lawyers helped to maintain tradition on the Corporation which was

undisturbed by small shopkeeper or radical groups.

Municipal corporations were able to assist or hinder the economic interests of their towns. For instance, the merchants dominating Leeds and Bristol had less incentive to concern themselves with their cities' interests than the Gloucester Corporation, whose members' livelihoods were bound up with the local economy. The inactivity of the Exeter and Lincoln corporations was also in contrast to Gloucester's measures to safeguard the economy and uphold the town's reputation, which were in the tradition of civic improvement and responsible management begun before 1800. A deteriorating economic outlook after 1815 reinforced the Whig tradition of religious toleration in the city and made particularly welcome those newcomers whose expertise and resources were needed.4

At the second level of analysis, that is, when considering Gloucester in its region, the formative influences of communications and the growth of Cheltenham become the central issues. In this period localised industrial decline and improved, and new means of communication strengthened Gloucester's position in relation to the old market towns of the region, though several of them were large enough to have a share in the marketing and wholesale trade which distinguished regional centres. Cirencester and Stroud were affected by the decline of the cloth industry and they came to be linked to the city by canal and railway. Tewkesbury was soon overshadowed by Gloucester for shipping and bypassed by the railway when Gloucester was experiencing economic growth.

Once the Gloucester Berkeley Canal was finished, the city's central position was stronger.5 By linking up with the canals of the Stroud


Valley the ship canal made Gloucester a more accessible source of bulk supplies for distribution through that area and, in so doing, retained the city's influence to the south, where it came up against the Bristol region. Gloucester's influence to the west of the Severn was confirmed by the completion of the Hereford Gloucester Canal and by the tramways to the Severn and roads across the Forest of Dean. The increasing number of carriers' journeys and the appearance of daily omnibuses going between Gloucester and the market towns signify a general increase in people on the roads, going about their business.

Many local business and family connections across the region naturally caused movement and interchange, and the city's larger economy attracted people at all levels. With or without the help of such bridgeheads, the majority of migrants into Gloucester came from within the region. In economic and social terms the transition from the town to the countryside was gradual, as the rate of migration was highest in the area immediately around Gloucester where business and family ties with the town were common, and where some, who earned their living in the town, chose to live.

In this period Gloucester was having to come to terms with the presence of Cheltenham, which was one of the market towns around the city. However, the spa town's size and character resulted in a complex relationship developing between the two places. To judge by the pattern of carrier services and migration, the area centred on Gloucester was cut back sharply to the north east, where Cheltenham dominated its own extensive region. However, as Cheltenham carriers made very little impression on Gloucester's hold on services to places within reach of both towns, one has to conclude that the people making use of them generally preferred to go to the city. Cheltenham shops may have made some inroads into Gloucester's wholesale trade, but it seems likely that goods went to shops in the general area covered by carriers connected with the city.
The size of Cheltenham’s internal market, the many professional men there, a metropolitan style in its retail sector and its more spacious proportions made the larger town a formidable competitor for business in the county, particularly that of the gentry who had the leisure to enjoy the social pleasures of the town. The gentry’s disappearance from the city Corporation, the absence of visitors at the Spa and, before 1840, the breakdown of the modest round of social events where the gentry had mingled with the urban élite were the last stages in a process which had begun before 1820. The town must have lost some of their trade, although they still attended county affairs held in the city and those living nearby supported the occasional ball or concert. The merchants and well-to-do businessmen moving into the city filled the social gap and the new employment they created more than made up the economic one. With Cheltenham so near, it was possible to refer to ‘the routine dullness of a country town’ in Gloucester.

The economic and social divergence of the towns was apparent in other respects. Gloucester retailers do not seem to have perceived opportunities for themselves in Cheltenham, as might have been expected: among almost 80 of the heads of household checked on the High Street in 1851 only one, a staymaker, was born in Gloucester, whereas 54 came mainly from large southern towns and London. A few professional men and wealthy retired people left Gloucester for Cheltenham.

The same trend was evident in the towns’ wider connections. Until

the end of 1825 Cheltenham was mainly served by a Gloucester based bank and that year an attempt was made to begin an insurance company with an equal number of directors for the two towns on the board. However, in 1843 Gloucester and Cheltenham launched separate building societies almost simultaneously.\(^{10}\) Banking had already gone the same way seven years earlier, when a second joint stock bank began in Cheltenham, once the first was proving a success in Gloucester. They were then in competition for banking in the county which they came to dominate through their branches. Cheltenham looked towards London, promoting railway connections by way of Swindon and considering proposals for a line via Tring,\(^{11}\) whereas for mercantile interests in Gloucester, a line to Birmingham was the priority and then others to link up with South Wales and Hereford. It happened that these different priorities benefited both places. These developments expressed the social divergence between Gloucester and Cheltenham, which left the county town with no option but to support the mercantile sector if it was to prosper. Formal public recognition of mercantile success began with the choice of E.L. Kendall, a ships' broker, to be mayor in 1851, followed by the election of W.P. Price, a timber merchant, to be a city M.P. in 1852.\(^{12}\)

It remains to examine the third and widest level of analysis, the implications for the city of improved means of communication with more distant parts, and how far Gloucester's economy was more fully integrated into that of the country. It has been argued already that the Gloucester Berkeley Canal had a decisive influence on the city and on its regional significance. Now it has to be seen in the wider context for which it

was built.

The canal enabled a much greater volume of freight to be carried on the Severn above Gloucester, to and from the Midlands, and made Gloucester the focus for much of the shipping on the river. This altered the relationship between Birmingham and Bristol as their connections with Gloucester changed. Bristol lost trade on the Severn to Gloucester, which became a port for Birmingham. That in turn deprived Worcester of its earlier dominance. Gloucester became the centre of the corn and timber trade on the river and the corn imports were on a scale to give the port a recognised place in the national market. By 1850 there were two causes for concern in a serious shortage of export cargo and a growing dependence on corn and timber imports, as railways were rapidly reducing once busy coastal trade. Major dock development at the entrance to the canal in the 1870s kept the Company viable, but it soon became harder to withstand competition from Avonmouth. 13

Closer ties with the Midlands, and Birmingham in particular, extended from the canal into other fields. Several outstanding men came to Gloucester in connection with the port, including G. Nicholls of Southwell, Joseph and Thomas Sturge, with their head office in Birmingham and a few shareholders active in the management of the company. Midlands merchants and shippers were the largest regional group to arrive. The banking connection began in 1819 and later the Gibbins of Birmingham gave it new force by guiding the launch of the Gloucestershire Banking Company. Likewise Birmingham and Gloucester men promoted the railway between those towns. Of the merchants who became directors of the Canal Company, the bank and railways, Samuel Baker, who had come from London, gave the most decisive leadership in difficult times.

The canal and docks, in addition to attracting investment for their construction and development and generally stimulating the town's economy,

exerted a long-term influence in other respects. The prolonged issues of the repayment of the Company's vast debt to the Exchequer Loan Board and of the improvement schemes for the River Severn cemented the bonds of local loyalty and interest between the Company, general opinion and the Corporation. So there was no danger of tension developing between two distinct centres of local authority.

Gloucester's new mercantile trade had the effect of integrating the city's economy more fully and directly into that of the country at large. Before 1830 it had become one of the many smaller ports of call for coastal shipping and more regular business connections were set up in London, Liverpool and South Wales ports, all of which had sailings to and from Gloucester. The principal imports from Ireland, the Black Sea, the Baltic and Canada also had a direct input into the general economy. It was usual for the timber ships returning to Canada to pick up emigrants in other ports, though a few locally owned ships took them out from Gloucester. The Gloucester Berkeley Canal made the Severn a more effective part of the inland waterway system linking the main industrial areas of the country.

The Gloucester Berkeley Canal certainly transformed the city's economy, but not quite in the way that its promoters expected in the long run, or had become clear by 1851. Their thoughts went no further than mercantile success based on capturing trade from major ports. In spite of endeavours to bring this about, only Bristol was affected to a limited extent. Liverpool was being enlarged and the expansion of coastal shipping was slowing down. The new and unforeseen factors decisive for Gloucester were the growing demand for corn imports and for timber for the railways. Nor had there been any expectation

or desire that mercantile expansion should lead to industrial development.

Due mainly to the interests and initiatives of the mercantile sector, Gloucester was about to become one of the country's second rank railway towns once the line from South Wales joined up with those from Birmingham, Bristol and London in 1851. In response to the demands and opportunities created by the expansion of trade, shipping, the docks and of railway construction, modern industries had been appearing gradually for almost 20 years. By 1860 they were a well established, important and still growing sector of the town's economy and one which outlasted the long decline of the canal in the present century.

To mention the main industries only, new corn mills came into operation, saw-milling became important and Moreland's match factory opened in 1868. Engineering firms, though not individually large concerns, together constituted a major new industrial sector. The Wagon Works, founded in 1860, immediately employed a large work force, which was well over 1000 strong before 1900. Employment for the rank and file in the new industries, in the docks and on the railway, marked the beginning of a different working class in Gloucester which was to grow and become organised for the collective protection of its members. The establishment of the Gloucester Co-operative and Industrial Society in 1860 was an early sign of its effective action in the city, organised by railway-men who had gained experience of the movement before they came to Gloucester.

The general movement of goods, people and ideas was increasing and going at a faster rate across the country. Towns of regional standing already had extensive and economically important links with London, in


particular. The capital was not only the principal wholesale market for a vast range of commodities, the largest port, the hub of the legal system, but also the main centre for financial affairs and private wealth, and for the dissemination of ideas and fashion.\textsuperscript{17} Above all, it was the seat of government which at this time was intervening more actively in matters affecting the economy and society. For Gloucester this appeared a two edged sword. The financial policies of the 1820s exacerbated agricultural depression and destabilised banking, with disastrous effects on the city's economy, but subsequent policies then assisted its revival. Government finance made possible the completion of the canal, but the policy then adopted threatened the company's survival. The Municipal Reform Act made it impossible for the Corporation to avoid levying rates and central intervention in some aspects of its responsibilities had to be borne, but later public health legislation was accepted as a way forward. At the same time, government departments and Parliament were asked for decisions which would safeguard city interests on such matters as railway bills. The great political issues of the day were debated across the country. Gloucester was wholeheartedly behind the repeal of the corn laws and publicly mourned Peel's death in 1850.\textsuperscript{18}

London experience and contacts were increasingly essential both in commerce and the professions, as medical and legal training became more structured. For instance, J.J. Powell left Gloucester to earn his living as a reporter, to realise his ambition of being called to the Bar.\textsuperscript{19}

Evidence suggests that visits or temporary residence in London were fairly


\textsuperscript{19}. G.J., 19.9.1891, p. 8.
common for Gloucester tradesmen and professional men who could often enlist the help of friends or relations already there. Poll Books to 1850 show the attraction of London, as half the non-resident voters were there, and of them over 60% were craftsmen. Ideas and practices brought back to the area exercised a cumulative and unremitting influence, which tended to create a more receptive attitude to those arriving from the capital for business purposes, whether for a few days or more permanently. Commercial relationships with other parts of the country were also integral to the local economy. Telford who oversaw canal construction and Eassie, the Scottish railway contractor are examples of the reliance placed on expertise from elsewhere in economic development.

There were two potent signs of the greater integration of the country through the agency of faster travel. It was essential to keep up with the news and reading rooms everywhere carried the latest editions of several London papers. In 1831 the Gloucester Commercial Rooms began with three London dailies, the Public Ledger, the Mercantile Journal and Lloyd's Lists. A weekly paper was also taken from Bristol, Birmingham and Liverpool along with the Gloucester Journal. Railways had just begun to add greater availability to speed. Though an excursion train leaving Gloucester was a rare event in 1846, it was no longer the case in 1851. Then, among other destinations, successive trains carried large numbers to see the Great Exhibition and a strongly worded complaint said that many more wanted to go, but were prevented as the fares were too high.


Did the changes which had taken place to 1851 make the city less like other county towns? In those of middling size, compared in Chapter III, faster rates of growth were associated with a greater input from either industry or water transport, or both, but those categories are extremely broad. As Gloucester was soon to become industrial and the relatively small and affluent section of the population effectively headed economic, social and corporate life, the city had affinities with Leicester, a much larger town.24 However, Gloucester was even more like Ipswich. Though the latter was not a cathedral city, they had considerable social similarities and both were thriving minor ports, serving their adjacent regions.25 Yet their regions were very different in character and the trade going through Gloucester docks was dominated by demand from the Midlands. The city was also within the orbit of other influences emanating from Birmingham, from banking to social causes in which the Quaker connection was prominent. As Gloucester ceased to be a town for the gentry it became more congenial for Birmingham merchants.26 Though remaining the agricultural capital of its region and the administrative centre of its county, Gloucester in 1851 was on the threshold of becoming a centre of modern communications and industry in ways that would give it a new-found significance with a far wider range than its traditional region.


Appendix 1

The Composition of the Occupational Categories

in Table 3.4

There is no generally accepted occupational classification for the early nineteenth century as forms of employment were changing and the data is deficient for the period prior to 1841. However, it is important to adopt some existing categorisation as far as possible. Though that of A. Armstrong has been used in Table 3.10, it is not entirely satisfactory because it omits those with independent means, it has an overlarge and varied category made up of craftsmen, retailers, wholesalers and dealers, and it treats building trades separately. Table 3.4 is closely related to the three very similar schemes set out by A. Rogers, including Tillott's classification. The differences do not seriously cut across it: they mainly reduce the number of very small groups and are as follows:

The inclusion of innkeepers among the retailers.

Industrialists and manufacturers are under the heading of business, to find a place for merchants.

Gardeners and agricultural workers make up nearly all the miscellaneous category.

A transport category has been introduced because it was important enough to require recognition.

Persons of independent means: gentry, those with private incomes, but not the retired with no specified source of income.

Professions: clergy, doctors, lawyers, dentists, veterinary surgeons, bankers, commissioned officers, senior public officials, architects, surveyors, engineers, auctioneers, accountants, teachers, clerks, policemen, artists.

Business: newspaper proprietors, land and commission agents, contractors, lessee of tolls, merchants, manufacturers - pins, soap, iron, pipes, nails; processors - brewers, tanners, salt refiner, vinegar maker, maltsters, millers, fellmongers, woolstaplers.

Retailing: bakers, butchers, beer sellers, wine merchants, cheese and bacon factors, grocers, fishmongers, greengrocers, seedsmen, druggists, innkeepers, coal merchants, clock makers and jewellers, ironmongers etc., book sellers, gun makers, marine store keepers, drapers etc., clothing - new and second hand - sellers, hatters, upholsterers, furniture brokers, music sellers, china and earthenware sellers, cutlers, tobacconist, hairdressers, unspecified

1. A. Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town, 1974, p. 45.

dealers, shopkeepers and employees, hawkers.

women also: milliners, milk sellers, furriers, fancy work sellers.

Crafts: building trades - also ship building, brick making, slate working.
metal trades - including smiths, nailers, pinners, wireworkers, edge tool makers, chain and block makers, braziers, tinplate workers, tinkers, bell hangers, grinders, mechanics, mill wrights, iron moulders and founders, machine makers, engravers, farriers.
Workers in wood - cabinet makers, wheelwrights, turners, carpenters etc., coach makers, cork cutters, last, patten and clog makers, brush and basket makers.
workers in leather - shoe and parchment makers, saddlers, fellmongers' tanners' and curriers' employees.
printing and book binding trades and paper stainers.
clothing and allied trades - including tailors, glove cutters, cloth workers, dyers, rope, sack, sail, mat, millpuff makers.
Soda water and sausage makers.
women also: dressmakers, seamstresses, etc., stocking, stay, bonnet, lace makers, paper bag makers.

Transport: boat owners, boatmen, mariners, watermen, pilots, bridge keeper, canal lock keeper, carriers, letter carriers, coachmen, drivers, drovers, railway firemen etc., guards, ostlers, horse-breaker, messengers, porters, waggoners, stable keepers.

Labourers: with or without specified connections, except for agricultural labourers.

Servants: unspecified domestics, butlers, waiters, boots, footmen, asylum attendants.
women also: barmaids, cooks, maids of all sorts, laundresses, charwomen, attendants at the almshouse, housekeepers, nurses of all sorts.

Miscellaneous occupations: agricultural labourers, gardeners, yeomen, stewards, fishermen, non-commissioned ranks, watchmen, time keeper, miners, storekeeper, warehouse men, sweeps, rag collectors, canvasser.

Those not included in percentages: men and women with no specified occupational connection or source of income, including some lodgers and retired persons; the majority of wives and daughters; a few students, tramps and paupers on outdoor relief; inmates of the gaols, infirmary, workhouse and asylum.
Appendix 2

Probate Valuations relating to Tables 5.7 and 7.4
for retailers, merchants, professional occupations
and members of the city corporation 1820-1851

Arrangement of the references

The arrangement is intended to keep repetition to a minimum.

The information is ordered under the three classes of document in which it is to be found.

The names in each sub-section are ordered chronologically, according to the date the will was proved.

The full dates are given, except in the case of P.R.O. references. The latter are made up of the class reference, IR 26, which is given once at the start of the section: each item then begins with the relevant volume and page numbers. These constitute the individual references. The year only is given.

Throughout the valuation is given last.

--- denotes membership of the Corporation 1820-1835 and for the years 1836-1851.

Retailers

Drapers:

Wills (registered in Gloucester to 1858).

Vick 30.8.1824, £2,000; New 6.6.1825, £100; Husbands 12.8.1830 £3000; Workman 16.10.1833, £600; Wheeler, 1.2.1856, £6000; Barrell 13.4.1849, £600; Bushell 6.5.1856, £600.

Cal. Wills. Ryder 4.3.1859, £450; G. Washbourne 31.10.1860, £3000; N. Washbourne 16.8.1861, £2000; W.H. Hughes 31.10.1861, £4000; Herbert 5.6.1862, £6000; Dewey 8.1.1863, £6000; Grimes 18.3.1865, £3000; Smith 10.6.1868, £10,000; J.W. Hughes 19.10.1874, £35,000; C. Washbourne 15.1.1876 £300.

P.R.O. IR 26/987 p. 148 Bonnor 1824, £800 (hosier); 1447 p. 822 Claxon 1837, £16,000; 1754 p. 665 Spier 1846, £10,000 (hosier).

other: GDR B4/2 K20 Kendall 1834 £31; S58 Sims 1861 £534.

Grocers:

Wills. Jordan 8.3.1823, £1500; Martin 1.3.1834, £800; Dowell 28.7.1835, £600; Andrews 20.5.1836, £7000; Saunders 25.7.1842, £600; Hewlett 21.5.1835, £800 (cheese factor); Hodges 8.3.1847, £1500; Roberts 1.8.1849, £5000; Baylis 17.2.1851, £50; Merrell 8.3.1852, £100; Pincott 27.5.1852, £300; Mountain 28.3.1853, £1500; Avery 12.10.1854, £200; Richardson 26.2.1855, £800 (tea).
Cal. Wills. Webb 21.10.1858, £450; Brown 8.1.1859, £2000; Hobbs 22.11.1859, £1400; Hooper 22.3.1862, £6000; Mayer 1.5.1867, £100; Baylis 8.1.1868, £3000; Hanman 26.1.1870, £3000.

other: G.R.O., D3117/3995 Ford 1845, £20,000 (cheese merchant).

Other retailers with valuations over £400:

Wills

cabinet makers: T. Woodward 10.10.1826, £5000; T. Woodward 1.12.1828, £600; T. Peach 9.10.1832, £1000; Hopton 12.9.1843, £600.
broker: J. Peach 21.5.1840, £3000.
pawnbroker: Gouldar 22.1.1852, £1500.
chemist: Rose 31.10.1846, £450.
hatters: Penny 27.10.1828, £450; Colchester 19.6.1844, £450.
bootsmaker: Hickman 27.9.1845, £1000.
hairdresser: Calton 23.10.1837, £450.
bakers: Clark £100, and Smith £450, 16.9.1837; Nest 2.2.1849, £1000; Watts 20.12.1856, £1000.
butchers: Piffe 1.7.1834, £450; Warne 21.6.1841, £500; Ravenhill 15.9.1849, £450.
fruiterer: Antill 16.4.1853, £600.

Cal. Wills

saddler: Owen 26.6.1858, £450.
pawnbroker: Moses 8.7.1858, £7000.
gunmaker: Fletcher 4.2.1859, £3000.
seedsman: Wheeler 23.5.1860, £1500.
stationer: Power 15.6.1860, £3000.
chemist: Lovett 23.7.1888, £16,245.

P.R.O., IR 26/1083 p. 240 Ellis, 1826 £30,000, ironmonger; 1816 p. 831 Prosser, 1845 £10,000, chemist; 1972 p. 710 Mann 1853, £12,000, wine merchant; 2114 p. 1158 Stanley 1857, £8000, cabinet maker/auctioneer.

Merchants and Port Officers


Cal. Wills. Whithorn 12.7.1861, £5000; Francillon 6.8.1861, £800; Baker 28.6.1862, £30,000; Clegram 4.12.1863, £7000; Burrup 27.3.1865, £1500; March 17.5.1865, £12,000; Lloyd 6.9.1865, £90,000; Higgs 25.9.1865, £4000; Brown 25.5.1867, £16,000; Sturge 9.3.1869, £4000; Partridge 28.6.1873, £450; Walker 15.11.1877, £70,000; Kimberley 26.10.1878 £60,000; Tripp 20.11.1880, £800; Francillon 20.12.1881, £891; Bowly 26.5.1884, £18,131; Shipton 29.10.1886, £22,227; Price 7.5.1891, £93,290; Potter 17.2.1892, £138,017; Sessions 23.6.1894, £11,106.


other: G.R.O. D4453 Box 11, Kendal 1840, £600.
Professional Occupations

Bankers:

Cal. Wills. Turner 14.11.1859, £9000; Kendal 6.1.1862, £20,000;
Baker 28.6.1862, £30,000 (merchant).

P.R.O., IR 26/1026 p. 548 T. Washbourn 1824, £61,000; 1148 p. 194
R.P. Wilton 1827, £55,000; 1595 p. 513 Wood 1841, £1,000,000; 1720 p. 85
Skey 1844, £12,000; 1894 p. 405 Cripps 1851, £2000; 1909 p. 239 Russell
1851, £18,000.

Doctors:


Cal. Wills. Lovegrove 28.9.1861, £4000; Meyler 5.12.1862, £3000;
Bower 8.6.1863, £450; Heath 8.7.1853, £450; J.W. Wilton 25.5.1867,
£14,000; Heane 11.3.1874, £10,000; Buchanan 17.11.1875, £3000; Cookson
20.12.1876, £200; Rumsey 27.1.1877, £500; Evans 24.7.1880, £35,000;
Charleton 15.6.1881, £12,437; Hitch 7.3.1882, £997; Hickes 16.5.1883,
£10,460; Wood 7.5.1888, £3198.

P.R.O., IR 26/1535 p. 410 J.P. Wilton £16,000, 1939; 1892 p. 915 Baron
1851, £18,000; 1894 p. 266 Coother 1851, £9000; 1897 p. 97 R. Fletcher
1851, £50,000.

Lawyers:

Wills. Allen 20.3.1822, £200; T. Commeline 20.11.1830, £3000; Crook
6.6.1836, £1500; Abell 22.4.1843, £1000; Cooke 18.2.1846, £450;
Addis 12.6.1847, £1500.

Cal. Wills. Pollard 30.4.1860, £5000; Swann 5.4.1861, £6000; Lewis
22.5.1861, £1500; Mason 1.10.1863, £450; Elliott 10.2.1864, £6000;
Matthews 8.7.1864, £4000; Ellis 29.12.1865, £4000; Addison 26.8.1865,
£12,000; J. Francillon 22.9.1866, £5000; Helps 19.3.1867, £14,000;
Maddy 19.11.1867, £70,000; Carter 22.10.1868, £90,000; Wilkes 20.3.1869,
£10,000; S. Commeline 22.10.1868, £5000; Burrup 1.6.1871, £10,000;
Whitcombe 1.2.1873, £14,000; H. Evans 27.4.1874, £9000; Holt 19.5.1876,
£16,000; R. Wilton 5.5.1877, £60,000; Smith 3.7.1879, £8000;
H.H. Wilton 19.11.1881, £30,000; Fryer 21.12.1885, £11,248;
Jenkins 25.2.1887, £247; E. Washbourne 27.6.1887, £5736; A.G. Jones
4.11.1887, £13,689; Viner Ellis 8.11.1888, £2184; Herbert 17.1.1888,
£2659; Sleed 2.12.1889, £295.

P.R.O., IR 26/838 p. 1377 Ricketts 1820, £20,000; 935 p. 442 H. Wilton
1822, £45,000; 1148 p. 194 R.P. Wilton 1827, £55,000 (banker);
1511 p. 539 Chadborn 1839, £252,000; 1636 p. 129 Counsel 1843 £14,000;
1810 p. 449 J. Lovegrove 1848, £14,000; 1846, p. 398 Phillpotts 1849,
£25,000; 1947 p. 797 Sleed 1852, £1500; 1961 p. 839 Davis 1853, £3000.

Other members of the Corporation. 1820-1835.

Wills. S. Charleton 17.4.1854, £600; Dowling 28.4.1863, £6000.

Cal Wills. Taylor 24.1.1868, £4000; Woodcock 27.4.1867, £30,000;
D.M. Walker 18.9.1871, £10,000.

P.R.O., IR 26/1307 p. 42 D. Walker 1832, £5000; 1543 p. 249 A. Walker
1839, £4000; 1564 p. 828 Sadler 1840, £200; 1678 p. 558 S. Jones 1844,
£35,000.
1836-1851.

Wills. Buchanan 1.2.1840, £7000.


P.R.O., IR 26/1840 p. 818 Hicks 1849, £4000; 1944 p. 981 Rees 1852, £4000.
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