Bridge as Portrayed in Historical Sources Prior to 1939

CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

II

III :

IV

VI

VII :

VIII:

IX

XI

The Development of Bridge before 1840

- John Sleeman

Landownershi and Farmin in Brid e durin the

1840's: The Tithe Map and Apportionment

Miss Kim Davies

Brid e: As Portra ed b Census Material
1851-1871: An Introduction
- Mrs. Zofia Wells

Brid e: As Portra ed b Census Material
1851-1871: Family Structure and Household Size
- Miss K. S. C. Chandler

Bridge as Portraxed bx Census Material,

1851-1871: Occupational Structure
--Mrs. Zofia Wells

Brid e: As Portra ed b Census Material,

 \_L:\_\_:\_
1851-1871: The Origins bx Birth of its Inhabitants

- Martin Morris

Bridge as Recorded in Trade Directories, 1839-1882
- Brian Phillips

Bridge as Presented in Local Newspapers between
1840 and 1878

— Robert A. Scott

The Establishment and Earlx Administration of the New

Poor Law in the Bridge Union

— Miss J. A. Nunn

The Funeral of a Bridge Fireman - April 1910
— Mrs. P. Reilly

Bridge: A Portrait of the Village between the Wars
— Crispin Whiting.

13

25

27

43

52

57

72

107

119

121

NON-PHOTOGRAPHIC ILLUSTRATIONS AND MAPS Facing page

1. Sir A. Braems, extract from Parish Records.

5
2. Map relating to apportionments in Bridge.
The apportionments have been taken from
the original tithe map and are superimposed
on the most recent Ordnance Survey map
covering Bridge. 20

3. Map of railway development in Kent taken from
F. W. Jessup Kent Histor Illustrated
(2nd Ed., Maidstone, 19735, 53. . 45
4. Map showing a five-mile radius from Bridge and
the western boundary of East Kent. This is
based on the map compiled and drawn by

Jill M. Boorman in Marcus Crouch, The Cream
of Kent (Sheerness, 1973), 8 - 9. 52

5. Two maps showing those parishes in 1851 and
1871 within five miles of Bridge in which
10 or more village residents had been born.
This is based on the map showing parishes in
the County of Kent taken from G. H, Garrad,

A Survey of the Agriculture of Kent(l954), 219. 56

6. Rules and regulations for allotment tenants on
the Bifrons Estate, Bridge. 94

7. Parishes included within the Bridge Poor Law Union
in July 1835. This is based on the map showing
parishes in the County of Kent taken from Garrad,

op.cit., 219. 111

PREFACE

Bridge as Portrayed in Historical Sources Prior to 1939 represents
the fifth unpublished Group Research Project, submitted under the general
guidance of two project directors, as part of S214: Aspects of the
Economic and Social Histo of Kent, which is one of the Part II Courses
in Economic and Social History, run over two terms in the Faculty of
Social Sciences. The two project directors were:

Mrs. Penny Reilly who, as a resident of Tyler Hill, is a
member of the Blean, Hackington and Tyler Hill Society.
Mr. John Whyman, lecturer in Economic and Social History
at the University of Kent at Canterbury.

Following the success of Tyler Hill: The Changing Scene Since 1890 (1976)
it was decided during 1977/78 to study aspects of the economic and social
development of Bridge as portrayed in historical sources, particularly
of the mid-nineteenth century. The chapter titles, apart from the
introductory and concluding chapters, indicate which sources have been
researched in detail; namely the tithe map and apportionment of 1840;
the census enumerators' books 1851-1871; trade directories between 1839
and 1882; local newspapers between 1840 and 1878, and the Minute Books
of the Bridge Board of Guardians between 1835 and 1847.

This Project is the work of nine undergraduates. It has been
researched and compiled over an eighteen-week period alongside the
presentation of substantial seminar papers and conventional essays. It
does not pretend to offer the last word on the history of Bridge. Its
authors hope, however, that it contains some facts and conclusions of
interest to all who are fascinated by the history of Kent and its village
communities.

we gratefully acknowledge the helpful assistance which we have received
from several residents in Bridge, who have placed at our disposal their own

\_ local knowledge, sources and photographs, including Mr. J.J. Williamson;

Mr. H. Hawkins; the Rev. Canon C.E.H. Perry; Mrs. N. Mallinder, Chairman
of the Bridge Women's Institute; Mrs. M. Sullivan; Mrs. C. Turff;

Messrs. G.W. Finn, Estate Agents, Fordwich; and the Matron of The Close.

We are much indebted to the Cathedral Library Archives, to the County Record
Office, and to the Beaney Institute, for access to the tithe records, poor
law records, census enumerators' books, directories and newspapers. Also,
so far as illustrations are concerned, the authors are grateful to

Mr. F.G. Kirkwood and Mr. J. Styles, the University photographer, for taking
and developing some interesting photographs, and to the Faculty of Social
Sciences in the University for its generosity in providing some financial
assistance towards the production of this Project.

Finally, we offer our joint thanks to Mrs. Mollie Roots, Mrs. Muriel
Waring, Miss Janice Sewell, and Miss Julie Patterson, for typing up and
checking so patiently nine chapters and several hundred footnotes from
hand-written and much altered manuscript chapters. Any factual errors or
slips in presentation are, of course, our responsibility entirely.

John Whyman
July 1978

1.
I: THE DEVELOPMNT OF BRIDGE BEFORE 1840

John Sleeman

SITUATION

The parish of Bridge adjoins the parish of Patrixbourne to the north
and is situated on the main London to Dover road, being some twelve miles
from the latter, sixty miles from the former and 2; miles eastward of
Canterbury. The parish probably took its name, Bregge, from a bridge which
crossed the Little Stour, a feeder of the Stour itself. The great Dover
road, formerly the Roman Watling Street, passed through the actual village

of Bridge.(l).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES

Although the Hundred of'Bridge is mentioned briefly several times in
the Domesday book of 1086, archaeological evidence suggests that there was
earlier settlement in the parish. Three tuuli discovered in Gorsley Wood,
were opened under the supervision of the local vicar, the Rev. Francis T.
Vine in the late nineteenth century. In a written report, he recollected

how:

"Only one at first caught the eye, but closer scrutiny revealed three
tuuli of progressive size as to their heights and the length of their
diameters, their centres lying in one straight line and the circular
boundaries of the two outer mounds coalescing with that of the central
one at the points of junction. .... some fragments of a broken urn
and a pavement slanted downwards from the exterior towards the centre
of the mound. This pavement was'formed of large red bricks and was
bordered by flint stones. .... The stone being now uncovered, the
earth was dug out roud its sides and it was found to bg the covgr of
a large kistraen or stone chest. .... In each tuuli Lthere was] a
kistraen similar in most respects to that previously discovered. ....
Two small pieces of charred bone and a few fragments of thin glass
were all that could be found amongst the debris. The contents [pf the
third tumulij were different. In it was a large quantity of bones in
small fragments. Some of the bones seemed to have been burnt, but the
greater part had escaped the fire." (2)

Frm an examination of the various articles found in and about the tuuli,
the interments were assigned to the Romano-British period.

Much more recently, in September 1956, human remains were discovered
halfway up Bridge Hill, on the lower side of the village, partly under the
pavement of the north side of the Dover Road, by Post Office workers trench-
ing for telephone work.

"Upon excavation over a considerable area three inhumated burials were

foud. These were lying in a supine position in an approximately
south-west to north-east direction, with the skull to the south-west. In

one grave, there were two small Roman pottery jugs of the fourth century type
placed at the feet of the skeleton." (3)

2.

BRIDGE IN THE 16TH 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES

No documentary evidence relating to Bridge in medieval times has been
traced, but from the year 1560 the parish registers are available, from which
information concerning the population and social structure in the parish can
be determined. For several reasons parish registers have to be approached
cautiously. Local administration in this period was often weak, corrupt and
inefficient. Although the keeping of parish registers from 1538 was legally
required, there was no real means of enforcing this duty, so that during the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries many parishes maintained their records in
a slovenly way. Parish registers do not cover the entire population. For
England it is well-known that the proportion of persons baptized of those who
were actually born was substantially below 100 per cent. This situation
resulted from several causes, of which non-conformity (4) was the most obvious.
Anti-clericalism and slackness on the part of Anglican clergy also played a
part (5).

The original Bridge parish registers are kept in the church but the
Bishop's transcripts are available in the Canterbury Cathedral Library (6).
They suffer from many gaps during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,
particularly during the period 1640 to 1661. Furthermore, for a long period
the entries are written in Latin, are faded and conseque?tly are difficult
to analyse.

The problems mentioned above greatly complicate any attempt to calculate
the population of Bridge prior to the first national census of 1801. However,
it is possible to discern in many years an abnormally high mortality and
possible causes of death. While by a simple subtraction of the nuber of
burials from the number of baptisms it is also possible to get some idea of
the different stages of population growth in Bridge.

Bridge parish seems to have escaped both the plague and smallpox
epidemics which struck London, Canterbury and even Faversham during the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly in 1625, 1636 and 1666 (7).
In those years there was an average number of burials in Bridge.

Plague, as a highly infectious desease, which did not discriminate

.between rich and poor, had been endemic in England since it first appeared

as the Black Death in 1348-49. To start with it had afflicted towns and
villages but from the fifteenth century onwards it was an increasingly
urban phenomenon. Urban overcrowding helped it to spread. During the
seventeenth century plague rarely afflicted relatively isolated rural commuities.
Bridge escaped the plague epidemics in Canterbury probably because its small
population was dispersed about the parish to such an extent that the disease

had little chance of spreading. This seems all the more likely with only

89 and 120 commuicants in the parish respectively in 1588 and 1640 (8).

Assuming that communicants largely meant the number of people over the age of

14, which would have been about 602 of the population, then one can estimate

a parish population for the two years of approximately 120 in 1588 and 150

in 1640.

Generally, in England the death rate in prerindustrial times was highly
volatile. Epidemics of influenza and typhus, which caused excessive deaths,
no doubt afflicted Bridge on a number of occasions, but the evidence to say
the least is rather tentative, especially since the small population of the
parish makes it difficult to recognise short-term population crises.

In 1597, a year noted by historical demographers as being unhealthy,
particularly in Northern England (9), burials rose to over twice the average
figure in Bridge. Poor harvest yields from 1594 to 1597 inclusive (perhaps
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the worst sequence of the entire century) restricted food supplies to such
an extent that huan resistance to particular diseases was lowered.
Economically marginal people like infants, widows and beggars in the parish
suffered from either influenza or typhus. Over the two years 1596 and 1597
burials reached 11, as against no recorded burials in 1595 and 1598.

1616 was another year of population crisis, when the total number of
burials for the year reached 11. Although the harvests for the previous
three years were by no means deficient Creighton believes that this
particular year was unhealthy throughout England (10). In order to distinguish
between different diseases one needs reasonably accurate statistics relating
to infant mortality. Infant mortality in Bridge accounted for a sizeable
proportion of deaths prior to the nineteenth century, as can be seen by such
entries in the registers as:

"Mildred, an infant, the daughter of Jaes Jurdonn, buryed April 15th,
1689"

"John Burley, an infant, February 2nd, 1792"

Smallpox, for instance, affected children in particular, along with influenza,
while enteric typhoid mainly killed adults. without a distinct seasonal
pattern of mortality, as in 1616 one cannot attempt to pin-point a particular
disease as the cause of the excessive burials.

In 1629 burials were again well above the average figure, reaching
13, compared with two in 1628, three in 1630 and two in 1631. For mortality
to be this high in so small a parish population something obviously abnormal
occurred. The harvests in the preceding three years were not deficient and
there are no entries in the registers which provide clues as to the causes of
death (11), except the fact that the majority of burials occurred in the
winter and early spring. Possible causes of mortality in this situation
would be influenza, typhus or even a particularly cold winter.

The highest number of burials in any year during the period 1560 to
1840 was 16 in 1679, closely matched by 15 in 1790 and 1792. Major sickness
is suggested following on two poor harvest years. That of 1677 was

-deficient and the following harvest in 1678 was particularly bad with grain

prices rising to over 30% above the moving average (12). For the three years
1678-1680 30 burials are recorded, mainly during the winter months which

once again suggests influenza or typhus.

That poverty existed in Bridge is clearly evident from several entries
in the burial register during the later seventeenth century:

"Francis Marsh (a poor hous-holder) April 20th 1686"

"Thomas Harding (a very poor antiont house-holder) was buryed
December 6th, 1689"

"Buried Mary Taylor, a poor stranger (or travelling woman) on the
9th day of November, 1696".

Whatever types of sickness caused the short-term population crises during

the period 1560-1840 they were never strictly epidemics. Rather they were
more likely to be localised cases of disease, restricted perhaps to a hand-

ful of families and certainly induced by a lack of proper nutrition, which
in some households resulted from domestic poverty.

4.

Poverty continued to exist in Bridge at least up to the latter part
of the eighteenth century, as can be seen from the following entries in the
parish burial registers:

"November 18th, 1792, John Bentley, a pauper"
"November 30th, Win East, a pauper".

Poverty existed alongside the wealthy families and country seats, who
caught the eye of contemporary writers and travellers of the eighteenth
century.

"Proceeding towards Canterbury and passing the sixty-third stone, you
enter Barham Downs .... Several villages and elegant gentleman's seats
are situated on the right and left of these downs; on the right is an
eminence, on the left a beautiful vale, in which runs a small branch
of the river Stour. On the right is Den-hill house and gardens, the
seat of Lady Gray; near which is Nethersole house, the mansion of --
Winchester, esq; which is situated in the small village of Wym1ingswold."(l3)

Fuller and more detailed contemporary descriptions of Bridge and its \
surrounding area begin to appear during the eighteenth century. The Rev.
W. Grostling, who travelled the Dover to Canterbury Road, in the latter part
of the century, passed through Bridge. He has left a record of his
recollections of the area as follows:

"The old Watling Street we see and distinguish by its being in a direct
line for the length of the Down /Barham/: but it has some short hills,
which carriages usually avoid by—keeping on the upper side of the Down,
which is more level, and on which we see the ground posted off for
horse racing with a handsome building near the starting post, completed
in 1774, for the reception of company, with offices underneath for
their refreshment.

After leaving the Down we find at the foot of a hill the village

of Bridge, where we cross a river (over which a bridge has been built

by subscription), by some called the Little Stour. It rises from a

spring at Bishopsbourn (the next parish) and is sometimes almost dry; at “the?
times (uncertain ones) a flood comes down from springs about Elham
with great rapidity; till interrupted by what the neighbours call
swallows, where it sinks into the earth till that is saturated, and
then rushes on again till the next interruption of the same kind; so
that a stranger might be amazed at walking near this riverside and
downstream till he has lost it, and finds the channel dry. This flood
(and some others we have like it) our people call the Nailbourn; its
channel is sometimes dry for years together, and sometimes, but rarely,
it has come down twice in one year.

From Bridge to Canterbury is three miles, the country enclosed
for fields and hop grounds". (14)

While such is a traveller's account of the village, Edward Basted, who
devoted over forty years to researching and writing a history of Kent, sets
the scene both historically and in his own day at the close of the eighteenth
century. He personally visited every parish in Kent and for a time had lived
in Canterbury, in St. George's Street and in the Cathedral Precincts. Like
other contemporary county historians he confined much-of his attention to the
property and genealogy of landed families and to the history of parish churches,

-~....\_\_\_. . lﬂgi in 9-}

I \¥\\“
. K .\

>~‘..% '}”~— r.a- -- -. . ‘ « ’. I ‘- %
[K N: . § /. M. r ‘ 1,1» :9’/172/7’, r/-rz.J»/22:9-2.7 ,3»-' » A/,A,-.-A.\_\_\_s;
\ 3; ’ . - I " .- V E

‘ 7&2’ V I-QTL9 tZ.J’(9'c9) (.{./Lt‘ .-/ :3‘./',\_,.,«-=--""""' § .

. .1“‘\* - -. ""' K” ’ cﬁg-,1 . ' -

‘,7 7”?‘ 19;? ﬁx//. -»/zrcrogé 969-///-12../' f 9\_/(.v..'.'?) :17 ~;\*/3:-
s-' x . ,,»- ~ \_ ,. 1- ,-
% :1; ‘‘..\*;,12’'/’" /% .

 CDo,vc'9:,€ £7 afgfz‘
 ;«4‘es‘:‘iwzM‘ ; % ,
 ' ‘ I 7:71 £¢')r(//&v:rz.? Z’/")4
. E4 »?d«ﬁ’}03 ﬂ a»£f”‘a”Z", “"/Ed’//’12zf
//71:» /jg 3‘: mi 8 I

' IV " qr.» cl’/?;rJ{0’z7‘z9'/2.’/:1’-'.§,‘Pg /3;

'3 '6§"T$?u-r r7.1£'3-/;»?J§’Z;%&' Ha/z7Le3‘i./271.2"/.Z <9 ffszz} :0

” g/-."‘-;';'.' ‘ .
L7) .-
)ja"(7 V I 7

 5”’//‘XQPH/M .

.\_ ‘lid
I
.\
.9

’\‘

"‘o

< % ﬂ’)? A
7"‘ m ,m».
Q I ﬁg '7 . - » } :

LA

ff
'2.) ‘V;
- ,3

. (2\_)\_""”-:"‘“..7"""'\_,‘."““ " " ‘\*‘"~=‘~=—-;;\_--~— . R;

. . ‘ // % I.) ’ /
5 3/ «W74 0'/3" 0'/'é;L.f~.3./ft?‘-{.1/’.-E
‘ ' . . 5 ,7”-a0.ﬂ£;,.5\_\_ . , "\A -
J,” / (W! \_h. \_ . -. <9:/» .1,’/?"\_\_\_z./Q /L‘.(- if:
9.‘. ‘’‘-’’”@Z‘ 7 %?v0§’\*\*‘7é 9/’ ,3
0’3”‘\*?'¢? aiﬁné tr?//a7,-5/|.1§Z?.7.c‘3.ar.//.z.' -/2;/4,5.
("'7 73(9) in «2zrc"c" 2”/1“:/z If./"£7 "A 101/ ’’‘"'°('}»»
. ,4“ B ‘-\_)’//‘/\_//...L. s .

, c 4 ) -4, > if
.I/(.Jl/ '~/</l?é':’/Z-(Z/'21///1‘§~\_-$7 ‘ﬂ

-\_.. T—o¢'

.’ 7 . .7 V ' ,..
 g’3.Q,/\_”f(9.. ,5 van /4

5.

their incubents and ecclesiastical patronage. This definition of local
history in his own day is well reflected in his account of Bridge:

"THE MANOR OF BLACKMANSBURY, alias BRIDGE was parcel of the possessions
of the abbey of St. Augustine belonging to thesacristie, as appears

by the registers of it, in which frequent mention is made of this
manor, with the free tenants belonging to it .... In which state this
manor continued 'till the suppression of the abbey in the 30th year of
King Henry VIII £l538-9/ when it came into the king's hands, where it
remained till the 36th-year of that reign 1l544j§/, when this manor,
with divers lands in Houndpit and Blackmansbury, was granted to Henry
Laurence, to hold in capite by knights service .... and in his des-
cgndantg it continued till the 18th year of queen Elizabeth's reign
1l575-Q/, when it was alienated .... to William Partherich, esq. ....

His grandson Sir Edward Partherich, of this place, passed it
away in 1638 to Sir Arnold Braems, descended of a family originally out
of Flanders; where his ancestors were opulent merchants. Jacob Braems,
his ancestor, was of Dover, merchant, and built the great house now
the custom house there, where he resided. Sir Arnold Braems .... built
a spacious and magnificent mansion on the site of the ancient court-
lodge here, which he named BRIDGE-PLACE, in which he afterwards resided,
as did his son Walter Braems, esq. till his death in 1692; but the
great cost of building this seat so impoverished the estate that his
heirs, about the year 1704, were obliged to part with it, which they
did by sale to John Taylor, esq. of Bifrons, who soon afterwards pulled
down the greatest part of this mansion, leaving only one wing of it
standing, the size and stateliness of which being of itself full
sufficient for a gentleman's residence, cannot but give an idea of the
grandeur of the whole building when entire. He died in 1729, since
which the manor and seat has continued in his descendants, in like
manner as Bifrons above described, down to his great grandson Edward
Taylor, esq. the present possessor of them. There is not any court
held for this manor.

BEREACRE, now called Great and Little Barahers is\_anothgr manor in
this parish, which in the 21st year of King Edward I 1l292j§/ was in
possession of Walter de Kancia .... Not long after it passed into a
family of its own name. After this name was become extinct here, it
came into possession of the Litchfields, who owned much land about
Eastry, Tilmanstone and Bettgshanggr, and in this name it continued till
the 22nd year of Edward IV 1l482-3/ and then Roger Litchfield passed
it away to Richard Haut, whose only daughter and heir Margery carried
it in marriage to William Isaac, esq. of Patrixbourne, from whose
descendants Edward Isaac, about the latter end of King Henry VIII it
was sold to Petyt and Weekes, who joined in the sale of it to Naylor,
of Renville, from which name it was alienated to Smith and Watkins;
after which it was conveyed by sale to John Taylor, esq. of Bifrons, in
whose descendants it has continued down to Edward Taylor, esq. the
present owner of it." (15)

Having described the descent through several centuries of major properties

Edward Hasted noted how a form of charitable poor relief in Bridge had

originated in the early seventeenth century, when "Sir HENRX PALMER, of
Bekesbourne, by will in 1611 gave 10s. to be yearly paid out of his manor of
Well-court, towards the relief of the poor". At the close of the eighteenth
century eighteen poor persons derived some relief from his particular charity.(l6)

It was very much a part of Hasted's conception of local or parish
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history to describe the history and architecture of the parish church.

"Bridge is within the ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION of the diocese of
Canterbury and deanry of its own name.

The church, which is dedicated to St. Peter, consists of three
isles, a high chancel, and a north sept or chancel in the middle of
the north isle. It has a spire steeple at the south-east corner, in
which there are three bells. In the high chancel, within the alter-
rails, is a monument for Jane, second daughter of Walter Harflete, of
Bekesbourne, first wife of Sir Arnold Braems, Ob. 1635, and lies
buried in St. Mary's church, in Dover .... Against the north wall is
a painted portrait of Robert Bargrave, gent. of Bridge Ob. 1649 ....
The north chancel is made use of for a school, by voluntary contributions
.... In the register are many entries, from the year 1580 to 1660
of the family of Bargrave, alias Bargar, residents in this parish, and
one for Thomas, son of John Cheney, gent. who died in 1620.

The church of Bridge, which is a Vicarage, was always esteemed as
a chapel to the church of Patrixbourne, and as such is included in the
valuation of that Vicarage in the kings books, the vicar of which is
instituted and inducted into that Vicarage, with rte chapel of Bridge
annexed to it.

The parsonage of this parish, therefore, as an appendage to that
of Patrixbourne is the property of Edward Taylor, esq. of Bifrons." (17)

In the describing the church one notes how Edward Basted used his eyes
very carefully in order to record its main architectural features and also
how he consulted an original historical source in the parish registers, yet
he did not state when the church was founded or first erected. It is to
later sources that one must turn for this inlormation. John Newman believes
that parts of the church are from the twelth century for there is a genuine
Norman doorway reset in the north transept. (18)

Hasted provides in addition a list of the vicars and patrons of the
church of Patrixbourne with the chapel of Bridge: (19)

Patrons
(Or by whom presented)

James Coleby, May 8, 1644
John Fige, A.B. obt. 1667
John Mackallan, A.M. Nov. 20, 1667,
obt. January 27, 1698.
Maragret Braems, widow .......... John Bowtell, S.T.P. February 20, 1697,
obt. January 5, 1753.
Mary Taylor, hac vice ........... Herbert Taylor, A.M. February 3, 1753,
obt. September 29, 1763.
Herbert Taylor, esq. ............ Edward Taylor, .3. November 16, 1763,
obts. December 1798.
Edward Taylor, esq. ............. Willia Toke, Kay 1799, present vicar.

The last entry shows how up-to-date Hasted could be in his information
given that William Toke took up his living in May, 1799, whereas the preface
to the 2nd Edition of that volume which describes Bridge was written in
London on December 1st, 1799. Basted further noted that John Fige was buried
in Bridge church, John Mackallan, in the chancel of Patrixbourne church and

1 Vicars rr

Bridge Church prior to its Victorian renovation.

N»

‘early 19505.

..n
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John Bowtell was buried with his wife Olive under a tomb in that churchyard.(20)

In concluding this section it is necessary to point out that there is
much which is not known about pre-1800 Bridge, especially with reference to
its size and to the economic and social life of its ordinary folk, but the
passage of time leads to new discoveries so that when Bridge Farm, which was
situated on the main Canterbury to Dover Road was demolished in 1962, the

following interesting discovery was made:

"The continuous jetty or overhang at the front gave the first clue that
the house might be much older than it appeared and as demolition
proceeded and the main timbers were exposed, the right hand end of the
jetty was seen to be false and had masked a 15th century wagon entrance
leading to the buildings behind the house.

Little is known of the house's early history but there is little
doubt that the farm was once part of the Bridge estate known in more

recent times as Bridge Place." (21)

A detailed photographic survey of Bridge would reveal the survival to
this very day of buildings or parts of buildings whose history can be traced
back to the eighteenth century or earlier. Of course, much more has survived
from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

EARLY 19TH CENTURY BRIDGE

As time progresses so more and more information can be obtained from
written or docuentary sources concerning the economic life and social
structure of the village. Nineteenth century trade directories highlight
some of the leading features of the parish and provide lists of local gentry
and business, professional and trading fmnilies, including farmers. The
historical value of directories as such is fully explored in a later chapter.
A comparison of an 1828-9 directory (22) with one other published in 1838 (23)
reveals some interesting facts. The numbers involved in commerce apparently
increase quite considerably over this ten year period from 13 to 21 entered
names. While early directories may underestimate the numerical strength
‘of some trades this problem becomes less acute as the nineteenth century
progresses. From the following lists a picture of village shops, crafts,
industries, notables and inns can be obtained:

For 1828-9:

Frederick Colegate, Carpenter
William Fagg, Baker

William Fagg, Smith, etc.

Margaret Green, Grocer

Saml. Hardiman, Watch maker
William Hyde, Sacking manufacturer
Richard and Henry Jarvis, Butchers
John Martin, Saddler

John Minter, Butcher

wm. Verrier, Painter, pluber, etc.
Thomas White, Shoemaker

Thomas Hawkin, Red Lion Inn
Frederick Colegate, White Horse Inn.

For 1838:

Thomas Bushell, the "Gate"

Frederick Colegate, Builder and Carpenter
Thomas Collard, Tailor and draper

Charles Davis, Grocer

Jno. Dyson, Boot and shoe maker

Wm. Fagg, Blacksmith and farrier

Samuel Hardeman, Watch and clock maker
Thomas Hawkins,Red Lion Inn

Charles Hodges, Butcher

Daniel Hooker, Grocer

John Horton, Baker

Hen. and Rich. Jarvis, Butchers

John Martin, Saddler and harness maker
John Nelson Paine, Hair dresser

William Nix, Surgeon

Wm. Pine, Boot and shoe maker

Wm. Sayer, Painter, plumber and glazier
Rich. Sherrard, White Horse Inn .
Amelius Sicard, Surgeon

Thos. White, Boot and shoe maker

William Williams, the "Plough and Harrow" (and brewer).

Professions and Trades in Bridge 1828-9 and 1838, in Alghabetical Order
1828-9 1838

Baker 1
Blacksmith

Boot and Shoe Makers 1
Brewer
Builder
Butchers
Carpenters
Draper
Farrier
Glazier
Grocers l
Hairdresser

Harness Maker

Inns ‘
Painter

Plumber

Sacking Manufacturer
Saddler

Smith

Surgeons . 2
Tailor
Watch and Clock Maker 1 l
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No. of trades l2 l9

R0. of tradesmen 14 28
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In the ten year period a number of new businesses appeared, notably a
builder, a tailor, a draper, a hair dresser, two surgeons, two boot and shoe-
makers and a second grocer. If this was a genuine expansion, it was probably
the result of two factors.\_ First, there was a rapid growth of population in
Bridge between 1821 and 1841 from 432 to 817; and secondly, additional
business accrued to the village from the construction of the Bridge Poor
Law Union Workhouse, the history of which is examined in a later chapter.

Already by 1828 residents andiravellers could quench their thirsts at
one of the two inns in Bridge. The White Horse Inn, which is mentioned in
both trade directories was once a "baiting", or halting house. Although it
was hardly distant enough from Dover for a full stage, it was conveniently
situated for a change of horses, certainly it is an old building, which is all
too evident from the Tudor fireplace in the large bar, with its moulded
beams above. (24) It served also as the village Post Office, with the mail
in 1828 arriving at eight in the morning and being dispatched at six in the
evening. These were days when coaches and carriers to and from London,
Canterbury and Dover passed daily through the village. (25)

This chapter concludes by examining population growth in Bridge
following the first national census in 1801. A simple subtraction of the
number of burials from baptisms entered in the parish register suggests that
population growth was very slow until the beginning of the nineteenth century.
The 1801 census counted 325 inhabitants of whom 152 were males and 173
females. By 1811 the population had risen to 397, continuing an unbroken
upward trend thereafter to 432 in 1821, to 543 in 1831, to 817 in 1841 and to
864 in 1851. The number of inhabited houses, families, occupations, males,
females and total population as enumerated over the first four censuses
are shown in the following table. (26)

Inhabited Those
Year houses Families Employed in 13 Other Males Females Total
agriculture Trade Occupations
1801 42 65 74 44 207 152 173 325

persons persons PEISOIIS

‘1811 76 81 51 16 14 199 198 397

families families families

1821 86 99 37 36 26 202 230 432
families families families

1831 97 101 45 24 32 261 282 543
‘ families families families

Several points of interest can be found in these statistics, the ratio

of houses to inhabitants, for instance, improved dramatically, so that there
was one house for every 7.9 people in 1801 compared to one for every 5.3

persons in 1811, 1:5 in 1821 and 1:5.5 in 1831.

In 1811 males exceeded females in the population, having increased their
numerical strength by 47 since 1801, but over the decade 1811-21 the number
of males in the parish increased by only three, whereas the nuber of females
rose by 32. Apart from including the possibility of male migration to and
from neighbouring Canterbury during the years 1801 to 1821 in search of work,
females exceeded males in number in 1821 and 1831, as they had done in 1801,
by virtue of the fact that girls were less likely to die in infancy compared
to boys.

APPENDIX

ABSOLUTE BURIAL FIGURES F08 BRIDGE FOR KNOWN YEARS; 1560-1840.

1560
1561
1570
1571
1572
1577
1578
1579
1580
1583
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594 .
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613

‘1614

1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629

"1630

1631
1632
1633
1634
1635

2
9
3
0
1
1
2
1
5
3
6
6
3
4
0
3
3
3
3
0
3
8
0
4
1
6
4
1
0
1
3
4
2
1
3
1

1

5
8
5
4
2
4
1
5
6
5
0
2
3
3
2
0
4
2
0

1636
1637
1638
1639
1660
1661
1662
1666
1667
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
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1736
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1760
1761
1762
1763
1764

1765

1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
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1774
1775
1776
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1779
1780
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1782
1783
1784
1785
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II: LANDOWNERSHP AND FARMING IN BRIDGE DURING THE 1840's:
THE TITHE MAP AND APPORTIONMENT

Miss Kim Davies

"Kent is mainly an agricultural county, and not in anysense a
manufacturing county, like Yorkshire or Lancashire" (1)

In a rural community, such as Bridge in the mid nineteenth century, farming
was the most important village "industry". The evidence of agrarian change,
at that time, is to be found in lamdtax assessments, rentals, crop—returns,
officially printed population censuses, parliamentary papers on the state
of agriculture and tithe awards. (2) Tithe commutation played an import-
ant part in Kentish agrarian history. Tithes, as a tenth part of the
produce of the land, (3) were a payment exacted from the inhabitants of

a parish for the maintenance of the church and its incumbents. In the
first instance, tithes were paid to the rector (4) of the parish, but

the Reformation saw the transfer of a large proportion of this revenue

into the hands of laymen. ’Lay impropriators, as they were known, still
held nearly one quarter of the net annual value of all tithes at the

time of commutation. (5) In principle tithes were payable in kind, and
were levied on all yearly profits.

The medieval open—field system, typical of the Midlands, never prevailed
extensively in Kent, and the enclosure of the county was largely complete
before the sixteenth century. The parliamentary enclosure acts of the later
eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries so far as Kent is concerned, invol-
ved the enclosure and bringing into cultivation of limited areas of commonr
land, but in those counties where the parliamentary enclosure movement was
more significant, the opportunity was taken to convert tithes into an
equivalent allotment of land. In an old enclosed county like Kent, almost

every parish witnessed a tithe survey, (6) which resulted from the Tithe
Commutation Act of 1836.

% of land area covered % of land area covered

by Tithe Surveys by Enclosure Acts
Kent 97.8 Nil
Northampton 23.5 51.8 (7)

‘THE ‘IITHE (DMMUTATION ACT OF ’|§\_3\_§

The payment of tithes in kind caused endless disputes between farmers and
tithe ownamg so that

"frequent disputes arose concerning the nature of titheable
produce. when tithes were alloted to more than one owner
further litigation began. It was asked what constituted

the vicar's tithe and how much belonged to the rector and
lay impropriator, should the tithe be collected by the owners

and if so when, or should it be delivered by the farmer, and
if so, to what place?" (8)

Tithes were an imposition which bore most heavily on progressive farmers,
whose increased yields involved them in increased tithe commitments. This
reason, clearly, was in the mind of Lord John Russell as Home Secretary who,

14.

when introducing the Bill for the general commutation of tithes in 1836,
described the system as "a discouragement to industry, a penalty on skill,
a heavy mulct on those who expended the most capital and displayed the
greatest skill in the cultivation of the land." (9)

As well as being unpopular, tithes were administered inefficiently,
so that a "tithe system", as such might not exist, which to some extent
was the case in early nineteenth century Kent. Tithing practises became
so complicated, so encumbered by local varieties of exemptions, prescriptions,
extraordinary charges and moduses, (10) that one of John Boys's correspondents
was forced to admit that,

"What is meant by a fair commutation of tithes, I know not.
An equivalent or commutation that would satisfy most parties
is perhaps impossible". (11)

In the event, Russell's formula, in the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836, did
satisfy most parties. The underlying principle replaced tithes in kind by
a fluctuating money payment (12) known as corn rent, or the tithe rent
charge, which was adjusted each year on the basis of a seven year national
average price of wheat, barley and oats. In 1836 the septennial average
price of wheat was 7s O%d per bushell, as against 3s 11%d for barley and
2s 9d for oats. (13)

The Act established Tithe Commissioners who encouraged voluntary
agreements between tithe owners and payers, imposing Awards only on districts
where litigation was in progress. while critics of the Tithe Commissioners
may have complained of inactivity and delay, 75% of the settlements in
Kent were completed within six years of the confirmation of the first agree-
ment. (14) By the end of 1848 tithe commutation in Kent was virtually
complete. (15)

The Act provided for a field—by—field survey of landownership,
occupancy and use in each tithe district, which was duly recorded on the
tithe maps and tithe apportionments. These were made in triplicate. The
original was placed in the custody of the Public Record Office, while the

, other copies were deposited with the incumbents and church wardens of each

district, and were to be preserved in the parish chest, and in the relevant
diocesan registry.-(16) A series of apportionments and maps for East Kent
is in the custody of the Cathedral Archives and Library in Canterbury. These
records have been described as "the most complete record of the agrarian
landscape of any period". (17)

THE TITHE MAPS

Most of the Kentish maps, which reveal the names of their surveyors, were
produced by men who were resident in London or in the county. The Bridge
tithe map was drawn in 1838 by Mr. J.M. Davey of Canterbury (18) to a scale
of three chains to one inch. He would have produced one or two plans for
other parishes near Canterbury.

Alltﬁhemaps were inspected at the offices of the Tithe Commissioners,
and those attaining a standard of accuracy and admissible in courts of law
were affixed with the Commissioners‘ seal. Only those maps which received
this official seal of approval were regarded as first—class maps; the
remainder were second class. (19) Just over half the Kent maps passed
the system of checks, which was well above the estimated national average
of 2q%. (20) The Bridge map received an official seal on 18 February 1841.
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It lacks, however, some features which are considered fundamental to a modern map
Although the most serious omission is that of a key, it did delineate the
ecclesiastical parish, and the boundaries of each tithe area. The latter
corresponded most commonly with fields rather than with farms. Other topo-
graphical features which were shown included roads, woods, streams, footpaths

and buildings. Inhabited buildings were tinted red; the remainder were
represented by shaded areas. Larger properties, such as Bridge Place, and

some farms were named. Each tithe area was numbered, which allows it to be
identified on the apportionment. ,

THE APPORTIONMENT

This was prepared on parchment, in manuscript, and consisted of an opening
"Articles of Agreement" (21), followed by the Schedule which was divided
into eight columns.

(i) Landowners listed auhabetically.

(ii) Occupiers, either a landowner as "himself" or a named tenant.

(iii) A number referring to the map. Because properties were listed by
landowners numbers occur in no clear order. The surveyors numbered
properties on the ground as they came to them.

(iv) Name and description of property. Here is a primary source for field
names, farms and house names, but in some cases field names were not
given.

(V) State of cultivation, as a primary source for the study of land use, but
limited in value because the nature of the crop was not indicated.

(vi) Acreages in acres, rood and perches, with 40 perches = 1 rood and
4 roods = 1 acre.

(vii) Rent charge in lieu of tithes.

(viii) Remarks.

At the end of the Schedule was a summary of the total acreages of each land-
owner and occupier. (22)

when using the Bridge apportionment as a source for reconstructing
elements of the landscape c1840, someasassment of its accuracy must be
attempted. In particular, three questions may be asked:-

(i) How relevant are the summaries of parish land use in the preamble to
the Schedule?

(ii) Are the names entered in the ownership and occupation columns, those of
the true owners and occupiers of land?

(iii) What are the criteria upon which land was classified according to

use? (23)

Since land use statistics were frequently estimates, inaccuracies could
occur through incorrect assessments. The summaries often referred to a time
earlier than the date of the award. Although the actual acreages were some-
times inaccurate, the proportions of arable, pasture, wood and the like were
stated, it is believed, with reasonable accuracy. (24) Under the 1836 Act,
an owner of land meant any person in the actual possession of the receipts
of the rents and profits of that land. Thus, it is almost certain that some
mortgagees and "tenants-for—life" were assumed to be owners. In a reply to
a question about whether the Tithe Commissioners investigated a person's
interest in a parcel of land, William Blamire, a Tithe Commissioner, replied
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"Oh dear no!" The names of occupierslisted in the apportionment, on the
other hand, can be checked against parish rate—books, directories, or the
census enumeration schedules of 1841.

Land in terms of its cultivaitimiwas differentiated by observation.
According to the Tithe Commutation Act, land which was judged to have been
ploughed within the previous three years for crops, rotation grasses, or
fallow, was to be regarded as arable. Grassland or leys, which had not
been under the plough for three years, were to be recorded as grass. Even
if these instructions were strictly followed, problems of interpretation
remain in Kent, particularly, where convertible husbandry was practised in
the mid nineteenth century. (25) The most impaﬁant distinction was that
made between arable and grassland. Farmers on their arable land paid tithes
equivalent to about one fifth of the value of their rent, whereas on grass
they paid less than one eighth. Lands devoted to hop grounds were charged
with supplementary or extraordinary rent charges.

BRIDGE AS PORTRAYED IN THE TITHE MAP AND APPORTIONENT

The parishes of Bridge and Patrixbourne were designated as one tithe district
by the Tithe Commissioners (26) Defining an area was the first task in
commutation. Known as a tithe district it was distinguished‘from a parish,
since

"What was frequently disputed was not the existenn of a parish,
but the exact extent of its boundaries. This was particularly
important for someone who was a tithe owner in one parish and
a tithe payer elsewhere." (27)

Few problems arose in Bridge. A meeting was held between the tithe owners
and landowners on 22 October, 1838, and agreement was readied on 8 March
1839. Notice of appeal appeared in The Kent Herald on 7 July 1840.

"The Draft Apportionment of the agreed Rent—charge with maps and

costs of commutations, are deposited at the White Horse, Bridge,

and the day of Appeal is on Thursday the 30th of July at the

same place, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, Robert Lake, Appntioner" (28)

All payments having been confirnedby 17 February 1841, the first payment of —
rent charge was to be effected by July 1841. The total sums agreed to be

paid were:-

(i) To the lay impropriator, Elizabeth, Dowager Marchioness of Conyngham
£876 16s 0d (in lieu of tithes on corn and grain)
£ 23 4s 0d (in lieu of Rectorial rent charge)

£900 Os Od

(ii) To the Vicar, the Rev. Charles Hughes—Hallett
£395 16s 0d (in lieu of other tithes)

£ 4 gs Od (in lieu of Vicarial tithes)
£400 Os Od

Unfortunately the Apportionment failed to distinguish between the rent
charge assigned to Patrixbourne, as opposed to Bridge, but, nevertheless,
all land was subject to tithe and in Bridge this amounted to 1134a. 3r. 13Pp
which can be broken down as follows, according to its state of cultivation.
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a. r. p.
Arable 665 1 20 (29)
Meadow or pasture 160 3 28
woodland 204 " 22
Hop grounds 90 " "
Market gardens 14 1 23 (30)
G1 H H H
1134 3 13

While 32% of Kent was given over to grassland (31) this was clearly not the
case in Bridge, which as part of a predominantly arable farming area had a
ratio of arable: meadow or pasture of at least 4:1. Just over 58% of the
total land area of Bridge was devoted to arable farming; only 14% was
meadow or pasture.

Parishes within a tithe district could display quite different charac-
teristics of landownership, and in this respect there was a striking contrast
between Bridge and Patrixbourne.

Acreage No. of landowner:
In Bridge In Patrixbourne

Under 1 28 3

1 4 —

2 5 1

3 3 -

4 1 1

5 \_ -
Total 41 5
Total as a percentage 80% 23%

of landowners

Bridge contained a large number of landowners with holdings of less than
one acre. It was a parish where owner occupation was common, especially
since the summary listed 51 landowners for Bridge, as against 17 for
Patrixbourne. 41 of Bridge's 51 landowners, which was 80% had holdings of
less than five acres. Because owner occupiersrepresent an interesting group
in Bridge, they justify more detailed study.

Name Size of holding Occupation gir known)(32)
a. r. p. ‘

AUSTDT, DANIEL. 28 0 35

BRICEL RICHARD 2 1 12 Gentry

CONYNYHAM 168 3 35 Nobility

COLEGATE, FREDERIC " 1 26 Builder/Carpenter

DAVIS, CHARLES " " 27 Grocer and dealer in sundries
DmNmm,wnmnm 3 " 8

FISSENDEN, PETER 1 1 1 Gentry

FAGE, SARAH " 1 28

FAGE, WILLIAM 1 3 28 Blacksmith

GAMBRILL, WILLIAM " " 16

GREGORY, REV. EDWARD 20 3 29 Clergy

GUARDIANS OF BRIDGE UNION 2 1 "

HARTLEY, REV. JAMES 4 3 13 Clergy

HOWARD, CHARLES 1 " 15

HODGES, CHARLES " " 3 Butcher

HYDER, WILLIAM " " 23

HARDEMAN, SAMUEL " 1 32 'Grocer and dealer in sundries
JARVIS, HENRY 9 3 15

Name

JARVIS, RICHARD

SONDES, RT. HON THE LORD
SMITHSON, MILLER

SICARD, MARY

TYSON, JOSEPH

VERRIER, WILLIAM
WILLIAMS, WILLIAM
WHITE, THOMAS

wEsLEYAN, CHAPEL

Nine of those 27 listed landowners wer also tradesmen;

Size of holding

'C<Q< -P
- - - -ro : I-Qty
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Occupation gif known) (32)

a. r. p.
1 31 Butcher
3 28 Nobility
ll 1 1
1 11
H 3
" 9 Plumber/glazier/painter
" 24 Brewer
" 15 Boot and shoemaker
I! 1 2

two were clergymen

and twonere institutions, namely the Bridge Guardians and the Wesleyan

Chapel.

Although the summary does not indicate the type of holding that

each of these landowners had, the Schedule shows that Charles Hodges‘
three perches consisted of a house and a garden, whilst William Fagg's
holding amounted to a house, a shop and an area of pasture land. While
the nobility possessed sizeable holdings, the general pattern of smaller

holdings consisted of a house and garden.

usually contained subsidiary areas of cultivaition.

The progressively larger holdings

A large landowner, such as the Marchioness of Conyngham, occupied

a large acreage and yet also rented out large areas of land.

Ten-different

people occupied 598 acres which the Marchioness owned but did not occupy.
Bridge was an area of compact small holdings, even among those tenants
who did not own the land which they occupied.

Landowner

Beckingham,

Louisa
Bear,

Catherine
Marchioness of

Conyngham

Colegate,
Prederic
Curtis,
George
Foord,
Thomas
Phillpott,
Stephen

Occupier

Swan,
William
Andrews,
Eleanor
Rickwood,
John
Dyason,
John
Shaxby,
Charles
Lawrence,
John
Martin,
John

No. Name and description
Y45 Cottage and Garden
Y74 House and Garden

Y2 Cottage and Garden
Y68 House and Garden

Y22 Houseyard and Premises
Y67 Cottage and Gardens
Y58 House and Garden

Quantity
a. r. p.
v- v 35
" " 16
n n 27
n u 27
" " 9
" " 15.
n n 24

It was infrequently the case that occupiers held land elsewhere in the

parish.

As and when this did occur, the tithe apportionment would rarely

provide information showing the precise relationship between the separate
In one obvious case of scattered occupancy

portions of a total holding.

the connection can be seen.quite clearly.

It concerned William Dutnell

who owned some building ground in association with a rented brickfield.

Landowner
Conyngham

Dutnell, William

No. Name and description of land

Occupier \_\_
Dutnell, William Y113 House and Brickfield
Himself Y1O Building Ground
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These two holdings were scattered only in the sense that they were geographi-
cally separated.

Mixed farming is yet another theme which can be identified from the
Bridge apportionment. Those inhabitants who occupied larger holdings were
tenant farmers. There were no specialist farms, and land was being applied
to all types of farming and other uses.

Landowner Occupier ﬁg. Name and description State of
of land cultivation
Barham, Rev Richardson, Y63 Bridge Farm Homestead
Richard James Y64 Two acre meadow Pasture
Y81 Six acres Arable
Y82 Further sheeplands "
Y95 Two and a half acres Pasture
Y96 Union fields Arable
Y97 Stour meadow Pasture
Beckingham, Brice, Y148 Chalk pit
Louisa Richard Y15O woodlands Hops
Y156 Little Hammel Pasture
Y157 ' Barn meadow "
Y158 Little Pett Farm Homestead
Y159 Halfhacre meadow Pasture
Y173 Great Fields Hops
Y174 Rough Hill Arable
Y175 Stable Field Arable
Y183 Old Down Arable

The high incidence of owner occupiers in Bridge points to a "closed"
community, in the sense that land was largehyheld by local people. Larger
Landowners, however, possessed holdings in the neighbouring parish of
Patrixbourne as well as in Bridge.

Name ggantity Of land held

\_ In Bridge In Patrixbourne
a. r. p. a. r. p.

Barham, Rev. Richard 62 3 36 26 " 2O

Beckingham, Louisa 177 2 20 4 3 19

Conyngham, Marchioness of 767 3 15 643 3 7

Sondes, Rt. Hon. the Lord 47 3 28 111 1 32

Kent had long been famous for its hops and Bridge contributed to their
cultivation during the nineteenth century; indeed the favourable soils of
East Kent, "mainly around Canterbury ... hadlong been given over to intensive
forms of cultivation such as hop growing" (33) There was an extraordinary
rent charge upon hop grounds of 12/s per imperial acre, which was listed
among the "Articles of Agreement" at the beginning of the apportionment
as follows. A

State of cultivation Quantity Amount of rent charge

a. r. p.
Hops 5. 3 5 Extraordinary charge on
5a. 3r. Sp. at 12/s per acre
£3 9s 4%d.

This extraordinary charge ceased when lands to which it was applied were no
longer hop gardens after commutation. Conversely, the extraordinary Qharge
applied to lands which were converted to hop production. The gross rent

for tithe owners was adjusted according to their involvement in hop cultiva-
tion. Under the 1836 Act an extraodinary charge could also be applied to
market garden produce. Bridge had just over 14 acres of market gardens,

but they were not subject to any extraordinary rent charge in the Schedule.

CONCLUSION

While the Bridge Tithe Apportionment and Map provides valuable infor-
mation on land ownership and occupation, the information relates only to
one point of time, and the picture provided of agriculture in the parish is
incomplete in many respects. Information is lacking on soil types and courses
of crop rotation. There exists, in addition, tithe files for each tithe
district, which contain replies to a printed questionnaire, which in turn
had been sent to all tithe payers before commutation. The files have not
been consulted in the case of Bridge, since "where there was an Agreement

between the parties, the files are not likely to contain very much Of interest“ (34)
A fuller picture of farming in Bridge demands the consultation of other doc-
umentary sources, such as probate inventories, or estate records which contain
farming accounts or leases stipulating husbandry covenants.
APPENDIX AND MAP RELATING TO APPORTIONMENTS IN BRIDGE
AND PATRIXBOURNE

Landowner Occupier N3. Name and description State of Quantity

of lands and premises cultivation a. r. p.
Garner Boyack Y7 House and Garden " " 39
Harriet Alexander
(Heirs of)
Garner Wilson Y8 House and Garden " " 13
Harriet William
(Heirs of) V
Fissenden Paul Y13 House and Garden " " 9
Peter Samuel
Conyngham Denne \_ Y15 Bridge Field Arable 7 2 4
Marchioness of George
Conyngham Brice Y16 The Park Pasture 4 2 19
Marchioness of Richard
Fissenden Himself Y17 — Pasture " 3 28
Peter
Fissenden Price James Y18 Four Houses and Gardens " 1 4
Peter and Others
Fage Himself Y24 - Pasture 1 3 4
William
Beckingham Horn Y44 Bourn Paddock Pasture 39 2 8
Louisa Henry
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Landowner Occupier L. Name and descri tion .

of lands and gremsies cultivation a, I-, p,
Hardeman Horton John Y49 Two Houses and Gardens " " 16
William and another
Hardeman Goodman Y53 Four Cottages and Gardens " " 11
William Thomas and

others
Tritton Williams Y6O Two Houses and Gardens " " 20
Ann William
Tritton Duckett Y61 Houses and Gardens " " 28
Ann Thomas
Neal May Thomas Y62 Five Cottages and Gardens " " 33
James and Four
others
Barham Richardson Y63 Bridge Farm Homestead " 3 19
Rev. Richard James
Barham Richardson Y64 Two Acre Meadow Pasture 1 3 15
Rev. Richard James
Hodges Himself Y65 House and Premises " " 3
Charles
Foord Lawrence Y67 Four Cottages and Gardens " " 15
Thomas John and
others
Colegate Himself and Y68 House, Yard and Premises " " 39
Frederic Dyason John
Fagé Eaden Edward Y69 Two Cottages and Gardens " " 11
Sarah and another
Marsh Callard Y7O House and Garden " " 15
Richard Thomas
Keiler Hooker Y72 House and Garden " " 8
Maria Daniel
Sicard Herself and Y73 Two Houses and Gardens " 1 11
Mary another
Gambrill Himself Y76 House and Garden " " 16
William
Guardians Themselves Y92 Union Spot Arable " 3 25
of Bridge
Union
Guardians Themselves Y93 Union House — 1 1 15
of Bridge
Union

Barham Richardson Y95 Two and a Half Acres Pasture 2 2 12
Rev. Richard James

landowner
Barham
Rev. Richard

Barham
Rev. Richard

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Beckingham
Iouisa

Beckingham
Iouisa

Beckingham
Iouisa

Beckingham
Iouisa

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Patrixbourne

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conyngham
Marchioness of

Conynghwm
Marchioness of

Occupier

Richardson
James

Richardson
James

Brice
Richard

Brice
Richard

Brice
Richard

Rutter Ann
and others

Steed
John

Steed
John

Steed
John

Herself

Brice
Richard

Hopper
William
and another

Brice
Richard

Brice
Richard

Herself

No.

Y96

Y97

Y102

Y103

Y104

Y105

Y106

Y107

Y109

Y11O

Y111
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Name and descrigtion
of lands and gremises

Union Fields

Stour Meadow

Bridge Place Meadow

Bridge Place

The Slip

Two Cottages and

Dog Kennel Meadow

Dog Kennel Meadow

Dog Kennel Meadow

Bourn Hop Ground

Bridge Place Pasture

X63(E) Cottages and

X78

X79

X81

Part of Bifrons Park

Soothouse Meadow

Mill Plantation

State of
cultivation

Arable
Pasture
Pasture
Homestead
Pasture
Gardens
Pasture
Pasture
Pasture
Hops

Pasture

Gardens

Pasture
Pasture

Plantation

Quantity
a. r. p.
5 1 31
2 3 27
9 1 1
1 2 9
” 3 30
" 2 16
3 1 57
1 " 30
3 1 3
17 5 "
6 5 20
" 1 12
12 2 6
3 " 11
5 " 20

14
15
16
17
18

(19)

E32’?
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FOOTNOTES

George F. Bosworth, Counpy Geographies: Kent (Cambridge, 1909), 67
J. Thirsk, "The Content and Sources of English Agrarian History after

1500", The A ricultural Histor Review, III (1955), 77

Tithes were of three kinds: (i) predial, on agricultural crops,

(ii) mixed, on the increase of farm stock, and (iii) personal, from mills
and factories. The Tithe Commutation Act of 1836 related mainly to
predial tithes.

A rector may have been a bishop, prioress, monastery, nunnery or college.
H.C. Prince, "The Tithe Surveys of the Mid Nineteenth Century",

The Agpicultural Histopy Review, VII (1959), 15

Apportionments and maps are extant for almost all of the tithe districts
of Kent. 862,638 acres, or 86.8% of the surface area of the county,

at the time of the tithe surveys, were subject to tithes. In all but
one parish (Goodnestone-next-Wingham) the use and extent of tithe

free land are described in the Kent tithe surveys. This means that

in total, they contain a record of the ownership, occupiers and use

of 974,706 acres of land, amounting to 98.1% of the surface area of
Kent c 1840, according to R.J.P. Kain, “The Tithe Commutation Surveys”,
Archaelo ia Cantiana, LXXXIX (1974), 104-105.

Gilbert Slater, The Epglish Peasantpy and the Enclosure of Common Fields
(1907), 189

Prince op. cit., 15

The Secretary of the Tithe Redemption Commission, "The Records of the
Tithe Redemption Office", The Journal of the Societ of Archivists, I
(1957), 132

Tithes converted to fixed annual moneypayments. A modus was not
strictly equivalent to a tithe payment, which varied from year to

year, according to the amount and value of farm produce.

Kain, op. cit., 102

Until the Tithe Act of 1891, payment of rentcharge was the occupiers
liability.

Prince, op. cit., 17. The amount of corn rent was to be obtained by
dividing £100 of tithes into three equal portions of £33 6s 8d, cal-
culating how much wheat, barley and oats could be brought with each
portion, and multiplying these quantities by the average price in
succeeding years.

Kain, op. cit., 106

Ibid., 102

I5id., 117

Prince, 0 . cit., 14

Jacob Mills Davey, 43, St. George's St. is listed as an Auctioneer or
Appraiser (also a Broker) in Sta leton and Co's To 0 a hical Histo
and Directopy of Canterbppy (1838), 15. Also on p. 29 as a Surveyor.
In many parishes landowners tried to save themselves some of the cost
of a new survey by presenting Assistant Commissioners with maps drawn
originally for other purposes, such as poor law assessment. Unsealed
maps consequently constitute a very mixed collection, and the only

way in which accuracy could be proved was by selecting lines on a

map and measuring them on the ground, but Tithe Commissioners could

neither meet the costs of such operations nor impose the necessary
expenses on the responsible parties.

Kain, op. cit., 113

Providing details of the area of the parish, the area subject to

tithes, indicating how much was devoted to arable, meadow, wood, pasture
or hops. Also included are the names of the tithe owners and
Commissioners and the gross rent.
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Kentish Sources: Aspects of gggiculture and Industry (Maidstone, 1961),1
Gardens and market gardens were not clearly distinguished in the main
part of the schedule.

R.J.P. Kain, "Tithe Surveys and the Study of land Occupation", Egg

Local Historian, XII (2) (1976), 88

Pi 0t and Co's Ro al National and Comercial Directo

1840 .
D. Harvey, "Fruit Growing in Kent in the Nineteenth Century", in ed. M.

Roake and J. Whyman, Essays in Kentish History (1973), 224
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III: BRIDGE: AS PORTRAYED BY CENSUS MATERIAL 1851-1871:
AN INTRODUCTION

Mrs. Zofia Wells

The material used for this and for the next three chapters has been

drawn from the census enumerators’ schedules for 1851, (1) l861 (2) and 1871 (3).

They were compiled from census forms which had been issued to every householder
for completion on a specific census night, which was in 1851, March 31st; in
1861, April 8th; in 1871, April 3rd. The resulting schedules are open to
public inspection after a lapse of 100 years. The returns for Bridge exist

on microfilm in the Beaney Library in Canterbury. Before 1851 the information
contained on these sheets is of limited value, so that the 1841 schedules,
which have not been consulted for this study, listed names, approximate ages,
sex, professions, trades, employed or of independent means, and where born:

in the same county, or in Scotland, Ireland, or foreign parts. Subsequently
for 1851, 1861 and 1871 the following headings were used:

1. Road,Street and name of house, but for 1851 and 1861 these details
are incomplete, with only Petts Bottom, Bridge Hill and Bridge Village
being specified.

2. The number of houses and whether they were inhabited, uninhabited
or under construction.

3. The name and surname of each person residing within each household.
4. Relationship to head of family. A

5. Whether married, single or widowed.

6. Age.

7. Rank, profession or occupation.

83 Where born.

9. Disability.

Apart from a few inevitable difficulties such as unaccustomed hand-
writing or doubtful spelling it proved relatively easy to transcribe these
details either on to individual cards or foolscap sheets. The main areas of
historical analysis cover family and household size and structure, age
structure, occupational structure, and origins by birth. The trends and
problems encountered within each of these separate areas are examined in
some detail in the next three chapters. Only a few general problems are
raised in this introductory chapter.

Although each official census enumerated village and town populations
with a high degree of accuracy, incentives for evasion still remained because
of fears of taxation or other state interference in family or personal life.
Inevitably some inaccuracies arose because of ignorance or uncertainty on
the part of both enumerators and householders, whose standards of literacy
were not always very high. (4) Precise ages were not always given for women
or for the elderly and infants. (5) Instances have been cited for some
communities where some children are missing altogether, but there is little
possibility of this omission occurring in a small community such as Bridge.
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Other difficulties arise because census statistics relate to one
specific night in every ten years. Only those persons who were resident
in households or institutions on the census night were recorded, so that
it will never be known how many people were absent on that particular
night. Even a few absentees in a small community can affect calculations
of family and household size, with parents or children possibly visiting
relations elsewhere. Similarly occupational analysis can likewise be
affected, particularly since the numbers within each category were
invariably low in a small village.

Despite these problems census material represents a rich source
of historical information and from analysing successive schedules changing
patterns of community structure and life can be traced.

FOOTNOTES
1. P.R.O. 974/H.o. 107/1623.
2. P.R.O. R.G. 9/518.

3. P.R.O. R.G. 10/965.

4. A. Rogers, Approaches to Local History (2nd. Ed., 1977), 37.
5. ibid., 38.
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IV: BRIDGE: AS PORTRAYED BY CENSUS MATERIAL 1851-1871:
FAMILY STRUCTURE AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Miss K.S.E. Chandler

INTRODUCTION

Census data from 1851 to 1871 provides an interesting insight into the.
structure and composition of households in Bridge. From this source the local
historian can calculate the average number of children, servants, lodgers
and relatives to be found in each household. Also revealed is the type of
;family which could support these various categories of people. Furthermore,
it is possible to assess such general trends as changing family size, or the
wealth of the village community, as measured by the number of servants which
it could support. Lodgers and visitors indicate family and social contacts
with the world outside Bridge. Hopefully from the censuses which were.
conducted between 1851 and 1871 a reasonable picture of household and family
life in Bridge can be built up.

In order to analyse the household unit in any meaningful way, it is
necessary to break it down into more manageable categories. Households can
be distinguished from families which in turn subdivide into the nuclear and
extended family. A nuclear family includes only parents and children whereas
an extended family contains other relatives, such as grandparents or maiden
aunts. All families constitute households which may or may not include
servants, lodgers and visitors.

THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

Nearly all household units living in Victorian Bridge were nuclear

families of parents and children. Single member households or households

of brothers and sisters, have been excluded from this analysis of the nuclear
family. As childless families their inclusion lowers the average number of
children per family. This represents no more than a minor adjustment since

such families were few in number and never formed more than 5.4% of the total
number of households. Having dealt with this anomalous group, the average

size of the nuclear family can be calculated for each year of the census, paying
particular attention to children who were an important element in the population
and family structure of mid—nineteenth century Bridge.

Over the years 1851 to 1871 Bridge experienced a rise in population, which
was associated with an increasing number of households and a larger size of
nuclear family, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1 1851 1861 1871
Total population 625 727 790
Number of households 134 148 167
Average size of nuclear family 3.88 3.93 4.03

Such trends were nationwide. In Bridge itself the number of parents per
nuclear family remained fairly constant at about 1.77. An average of two
parents for all households would not be obtained on account of single parent
families, as and when one parent had died or had chosen to live elsewhere.

Table 2 shows how the number of children per nuclear family rose to a peak
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of 2.25 in 1871. This and other figures do not confirm the general impression

Table 2
1851 1861 1871
Average number of parents per
nuclear family 1.84 1.77 1.78
Average number of children per
nuclear family 2.04 2.16 2.25
Average number of children per
nuclear family (excluding 2.86 3 3.17

childless nuclear families)

that Victorian families were very large since when all the childless families
are excluded from any calculations, the mean for 1871 did not rise above 3.17.
Bridge was by no means unusual in having relatively small families. Indeed,
generally the impression of large families is somewhat erroneous, as noted

by several writers, including Dr. Armstrong, in his social study of York

over the first half of the nineteenth century. (1)

Moving away from general trends, numbers of children per family can be
related to the ages of parents and to the occupations of heads of households.
Some families were childless. Table 3 touches on childless nuclear families,

Table 3 Childless nuclear families
Number Percentage of nuclear families
1851 31 28.9%
1861 40 27.8%
1871 46 ' 29 %

which in total increased between 1851 and 1871 while remaining fairly constant
at about 28% of all nuclear families. Table 4 shows that 45% of childless
families occurred where the head of the household was sixty years or over.
It would be wrong however, to suppose that such families had never raised

Table 4 Childless families where the head of the household was 60 years +
Number Percentage of childless families
1851 20 54%
1861 13 32.5%
1871 23 50%

children, since in many cases their sons and daughters would have left home
already either to get married or to find employment elsewhere. That this was
so is evident from comparing families over the three census years. During
the two decades falling between 1851 and 1871 some children moved away to set
up their own homes both in Bridge and elsewhere.

Childless families also occurred, where the head of the household was
either a widow or widower. The significance of this fact is illustrated in

Table 5. Inevitably there is some overlap between the figures portrayed in
Table 5 Childless families where the head of the household was widowed
Number Percentage of childless families
1851 8 21.8%
1861 9 22.5%

1871 6 13%
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Tables 4 and 5 in the sense that many widowed parents had passed their

sixtieth birthday. At least a proportion of both groups would have experienced
children leaving home. No doubt some children had moved away as and when it
became more difficult for their mothers or fathers to support them. A majority
of the remaining families with no children had heads of households who were

in their late fifties or twenties and early thirties, in which case either
their families had grown up, or the couple had recently married. Yet there
were also examples of couples in their prime of life who had no children,
possibly because family limitation was being exercised. From the census
statistics it can be seen that a larger proportion of landed and skilled
trading families had none or fewer children, and certainly they were among
those social groups who were the first to benefit from the spread of birth
control techniques. Additionally there were examples of very mobile couples,
who were not tied to one locality by any necessity to raise children.
Childlessness would also arise where one of the parents was infertile or

where a parent had a 'living—in' job as a domestic servant.

Family size varied from one household to another in Victorian Bridge.
Although there were large families of four or more children they comprised
no more than one quarter of the nuclear families. In another sense, however,
this 25% was highly significant, because it accounted for nearly 61% of the
total number of children in the village averaged at over the 1850s, 1860s
and 1870s, which is clearly a considerable proportion. The details are
set out statistically in Table 6.

Table 6 Children in families of 4 + children
Number Percentage of all children
1851 149 56.7%
1861 179 57 %
1871 245 69 %

An even higher average percentage than 61% would have resulted had some
families not sent their children away to become ‘living-in‘ servants at an
early age. Children from large labouring and agricultural families were
the most likely to leave home early. Labourers and agricultural workers
headed a considerable proportion of the larger families of Bridge between
1851 and 1871. They were least likely to be in a good financial position to
support large numbers of children. Census figures, with respect to large
families can underestimate the total number of children having been born
into such families, with parents being capable of having more children, and
with some children having died in infancy or having gone into domestic
service or apprenticeship outside the family home.

It was because agricultural labourers formed the largest single
occupation in Bridge, that in terms of sheer numbers they featured so
strongly in the category of larger families. Their predominance in this
respect was such that they did not feature so frequently with respect to
smaller families. Low incomes for them did not act as a restraint on
family size, even though they were not totally ignorant of birth control
methods. Table 7 relates specifically to the size of agricultural labouring
families. In 1871 one agricultural labourer supported ten children. Some
of the families of other labouring men were well in excess of four or five
children, so that the 1851 census revealed a journeyman miller with 8 children
and a gardener with nine children. In 1871 a gardener's wife supported eight
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Table 7 Agricultural labourers‘ families with 4 + children
Number % of families with 4 + children
4 children 1851 — 4 28.6% 1861 — 8 66.7% 1871 — 6 30%
5 children 7 70% 2 28.6% 7 54%
6 children 2 50% 6 60% 6 75%
7 children 2 50% 2 70% 2 50%

children, possibly in a single parent family since there was no reference to
her husband. All these families with more than seven children were associated
with labouring occupations. None of them represented affluent tradesmen or
craftsmen, who would have been better placed financially to support such

large families.

It was one of the contradictions of Victorian England that those who could
least afford to support large families often had most children. Conditions
were of course healthier in the countryside, as one factor among others helping
to reduce death and in particular infant mortality rates. Compared to the
nineteenth century, children today are more expensive to support in terms of
food, clothing and education, and their dependence on parents can extend over
twenty years, during which time they contribute little or nothing to the family
income. Very different was the position in the nineteenth century when
children were looked upon as an investment for old age. Children who were
born into labouring families in Bridge in or before 1851 would be expected,
at quite an early age, to seek gainful employment, so as to earn money and
increase the wealth of the family unit. Depending on how long they stayed in
the house, they might support their parents in old age. Bearing such facts
in mind, it is hardly surprising to discover that it was the labouring classes
who, on the whole, had the largest families.

, From studies of particular families it is possible to find out at what
intervals parents were having children. There were seven children in the
Philpott family for instance in 1861. They were aged seventeen, fifteen,
fourteen, twelve, eight, six and two. Assuming that Mr. and Mrs. Philpott
had their first children during their first year of marriage, which was

quite usual, then they would have been aged thirty and twenty—two respectively
when they were married. Mrs. Phil ott, on the evidence of surviving children,
had given birth to a child almost every other year, with three years repre-
senting the longest period without a new baby being born. Such a gap might
have resulted from family planning or from a baby having died at birth or
early infancy, at a time when infant mortality was extremely high. The
Philpotts in terms of the number and spacing of births were typical of many
families throughout England and Wales in the middle of the nineteenth century.

while the census from 1841 onwards provides accurate figures on the

number of children living at home, it does not directly indicate the possibility
that quite young children were employed and living elsewhere as servants.

This can be shown to have happened, however, by comparing surnames as between
families residing in Bridge with domestic servants living in other households,
looking also at such additional evidence as date and place of birth. There

were servants employed in Bridge who had been born into particular families.

In 1861, for instance, eleven servants possessed identical surnames to Bridge
families, seven of whom were children of Bridge families. The other four
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being somewhat older were related in some other way to families living in
the village. In 1861 Ca tain Winter, a retired army officer, employed a
16 year old loc§TTy\_E5?HBgirl:\_Elizabeth Griggs as a housemaid, who very
likely was the daughter of Mr. Griggs, the village blacksmith. Not only
had all his children been born in Bridge but the census for that year
reveals a suitable gap in the ages of his other children, at 19, 13, 11,
8, 5 and 2 into which the girl would have fitted. Another similar example
concerned a twenty—three year old, Mary Austin, who had been born in Lydd,
and who was one of two daughters of a forty—two year old widow, Mrs. Austin.
The latter's second daughter aged twenty had also been born in Lydd.
Possibly the eldest sister had no alternative but to go out to work, since
her mother was a widow, with no occupation, she could not afford to have

a twenty—three year old dependent on her hands. In the case of older
servants, they were often the unmarried brothers and sisters of families
who were living in Bridge, while in the specific case of Mr. Vinson

who at 58 was employed as a butcher by Mrs. Gregory, he was probably
married to Mrs. Vinson who was living elsewhere in the village with her
two children./ A close examination of census data shows that the total
size of any family could differ from an enumerated family unit, as it
included only those members who were actually living in the household at
the time.

In concluding this section on nuclear families in Bridge, while the
number of children to families increased very slightly, at no time between
1851 and 1871 did the average number of people in this basic household unit
rise much above the level of four. Families exceeding this norm were
limited largely to the labouring classes. It has been emphasised that the
children enumerated in households were those living at home. Over this
twenty year period some children inevitably left the family home to reside
elsewhere. Family size varied according to the differing age of parents
so that those who were aged thirty had experienced less opportunity to have
as many children as at the age of forty. Commonly children were born at
regular intervals every year or every other year, yet Table 8 shows that
there was no consistent correlation between family size and father's age.
If anything families increased in size as father's age diminished. Whilst
each census yields plenty of statistics there are few positive clues as to
how and why they appear as they did.

Table 8 Average age of fathers with respect to family size
1851 1861 1871
3 children 46.1 yr. 47.1 yr. 54.5 yr.
4 children 48.6 44 44
5 children ' 43.4 42 46.9
6 children 35.5 46 44
7 children 41 45 43

THE EXTENDED FAMILY

The nuclear family broadens out into the extended family as and when
other relatives were living in the same household. It is commonly asserted
that prior to industrialization the patriarchal family predominated in
rural society, and was "marked by strong ties between the generations,

living together or proximately in a state of stable self sufficiency." (2)
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Industrialization, on the other hand, introduced the transient unstable family.
Victorian Bridge existed in a rural setting and was in no sense an industrialized
community like many towns or villages in the Midlands. However the village was
modernising and changing its character to some extent during this period and it
displayed little evidence of a patriarchal system. Table 9 shows that between 1851

and 1871 the number of relatives per 100 households never exceeded 7.7.

Table 9 Number of relatives per 100 households
1851 5.6
1861 7.7
1871 7.08

Table 10 illustrates how extended families as a proportion of households never
exceeded 27%. Family relatives were not concentrated in just a few households
but were spread very thinly amongst several families in Bridge.

Table 10 Extended Families
Number % of all househo"is
1851 24 17.9%
1861 34 22.9%
1871 43 27.2%

Table 11 reveals that of all extended families in 1851, 70% had only one
relative living with them. The percentages for 1861 and 1871 were higher
still. Of the remaining relatives the majority were to be found in groups
of two or three and in only one exceptional instance in 1861 was there a
family containing six other relatives, namely a daughter-in—law and five
grandchildren. Relatives who were taken into families ranged from grand-
children or parents to aunts—in—law. Only 26% were ”in—laws”, while grand-
children, brothers and sisters comprised the most frequently enumerated
relations residing as members of extended families in Bridge.

Table 11 Households with only one relative
Number % of extended families "
1851 17 70.8%
1861 25 73.5%
1871 35 81.4%

Families who had relations living with them were commonly headed by

skilled or semi-skilled men and contained few children, as is shown in

Table 12. It mattered little how poor the head of the household was since
in 1851 a widowed pauper of seventy—two had her widowed daughter—in—law and
three grandchildren staying with her. Trading as a grocer in Bridge in 1861,
Mr. Davis at the age of twenty—eight was married with no children but he had

Table 12 The number of children in extended families
1851 1861 1871 TOTAL

0 children 2 2 4 8
1 Child 1 3 3 7
2 children 2 1 1 4
3 children 1 0 0 1
4 children 1 1 O 2
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living with him his mother, a sister and a nephew, and so he had a typically
extended family. Generally speaking the extended family was not a common
phenomenon in Bridge and between 1851 and 1871 had mostly only one relation
living with them. As a rule they were not of the poorest kind, the head of
the household often being a labouring man with no children, or a prosperous
craftsman, such as a watchmaker or a wheelwright.

HOUSEHOLDS WITH DOMESTIC SERVANTS

Only some nuclear and extended families could afford to employ domestic
servants who from first impressions appear to have constituted an important
group in the village community. Almost 24% of all households in Bridge in
1851 contained servants compared to only 20% in 1861 and 1871, as shown in
Table 13.

Table 13 Households with Servants
Number % of households
1851 32 23.8%
1861 31 20.9%
1871 34 20.3%

Table 14 illustrates how in 1851 servants constituted an important proportion
of the workforce, more so than in 1861 or 1871. The fact that domestic servants
were quite numerous in Bridge might suggest a fairly wealthy village, for
people who maintained servants paid them wages and had to feed and house them\_
In the matter of affording or employing resident domestic servants there were
several limiting factors. Of those Bridge households who could afford servants,
well over 50% employed no more than one servant during the 1850s and 1860s as
Table 15 demonstrates. In some households the servants employed were actually
relatives of the family, such as brothers or sisters who paid for their food
and lodging by working in the house. A substantial proportion of the servants
who were employed were both young and unskilled, for which reasons they were
only paid low wages. It was only a minority of wealthy households who could
afford more than one domestic servant. Taking these limitations into conside-
ration warns against exaggerating the wealth of Bridge from the point of view
of domestic service employment. Even when the number of domestic servants

was at its peak none were being employed in almost 80% of Bridge households.

Table 14 Total Number of Servants
Number % of working population
1851 ' 57 9.12%
1861 60 8.26%
1871 60 7.59%
Table 15 Number of Households with One Servant
Number % of all households with servants
1851 19 59.4%
1861 20 64.5%

1871 17 50%
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The census enumeration schedules indicate the sex, ages, duties and
employers of domestic servants, helping thereby to recreate the social
structure of the servant class. For Bridge 1861 has been selected as a
sample year and several interesting features are revealed, commencing with
a predominance of female domestic servants, who accounted for 41 (68%) out
of 60 servants, who were then being employed in the village. An overwhelming
majority of 52 (or 86.6%) were single. Three of the remaining eight were
widows. Rarely were married people employed as domestic servants and on
contemplating marriage they were expected to leave their position. It is
also not surprising to discover that whereas 35% of the servants were aged
thirty years and over, 45% were twenty years of age or under.

Having determined that the typical servant in Victorian Bridge was

female, single and under the age of twenty, who in 1861 were the employers

of domestic servants? Heads of households who employed only one servant
varied from agricultural labourers to men of independent means. A single
servant was engaged at a general level to perform all manner of work. Heads
of households who employed two or more servants were invariably of independent
means, owned land or were professional men, successful tradesmen or clergymen
and army officers. In 1861 of five families who employed two servants a

piece all fall into one of the above categories, as is shown in Table 16.

Table 16 Families employing 2 servants in 1861

LANSBERRY — a landholder

EYERS — a publican

BARTER — a butcher

HORNSBY — a licensed Victualler
SICARD — a surgeon

Table 17 illustrates how only two households employed three servants, who
very likely assisted with the running of the business, while living with
the families who employed them. Three families employed four servants.

Table 17 Families employing 3 servants in 1861

COLLINS — a farmer of 318 acres
MUTTON — a brewer

They were headed by a curate and two gentlemen of independent means, as
enumerated in Table 18.

Table 18 Families employing 4 servants in 1861
ALDWORTH - curate
EDLING — tenure landholder
HAMMOND - fundholder

C

Throughout the twenty years falling between 1851 and 1871 there were
only seven households with more than four domestic servants, three of which
concerned the same families, one of whom was a widow, landed proprietor and
fundholder, Mrs. Gregory, who had engaged between seven and eight. Other
heads of households who employed more than four servants included a farmer,

a retired Army Captain, a landowner and a trainer of racehorses, two of whose
servants were apprentices.
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For many families, servants were clearly a great luxury and as such
were confined to the more prosperous households in Bridge. As and when
more than four servants were employed, substantial incomes or wealth were
implied. Mrs. Gregory stood among the very wealthy families who could
afford to engage servants for particular tasks. Her butler had overall
charge of all the servants and waited upon the mistress of the house at
the dining table. Her food was prepared for her by a resident cock. She
employed a lady's maid to superintend her wardrobe, while a governess was
responsible for the children's education and general upbringing. These
were all specialized tasks which involved some responsibility, as opposed
to the kitchen maid, the footman, the groom, the housemaid, the page and
the gardener, whose duties were more menial and less specialized. Single
servants in less well off households functioned as general servants or
‘housekeepers’, whose responsibilities could range from house work to
opening the front door. As a general rule the wealthier a household the
more servants and the greater the division of labour it could afford.

A person who was employed solely to be a cock, was more experienced and

specialized than a general servant or kitchen maid. Some tradesmen also
employed servants for tasks which were specific to their own trades, so

that Mr. Eyers who was an innkeeper in 1861 employed a stable boy and a

coachman.

Since the majority of servants were employed in tasks of a general
nature, requiring no great skills, they were employed from within Bridge or
its environs, whereas cooks or governesses might be sought from further
afield and by such means as advertizing in the provincial or national press.
Table 19 shows how in 1861 55% of the domestic servants working in Bridge
had been born either in or within five miles of the village. 23% had been

Table 19 The Origins of servants working in Bridge in 1861
Number % of servants
Born in Bridge 7 11.7%
Born within 5 miles 26 43.3%
Born in Kent 14 23.3%
Born outside Kent 13 21.7%

born elsewhere in Kent while almost 22% had been born outside the county.

The latter fact cannot wholly be explained by the bringing in of skilled

or specialized servants, since there were insufficient large households

to employ them. Partly the answer to this problem lies in wealthy families
who had moved about the country taking their servants with them. In 1861

for instance the curate, Mr. Aldworth, was an Irishman who had married a
Scottish wife. They had four servants, two of whom had been born in Scotland
and one in Sussex. Also in 1861 Mrs. Gregory who herself had been born in
Cheshire, employed in her large household two Lancashire born servants.

While domestic servants in total, formed an important part of the
labour force in Bridge from 1851 to 1871, only a few households could afford
to employ domestic servants as in most other villages and towns.

HOUSEHOLDS WITH LODGERS

Lodgers were often at the opposite extreme from domestic servants as
yet another component of Victorian households for many were 'contractural
borders‘ (3). At no time did they represent a significant proportion of
the total population of Bridge remaining fairly constant about 3%, as shown
in Table 20. Table 21 further shows how only in 1861 did families in
Bridge offering accommodation to lodgers approach 13.5%, although 1861,

Table 20 Numbers of Lodgers
Number % of the population
1851 20 3.2%
1861 36 4.4%
1871 24 3.03%

compared to 1851 and 1871 was an exceptional year. (4) All these percentages\_
were considerably lower than the 21.3% which Dr. Armstrong calculates for
York in 1851. (5) Lodgers although few in number are worthy of study,
particularly with respect to their occupations and who took them in. The
average Bridge lodger of 1861 was a male. Indeed, 92% were men, and there
were only three female lodgers, two of whom were widows, the third being

a fourteen year old boarding scholar. Thirty or 83.3% of the lodgers were
single, 11% were widowed, and two were married. As to occupations, most
were labourers or semi—skilled working men and significantly the occupation
of the head of the household often corresponded to that of his lodgers,
suggesting thereby that he was their employer. On the other hand, this

was not always the case, so that in 1861 the curate of Bridge and the Clerk
to the Guardians were also lodgers. Almost inevitably most of the lodgers
had migrated into the area. So that for 1861, Table 22 reveals how only

Table 21 Households with Lodgers
Number % of the population
1851 11 8.2% \_
1861 20 13.5%
1871 15 8.9%
Table 22 Origins of Lodgers in 1861
Number \_ % of lodgers
Bridge 2 5.5%
From within 5 miles 9 25%
From Kent 7 19.4%
Elsewhere 18 50%

two lodgers (5.5%) had originated from Bridge, whilst 50% had been born
outside Kent in counties as far away as Derbyshire, Hampshire or Suffolk.

The typical lodger residing in Bridge between 1851 and 1871 was male,
single, working in an unskilled or semi—skilled job and employed sometimes
by the head of the household in which he was living. There remains however the
question who took in lodgers and why? Often they resided with families who
were at the bottom end of the income ladder who accepted lodgers to eke out a
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basic living. As and when families took in lodgers, but had no children of
their own to support they were employing spare accommodation of theirs to
bring in more money. In 1861 of twenty people who accommodated lodgers,
seven had no children and six families had one. It is clear that families
with few children whose heads were often in their late fifties or sixties,
decided to take someone in if only to make full use of the family cottage
and to supplement the family income, which would be declining anyhow as old
age reduced the main breadwinner's earning power. Widows commonly accommo-
dated lodgers to provide extra income, or to support their children. Over
the three census years under consideration there was not one landed family
or household of independant means who took in a lodger. Finally and usually
there was only one lodger per household and it was only in 1861 that as
many as seven instances of lodgers residing in groups of three occurred, as
shown in Table 23. '

Table 23 Number of lodgers per household and % per total
number of lodgers
1851 1861 1871
1 Lodger 5 45.5% 11 55% 10 71.4%
2 Lodgers 5 45.5% 2 10% 2 14.3%
3 Lodgers 1 9% 7 35% 2 14.3%

At that time there was a sudden upsurge in the employment of bricklayers,
carpenters and others in the building trade, for whom accommodation had to
be found in the village. The next chapter explains how this situation arose
from the restoration of Bridge Church coupled with the construction of the
London, Chatham and Dover railway between Canterbury and Dover.

HOUSEHOLDS WITH VISITORS

Possible visitors staying in the village on the day when the census
was taken constitute the final component of households, as enumerated between
1851 and 1871. They represented not only a very tiny part of the total
population but according to Table 24 very few households were entertaining
visitors either in 1851, 1861 or 1871.

Table 24 I Number of Visitors Number of Households with Visitors
Number % of total population Number % of households
1851 11 3.9% 10 7.5%
1861 11 1.5% 10 6.8%
1871 7 0.9% 7 4.2%

An unknown number of unrecorded Bridge residents would also have been visitors
elsewhere when the census was taken. Most of the visitors to Bridge were

single or widowed females so that in 1861, for instance there were eleven
visitors staying in Bridge, eight of whom were single women and a further two
were widows. The solitary male visitor at that time was a commercial traveller
in woollen cloth who had been born in Ramsgate.

It is impossible to determine for what reasons these people were visiting
Bridge. The majority were no doubt purely visitors who were paying social
calls or visiting relatives. There are no clues as to how long they stayed.
One of the 1851 visitors was probably the father of the head of the household
where he was staying. Another was an eleven year old scholar, born in Dover
who was receiving education in Bridge or visiting a friend. Whom and why
people were visiting remain matters of mystery, except that they were either
quite young (under twenty years of age) or quite elderly and predominantly
they were women who were unlikely to be gainfully occupied and as such were
genuine visitors, rather than paying guests.

THE AGE STRUCTURE OF VICTORIAN BRIDGE

Each successive census between 1841 and 1871 yields interesting and
valuable information on the age structure of Victorian towns and villages.
Comparisons over this period show whether a community on average was growing
older or younger. Also revealed are numbers and proportions of those who
were either too old or too young to support themselves. “or Bridge Table 25
shows how between 1851 and 1871 the percentage of the population, which was
60 years of age and over increases from 10.6% to 12.2% thereby indicating a
very small rise in the number of older people who, if not still employed,
were ageing dependants living in the village. A tendency towards longevity
resulted from diatory, medical and environmental improvements which were
nationwide'and which helped likewise to reduce infant and child mortality,
so that the proportion of 0-15 year olds, also rose from 35.7% to almost 40%.

Table 25 The Age Structure of the Population of Bridge
the number and % of the total population
1851 1861 1871

60 + 68 10.6% 88 12.5% 92 12.2%

16-59 330 52.8% 367 50.5% 382 48.3%
0-15 223 35.7% 272 37.4% 316 39.9%

0- 5 95 15.2% 106 14.6% 112 14.2%
6-15 128 20.5% 126 22.8% 204 25.8%

The reason for more children in the village resulted also from an increasing
birth rate, yet there was a proportionate fall by 1% in the number of children
five years or under set beside a 5% rise in the number of 6 to 15 year olds.
While Bridge witnessed between 1851 and 1871 an increase in its youngest and
oldest members there was a proportionate decline in its largely working
population composed of those who were aged from 16 to 59, from 52.8% to 48.3%.

It is possible that such a shift in the age structure of the community
reduced the productive wealth of the village because of an increasing number
of dependants set against a declining proportion of working people who were
called upon to support them. On the other hand, there were more births and
people were living longer, which could be indicative of greater prosperity.
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CONCLUSION

Such an apparent contradiction in the interpretation of census data
provides but one illustration of the problems which face a local historian,
who tries to draw any meaningful conclusions from series of statistics, as
presented by the censuses of 1851, 1861 and 1871. The census material
cannot be faulted for the abundance of accuracy of its statistics from which
many general conclusions and trends can be determined. The major problem
is that of interpreting the causes and effects of such trends which really
cannot be done without recourse to other historical sources such as family
papers, business records, newspapers or trade directories.

This chapter has sought to highlight some of the uses and conclusions
which can be drawn from census material but limitations have also come to
light. Census data relating to the years 1851 to 1871 reveal information
about the numbers, sizes and structure of families and households. Parents
and children were joined by domestic servants, lodgers and visitors, but
the picture is not always complete and nor is it possible to state precisely
how prosperous Bridge was as a village community during this period. The
information to be obtained is basically statistical as shown in the tables
and appendices to the chapter. Further information on family life which
adds flesh to the statistical skeleton provided must be sought elsewhere.

N
.
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The Distribution of Children in Families

number and % of the total Eonulation

Number of Children

l-‘
O(D®'\lO3Ul.b0l[\)v-‘O

Occugations of fathers with 4 + children in 1861

1

28.2%
16.2%
21.2%
10.6%
8.5%

5%

7%
2.9%
0.7%

1851 186
37 28.7% 40
26 20.1% 23
20 15.5% 30
16 12.4% 15
14 10.9% 12
10 7.8% 7

2 1.6% 10
2 1.6% 4
1 0.8% 1
1 0.8% O
O 0

Agricultural Labourer (17)

Army Officer
Baker
Blacksmith
Brewer's servant
Bricklayer
Butcher (2)
Farmer

Gardener (2)
Labourer

Landed Proprietor

Laundress

Miller's Journeyman

Saddler
Woodsman

46
38
16
10
20

i-‘O|—‘-5&0

1871

29.1%
24.1%

'10.1%

6.3%
12.7%
8.2%
5.7%
2.5%
0.6%

0.6%

Relatives Residing in Extended Families

Father

Mother

Brother

Sister

Aunt

Niece

Nephew

Cousin
Grandchildren
Son—in—law
Daughter—in—law
Sister—in-law
Brother—in—law
Mother—in—law

Father—in-law
Aunt—in—law

1851 1861
2 2 1
0 4

1 3

3 8

0 1

5 3

O 4

3 0

7 11

2 0

1 4

1 3

3 1

2 4

1 1

2 ,0

1871

1
2
6
5
1
4
5
2
20
2
2
2
1
4
0
0

TOTAL
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The Occupations of Heads of Extended Families, 1861

Agricultural Labourer
Annuitant

Builder

Carpenter

Carrier

Collector of Parish Rates
Fund Holder

Grocer

Licenced Victualler
Major General (retired)
Matcher

Pauper

Servant

Watchmaker

Widow

Wheelwright

Woodsman

The Occupations of Heads of Households employing Servants
Occupation

Agricultural Labourer
Army Captain

Baker

Brewer

Butcher

Carpenter

Commander

Curate

Draper

Farmer

Fund holder & landed proprietor
Independant

Licensed Victualler
Major General

Surgeon

Trainer of Racehorses

Number of Households

H
H H H b H O m H N H H H N H # M

Occupations of Lodgers 1861

Agricultural Labourer (11) Dressmaker
Annuitant Excavator (2)
Blacksmith Farm Servant

Gardener (2)
Harness Maker's Assistant

Brewer's servant
Bricklayer (4)

Brickmaker (3) Independant
Butcher's Labourer Labourer (4)
Carpenter (9) Nurse

Charwoman Police Constable
Clerk to the Guardians Servant

Curate Waggoner (3)

Widow
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7. Occugations of those taking in Lodgers

Agricultural Labourers (10)
Beer Retailer
Brewer

Brewer's Assistant
Builder

Butcher

Butcher's Labourer
Carpenter (2)
Carrier

Chemist

Gardener (2)

Groom

Laundress

Nurse

School Mistress
Servant

Shepherd (2)
Shoemaker

Tailor

Victualler (3)
Waggoner
Washerwoman
Wheelwright

Widow (7)

FOOTNOTES

All references relating to the census material on Bridge are to
be noted as follows:—

for 1851 — P R.O. 974/H.O.107/1623
for 1861 - P.R.O. R.G. 9/518
for 1871 — P.R.0. R.G. 10/965

(1) Alan Armstrong, Stabilitx and Change in an English Countx Town :

A Social Study of York, 1801-51 (1974), 176.

(2) Ibid., 175.

(3) Ibid., 180.

(4) See the next chapter, pages 45-46.

(5) Armstrong, oE.cit., 180.
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V: BRIDGE : AS PORTRAYED BY CENSUS MATERIAL 1851-1871:
OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE

Mrs. Zofia Wells

Any analysis of occupational structure from census data is restricted
by the niture of the material which is available. Comparisons with other
historical sources, such as trade directories or tithe Apportionents,
reveal inconsistencies and omissions. Certain limitations inherent in the
way the information was obtained can affect the statistics and conclusions
which are to be drawn from census material, and yet this observation applies
equally to nineteenth century trade directories. (1) It was heads of house-
holds who described occupations as stated in the census, even though one
man for whom a specific calling was enumerated may have followed several
occupations. The occupation given must be presumed to have been his main
job, but also there is no means of knowing whether an individual was
unemployed as opposed to being in full or part time employment at the time.
It is perhaps best assumed that all those for whom occupations were given
were also in employment on the night of the census. However, there were
some adults and adolescents who, being listed without occupations, may have
been permanently or temporarily unemployed. One man admitted to being "out
of business” in 1851 and in 1871 there was an "unemployed clerk".

One specific problem associated with the 1841 census where employers
were not clearly distinguished from employees,also arose in subsequent
censuses, despite specific instructions being given to enumerators on how
trades and crafts were to be described. While for 1851 there was a master
blacksmith "employing one man” there were also three other blacksmiths in
the village, including his son. Therefore did he employ his own son and
possibly one of the other blacksmiths? Were the others self-employed, or
could they have been working in another village? Sometimes these questions
can be answered by referring to trade directories, but the latter were not
always contemporary with the census.

Despite these reservations, it is possible to trace some of the occupational

‘changes which characterised Bridge over the twenty years falling between 1851

and 1871, but it must also be emphasised that a complete picture of the
employment patterns and social structure of the village cannot be obtained

from census data alone. Sometimes it is necessary to guess at the specific
status of particular individuals.

Classifying occupations can present great difficulties, particularly
for rural communities where the standard socio-economic groupings applicable
to urban societies are not necessarily relevant. Several researchers in
this field have encountered this problem and each has attempted to solve it
according to his own needs and the type of material used. (2)

Apart from scholars, retired and 'unemployed' persons, occupations have
been categorised into ten groups, plus a miscellaneous section for those who
do not fit into these categories. The ten groups are:

Agriculture

Domestic servants

Crafts and industries serving agriculture
The constructional trades

Food and Drink

Clothing

0

O\U'I-¥>\Nr\)-—-
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Transport
Services, other than domestic

. Professions and Administration
0. Dual occupations

—\kOG7-Q

In some cases this classification is arbitrary and somewhat tentative,
while it can be seen that some gardeners were employed by one family and were
recorded as members of the employers’ household, this conclusion does not
necessarily apply to all enumerated gardeners, some of whom could have been
self employed jobbing gardeners. For simplicity, however, they are all
classed as domestic servants.

By classifying occupations in this way it is easier to detect changes
which occurred within the village economy between 1851 and 1871, although
not everyone necessarily worked in Bridge itself. Bridge farmers employed
less than half the agricultural labourers who were enumerated. In 1851 there
were four farmers, one of whom,having only six acres, employed no labour.

Two employed eight men between them but for the fourth, who was probably
the largest employer, there are no equivalent details. Apart from the
farmers, two agricultural labourers also employed farm servants themselves.
In 1861 twenty—siX men and boys were employed in local agriculture as
against thirty-six in 1871.

The proportion of the total population who were working showed no
significant change between 1851 and 1861 at 37.6% and 38.2% respectively.
However, by 1871 the proportion had fallen sharply to 28.7%. This was a
drop of almost 10% over 10 years. Looking at adult males alone, aged 16 and
over, there was also remarkable consistency between 1851 when 88.65% of all
men were employed as against 88.5% in 1861. Over the next decade there was
an even greater decline to 63.34% in 1871. By contrast the proportion of
women who were employed fluctuated between all three census years, from
11.45% in 1851 to 19.2% in 1861 and to 14.4.,:? in 1871. Throughout the period
women accounted for approximately a quarter of all those employed, but then
there are problems of under-representation in the case dfwomen and children
which will be discussed later. The proportion and absolute numbers of
children who were employed declined sharply from 8.9% in 1851 to 2.8% in
1871 or from 19 in 1851 and 18 in 1861 to only 8 in 1871.

Bridge exhibited a fairly constant proportion of retired people and those
who had private incomes such as annuitants or fundholders, the majority of

whom were widows or spinsters. Retirement applied to retired tradesmen and retired
army and naval officers. The latter numbered two in 1851 and 1861 and three in

1871, but also in 1851 and 1871 Bridge was chosen as a place of residence for
serving army officers, who were presumably stationed in nearby Canterbury.

Retired labourers were often reduced to the status of paupers and were

so entered in the 1851 census, where there were also three female paupers,

one of whom was the widow of an agricultural labourer. All the paupers were
over 60 years of age, the youngest being 61 and the eldest an 81 year old
widow. Out door relief was not necessarily the sole source of income for
paupers, as and where working wives and children were enumerated. Neither did
old age necessarily inhibit continued employment. Nine agricultural labourers
aged 60 and over were employed in 1851, the eldest being 73. There was also
a butcher of 73.

At the other end of the age range were young and working children, so that
in 1851 three ten year old children were employed as farm servants. A nine
year old boy was the youngest employee in 1861 while in 1871 that distinction
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belonged to a servant and to the son of a gardener, who was "employed in the
garden", both of whom were aged 13. The 1867 Royal Commission on the

Employment of Children, Young Persons and Women in Agriculture found that
it was rare for children under

11 years of age to be permanently employed
throughout the year in East Kent but some farmers made it a condition of

The effects of such an irregular work pattern on education were remarked.
upon in the report. Although there were few complaints of entire non-
attendance, "constant employment causes great irregularity”. In 1851 only
64 Bridge children who were under 15 years of age were scholars, of whom
fifteen were under five. In some cases there were whole families of children
aged from two to ten who were entered as scholars. Possibly their mothers
had some kind of employment which was not revealed to the enumerator, which

1851, one of whom may have been running a private school and "minding" the
younger children, even though it was not uncommon for two and three year olds
to be found on the registers of National Schools at this time. By 1861,

when the number of scholars had risen to 99, fifteen were still below the

age of five. Nine years later the 1870 Education Act was passed to ensure
sufficient school places for every child between the ages of five and
fourteen, but there was no compulsion to attend. By 1871 the number of
children at school in Bridge had fallen to 52 which in view of the above

legislation seems surprising, and five of the 52 had yet to attain their
fifth birthday.

Of course not every child in the village would have received their
education at a school, since four governesses were employed in 1861, falling
to one in 1871. Some middle class children were sent away to boarding schools

as they grew older and where this was so they were excluded from the census
returns.

The occupational changes which occurred over the twenty year period

‘covered by the census material were complex, even though there were some

fairly obvious changes, notably a decline in the proportion and absolute
numbers engaged in agriculture and in those crafts serving agriculture,

alongside a growth in what is known today as the tertiary sector of professions,
administration and retailing.

Persons employed in agriculture, as a percentage of total numbers
employed, fell from 58% in 1851 to 32% in 1871, with the lowest point being
reached in 1861 at 28.4%. Transport showed a rise from 0.8% in 1851 to
1.3% in 1871,but the highest point was in 1861 when 2.9% were employed in
transport. The most spectacular irregular movement concerned the construc-
tional industry which employed 18% of the workforce in 1861, as against only
5% in 1851 and 6.6% in 1871. It was this sector which distorted general
trends for it was during 1861 that the Iondon, Chatham and Dover Railway
between Canterbury and Dover was completed, (4) the construction of which
brought additional men to the area and created alternative work for labouring

men who were already living in Bridge. It is very significant that the 1861
population of Bekesbourne was swollen by 125 additional railway labourers. (5)

The effect on Bridge was less dramatic, there being only one railway labourer
plus two navvies and two excavators. But in Bridge there was another buildi
project in progress — namely the repair and rebuilding of the parish church.n%6)

Railway construction and church restoration together had a marked effect on
the numbers employed in the construction industry:

1851 1861 1871

Brick manufacturer 2 4 -
Bricklayer 2 11 1
Carpenter 3 14 5
Labourer 1 11 1
Builder — 1 —
Plumber — 1 2
Plumber's assistant — 1 —
Plumber's apprentice — — 2
Carpenter's apprentice — — 1
Painter 1 1 ~
Excavator — 2 —
Railway labourer — 1 3
Navvy — 2 -
TOTAL 9 49 15

Significantly, as noted in the previous chapter, there were seven families
who were accommodating in 1861 three lodgers each. The arrival of these
additional workers helped to sustain several villageserviceswmich were in
competition with the proximity of Canterbury. One example can be found in
the rillage laundry which employed nine women in 1851, thirteen in 1861 but
only four in 1871. The brewing industry prospered to the extent that five
brewers‘ servants were employed in 1861, whereas only two had been.employed
ten years earlier. By 1871 the number had been reduced to three.

In the field of transport there were just two carriers in 1851, but ten
years later this group consisted of three carriers, three waggoners, a
waggoner's mare and an ostler. Enumerated in 1871 were a carrier, a carter
and a turnpike gatekeeper.

One change of a more permanent nature concerned the growth of the middle
classes, who included professional men and people of independent means.
Their increase and wealth meant employment for domestic servants and custom
for shopkeepers. Between 1851 and 1861 the number of domestic servants
increased from 54 to 67, and constituted nearly a quarter of the workforce.
By 1871 their number had declined slightly to 62 but nevertheless this figure
represented a higher proportion of those employed at 27.5%. Not only did
the number of servants increase but their range widened, which suggests for
some people, at least, a higher standard of living. The number of general
servants was at its lowest in 1861, when more specialist and highly paid
servants, particularly men, were most in evidence.

Domestic servants: Male . 1851 1861 1871
House servant 1O 4 4
Gardener 3 7 9
Footman 1 - -
Butler 1 1 1
Coachman 1 3 2
Groom/Gardener - 1 —
Groom - 3 4
Page — 1 —
Stable boy — 1 —
Garden labourer - 1 1

TOTAL \_ 16 22 21
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Domestic servants: Female

Housekeeper
Governess
lady's Maid
Nurse

Cook

Housemaid
General servant
Kitchen maid
Parlour maid
Maid

Nurse-maid
Under—nurse
Cook/Housekeeper
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TOTAL

DJ
CD

45 41

TOTAL ALL SERVANTS 54 67 62

The expansion of the professional and administrative sector was a well
known characteristic of the second half of the nineteenth century, and resulted
partly from a growth of local government. Bridge in addition was becoming an
attractive area of residence for professional people within easy reach of
Canterbury, and so, not surprisingly, a solicitor and a veterinary surgeon
were enumerated in 1871. These considerations also attracted serving and
retired army officers.

Professions and Administrative

1851 1861 1871
Post Mistress —
Assn't. Post Mistress
Doctor
Chemist
Rates Collector
Assn't. Rates Collector -
Clerk to Guardians -
Solicitor —
Curate —
Veterinary Surgeon/Coursing

judge

Army captain 1
Articled clerk
Railway contractor
Civil Engineer
Clergyman
Policeman
Schoolmistress

|\_.:\_.x|
||.\_s|.\_.\\_\

1
2
1
2
1
F)

I
I
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TOTAL 7 14 14
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From the middle of the nineteenth century Bridge experienced a decline
in traditional rural crafts, the number of which had halved by 1871. Between
1851 and 1861 the sawyer and the wattle weaver disappeared, followed by the
wheelwright during the following decade although there remained a wheelwright
cum carpenter, a fairly common combination, even though the specialised skills
of a wheelwright were not possessed by every carpenter.

Crafts and Industries serving Agriculture

1851 1861 1871

Miller 2 2 2
Miller's labourer 1 — -
Journeyman Miller 1 1 —
Saddler 2 1 2
Blacksmith 4 2 4
Wheelwright 3 1 —
Woodsawyer 1 — -
Wattleweaver 1 — —
Blacksmith's Apprentice 1 — —
Blacksmith's Assistant - 1 —
Harnessmaker's Assistant — 1 —
Miller‘s Carter — 1 1
TOTAL 16 1O 9

Trends in village shopping during this period are difficult to analyse
and are probably more accurately traced through trade directories, particu-
larly since some of those enumerated may have been employed in Canterbury
or elswhere. Food and drink retailers, including brewers, who often combined
manufacture with retailing and some other occupation, increased from 20 in
1851 to 21 in 1861 and 1871.

Although numbers employed in victualling remained fairly stable there
was only one brewer in 1861 as against two in 1851. One of the effects of
improved railway communication was to allow larger breweries to extend their
marketing area, so that Bridge by 1871 was included among the retailing outlets
of Shepherd Neame of Faversham. Even in 1851 brewing and/or being a publican
does not seem to have been viable as a single occupation with one brewer
being also a coal-merchant as well as keeping the ‘Plough and Harrow‘, while
the proprietor of the ‘White Horse’ was training racehorses, a business which
expanded under his son's management up to 1871. One brewer employed up to
five brewer's servants in 1861, whereas in 1871 there were only three to an
equivalent number of brewers.

1851 1861 1871
Brewer 2 1 3
Brewer's Servant 2 5 3
licensed Victualler 2 1 2
Publican - 1 -
Innkeeper - — 1
Beer Retailer — - 1
Errand Boy 1 - —

TOTAL 7 8 10 9
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In 1851 Bridge had three butchers who between them employed two labourers
and a journeyman butcher. Only two butchers remained in 1861, one of whom
employed a labourer, while for 1871 there were just two butchers plus a
combined butcher and grocer. The number of bakers fell sharply from four in
1851 to one in 1861 when also there was a combined grocer and baker, and a
baker and carter who between them employed an assistant baker and a boy.

Ten years later in 1871 these combined occupations had disappeared and instead
there were three bakers. Grocers increased in nuber, quite apart from those
who combined grocery with another trade. In 1851 there were two grocers plus
a combined grocer and carpenter. By 1861 two more grocers had appeared, along
with a grocer's assistant who was not listed ten years later. In 1851 Bridge
had a fruiterer and a tea—dealer but they were not enumerated in 1861.

The changing pattern of the clothing and footwear trades was equally
complex. In 1851 Bridge had six boot and shoemakers, three of whom described
themselves as cordwainers. By 1861 the cordwainers had vanished but there
was now a girl 'shoebinder'. Ten years later, however, only two shoemakers
served the needs of the community in 1871. While the village tailor had
retired by 1871 and had not been replaced, dressmaking proved to be a thriving
female occupation, with three dressmakers in 1851, rising to four in 1861 and
1871. Two sempstresses and a shirtmaker appeared only in 1851. Canterbury
was not far away for these services, but other needs of the fashion conscious
ladies of the village were satisfied by two milliners, one of whom in 1861 was
also a dressmaker but in 1871 they were no longer enumerated. Bridge sustained
throughout this period a draper, but his two young assistants, who were brothers

of 16 and 18, appeared only in 1851. Also enumerated were a watchmaker, and
from 1861 a postmistress.

Specifically for 1871 there were certain people whose occupations are

difficult to classify and who may have been working outside the village.

They included a 'matcher', a ‘fly bobsetter', a ‘case merchant’ and a
'matmaker'. By now the horse training establishment founded by Richard Sherrard
senior was in the sole occupation of his son and living in the village were a
jockey, two stable lads and two apprentice lads.

\_ The village of Bridge possessed an economy which was neither static nor
unchanging between 1851 and 1871. Census data over this period reveal
considerable occupational changes. A decline of traditional rural work, both
on the land and in crafts and industries, was countered by the demands of a

growing middle class sector, who employed more domestic servants and were
important consumers of goods and services which were produced and sold in the
village, but how many of Bridge's inhabitants worked in Canterbury or elsewhere
is not known.
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APPENDICES

I. The Employed Pogulation of Bridge.
1851 1861 1871

237 278 227

Emgloxed as a percentage of the total Eopulation

léil léél l§Zl
37.6% 38.2% 28.7%
Independent or Retired
léil l§§l l§\_l
3.65% 3.16% 3.54%

II. The Emglozgent of Men

a) Men emgloxed as a Eercentage of the total gogulation

1851 1861 1871
88.65% 88.5% 65.34%
(164) (208) (140)

III. Percentage of emgloxed in eleven different categories

jfﬁzl 1861 1871
Agriculture 38.3 28.4 32.4
Domestic Service 23.2 24.0 27.5
Crafts 6.75 3.5 3.25
Construction 5.0 18.0 6.6
Food and Drink 8.0 7.5 9.3
Clothing 6.75 4.3 3.0
Transport 0.8 2.9 1.3
Services 5.9 5.4 2.2
Professions and
Administration 2.5 4.6 7.0
Dual Occupations 1.6 0.35 0.4
Miscellaneous 1.2 1.05 7.01
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IV. Emploxment of Women
a) Women as a Eercentage of the workforce

1851 1861 1871
25.8 25.0 25.5

b) Working Women as a gercentage of all women

1851 1861 1871

11.45% 19.2% 14.4%
C) The Percentage of Women emgloxed in eleven different categories

1851 1861 1871
Agriculture 1.5 O 0
Crafts 0 0 0
Construction 0 0 0
Clothing 9.2 9.7 6.66
Transport 0 0 0
Services 100 100 80
Prof. and Admin. 28 30 4 42
Domestic Service 61.5 62.5 68.3
Dual Occupations O 0 0
Miscellaneous 0 O 0

V. The Emgloxment of Children
a) The Eercentage of all children emgloxed

1851 1861 1871

8.9% 6.25% 2.8%
b) The Percentage of children employed in eleven different categories

1851 1861 1871
Agriculture 10.64 8.86 0
Domestic Service 9.25 7.46 11.29
Crafts 0 0 0
Construction 0 4.0 0
Food and Drink 10.0 9.5 0
Clothing 6.6 O 0
Transport 0 0 0
Services 7.14 6.66 0
Prof. and Admin. 0 0 0
Dual 0 0 0
Miscellaneous 0 0 8.55
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c) The Ages of Children Emgloyed

Age 1851 1861 18 1

9 - 1 -
1o 5 - —
11 — — —
2 3 1 -
13 5 4 3
14 3 4 2
15 5 8 3

TOTAL 19 18 8

d) The gercentage of Children at School
1851 1861 1871

30 36 1655

FOOTNOTES:

All references relating to the census material on Bridge are to be noted
as follows:

1851 — P.R.O. 97 4/HO 107/1623
1861 — P.R.O. R.G. 9/518
1871 — P.R.O. R.G. 10/965

(1) Trade Directories and how they portrayed the history and life of Bridge
are examined in Chapter VII.

(2) A. Rogers, Agproaches to Local History (2nd edition, 1977), 99-102
(3) Re ort of Mr. Geoffre Stanho e to the Commissioners on the Em lo ent \_

of Children Yo Persons and Women in A riculture, Volume XIII 11868—9),o—7.
(4) F.W. Jessup, Kent History Illustrated (2nd edition, Maidstone, 1973), 53.

(5) G.S. Minchin, "Table of Population 1801-1921” in Ed. w. Page,
The Victorian History of the County of Kent Volume III (1932),321

(6) Kelly's Comercial Directory of the County of Kent (1882), 68.
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VI:BRIDGE 2 AS PORTRAYED BY CENSUS MATERIAL 1851-1871:
THE ORIGINS BY BIRTH OF ITS INHABITANTS

Martin Morris

INTRODUCTION

Some valuable information can be obtained from Victorian census enumerators'

books concerning the origins of Bridge's population, especially for the years
1851, 1861 and 1871, even though it was the 1841 Census which recorded for the
first time the origins of individual villagers, as to whether each individual
had been born in the same county as his place of residence, or whether in
"Scotland, Ireland, or Foreign Parts". Commencing with the 1851 Census the
information provided was more specifically actual places of birth, so as to
present an almost complete record of origins by birth of the inhabitants of

Bridge.

This chapter is the last of three which from looking at the census
returns of 1851, 1861 and 1871 illustrate family and household structure and
means of living whether by profession trade employment or independent means,
passing on now to the origins by birth of Bridge residents.

The ‘where born‘ or birthplace columns of the census enumerators' books
for Bridge for 1851, 1861 and 1871 (1) show to what extent its inhabitants had
been born there as opposed to the surrounding area or places further afield.
It might be argued from returns which show a high percentage of residents born
in Bridge that the village was a self contained and perhaps inward looking
community. Other chapters indicate, however, that this village, close to
Canterbury, was not wholly agricultural, such that all of its inhabitants
would have been born at least in the surrounding area if not in the parish
itself. Bridge had a fairly diversified economy and so could be expected to
attract as inhabitants people who had been born elsewhere.

In compiling this chapter several problems have arisen. How does the
local historian devise a meaningful classification for the places of birth of
the inhabitants of Bridge? One very clear distinction is between those born
in Bridge itself as opposed to other areas such as “within five miles“. Five
miles was a comfortable distance to walk there and back in a day. Beyond five
miles it is logical to think in terms of East Kent as an area east of a line
starting from the Isle of Sheppey southwards through Faversham to Ashford and
then south—east skirting Romney Marsh so as to meet Kent's southern coast of
Hythe. Further afield lay the Weald and West Kent, the Home Counties, and
elsewhere, which could extend to all parts of England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland
or Foreign countries. These distinctions so far as Kent is concerned are
illustrated by a map.

The more specific problems which arose during the research stage of this
project were associated particularly with illegible handwriting on the part
of the Census Enumerator, coupled with poor microfilm reproduction, which called
inevitably for some assumptions and guesswork. Some columns were even left
blank!
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OVERALL TRENDS

Although pages of pure statistics can prove boring, it is necessary at
least to state that in 1851 224 Bridge residents had been born in the parish
which figure rose to 272 in 1861 and then rose again to 277 in 1871. Absolute
figures however can be misleading, so that the percentage of the population
born in Bridge actually fell between 1861 and 1871. These trends are shown
in the following table which also indicates ever decreasing numbers and
proportions born with ever increasing distances from the village.

TABLE I : NUMBERS BORN WITHIN EACH AREA IN THE CENSUSES OF 1851, 1861 and 1871

L51 1\_8.5\_1 EE

Bridge 224 36.1% 272 37.4% 277 35%
Within 5 miles 191 30.8% 221 30.4% 212 26.8%
East Kent 136 21.9% 122 16.8% 189 24%
West Kent and 37 6 % 67 9.2% 66 8.4%
Home Counties

Elsewhere 32 5.2% 45 6.2% 46 5.8%

TOTAL 620 100% 727 100% 790 100%

The information portrayed in this table is illustrated more graphically in the
three circular diagrams on the following pages.

Mobility of population must not be exaggerated in so far as a clear
majority of Bridge residents had been born within the parish or within a five
mile radius, amounting to well over 60% between 1851 and 1871. Distances
travelled for purposes of residence or employment were more limited in the
nineteenth century than they are today. In 1861 67.8% of the inhabitants of
Bridge had been born either in the village or within five miles of it. East
Kent as a whole was primarily agricultural. Most migrants into Bridge were
attracted from this area and Table II shows how over 85% of the inhabitants
of the village had been born in East Kent, including Bridge and its immediate
five mile radius. In none of the census years had more than sixteen per cent
of the inhabitants of Bridge been born outside this immediate area.

TABLE II : NUMBERS BORN WITHIN EAST KENT

Absolute Numbers Percentage of Total

1851 551 88.8%
1861 615 84.6%
1871 678 85.8%
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BRIDGE: 1851 CENSUS
BIRTHPLACE OF INHABITANTS

Bridge 36.1%

within five
miles 30.8%

East Kent
21.9%

BRIDGE: 1861 CENSUS
BIRTHPLACE OF INHABITANTS

Bridge 37.h%

Else-
where 6.2%

W.Kent and

within five
miles 30.h%

BRIDGE: 1871 CENSUS
BIRTHPLACE or INHABITANTS

Bridge 35%

within five
miles 26.8%

East Kent
2h%
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Females more than males were more likely to originate from far
away places, which can be shown both in absolute and percentage terms,
and yet higher proportions of females were born in Bridge in all age
groups except those who were working between the ages of 15 and 59.
Concerning working men there was a relative abundance of males of working
age. Trends such as these suggest higher occupational mobility among
females compared to males. Female employment in domestic service was
one reason for this situation, which also meant that some aspiring
husbands soughtspouses from well beyond the parochial limits of Victorian
Bridge.

The extent to which specific birthplaces can be identified within
five miles of Bridge itself is shown in Table III and the two maps at
the end of this chapter, which list many places which would feature in
local conversations in Bridge today, such as Canterbury, Bekesbourne,
Bishopsbourne, Barham, Patrixbourne, Lower and Upper Hardres‘ and
Littlebourne.

TABLE III : LIST OF BIHTHPLACHS NOTED IN THE CENSUSES WITHIN FIVE MILES

0 ii‘ URI DGE

18 1

K
,.\_x
1-’
(D
0”‘
F4

7 10
18 2O
14 21
22

Adisham
Barham
Bekesbourne
Bishopsbourne
Blean
Canterbury
Chartham
Denton
Fordwich
Goodnestone
Harbledown
Ickham
Littlebourne
Lower Hardres
Kingston
Nackington
Nonington
Patrixbourne 1
Petham

Sturry

A Thanington

Upper Hardres 1
Waltham

West Beer

West well

Wingham

Wickhambreaux

womenswold
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TOTAL 191 221 212

Bekesbourne, Bishopsbourne, Canterbury and Patriybourne feature prominently
in the table, and the Canterbury figures are interesting for showing that
not all Victorian migration by any means was from rural to urban areas,
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but equally the close proximity of Bridge to Canterbury must not be
overlooked. is between 1851 and 1871 migrants rose significantly

from Adisham, Barham, Bekesbourne, Canterbury, Nackington and Petham,

but declined noticeably from Bishopsbourne, Chartham, Harbledown,

Lower and Upper Hardres, Littlebourne, Kingston and Qturry. Migrational
movements were two way as can be seen by comparing the 1861 and 1871
figures against those for 1851 in the specific instances of Bekesbourne,
Goodnestone, Patrixbourne and Petham.

A surprising increase in the numbers originating from the rest of
East Kent is revealed in the 1871 census returns which perhaps is to
be attributed to a greater mobility of workers within this agricultural
region. Persons originating from West Kent or the Home Counties were
very much in a minority, and yet places such as Croydon, London, Chelsea,
Woolwich, Greenwich and Middlesex were well represented, although more
so in the later than earlier census years.

A few foreign birthplaces were also recorded for Bridge throughout the
mid nineteenth century; for instance, the West Indies, in all three census
years, suggesting previous military, naval or commercial connections with
that part of the world. So far as the United Kingdom was concerned,
Bridge residents had been born in several different counties, as well as
in Scotland or Wales. Victorian Bridge had a population which was in no
sense isolated from outside influences and inward migration. However,
it was also the case that most of the people in the village between 1851 and
1871 had been born there or in some other part of East Kent.

FOOTNOTES

1. All references throughout this text relating to census material on
Bridge are to be noted as follows:

For 1851 — P.R.O. 974/H.O. 107/1623
For 1861 - P.R.O. R.G. 9/518
For 1871 - P.R.O. R.G. 10/965

The census enumerators' books are on microfilm in the Beaney Institute
in Canterbury.

57.

VII:BRIDGE AS RECORDED IN TRADE DIRECTORIES, l8§2-1882.
Brian Phillips

TRADE DIRECTORIES: THEIR ORIGIN, NATURE AND HISTORICAL VALUE

Directories are essentially lists of people and businesses, of which
the most familiar variety encountered today is the telephone directory.
Their purpose is to aid contacts.

"Directories are, by nature and origin, instruments of
commerce. Like roads, railways and the telegraph, they
are a means of communication, essential to extensive trade
relations and a wide market and they were compiled to meet
the commercial needs of easy and rapid intercourse between
buyer and seller". (1)

Some publications catered for a special need, such as the police
directories of Walsall in 1813 and Newcastle—under—Lyme in 1836 (2).
The first known directory was published in 1677: A Collection of the
Names of the Merchants Living In and About the City of London: Printed by
Samuel Lee. It pre—dated the first European directory by fourteen years
and was concerned solely with the wholesale trade (3).

In the later eighteenth century directories began to appear outside
the capital. Sadler's compilation covering Hampshire, of 1784, is the
earliest known county directory. This outward spread reflects an
enlargement of market areas, for which informal personal contacts are
becoming inadequate. Their emphasis now turned towards a developing
retail trade, providing greater information on shops and other local
amenities for a more mobile population whose settlement patterns were
changing. The spread of the holiday habit and the development of
new resorts in particular created an urgent need for such information
amongst resident visitors who were unfamiliar with the area in which
they were staying (4).

Purely court directories, listing residents of "quality" only, .
were rare outside London until the later nineteenth century. Increased
use of mail services was another stimulus to the production of directories,
if only because the number of undelivered letters rose and their intended
recipients had to be traced. Many directories were compiled by or with
the help of postmen. In 1836, Frederic Kelly's famous link with the
Post Office began, as shown by the title of his firmfs directories(5).

By l8l4, when the first of Pigot's general directories came out,
there existed already a class of professional directory publishers,
employing skilled agents to collect information. As the century
progressed, Kelly's successive publications eliminated rivals from
the market. High standards of accuracy were aimed at in the business,
though entertaining stories of rogue publishers abound. John Machoull
of Worthing, who brought out a local directory in l8ll and volumes of
memoirs in 1809 and 1822, came from a family with an appalling criminal
record. His mother, nicknamed W Gunpowder",was adept at stealing pewter
pots from inns. His three sisters were thieves, while his brother
Benjamin had been hanged for stealing a watch. Another brother, James,
was also a petty thief and suspected of murder. He was tried for robbing
the Paisley Bank at Glasgow of £20,000, condemned to death\_and reprieved
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but died in jail soon afterwards. Machoull himself was a forger and
kept a disreputable lodging—house in London, whence he retired to the
Sussex coast c.1810, to keep up complaints that he was being persecuted! (6)

In similar vein, the preface of another directory lamented the
harmful effects of "...narrow—minded and unprincipled comment of certain

individuals in the trade (making use of journals)... to propagate the
grossest misstatement and cowardly innuendoes..." (7)

Illustrated at this stage is a complete mid-nineteenth-century
entry for the village of Bridge.

— ' “

3331363 derives its name from its situation in a valley and a north transept or chancel, in the centre of the north
on the Roman and modern road to Dover, at a bridge of the aisle. The living is a perpetual curnc annexed
over I feeder of the Stour. It is in the hundred of Bridge to Pntrixbonrne Vicarage, joint annual value ' ' , in tho
and Pethnm, and union oi’ Bridge lathe of St. Augustine, ntrona re oi‘ the Dowager Morchioness of Cunyn him; the
Canterbury county court district, l0Ct.'S8 and orchdeacoary, ev. Jo in Stevenson, .\i.A., is the incumbent. here is n
Bridge deonery, 3 miles south of Canterbury, with a po ula- N ational school, and a Literary and Scientiﬁc Institution for
tlon in 1861.0! 804, and nnaren of 1,101 acres. The nlon Bridge and Patrlxbourna. In the neighbourhood are several
wot-l':houue contained 241 inmates out oi this. number. The gentlemen‘: seats.

church of St. Peter consists of three aisles, a. high chancel, Pzrsrnocas in half a mile west; Ronwell, 1 north-west.

rntvnn nnsxnnxrs. cmuxzncxan. Jarvis Ann (Mm), butcher
Aldworth Rev. Ht. Ledger. u.A Adams George, farmer Kelseﬁ George, farmer
Bo at-it Mrs Banks Robert Young, llnendraper K rig t Geo: , shoemaker
Ed ‘in; Mr! Barter John, butcher Lawrence Jo , grocer
Elgar Mrs Cuiegnte Richd. builder 5: wiieelwright Marsh James, farmer
’}‘rv~:r Mr. Thomas Collard Thomas, tailor Martin John, 5. ,.-let-
Gr-.-gory Mrs Collins John, farmer, Pettltouse farm Moss Alfred, grocer 6: baker
Jar-sin . Ir. Henry Davis J ohn, grocer Mutton Richard, ale 3; porter brewer,
Jarvis Mrs Datnall W ilham, brickmaker wholesale 5: retail
Johnson Mrs Byers Joseph, Red Lion Sayer William, plumber Sc glnzier
Kin . ord Rev. Brenchley, :r.A.[cnrnte Fa Thomas, blacksmith Sher:-nrd Richard, postmaster
o Bisho bourne] 1-‘inc William boot 6: shoe maker Sicard Amelius, surgeon
La 1-. - Freer Fanny (hiss), seminary Steed John, gvtzier
Martin 1- Fryer George, miller Thomas James, chemist
Pittock Thomas, esq Hardeman William, watchmaker Sc Verrier William Curling, plumber 6;
Pratt Lieut. David went to the Kent ﬁre &-. life oiiice hop bag nnuinfacturer
Smith Rev. Xsaac [curate H ges Cliarlcs, butcher Wells Richard, master of National sch!
Stevenson Rev.John,x.A. incumbent], Homans ii iiiiam, builder 5: registrar of White Thomas, boot Sc shoe maker
Patrixhourue births, tleaths 8: marriages White William, farmer
Winter Capt. Charles HornsbyCharlesFortescue, WIn‘teHorse Williams Daniel, ngrocer
Huntep Gilbert, farmer Wills Richard, bu

P051 OPPIC\_Ba-Rlcllnrd Sherrard receiver. Letters from Registrar of Births, Deaths;-Mar7iages,Vl’m. Hotnans.
London Irnve from Canterbury by mail cart at 7 Mn. National School, Richard Wells, master; Mrs. Sophia,
6: dispatched at 8 p.m. The nearest money order oﬂice Sayer mistress
is at Lnnterbury Um'u\_n 'li'r=rjxa3zse,\_James Betts, master

"zr,\*::,:‘;.".\*;.:\*;;:\*.t'.‘:nm.,. Torth °'.‘i.'.ii’.3-W ’° °““'\*'‘’“'’ “ ”°'°' P“ “W

Source: Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1859), 468.

It has been selected from one of several trade directories which have
been consulted for this chapter. It helps to set the scene for the
later 1850's by offering a general description of Bridge as a parochial
community. Considered in isolation it represents no more than a static
picture for 1859. Similar and sometimes fuller and more historical
accounts can be gleaned from guidebooks, histories and almanacs. (8)

Of equal or greater informative value are the lists of "private
residents" and those in commerce and trades which follow the opening
descriptive and topographical paragraphs. This format or arrangement
of entry remained unchanged throughout the period covered by this
chapter and was equally applicable to other towns and villages throughout
the country.

The historial value of trade directories with particular reference
to Sussex has recently been assessed as follows by John Farrant.

"For the social historian they can indicate the internal
structures of communities; for the economic historian the
relative and changing importance of occupations and industries
may be revealed....In few instances are directories undoubtedly
better in quality of information than other sources: census
enumerators' tallies are more comprehensive and probably more

59.

accurate in identifying individuals; rate books can be much
more preferable for discovering the distribution of occupa-
t1°nS3 and so on. But directories have the indisputable
advantage of being printed and published books, collectively
covering most parts of England, with some localities recorded
at yearly intervals over long periods." (9)

Professor Hoskins draws attention to how they "give us a good start
for reconstructing the kind of community which existed over a period
of about a hundred years from the 1830's to the 1930's". (10)

Many a scholar who is honest with himself will appreciate the
limitations of the source more than its advantages. Thematic studies
involving several different places perhaps fare better from directories
than general surveys of any one locality. One particularly good
comparative investigation of this kind exists in Professor Everitt's
study of carriers‘ services in Leicestershire. (11) Relatively few
writers have based their research largely on the evidence of directories. (12)
More commonly historians have used them in conjunction with other evidence
in examining family names, (13) local government and politics (14) tram
and bus services, (15) education for children and adults, (16) or the
extent of Nonconformist and Roman Catholic worship. (17)

SOME LIMITATIONS OF DIRECTORIES AS THEY RELATE TO BRIDGE

Seventeen directories, all covering either Kent or the Home Counties,
have been examined. They are listed in Appendix I together with the
relevant page numbers, and all references in this chapter to trade direct-
ory years relate to these entries, unless otherwise stated. Such
succeeding entries as for 1839 and 1840 (Pigot and Co.), 1851 and 1852
(Post Office) and 1874 and 1875 (also Post Office) proved to be completely
identical. Clearly it was a common practice to repeat entries on a
year-by—year basis, but also to be noted are the different details given
for 1866 (Post Office) and 1867 (Harrod), which demonstrate varying
standards between firms even at close points in time. Twelve of the

. seventeen directories were published by Kelly, the exceptions being those

of 1839 and 1840 (Pigot), 1847 (Bagshaw),1858 (Melville and 1867 (Harrod).
Short—term variations in entries may reflect the reliability or interests of
publishers rather than actual social or occupational changes. Pigot

alone chose not to list farmers. It is well known that various methods of
compiling directories were adopted, involving personal visits, circulars,
advertisements, or extraction from other lists or directories. (18)

One glaring error must suffice as an example of carelessness. John

Steed. recorded as a "grazier" by Kelly between 1845 and 1859, appears as
a"grocer" in Melville's directory of 1858. People's names were, however,
the greatest victims of mutilation, or misrepresentation.

Another major weakness of directories arises from the selective
nature of their resident and commercial lists. "Private residents", as
they were termed from 1859 onwards, varied in total from about six in
1839 (19) to 34 in 1882. The number of commercial names varied less,
from between 27 in 1839 to 38 in 1845 and 1870. Professional men
such as surgeons or clergymen often appeared in both sections. (20)

As far as the population is concerned the directories show that Bridge
had 543 inhabitants in 1831 (21) compared to 941 in 1871, (22) but it is
to the census that one must turn for-grea&z'demographic detail as shown
in three earlier chapters. (23) While the Victorian census was all-
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embracing, directory entries for Bridge did not list even ten per
cent of the population. Directories were chiefly consulted by the

middle and trading classes, who sought the names and addresses of
local gentlemen, spinsters or widows of independent means, such
social equals as clergymen or officers in the services, as well as
the heads of professional,trading or business firms. Domestic
servants, employees, or labourers, who comprised a majority of the
population, had no place in such works of reference, but conversely,
the comprehensive census schedules did not always reveal the true

status of a person within many an occupational category.

Altogether, approximately 250 differently named people, appeared

in the directory lists between 1859 and 1882. Much uncertainty

arises however from listing people with similar but slightly different
names, such as William Verrier, plumber, who appeared in 1859 and

1847, and William Curling Verrier, plumber and hop bagging manufacturer,
who was recorded from 1851 onwards. The latter was probably one and
the same person or could be the son of the original William Verrier.

The members of the Wye family in charge of the National School in 1874 -
Robert Wye, Mrs. Mary Wye and Miss Ellen Wye - are separated by only a
few years from Robert Wye, Mrs. Susan Emmeline Wye and Miss Fanny Wye,
as listed in 1878 and 1882.

To some extent the historian is forced to make assumptions
concerning family relationships, including whether people bearing the
same surname are in fact, relatives. One possibility is that the
Wyes appear as an extended family, Miss Wye being Robert's sister
or Mrs. Wye being his mother, in the absence of other information.

SOM GENERAL FEATURES OF BRIDGE

Factual discrepancies between the directories are revealed for
such seemingly indisputable matters as the population and acreage of
Bridge. The population in 1841 was given as 817 by Bagshaw (1847)
as against 632 by Kelly (1851); for 1851, Melville (1858) recorded
804, which surely must be a clerical error since Kelly (1855) had

‘recorded it as being 864; for 1861 the population was variously

800 or 895. (24) There is general agreement that Bridge parish
covered 1161 acres, though acreages of 1169 and 1280 were recorded
also. (25)

Other basic facts which were diligently reported in virtually
every directory included the numerous ecclesiastical and civil
administrative districts in which Bridge was located, however archaic
they had become. Only Melville's five economical sentences in 1858
omitted these particulars, though two of them informed the reader that
the spiritual living was a perpetual.curacy and that the Wesleyans
possessed a place of worship. One year later, in 1859, this latter
fact received no mention, possibly because editorial space was required
for other pieces of information, notably the first mention in that same
year of a local Literary and Scientific Institution for Bridge and
Patrixbourne, together with the Canterbury County Court district. In
1862 the existence of the Canterbury police district was first noted.

The development and increasing complexity of local government
is a strong theme in these directory entries, commencing with the Poor
Law Union which took its name from Bridge. Over the years more and more
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of its officials were listed, along with the parishes contained within

the Union from 1862. From 1870 appeared statements of its rateable value
and gross estimated rental. All these particulars were given in voluminous
detail for 1882. The creation and operation of the Union and its workhouse
are examined in a subsequent chapter. (26)

The allocation of space to describing the parish church, which would
have interested those readers for whom directories were designed, did not
diminish through time, as can be seen from the 1867 and 1882 entries.
Despite such preoccupations other economic and social features or develop-
ments did not pass unnoticed. - Gas lightingin Bridge was first mentioned
in 1862, while from 1874 the Bridge Gas, Coke and Coal Co., Ltd., was
included in the commercial section. Mindful perhaps of the agricultural
interest, the 1870 directory was the first to state that the local soil
was chalky and that the chief crops were wheat, barley and oats, with hops
being added to these details in 1882. Improvements in postal services
were effected to the extent of two daily collections by 1878 and two
deliveries by 1882, while money order, telegraph and savings bank facilities
at Bridge Post Office had appeared as early as 1874.

Some indication perhaps of the prosperity of the village, patchy
in coverage over time is revealed by fiscal valuations. The Property
Tax assessment in 1842 was £5,655, while subsequent rateable values
rose from £2,957 in 1847 to £5,067 in 1870 and 1878 and to £5,517 in 1882.

THE PRIVATE RESIDENTS OF BRIDGE

The people listed under this heading were described as "Gentry"
before 1859, such as Mrs. Beasley and T. Pittock, esq., in 1851. The
size of this more exclusive social category increased during the period,
from at least half—a-dozen in 1859 (27) to 11 during the 1840's and 1850's,
to between 15 and 17 during the 1860's, to 21 in 1870, to 25 in 1878,
accelerating thereafter to reach 54 by 1882. What appears to be a
sustained rise concealed, however, some fluctuations among specific
groups within the elite of Victorian Bridge.

From 1845 there were normally two or three officers, falling to

‘one only in 1866 and 1867. Their numerical strength having recovered

to five in 1870, then declined before reaching six in 1882. Clergymen
were most numerous in 1859 when four were listed including the incumbent,
the Rev. John Stevenson, who lived at Patrixbourne. Earlier in that
decade none had been recorded. There were also seven widows in 1859.

A subsequent reduction in their number was reversed so that there were
again seven in 1878, and eight in 1882. Spinsters were not recorded
before 1866 and thereafter were never more than three in 1878. Males
other than officers and clergymen rarely constituted more than half of

the private residents, and in 1855, 1858, and most of all 1859 were
surprisingly few in number, yet there were many in 1878 and 1882 Q2 and 17),
even though their relative importance had not increased. This development
and increase in the number of resident widows were chiefly responsible for
the higher numbers of private residents towards the end of the period

The directories suggest that social upward mobility within the
village was restricted. Few people managed to get transferred from
the commercial to the private entries and when this did occur it is

possible that a namesake may have irrupted on to the scene. Mrs. Boyac
who ran a private ladies‘ school, "crossed" between 1858 and 1859, (28)
but then Conducting a private school was a perfectly respectable
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occupation. Other instances included George Kelsey, a farmer,
between 1867 and l878; Joseph Eyers, who managed the Rgg\_Lign,
livery stables and a carriage business between 1870 and 1874; and
Edward Gibbs, the brewer, during the same period. The only villager
to be listed in 1839 and 1882, William Sayer, a plumber, also achieved
private resident status. -

THE BUSINESS COMUNITY IN BRIDGE

Some idea of the commercial life of Bridge is obtained from the
commercial lists., An alphabetical list of trades and the numbers
engaged in each constitute Appendix II to this chapter. Such data
fail, however, to portray a full picture of the village‘s economic
activity. A mere counting of trades reveals absolutely nothing about
the relative sizes of such business enterprises, in terms of capital or
numbers of staff employed. There is also no hint as to their turnover
or profitability, all of which are essential prerequisites for serious
business history. Though certain calculations are set out below, they
are not to be regarded as authoritative in any respect. They are merely
suggested trends. Assuming that “entered trades are comparable then
increasing numbers suggest an expanding village economy.

The basic information that can be extracted with a minimum of
controversy concerns the range of occupations, showing which ones
endured, which vanished and which emerged. It can be seen that bakers,
a blacksmith, boot and shoemakers, a brickmaker, one or two builders,
butchers, farmers, grocers, inns, a linen draper, a miller, plumbers,

a saddler, a surgeon, a tailor and a watchmaker were permanently repres-
ented. Only some of these trades were represented by more than one
enterprise for serving the daily needs of the village. Other fairly
persistent trades included a brewer (up to l874), a chemist, one or two
glaziers during the 1850's and l860's, one or two private schools, and ,
one or two wheelwrights. At least one general shopkeeper was listed
regularly from l866 onwards, there having been three in l845 and one in
1847. Regularly listed towards the end of the period were one or two
beer retailers, one or two carriage proprietors, one or two carriers,

a coal merchant, one or two insurance agents and one or two livery
stables.

O—-‘T
Trades which died out tended to be crafts, notably a basket and
sieve maker, a farrier, a harness maker, a linen manufacturer (displaced
by the linen draper), a straw hat maker and a hop bag manufacturer.
Rather isolated and short-lived were a broker, a commercial traveller,

a jeweller, a manure agent, a marine—stores dealer, a rent collector, ‘\
a tin—plate worker and a toy dealer, whose presence was not vital to

the local economy. Intermittent entries included a bricklayer, a
carpenter, a grazier, one or two greengrocers, one or two painters and I
an undertaker, while from 1878 the village possessed a veterinary
surgeon. The function of "dealer" was performed under three different
labels at three different times by three different people, viz.: "dealer
in sundries" (1839), "general dealer" (1870) and "provision dealer" (1882).
The first two were possibly close to being unspecified "shopkeepers".

Trades appearing relatively late often performed specialist services,
such as a contractor, a decorator, a plasterer, and the veterinary surgeon.
The agricultural interest between 1878 and 1882 was represented by a
resident landowner and one or two hop growers. Farmers were included
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throughout, with the single exception of 1839 (Pigot), this particular
omission having been noted already. Between three and five farmers
were listed from 1845 to 1858 rising to a steady six between 1859 and
1867, falling to five between 1870 and 1878 and dropping back to four
in 1882 as in 1845. Fluctuations in the number of farmers did not
necessarily indicate changes in agriculture, or farm size, particularly
since farm acreages varied and extended across parish boundaries.

Some trades and occupations were noted intermittently, almost it
seems at the whim of directory compilers. Carpentry, bricklaying, hop-bag
making and painting, when mentioned, were carried on by people who had
other, more enduring occupations, while being a wheelwright or undertaker
in a village the size of Bridge was clearly not a fu1l—time pursuit.

Trades such as these were often combined with building, so thatwilliam
Marshall in 1882 was a builder, wheelwright, contractor and undertaker,
while Joseph Taylor and Sons engaged in bricklaying, plastering, plumbing,
decorating and glazing. Job Lawrence exercised a more unusual combination
in grocery and bricklaying in 1845, 1847, 1858 and during the 1860's, and
may well have combined these occupations in the intervening years when only
his retail business was recorded. A less unusual supplementary activity
for a grocer was to be a baker, as was Daniel Hooker in 1845, followed by
Alfred Moss from 1859. Eight individuals followed more than one occupation
or trade in 1845 and 1867, compared to five in 1878, rising substantially
to twelve in 1882.

The table which follows, summarizes some of the data so far discussed.
Clearly revealed are two apparent "booms" between 1839 and 1845 and between
1878 and 1882, though of course the former may have more to do with the
superior coverage shown by Kelly in 1845 contrasted with Pigot in 1839 or
Bagshaw in 1847. The figures in the first two rows are inflated by
combined trades, such as building, which have been separated for specific
analysis.

1839 1845 1847 1851 1855 1858 1859 1862 1866 1867 1870 1874 1878 1882

No.of trades 22 30 23 23 25 29 25 22 25 25 28 29 32
No.of trades X

Nos.in each 36 48 34 36 38 41 40 37 40 40 43 42 46
Commercial

names 27 38 30 33 34 32 35 31 33 31 38 35 36
Nos. with dual

occupations 5 8 3 3 3 6 5 6 6 8 4 5 5
Family concerns 0 l O O 1 O O O O l 1 1 1

36
54
35

12
2

As between 1839 and 1882 the number of trades specified rose by over 60%
whereas the number of commercial names rose by slightly under 30%, which would

be consistent with a more widespread linking of trades.

By 1882 compared to

earlier decades there were fewer boot and shoemakers, builders, butchers,
farmers and plumbers, whereas the following trades had appeared or strengthened

their position:
stables, surgeons and "shopkeepers".

carriage proprietors, carriers, insurance agents, livery
Many of these changes involved no

more than a plus or minus shift of one, or at most, two, enterprises, with
the total numbers involved being obviously small in a village so close to

and within walking distance of Canterbury.

Apart from farming there were

never more than four names recorded for any one trade at any one time, which is

consistent with an agricultural or rural community.

The next table attempts to portray, in what the author regards as a

novel fashion, the rate of turnover in business management and other changes
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in the occupational structure of Bridge over the period 1859 to 1882.
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The numbensin row A relate to "occupational units", which are defined
as the number of trades inflated by the numbers engaged in each one.
Notable increases occurred between 1839 and 1845 and between 1878 and
1882. It is from information contained in the next five rows, B-F,
that the annual averages shown in rows G—J are calculated, as one way
of compensating for the irregular intervals at which the directories

were published.

Comparing rows G and H, it can be seen that new and disappearing
"occupational units" more or less balanced each other at most times,
with a slight bias in favour of growth. Row I reveals that the handing-
over of a business to another member of the family was most evident in
1855-8, 1867-70, but especially in 1858-9. Row J records other
changes in management which were also greatest in 1958-9, as well as
being notable between 1845 and 1847, between 1867 and 1870 and between
1878 and 1882. Finally, row K shows the percentage of concerns which
remained in the same hands, ranging from a minimum of 35% in 1859-45 to
70% or over in 1845-7, 1851-5, 1859-67 and 1870-8.

Too much stress should not be placed on these calculations and in
particular rows G-K are approximations only. For most of the period under
review different directories displayed different qualities and this fact
must always be remembered. These structures are less applicable, however,
to the years 1878-82. For this span, relatively pure light can be thrown
on change and continuity in the business community of Bridge, as both
directories were produced by the same firm and presumably by that date
techniques for obtaining information were at their most sophisticated

and successful.

Not to be overlooked are the handful of women, seventeen in all,
who appeared in the trading sections. Most of them, like Elizabeth
Collard the tailoress in 1866 or Hannah Dutnall, a brickmaker, in 1874,
were widows who carried on famil businesses. Only the various private
ladies and boarding schools, (29§ which were perhaps superior to
Mrs. Long's beer retailing establishment in 1874, provide clear examples
of female management having nothing to do with family inheritance.

PERIODS OF RESIDENCE OR TRADING IN BRIDGE

The frequency with which every private, official and commercial
name appeared has been calculated, so as to gauge durations of residence
in Bridge between the years 1859 and 1882. The following table shows
that apart from spinsters a solitary entry was the most common for all
social categories, with this fact being slightly less predominant amongst
male traders and male civilian residents. Although seven officials
stayed between six and ten years as against only one who stayed for up
to five years,1onger periods of residence were usually rarer with one
other notable exception in 21 male traders whose business life in
Bridge lasted between 21 and 25 years. Caution is again needed in
interpreting the conclusions owing to the differing reliability of
directories, coupled with ignorance of the forces which were at work
behind such figubes. It is not possible from a directory alone to
say whether disappearances resulted from migration or retirement or
death. It is possible, however, to note that 55 surnames during this
period were borne by more than one person, and to discover or suggest
chronological continuities of residence or trading arising from at least
forty instances of family relationships. This observation, moreover,
can be linked with the high degree of stability in business management
which was noted in the previous section.
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Length of
recorded stay: 1 entry 1-5 yrs. 6-10 11-5 16-20 21-5 26-30 31-5 35-40 40+

MALE TRADERS 49 18 12 11 5 21 5 4 2 1
FEMALE TRADERS 8 4 3 1 1
ALL TRADERS 57 22 15 12 6 21 5 4 2 1
OFFICIALS 12 1 7 2 1 1 1
w1Dows 10 6 4 1 2
SPINSTERS 1 2 1
CLERGY 7 2
OFFICERS 6 3 1 1
CONYNGHAM

FAMILY 2 1
OTHER MALE

RESIDENTS 11 7 8 2 2

:—\_.:——.—j

TOTAL PRlVATE
RESIDENTS 37 18 12 7 5 1

GRAND TOTAL 106 41 34 21 12 22 5 5 3 1

CONCLUSION

The seventeen trade directories which have been examined for this

chapter help to reconstruct the economic life and social structure of Bridge

as a Victorian village community between 1839 and 1882. They suggest that
gentry and professional and trading families managed to thrive over this
forty-year period. This conclusion seems justified despite the variety of
publishers and the different standards which they adopted. Much added
detail is provided for the four years separating 1878 and 1882. These
were years of change. With respect to agriculture, hops appeared along-
side cereals as a major cash crop. There were two hop growers in 1882
instead of one in 1878. The number of farmers dropped from five to four,
while no grazier had been listed since 1859. The number of listed

private residents rose sharply from 25 in 1878 to 34 in 1882, attaining
thereby parity with the number of commercial names. Businessmen who were
involved in more than one trade and the number of "occupational units"

also rose significantly. Finally, there was a rise of almost 10% in
rateable value from £3,067 in 1878, to £3,317 in 1882.

Although trade directories contain much economic and social
detail for the Victorian period, their different approaches, omissions,
faults and whims also reveal as much about the compilation of such works
as about local history.

APPENDIX I

Primary Sources

Pi t and Co's Ro a1 Nat'ona1 and Commercial Director and To o a h
(1839). 235.

Pi t and Co's Ro a1 National and Commercial Directo and To o a h
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S. Bagshaw, Histo Gazetteer and Director of the Count of Kent
(Sheffield, 1847),vo1ume II, 234-5.

Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1851), 260.

Pgst Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1852), 260.

Pgsﬁ Ofﬁigg Directory of the Six Home Counties (1855), 280-1.

Mg1vi]|g ang Cg's Directory grd Gazgteer of Kent (1858), 35.

 (1859). 468

ggg; Oﬁfjgg Djrggtgry of rhg Six Home Counties (1862), volume 11, 752.
pgg; omge Djrgctgry of the Six Home Counties (1866), volume 11, 849-50.

G H a d C ' Po al and C mmercial Director of Kent (1867), 112-3.

Pgst Office Directory 9f the Six Home Counties (1870), volume 11, 1041.
Pgst Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1874), volume II, 1159-60.
Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1875), volume II, 1159-60.

Post Office Directory of the Six Home Counties (1878), volume 11, 1292-3.
Kelly's Directory of Kent (1882), 67-8.

A useful finding 1istof'Kentish directories exists in W. F. Bergess and
B. R. M. Riddell, Kent Directories Located (Maidstone, 1973).
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21 Pigot and Co's Directory, 325.
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(29) "Boarding academies" in 1839; "seminary" in 1845 and 1859; "ladies'
boarding school" in 1847; "boarding schools" in 1851, 1855, 1858, and
"ladies' school" from 1874.
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VIII: BRIDGE AS PRESENTED IN LOCAL NﬁWSPAPERS
BETWEEN 1850 AND l8Z8

Robert A. Scott

INTRODUCTION: THE KENTISH GAZETTE AND OTHER CANTERBURY NEWSPAPERS,
lZ68-1855

Charles Lamb once observed that

"Newspapers always excite curiosity. No-one ever lays
one down without a feeling of disappointment."(l)

In many ways this comment is relevant to the use of old newspapers
as a source for studying the history of mid-Victorian Bridge. Dr. Alan
Rogers, however, notes that "a lengthy run through even a weekly is a
laborious task" (2) especially since the contents of local newspapers
have never been indexed.

Following on a Bill for abolishing the compulsory Newspaper Stamp,
which took effect on 29 June 1855 there dawned an era of cheaper and
more comprehensive newspapers with greatly extended local coverage.»
The Kentish Gazette, as the principal source of reference for this
chapter, has enjoyed a continuous publication since 1768 and can be
consulted in the Beaney Institute in Canterbury. Bridge was merely
one small community within the circulation area of the paper which
in its local news coverage took in regular reports from such towns as
Tonbridge, Rochester, Margate, Deal,Dover or Hythe. Thus information on
a village as small as Bridge is often sparse or superficial leaving many
of the local historian's questions unanswered.

The Kentish Gazette first appeared towards the end of May 1768.
It cost twopence and replaxﬂ.The Kentish Post as one of England's earliest

\_provincial newspapers, having first appeared in 1717. The present day

Gazette claims dubiously to have existed from that earlier date. Its
Canterbury printer, James Simmons, used the first issue to announce the
following objectives "To the Inhabitants of the County of Kent and the City
of Canterbury":

"I hope to render it not only valuable but entertaining; that,
biased by no Party, and under no influence whatever, it shall
be open to the favors of every corresponding Friend, and all
possible Care shall be taken for the due management and
Circulation thereof." (3)

Such good intentions did not persist so that by 1840 The Kentish Gazette
had become associated with the Conservative interest whilst its great
rival The Kent Herald supported Liberal views.

Selected years have been examined for the purpose of this chapter,
namely 1840, the odd years of the l840's, followed by the even years
from 1850 onwards. Originally it was intended to look at only one week
in each month, but it soon became clear that since information on Bridge
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was intermittent, a more detailed study was required. It is easy to
miss events, perhaps of some importance, using such an approach, but it
is not the aim of this chapter to record all the events which occurred
in Bridge, rather to portray aspects of the village's everday life as
reported by a local newspaper. Hopefully a fair coverage has been
achieved.

On Tuesday, 7 January 1840, The Kentish Gazette and Weekly Journal

for East and West Kent was published, price fourpence, copy number 7122,

with a circulation "every Tuesday through the principal towns and
villages of Kent and part of Sussex, Surrey, Essex and Middlesex", being
widely read amongst "the nobility, gentry, clergy, agriculturalists and
mercantile classes". (4) It contained only four pages each of which
had six columns; it was printed in Canterbury by Robert Smithson.

Local news formed only part of the content of Victorian local
newspapers. As well as national and foreign news they contained selected
items from both London newspapers and from other newspapers under the
all—embracing heading<ﬁ‘Provincial Intelligence. The local news of

The Kentish Gazette was largely limited to Canterbury itself and to

other major towns of East and West Kent. News from Canterbury covered
its various clubs, the City Magistrates’ Court, the East Kent Quarter
Sessions, the Canterbury Hospital and Dispensary, market prices, and
births, deaths and marriages. This was the pattern of local reporting
until 1855.

The Kentish Gazette had to compete against rival newspapers.

The Kent Herald, at the end of 1854 was "printed and distributed every
Thursday morning by George Burch, 9 High Street, Canterbury". Having
seven columns to each of its four pages, it cost the same as the Gazette,
enjoyed the same wide circulation and claimed similar sales figures.

The Kentish Observer was more expensive at fivepence but it did
incorporate "the Ramsgate and Margate, Deal and Sandwich, Dover, Hythe and
Folkestone, Ashford and Romney, Faversham and Sittingbourne, Herne Bay

and Whitstable Journals". Published on Thursdays it contained eight
pages of six columns each. Every Saturday was published the youngest of

-Canterbury's newspapers, The Canterbury Journal and Farmer's Gazette (5),

but its circulation at mid-century was only one quarter that of the
Gazette.

The repeal of the Stamp Duty half way through 1855 had a sudden and
dramatic effect on the newspapers of East Kent. The reaction of the

Gazette was typical of the contemporary press as a whole.

"On TUESDAY NEXT, JULY 3, The First Tuesday in the

Ensuing Quarter
That Old—Established County Newspaper, the

KENTISH GAZETTE
will be ENLARGED to the size of the London Daily Papers;
with Eight Folio Pages, containing Forty-Eight columns
of reading...

Improvements are also now in contemplation which
will, it is expected, render the Gazette still more worthy
that generous and extensive patronage it has received and

quite equal... any other paper published in the country." (6)
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Cheaper local newspapers appeared on the scene and their prices were
"within the means of a large class of the community to whom the purchase
of a newspaper has hitherto been a prohibited luxury". (7)

1855 was also memorable for the first appearance of The Canterbury
News and General Advertiser on 14 July, which was introduced as a "Penny,
first-class Newspaper" (8). This paper must have been one of the
original "popular tabloids" intended for "the working man", which sought
to influence "the cause of Reform". (9) Certainly it met with immediate
success and was claiming after only twenty-three weeks that "we expected
to circulate five hundred copies per week, whereas our circulation has
averaged during the last few weeks upward of FIFTEEN HUNDRED and on one
occasion reached Eighteen Hundred." (10) Following on its initial success
it was extended and enlargedas The East Kent Times and Canterbury News.
From the mid 1850's onwards there emerged a wide and popular demand for
newspapers, which involved an extended coverage of local, agricultural,
scientific, and ecclesiastical news, as well as such items as literary
reviews, a ladies‘ corner, family column and 'Gleanings from Punch’.

ADVERTISEMENTS RELATING MAINLY T0 PROPERTIES AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

Then, as now, advertisements occupied a good deal of space in the
local press, and they provide useful information for the local historian.
Most of the advertisements were purely local. Residents of Bridge and
elsewhere learned of innumerable patent medicines, of schools, insurance
companies, amusements, or of impending sales and auctions, or of recently
published books and magazines.

The Kentish Gazette of 7 January 1840 for instance included
advertisements for the following:

The Agricultural and General Life Assurance Co.
Hudson's Botanic Tooth Powder and Tincture.

The Annual General Meeting of the Association for the Prosecution
of Felons and Thieves.

Dane Court Academy, Albion House School, Littlebourne.
Among the advertisers of 31 December 1878 were:
W. E. and J. Rigden, Pale Ale Brewers, Canterbury and Faversham,
Celebrated Family Pale, Stock and Mild Ales, Stout and Porter.
A Fortune for a Trifle. £20,000 for £1.
El1iman's Universal Embrocation.
Hay Fever and Colds cured by Dr. Dunbar's Alkaram Smelling Bottle.
J. W. Benson, Watch and Clock Maker.
R. Betts and Sons, Coal Merchants.
Pianofortes for Hire from 10s. per Month Zfrom7 H. J. Goulden.

Henry Lawrence's Improved Spectacles.

There were relatively few advertisements originating from Bridge, but
since the village was no more than three miles from Canterbury, as the
principal shopping and social centre of East Kent, its residents were
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naturally interested in those advertisements concerning Canterbury.
Purely Bridge advertisements concerned the Poor Law Union and the
Canterbury Races, which find mention elsewhere in this chapter.

Properties and household possessions which were advertised for sale
reflect, however, both styles of living and movements of people to and from
the village. Advertised for sale during March 1840 were "two well-built
and commodious Messuages" which it was suggested would suit "persons
retiring from business, or builders wishing to engage in speculation". (11)
Bridge was portrayed as an attractive and quiet village, which was suited to
retirement and yet was close to Canterbury.

The household possessions of a sugeon are clearly indicated in the
following advertisement which appeared in October 1841:

"BRIDGE

TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION By H. S. westfield. On Friday October 15th,
1841, all the HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, and EFFECTS, on the Premises of
William Nix, Esq., Surgeon (leaving that place). Comprising
carved mahogany four—post and French bedsteads with chintz furnitures,
bordered goose—feather beds, bolsters and pillows; mattresses,
palliasses, blankets, sheets and counterpanes, mahogany chests of
drawers, dressingand washing tables, dressing glasses, basins and
ewers, painted bedroom chairs, covered with satin hair and brass
bound, plate and plated goods, china, glass and earthenware,
fenders and fire-irons, the usual kitchen requisites and culinary
articles, and a variety of miscellaneous and useful property.

The whole to be particularised in catalogues, to be had on
Thursday previous to the sale, of the AUCTIONEER, 16 St. George's
Terrace, Canterbury, and at the place of sale.

Sale to commence at 11 o'clock." (12)

Subsequent auctions included during 1845 the "Household Furniture, Patent
Mangle, Double and Single Barrelled Guns and Effects... of the late

Mr. H. PYM at BRIDGE", (13) and nine years later the "Household Furniture,
Plate, Linen, excellent Race Horse, Corn, Fodder, Stable Implements and
Effects... of Mr. Richard Marsh (under a Bill of Sale)". (14)

On 2 April 1878 it was announced that the contents of Bridge Place
were to be auctioned within days as follows:

"BRIDGE PLACE, . '....\_
BRIDGE, NEAR CANTERBURY

on Thursday April 4th 1878

The Property of Walter Gipps, Esq., who is leaving the neighbourhood
comprising iron bedsteads, mattresses, palliasses, dressing tables,
looking glasses, chests of drawers, chamber ware, Turkey and other
carpets, rosewood sofa in green damask, walnut davenport, inlaid
occasional table, mahogany sideboard with celleret drawer, rosewood
pianoforte by Anderson, fine toned cottage pianoforte by Nutting and
Addison, mahogany chairs in American cloth, dinner and dessert
services, silver handle dessert knives and forks in mahogany case,
quantity of plated articles, handsome clock under glass shade,
walnut inlaid cabinet with glass back, fenders and fire-irons,
sundry chairs, earthenware, kitchen utensils, quantity of garden
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tools, wringing and mangling machine, chaff cutting machine,
oil cake crusher, lawn mowing machine by Green, large iron garden
roller, cucumber frames, waggonette in good repair, sociable
light dung cart, nearly new, five couples of fowls, &c., &c.

The lots may be viewed the day previous and on the morning
of the Sale which will commence at Twelve o'clock precisely.

Catalogues may be obtained of Mr. EYERS, the ZBe§7 Lion Inn,
Bridge; and of the AUCTIONEERS (Messrs. Sladden), Adisham and
Bekesbourne. (15)

Here was a substantial household which could afford the domestic
luxuries of two pianos, while an extensive kitchen garden is indicated
by the inclusion of garden tools and cucumber frames.

Eleven separate Bridge properties were included in a single
auction in six lots which Messrs. Cooper handled on Saturday, 24 March

1866: (16)

l. "A respectable DWELLING HOUSE and BUTCHER'S SH0D,,,,
now in the occupation of Mr. Stephen Bartter."

2. "A genteel and substantial brick—built RESIDENCE...,
now occupied by Mrs. Edlin at the yearly rent of £40."

3. "A respectable DWELLING HOUSE... with Two Acres and a
Half of first-class Meadowland adjoining..., now in the
occupation of Mr. Henry Jarvis and Mr. John Jarvis."

. 4. "TO respectable modern—built COTTAGES..., now in the
occupation of Mr. Henry Vye and Mr. Wm. Williams, at
the yearly rent of £10 each."

5. "THREE cottages with the gardens and appurtenances thereto
belonging, situated in Malthouse Lane..., occupied by
Harlow, Austin and Gimber, at the yearly rent of 2s. 6d. each."

6. "THREE similar cottages, adjoining Lot 5 ..., now in the
occupations of Munns, Wilson and Beakes."

Since some village businesses were family concerns which were
handed down from one generation to another they were rarely offered
for sale, but two advertisements have been found from Bridge.

"To be sold by auction,

by Messrs. Collard and Ashenden,

At the White Horse Inn, Bridge, on Friday the 3rd.

of November 1854 at Three o'clock in the Afternoon

to the minute by order of the Mortgages under a

power of sale.

A FREEHOLD MESSUAGE or TENEMENT and SHOP with

the Yard, Garden, and Appurtenances there unto belonging,
situate in Bridge Street in the Parish of Bridge, in the
County of Kent, and now in the occupation of Mr. Daniel
Williams at the low Rent of £12 per annum." (17)
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"Bridge, nr. Canterbury,

To Brewers and Others,

Leach and Son, will sell by Auction

On Tuesday 17th March 1868 on the Promises all the
BREWING PLANT UTENSILS IN TRADE, HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE
and OTHER EFFECTS of Mr. John Burch, Brewer, (under
a Bill of Sale)". (18)

THE BRIDGE POOR LAW UNION

The Board of Guardians

The Bridge Poor Law Union was fairly widely reported in the
local newspapers, either through advertisements for tenders or for
staff, or by reports of events at the workhouse, but, unlike the
Canterbury\_Union, reporters were not admitted to meetings of the
Guardians who during May 1860 "rejected a proposition for the
admission of reporters to their meetings." (19)

Board members were elected annually, and the l84O “Notice of

The Annual Election of Guardians of the Poor" was accompanied by a
specimen nomination form. (20)

FORM (A)

Nomination Paper for the Parish of

Name of Quality and Qualification of
the Person calling of Person proposed

proposed the person
as proposed
guardian

Name of
Descrip— Amount of proposer
tion of assess-
qualifying ment
premises

Three weeks later the first meeting of the Bridge Union for the current
year was reported with the Rev. Charles Hughes Hallet as Chairman

pro. tem. It was proposed by Mr. Brice, and seconded by Mr. Dowsett,
and carried unanimously that Mr. Charles Collard, be appointed
Chairman for the year. Mr. Thomas Collard proposed and Mr. Pilcher
seconded, and the meeting accepted Mr. Pope as vice—Chairman. (21)

The Guardians might conclude each term of office with some form of
celebration, such as in April 1849, when

"The retiring members of the Board of Guardians dined together...
at the White Horse Inn. Charles Collard, Esq., of Wickham Court
presided, and R. Brice, Esq., of Bridge Place officiated as vice-
Chairman. The party was numerous and dinner was served up in a
style which gave the greatest satisfaction to all present." (22)‘

It was typical of the style of Victorian reporting to lavish praise as
and when it was felt appropriate to do so.
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THE CLERK AND OTHER STAFF OF THE UNION

A letter of resignation was included in The Kentish Gazette of
14th July 1840.

"To the Guardians of the Bridge Union

GENTLEMEN,

FINDING that the Duties I have had to perform as
Clerk to your Board have not met with the Approbation

of the Poor Law Commissioners, I beg leave to RESIGN
THE SITUATION.

1 remain, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,
HERBERT COLLARD.

Bridge, July 10th." (25)
The same edition also invited applications for this now vacant post:
"CLERK TO THE BRIDGE UNION

The Guardians of the BRIDGE UNION will meet at the

BOARD Room of the UNION WORKHOUSE, BRIDGE, on FRIDAY, the
24th July, for the purpose of Electing a CLERK. The
salary will be £60 per annum. Testimonials of character
and offers of service must be left at the Workhouse,
Bridge, on or before 23rd of July.

CHARLES COLLARD,
Chairman." (24)

William Forth was elected Clerk and he occupied this post until his
death on 1 April 1865. He clearly carried out his duties efficiently

‘ since on 10 June 1856 it was reported how the Guardians had "presented

to Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Forth, Jun., a very handsome silver tea pot, from
the establishment of Messrs. Mason of this city, for the satisfactory
manner in which they have always discharged their several duties as
master and matron, during the time they have been at the union." (25)
Two years later a special meeting of the Bridge Guardian was convened
when

"The Chairman proposed that an advance of £20 per annum should
be added to the salary of Mr. FORTH, the clerk, g;eg7 merited
such an acknowledgement of his long and faithful services, he
having performed the duties of clerk and other offices in the
union for nearly 23 years. The proposal was carried by a
large majority." (26)

Following William Forth's death on 1 April l865 at the age of 70,

The Kentish Gazette regretted to announce his unfortunate and sudden demise

on the previous Saturday evening. He had visited Canterbury that day and
had"appeared to be in the enjoyment of his usual health." He "was highly
esteemed by his private friends, and respected by all with whom the
discharge of his public duties brought him into contact." (27)
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when it came to placing an advertisement for a new Clerk, the

Guardians resolved to pay an annual salary of £60 which was "a reduction
of £40 on the amount paid to Mr.Forth." (28) The new clerk was to be
paid no more than had been paid twenty—five years earlier to William
Forth when he first took up the post, despite which there was no

shortage of applicants, with Mr. A. Fielding, a Canterbury solicitor,
obtaining the office with twelve votes to Mr. T. Ashenden's (a descendant
of the now prominent Canterbury firm of estate agents) eleven votes. (29)

The Clerk assumed responsibility for placing advertisements in the
local newspapers for staff and for tenders for the Union. One such
advertisement for a schoolmistress in 1850 pointed out that

"The Salary of the late Schoolmistress was Twelve Pounds per
annum. The continuance or increase of this Salary will
depend on the competency of the person elected...In addition
to the Salary, Rations, Coats, Candles and a furnished
apartment will be allowed." (30)

Between then and the 1870's a higher salary was paid, since in 1872
a salary of £20 per annum was advertised, "with board, f rnished
apartments and washing", but also the person appointed was expected
to be"a member of the ESTABLISHED CHURCH, unmarried and a good

needlewoman... and to devote the whole of her time to the performance

of the duties of the same." (51) In 1868 the schoolmaster was
expected to be

"duly qualified,...a Single man or widower, a member of
the Church of England... Salary £21 per annum [EH37 a
higher sum may be awarded by the Poor Law Board, on the
report of the School Inspector." (32)

TENDERS FOR WORKHOUSE PROVISIONS, ETC.
The most common tenders related to supplying provisions to feed
the inmates of the Workhouse. Bread was also delivered on occasions
\*to the outdoor poor. The successful trader would then supply the
Union's needs for three months. Less frequently, the Guardians
would meet to receive tenders for the supply of clothing, materials and
foot-wear, and most ominously for the supply of coffins. Those tenders
relating to provisions provide some idea of the diet appropriate to a
pauper. It appears to have changed little over this period. One
typical invitation for tenders was advertised as follows during
March 1843:

"BRIDGE UNION

Tenders will be received by the Board of Guardians at

the Union Workhouse, Bridge, on Friday the 17th instant,
at or before Eleven o'clock in the forenoon, for the
supply of the undermentioned articles for the use of the
workhouse.

Second Bread at per 4 lb. loaf;

Second Flour at per sack;

Beef without bone, Necks of Mutton, and Suet at per stone;
Gloucester and Dutch Cheese, Second Limerick Butter;
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Scotch Barley, Raw Sugar, Yellow Soap, Soda and Salt at per cwt;
Black Tea at per lb;
Candles at per dozen lbs. and South Durham Coals at per ton.
to be delivered in sacks;

Also for the supply of Second Bread at per 4 lb. loaf for
Out Poor, to be delivered where the

Relieving Officer shall direct.

Persons tendering will be required to produce samples of
Cheese, Butter, Tea, Sugar and Soap.

Every article required must be of good quality and delivered
free of expense.

By order of the Board.
William Forth, Clerk." (33)

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS TO THE WORKHOUSE IN l8ZO

In 1870 The Kentish Gazette printed a correspondence between
Robert Lake, who thirty years previously had been the Bridge Tithe
Apportioner, and George Dering, concerning "Contemplated Alterations
in the Bridge Union House." Mr. Lake opposed the intended alterations
in favour of "a measure (if compulsory so much the better) calculated to
improve the dwellings of the honest and industrious class" which would
raise "the moral standard of the labouring people", added to which,

"the old and children deserve attention; not so the able—bodied
inmates... I am decidedly against any large outlay in our

Union house... I believe the district was scarcely less able

to meet extra charges than at present."

Mr. Dering in justifying the intended alterations referred to a recent
report from the Poor Law Inspector, Mr. Farnall, which noted how "the
construction of this House renders a strict classification of the
inmates impossible." Moreover

"the late Poor Law Inspector, Mr. Langley... was very desirous
that the Bridge Union House should undergo extensive alterations.
The Poor Law Inspector who preceded Mr. Langley, Sir John Walsham,
in a letter I received from him made use of the following
expression — 'I hope I shall not give offence when I say that,
provided all the inhabitants were removed to a place of safety,
I should be glad to see the Bridge Union House burnt to the
ground.'"

Mr. Bering believed that there were very few able-bodied labourers in the
workhouse. The inmates who were "deservin of compassion more than of
blame" were "old, infirm and invalide". (54%

Extensions and improvements to the workhouse were undertaken in
preparation for which The Kentish Gazette of 9 April 1872 reported
twelve tenders which had been considered

"For building casual wards, stable and coach—house, and
other works at the workhouse, Bridge Union, Mr. B. Adkins,
architect.

‘Quantities supplied: -

Featherstone £2,202. 188., Gaskin and Godden £2,175,
Stephenson £2,157, Stiff £2,049, Epps £2,047,

Richardson £2,042, Harnett £2,040, Wilson £2,028. 15s.
Bourne £1,987. 10s. Toad (accepted) £1,925, Judge £1,897,
and Woodcock £1,857". (35)
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Accepting the lowest tender was not always the overriding priority.
The Guardians showed some concern for quality and value for money.

INQUESTS AND COURT CASES CONCERNING THE BRIDGE UNION.

Over the years several inquests or court cases were reported,
as during December 1852 when

"Mr. Delassaux held an inquest here... on the body of a
child, two years old, named Gilbert Richard Sidders. It
was taken ill on Saturday with an inflammation in the
throat, when a blister was applied and some powders ordered
to be taken. The child died on Monday. Verdict - Natural
death." (36)

Eight years later a "Sudden Death in the Workhouse" resulted in an
inquest being held at the White Horse Inn, "on the body of Thomas
Austen, 78 years of age, a pauper". The deputy coroner, Mr. Fox,
was informed that "an old man who slept in the same ward heard the
deceased make a gurgling noise: but he took no notice, as such a
noise had often been made by the deceased", whereupon tL jury
returned a verdict of "Died from Natural Causes". (37)

Minor offences which occurred in and around Canterbury were
usually tried at the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions. Some cases
concerned Bridge Union, such as when

"John King and John Widderson were had before E. Foss,

Esq., charged with breaking all the windows in the vagrant
Ward of the Bridge Union. It appeared that the prisoners,
who had travelled the country in search of work, were
admitted by an order for the night; but as no food was
given to them, they broke the windows purposely to be sent
to prison. Mr. Forth, the master of the Union, stated that
by an order from the Board he was not allowed to give food,
unless in cases of extreme destitution. The prisoners in
defence said they had walked twenty-six miles that day
without food. Mr. Foss sentenced them to be imprisoned for
one week but told them that sentence would have been more
severe, had any bread been given them. The worthy magistrate
told Mr. Forth that he wished the Guardianto know that he
highly disapproved of the order that they had made." (38)

On 15 May 1860 the following conviction was also reported:

"Henry Johnson, alias ‘Deaf Burke‘, an able-bodied pauper,
inmate of the Bridge Union, was charged by the master with
refusing to work. The defendant, having been previously
convicted of a similar offence, was sentenced to a month's
imprisonment with hard labour." (39)

An assault case arose in July 1872 when one inmate attacked another
who had entered his bed—room to remove some articles from under the
bed. (40) Typically those cases which were reported were of a
relatively trivial nature, and were to be expected from among inmates
some of whom had previous criminal convictions. The magistrates at
the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions were also empowered to authorise
changes in the Poor Rate, as, for instance, during February 1860.

"NEW POOR RATE — At the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions on
Saturday the magistrates signed a new poor-rate of 4d. in the

pound for the parish." (41)
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EESTIVITIES AND CELEBRATIONS IN THE WORKHOUSE

Not every day in the life of the Workhouse was one of abject
misery. Paupers joined in the festivities which surrounded any
notable event in the village, thanks largely to the benevolence
of such propertied families as the Conynghams. They also enjoyed
annual Christmas and New Year celebrations as on 1 January 1876.

"NEW YEARS DAY AT THE WORKHOUSE — As has been the custom for
many years past, the inmates of the Union were liberally
entertained on New Year's Day. A dinner of roast beef and
plum pudding was kindly provided for them by the Marquis
Conyngham, and the wards were visited by the Earl and Countess
of Mount-Charles, Viscount Slane and Miss Parker, who also
contributed to the happiness of the occasion by the seasonable
gifts of tea, tobacco, snuff, and cake, his Lordship presenting
his kind presents in person with a word of greeting to each
recipient. There were also present, the Rev. E. T. Vine,

Rev. R. H. Cautley, and Mr. Pilcher (Steward to Lord Conyngham)Q (42)

During May 1864 Mr. Collard celebrated his retirentnt after twenty-
one years as chairman of the Bridge Union, during which time he had
"discharged the onerous duty of the office with credit to himself and
advantage to the ratepayers," by "ordering a dinner of good old English
fare — roast beef and plum pudding." (43)

Occasionally the pauper children received a special treat, as
on 21 January 1868 when Miss Parker provided a substantial tea;
following which they were entertained by Mr. Linam's magic lantern,
before Miss Parker and the other ladies presented prizes to the children.(44)

 §

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BRIDGE UNION RURAL SANITARY AUTHORITY

The local government of the area was profoundly affected by the
establishment of the Bridge Union Rural Sanitary Authority, in relation
\_to which during June, 1874. The Kentish Gazette publicised Dr. Robinson's

report on the district:

"CONSTITUTION OF DISTRICT - the portion of the Union which is
placed under the jurisdiction of this board for sanitary
administration extends over 41,394 acres and includes 2,061
inhabited houses, with a population of 10,24}... with the exception
of those employed at the paper mills, nearly all the residents are
engaged in agricultural pursuits...

GENERAL SANITARY ARRANGEMENTS - The greater part of the water
supply of the district, which is derived from wells sunk in the
chalk, is pure in character... The means for excremental disposal
are generally rude and ill—contrived... The causes of enteric
fever which every now and again occur in these localities

afford indications of the ever—present causes of disease and show

a necessity for a complete change of the present arrangements.

SCARLATINA EPIDEMIC — Scarlatina [has been7 the principal
zymotic and not only destroyed more lives than any other of

this class, but was also the most wide-spread one. Bridge and
Petham suffered especially from the epidemic, in consequence of
the studied concealment of the early cases which occurred." (45)
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Sanitary progress was sometimes hampered by private residents, as
during 1876 when

"at a meeting of the Bridge Rural Sanitary Authority held

last week, it was resolved to initiate a system of periodical
scavenging in the parishes of Bridge and Chartham, and

contracts were duly sealed in that behalf. It is also
contemplated to substitute earth closets for the common

privies. These improvements are experimental, but if they

prove satisfactory they will be extended to the whole Union." (46)

At Chartham, earth closets were erected on the property of Mr. Young,
the Inspector of Nuisances, having pronounced that his common privies
"were not sufficient," but since he refused to build the earth closets
himself, the Bridge Authority took it upon themselves to do so.

This decision resulted in a case before the Canterbury County Court, where
Mr. Young contended that the Bridge Authority had acted illegally. For
their part the Bridge Union Rural Sanitary Authority, represented by

Mr. Fielding, claimed that their action was covered by the Public Health
Act, as a result of whiﬂ1Mr. Young now owed them £12. 12s. lOd. for
having erected the closets. The Judge found in favour of the plaintiff
being "of the opinion that the authority were justified in taking the
action they had, and held that the notices given met the case and had
been framed under the right section". (47)

lb
LAW ENFORCEMENT IN BRIDGE

Bridge like any other village had its fair share of minor crimes
which were tried at the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions. More serious
cases were heamdat the Canterbury Crown Court or at the East Kent
Quarter Sessions. ' Newspaper accounts show that many cases were
trivial and that justice was carried out fairly. Criminal reporting
increased from the mid 1850's as newspapers expanded in size and became
more popular.

Theft of a minor nature was the most common offence as at the
‘Canterbury Quarter Sessions during April 1850, when
‘ "William Attaway, 18, pleaded guilty to a charge of stealing,
on 3rd April at Bridge, two boards belonging to William
Williams. Jon Frederick Rose, alias Rye, was also in the
first instant charged with the same offence but turned evidence
against Attaway who had induced him to assist in the robbery.
A previous conviction of felony was proved againstthe prisoner
and the court sentenced him to three month's imprisonment and
hard labour". (48)

George Keen, a vagrant, was committed for trial at the Quarter
Sessions during October 1864

9 "for stealing an overcoat, the property of the Rev. Dr. Stevenson. —
The coat, which had been taken from Dr. Stevenson's carriage while
it was standing at the gate of the Bridge Union Workhouse, was
found in possession of the prisoner when apprehended". (49)

Imprisonment and hard labour were common punishments. Such was the fate
in May 1864 of a labourer, John Payn, who on pleading guilty was sentenced
to l4 days imprisonment with hard labour for "stealing 10 lbs. of old iron,
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value ls., the property of Mr. George Crothall, of Bridge". (50)
When, during August 1870 "a tramp, giving his name as Campbell, was
charged with stealing half-a-pound of sausages, value 4d., belonging to

George Pegden, of Bridge", he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to ten
days’ hard labour. (51)

Punishments imposed at Quarter Sessions were invariably of a
harsher nature, as and when during March 1872 George Edwin Fryer was
convicted of housebreaking and stealing £1. 9s. lld. from George
Fryer of Bridge, on 20 January 1872, for which he was sentenced to
six months‘ hard labour. L52) At the other extreme is an instance of
a theft being reported during 1876 with no culprit being taken involving
three five pound notes being stolen from the Post Office "under circum-
stances which would point to the theft having been committed by an

adept". (53)

Assault cases were particularly newsworthy material with detailed
reports of the evidence of both prosecution and defence witnesses.
Sometimes it was difficult to prove cases either way, especially when
the evidence was confused and unsubstantiated. Defendants who were
believed to be guilty were usually fined and ordered to pay costs, which
commonly exceeded any fine. The following instance was reported in Egg
Kentish Gazette on 7 August l860.

"ASSAULT - At the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions, on Saturday,
before W, Delmar Esq., T. H. Mackay Esq., Capt. Young, Geo. Neame
Esq., and Wm. Plummer Esq., Richard Eldridge, labourer of Lower
Hardres, was charged with assaulting William Noble, labourer, at
Bridge, on the 20th July. The complainant stated that on the

day in question, he was seated on a tug belonging to his master
when the defendant came up and pushed him off on the road, hurting
his shoulder very much. The defendant then got a pole and "poked"
him with it several times, remarking that he would like to knock
his brains out. - A witness was called who saw the assault. -
The defendant admitted that he pushed the complainant off the

tug but the complainant had scandalised both him and his Mrs.
several times, having reported that he had nothing to eat in

the house one Monday evening. The bench fined the defendant

5s. and 10s. costg, or in default of payment to be imprisoned

14 days - [Se wa§/ allowed a fortnight to pay the money." (54)

‘ Christmas 1869 was marred by a stabbing incident, following which
John and Thomas Oxley of Denton accused the village constable, William
Harnden, of stabbing them on Christmas Day in a scuffle as they and three
other men were dismounting from a trap in the village in the early houns.
Although they claimed to have been sober at the time, a defence witness
reported on how when he had seen John Oxley the next day, he had admitted
that he fell out of the cart as it was the easiest way to get out.
Harnden, who denied the charge was committed for trial, bail being
accepted. (55)

' A female case of assault arose out of a quarrel in a hop-garden
during the Autumn of 1850, when Ann Sargent was summoned at the
St. Augustine's Petty Sessions for assaulting Sarah Keeler in a hop-
ground belonging to Mr. Collins.

"The complainant stated that she was having a few words with the
defendant's father-in-law when the defendant came up to her and
knocked her down hurting her very much. Their master then came,
and took her off. - John Collins said that the complainant abused
the defendant, Z;h§7 knocked her down for it, and was hitting her
again when he separated them. The bench fined the defendant ls.

and 9s. costs." (56)
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All sorts of cases were heard and decisions taken at the Petty
Sessions, some of which involved children. The following affiliation
case was reported during August 1870:

C "John George Wilson was summoned to show cause why he should
not contribute to the maintenance of a male bastard child, of
which he was the alleged father. Defendant did not appear.
Jane Elizabeth Gosling stated that she was 21 years of age and
was in the service of Mr. Tucker, of Bridge. She first became
acquainted with the defendant in May 1869. He paid attention
to her and promised her marriage. The child was born on the
25rd May last. He promised to keep the child and to pay all
expenses. Ellen Gosling, mother of the plaintiff, stated
that the defendant had admitted he was the father of the child,
and promised to maintain it. — The bench made an order of
23. a week and expenses." (57)

During October 1876 James Kemp was summoned for having left his three
infant children chargeable to the Bridge Union since 15 July. What was
an offence of desertion was proved by Mr. Charles Holman, the relieving
officer, whereupon the defendant, "a big strapping looking fellow, who
said he could not keep his children, was sent to gaol for six weeks
with hard labour". (58)

with the introduction of compulsory elementary education parents

or guardians could be forced to send their children to a public elementary
school, as happened during July 1878 when George Willis and George
Davidson, both of Bridge, were ordered to appear before the bench on
summonses which had been executed by the School Attendance Board of the
Bridge Union. Evidence having been given, "the magistrates made an
order, in each case, that the children should be sent to school". (59)

There were cases and pronouncements which are not easily categorised,
so that on 15 May 1860, for instance, it was reported that the Magistrates
at the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions had signed a lighting rate of
Ed. in the pound for the Bridge lighting district. (60) The magistrates

\_also concerned themselves with unlawful hawking, unmarked carts and

stray dogs. Henry Reed was fined 2s. 6d. with 9s. 3d. costs in October,
1872, after being found guilty of hawking without a licence in Bridge,
where he had offered note paper for sale while in possession of an old
and expired certificate for the metropolitan district. Failure to

meet the fine incurred seven days‘ imprisonment. (61)

During November 1874, "Mr. Henry Harvey from Bridge was summoned...
on a charge of having allowed a cart to be used without his name and
description being painted thereon and having admitted the fact, ZHE7 was
fined ls. and 8s. costs." Also at the same hearing, the Rev. James
Hughes Hallett, of Petham, who did not appear, was fined ls. with
lOs. costs "for having allowed a donkey cart to be used without having
his name painted thereon", (62) which shows that the clergy clearly
came within the confines of the law.

Social status carried the obligation to set a good example so that
the Petty Sessions really showed their muscle when Major Henry Castle,

one of the leading landowners of Bridge received a summons during August
1878,

"for allowing a dog belonging to him to be at large on the 26th
of July. A police-constable found the dog in the street on
the evening of the 26th ult., and on finding out the next day
that it belonged to Major Castle he took it to his house. It
was a Parmenian dog and the officer said he had never seen it
about the street before. Fined 1s. and 9s. costs". (65)
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The magistrates were indulging in a form of consumer protection
when in October 1876 they fined George Lott, who was a marine store
dealer in Bridge, 205. and 9s. costs for having seven weights in his
possession which were light. The defendant claimed that it was he
who suffered since he used the weights only to buy in rags and bones,
having had no opportunity to get the weights inspected previously.
William Wilson, a beer-retailer and general provision dealer, was
also fined ls. with lOs. costs for having two incorrect scales in

his possession. (64)

THE CANTERBURY RACES

"They have lately had races at Canterbury; and the Mayor
and Aldermen, in order to get the Prince Leopold to attend
them, presented him with the Freedom of the City; but it
rained all the time and he did not come!"

William Cobbett, Rural Rides,
Canterbury, 4th Sept., 1825.

Bridge was famous even in the eighteenth century fer its proximity
to the Canterbury races which as one of the foremost sporting attractions
of East Kent were much publicised in the local newspapers, whether in
the form of advertisements, correspondence or reports. The fact that
the race course was on Barham Downs greatly influenced the village of
Bridge, in such matters as the provision of stabling and jockeys, and
in the business which the meetings must have brought to its inns and

other traders.

The main meeting was usually held sometime in late August or
September, having been once a four day event which was reduced to
two days or a single day, though still receiving Royal patronage in
the form of Her Majesty's Plate. In 1840 the meeting was still
sufficiently important to be accompanied by "GALAS DURING THE RACES",

for

"it will be seen on reference to our advertising columns

that St. Peter's Gardens, in this city, will boast unusual
attractions during the races. Mr. Dorby the celebrated
pyrotechnist is making extensive preparations for exhibiting
fireworks, gladiatorial shows, Hampton's balloons and a variety
of entertaining amusements." (65)

The fortunes of the Canterbury Races fluctuated considerably, with
an evident decline in their former grandeur during the 1840's. This
decline prompted The Kentish Gazette to observe that the l845 races
were "scarcely worthy of mention, either as regards the nature of the

sport or the attendance of the gentry of the county...ZEinc§7 on neither
day was the grandstand graced with more than half a dozen members of

Kentish families." (66) What was perhaps the sensational highlight of
the meeting occurred towards the close of the first day, caused

"by the driver of a van (named Bangham) coming down Bridge
Hill at a rapid pace. The vehicle was overturned and

smashed to atoms throwing the passengers in various directions,
one of whom, beside the driver, was much injured, though we
are glad to say no bones were broken." (67)

The 1847 meeting was seen as the most miserable of affairs with

the Gazette grumbling that "these once great county meetings and
annual holidays of four or five days duration were feebly imitated
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and wretchedly burlesqued on Thursday andFriday last." Greatly
lamented was the passing of those days when the grandstand had been

"the nucleus of fashion, of life, of the high-born, the
rich, the elegant, the lovely and the gay, Beauty in
all its phases, the blonde, the brunette, the lily, the
rose all shone resplendent there, a sight the boast of
Kent that Kent alone could boast,"

but in 1847 this "once celebrated arena of wealth and rank was
partially tenanted by a few citizens of "lowly degree", and The Kentish

Gazette could only bemoan "this marked desertion, this sudden and

general repudiation of the races by the gentry of the county." (68)
A somewhat rosier picture prevailed in 1850 when on the opening day

"The weather was fine, and a large concourse assembled to
witness the sport. The usual concomitants of races,
refreshment booths, various games of chance, fortune
telling, ‘elastic brothers‘, archery, 'cockshies',
itinerary musicians, etc. - proved scarcely less attractive
sources of amusement... than the racing itself."

The second day attracted "a much more numerous and fashionable
attendance than yesterday, the joint effects, doubtless of the
remarkably fine weather and the anticipation of superior sport,"

which was marred only by the fact that "some of the light-fingered
profession obtained some booty and succeeded in getting clear off." (69)
The 1850's did not produce a sustained boom. The first day of the

l852 meeting witnessed "an almost utter absence of gentry," (70) while
in 1854 "the company was very ﬁEE§¥E77ﬁ£?1EET$E5‘E38?$ of all that
pleasing a nature" but typical of the years was the race-card as
advertised for that meeting.

"CANTERBURY RACES

Thursday and Friday August 24th and 25th 1854. To start
each day at half-past One o'clock.

FIRST DAY.

A SWEEPSTAKE of 2 Sovs. each with 15 added... The winner
to be sold by auction immediately after the Race and any
other surplus over the selling price to go to the fund.
One mile.

The CANTERBURY HANDICAP. Five Sovs. each, 2 forfeit with
50 added. About one mile and a half.

A SWEEPSTAKE of 2 Sovs. each, with a purse of Sovs. added.
For Horses the property of Officers of the Army and Militia
quartered in the County of Kent, and to be ridden by Officers;
llst. lOlb. each.

SECOND DAY.
The CITY PLATE.

Heats about one mile and a half.

The sum to be given will depend upon the subscriptions
received from the City of Canterbury and will be named at
the time of entry.

88.

HER MAJESTY'S PLATE of 100 Guineas. Two miles.
A SWEEPSTAKE of 3 Sovs. each with 20 added.
Heats - about one mile and a half.

Gentlemen riders; professionals to carry 6lbs. extra.
A SWEEPSTAKE of 2 Sovs. each, with 15 added.

For horses the property of Officers of the Army and Militia
quartered in the County of Kent, and to be ridden by Officers;
11st. 7lbs... Heats - about one mile and a half, over four
flights of hurdles; the winner to pay for the hurdles.

The horses to be named for all the races to the Clerk
of the Course, at the White Horse Inn, Bridge, on Wednesday,
August 23rd, between the hours of two and four in the
afternoon... No gambling of any description will be allowed

here. Entrance to the course — Four wheeled carriages, 3s;
two wheeled, 2s; Saddle horses, ls." (71)

Bridge was actually represented in the races by at least
one owner, Richard Sherrard, who rode his two horses, Prevarication
and Miss Emily, with a fair amount of success. (72)

The Canterbury Races had their well—wishers, one of whom in a
letter which was published in The Kentish Gazette on 29 August 1854,
suggested a possible remedy which "might in some degree restore
Canterbury Races to the position which they once occupied". The
suggestion involved eliminating

"the minor affairs at Lenham, Maidstone, Folkestone and
Dover, and handZ:ing/ over the money now subscribed at
those places, so as to form one good meeting at Canterbury,
in humble imitation (sufficiently humble I will admit) of
splendid glorious Goodwood. One gathering Ofthis
description would, in my opinion, give far greater satis-
faction to the public generally than the little affairs to
which I have taken liberty of making allusion, without
giving offence, I trust, to any party.

Your obedient servant,

ONE WHO WELL RECOLLECTS THE OLDEN TIME". (75)

This suggestion was not taken up and in 1855 the Canterbury meeting
was reduced to a one day affair, (74) whilst a year later the
Editor of The Kentish Gazette wrote that while "we will not say
that the proceedings of late have been attended with chicanery,"
means should be employed "to induce noblemen and gentlemen to

visit and support the races... to remove all suspicion." (75)

In 1858 the races exhibited some of their former prosperity,
for although the meeting of that year was only a one day affair it
was reported that "we have heard only one opinion, and that is that
there has not been a better meeting at Canterbury these twenty
years." (76)
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l863 produced a successful meeting held over two days with the
support of the local gentry when "a good programme was prepared and
it attracted good fields for the different races." (77) By 1864
both the South-Eastern and the London, Chatham and Dover Railway
Companies were running special excursion trains at reduced fares to
Canterbury for the Races, while fourteen years later these railways
also conveyed race—horses to Canterbury or to Bekesbourne "at a single
fare for the double journey." (78)

The Kentish Gazette for 1872 could not fault the quality of
the assembled company, since "fine weather favoured" the first day
of the meeting, when "some capital racing was witnessed," and "the
attendance although not large was exceedingl select." The second
day was noted for "a goodly sprinkling of Zthg/ equipages of local
gentry." (79) Likewise the attendance on each day of 1874 "was
numerous and fashionable while the band of the Cavalry Depot discoursed

sweet music in the intervals of racing." (80)

By 1878 the Canterbury Races were approaching their final days.
Each meeting was reduced to one day only, and the assembled company
was noted less for its gentry than for the officers f: m the Barracks.

Traditionally, a Spring Meeting had been held as part of the
Easter Holiday festivities. It was revised in 1840 by "the spirited
exertions of one or two individual citizens", (81) but two years later

"the Canterbury Spring meeting at Barham Downs... did not afford
the usual sport. Mr. Sherrard‘s horse walked over the course for
the Easter Plate. A match or two of no great interest followed,
and the sports of the day were wound up by donkey racing and
other minor amusements." (82)

At the Spring Meeting of 1847 it was decided to prohibit booths from
the Downs, a decision which was welcomed by The Kentish Gazette,

"There can be no doubt that considerable damage is sustained
by the neighbouring residents, alike in their plantations and
hedge—rows, by the turbulent persons who have been accustomed
to stay in the booths drinkin ' ' i.ht. The keepers of
these places have only themselves to thank for the deprivation."(85)

Booths or no booths, the meeting itself was a relatively dull affair:

"This meeting which may be considered as held in memory of the
‘Easter Plate‘ races, took place at Barham Downs on Tuesday,

on which occasion there was a tolerable attendance of equestrian
visitors, consisting principally of the gentlemen connected with
the East Kent Hunt: but of pedestrians few were present, though
the afternoon was bright and fine. This circumstance may in

a great degree be attributed to the prohibition of the sale of
refreshments on the race course." (84)

Canterbury's Spring Meeting became very much the prerogative of
the hunting interest, the races being confined to horses that belonged
to the ‘East Kent Earth—stopping Fund‘. Sometimes they were expected
to have been in at the death of a certain number of brace of foxes, (85)
but by 1852 the attendance was very limited. (86) Spring meetings
thereafter were abandoned until 1872 when "an attempt to revive the
Easter Race meeting on Barham Downs on Tuesday last proved more
successful than could have been expected, owing to the liberal
support giwaito the meeting, as an Easter Hunt Meeting by Lord Gui}-
ford and C. S. Hardy Esq." (87)
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Steeplechasing provided an alternative activity for those
‘young bloods‘ who experienced insufficient excitement in hunting or
racing. It was rough riding with few if any rules, which enabled
Captain Boss to inform Lord Kennedy before a match that

"'1 understand that we may ride over each other and kill
each other if we can ?' ‘Just so’ was the reply." (88)

The neighbourhood of Barham Downs witnessed a steeplechase in
l845; the event was open to all England and some first rate horses
from different parts of the country were expected to take part in
the "strifes of the day." (89) The event actually took place on
24 March and was reported in The Kentish Gazette on the following day.

"Canterbury presented an animated appearance from an early hour,
long before the time for starting, hundreds of pedestrians were
seen wending their muddy way to the scene of competition — loud
in their surmises of the important events of the day.

The starting field where the horses were placed was

truly picturesque. Every description of vehicle and

spectators of every class and age crowded the spot... Never
before, in the recollection of the oldest Kent sportsman has

such a scene been witnessed and assembled for such a purpose

near Canterbury. Thousands of people thronged the line of chase
and all was animation, anxiety and eagerness.

The first Chase was for a sweepstake of ten sovereigns
each with 100 added. The line marked out for the running
was over three miles of a fair hunting country of the form
of a figure of eight, commencing in the field called Bridge
Place, belonging to Mr. Brice and finishing in the park not
far from the starting place... There were nearly thirty
leaps, many of them stiff fences, and a brook." (90)

SOCIAL LIFE AND PATRONAGE IN BRIDGE

Pattenr;of social life in Bridge varied with social status.
Larger households had their own life styles and while the middle
and upper classes organized their own amusements their patronage
and benevolence were often important in providing certain entertain-
ments and active interests for the lower classes. Much social
life centred on the public houses, the church, the local school and
agricultural shows, apart from sport which is examined separately.

Public houses provided the most frequented and regular form
of entertainment whether in the form of a social drink and natter
after work, or for gatherings, meetings and dinners of a more
formal kind. Some idea of the facilities available in a village
inn can be seen from an advertisement of 21 September 1871:

"FREEHOLD BREWERY AND PUBLIC HOUSE.

Mr. H. STOCKWELL has received instructions from the Trustees,
under the will of Mr. William Williams, deceased, TO SELL BY
AUCTION... All that Valuable FREEHOLD PUBLIC HOUSE, known as
the "PLOUGH AND HARROW," with convenient BREWHOUSE AND PREMISES
attached,... now let on lease to Messrs. Edward and Edmund
Gibbs at the low annual rent of £58, for a term expiring

22nd July 1878.
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The above property comprises Six Bedrooms, Sitting Room,
Smoking Parlour, large Club Room, Bar, Bar Parlour, Tap Room,
Kitchen, Larder, Small Yard, Cellar, Private Cellar, Cleansing
Room, Tun Room, Cooling Room, Malt Room, Hop Room, Office and
a 3-stall Stable with Loft over." (91)

Matters relating to the Plough and Harrow might be reported in
the local newspapers, as on 4 September 1860 when it was noted that
Mr. Richard Mutton's application for a license to sell spirits at
the Plough and Harrow had been granted by the magistrates at a
Special Petty Sessions which had been held to consider public house
licences. (92) Having obtained his wine and spirit licence, over
forty gentlemen assembled on one Tuesday during the following
November at the Plough and Harrow and "including several from
Canterbury and the surrounding villages,... Z}hei7 partook of an
excellent dinner and dessert provided by mine host (Mr. R, Mutton)

in first—rate style." (95)

Public houses were prone to some trouble on occasions, for
instance during 1874 when George Jordan, a labourer, refused to
leave the Plough and Harrow when ordered to do so. Having been
evicted once by P. C. Cordery, he went in again and had to be
ejected a second time, on which occasion he used very bad language
and became violent. when tried at St. Augustine's Petty Sessions,
Jordan was fined 10s. with 8s. costs, or in default, ten days‘ hard

labour. (94)

In an age of advanced evangelicalism, when excesses of most
kinds were frowned upon, cases of drunkenness were no exception and
for 1870 there was the case of a Bridge man who having arrived in
Rye was arrested there for drunken behaviour:

"At Eye, on Tuesday, Thomas Barton, 40, chairbottomer of
Bridge, near Canterbury, was charged... with being drunk and
disorderly — P. C. Wood said that he and Supt. Butcher were
called to the Strand on Monday in consequence of a distur-
bance taking place there. They found the prisoner in an
intoxicated condition and using very obscene language. He
moved on to the William the Fourth; afterwards he was
induced to go away. Witness, however, said he again

had his attention called to the prisoner at Landgate, where
the prisoner was lying on the pavement and forming a centre
of attraction for the mob. Finding it impossible to get
prisoner to go away quietly, witness took him in charge. -
Prisoner had no defence to offer. He said he had come into
the town to go shopping and was full of liquor. - The magi-
strates severely reprimanded the prisoner; for it transpired
that the shopping expedition had been undertaken on account
of his wife who had just been confined, and the money which
he took with him was to obtain necessaries for her, had
been spent in this disgraceful way. He was ordered to pay

a fine of 30s., and costs". (95)

The Kentish Gazette with its tongue placed firmly in its cheek,
printed the above under the heading "An Affectionate Husband".
with Canterbury so near at hand it is somewhat puzzling to

understand why Barton selected Rye for a shopping expedition.
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William Attaway, now aged 44, appeared again before the
magistrates in l876,having been convicted 26 years earlier in 1850
for theft as was noted in the section entitled "Law Enforcement in
Bridge". He wasan.habitual petty criminal who on this occasion
was described as "an elderly man, residing at Bridge". He was
summoned before the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions "for having been
found drunk on the highway at Lower Hardres on the 26th February",
to which accusation he pleaded "guilty" and was fined 5s. with 8s.
costs. He was also warned by the Chairman that "he might have
been dealt with much more severely and if he came again he would
be," to which the defendant replied "I thank you, for the honour
you have done me". (96) It is interesting to note how Attaway was 0
described as "an elderly man" at only 44 years of age.

Victorian public houses were meeting places for various
societies or gatherings, such as in 1868 when

"the meeting of the Bridge Constitutional Association held

a well attended meeting at the White Horse Inn. The chair

was taken by Captain Winter, A. Sicard, Esq., vice-chairman...
During the evening the announcement of the Conserv"tive

victory in West Kent was made known amid loud cheering, and the
healthsof the successful candidates were drunk with due honours.
During the evening several capital songs were sung by members of
the Association." (97)

Six years later at the St. Augustine's Petty Sessions, Robert Ayres,
landlord of the Red Lion Inn at Bridge, successfully applied for an
extension of time from lO p.m. until ll p.m. on the first Saturday of
each month, so as to accommodate the Bridge Friendly Society which
had 545 members. (98)

Towards the end of this period, the meadow adjoining the Red
Lion Inn witnessed a number of Stock Sales, which were held by Messrs.

Sladden, auctioneers of Adisham and Bekesbourne. At these sales
Farmers and gentlemen of the neighbourhood sold their surplus livestock,

prior to which the auctioneers commonly provided luncheon in the

‘adjacent inn.

Compared to the village inns the parish church was rarely
mentioned in the newspapers but on 6 December 1855 2hg\_§gg1jﬂz§§yi
printed a letter from an irate churchgoer concerning seating
accommodations in the Church:

"To the Editor of the Kent Herald. Sir — will you have
the kindness to insert what appears incredible, but is a

fact, viz;

\_ My house is my own, I pay church—rates, poor-rates,
highway rates and national taxes, but cannot obtain a pew
in the church for myself with Mrs. Boyack and my friend.
will any of your correspondents have the kindness to point

out a remedy?
Ymmstnﬂy,

Alexander Boyack, Commander R.N." (99)

This was clearly a disturbing situation to a man who was considered
to be one of the village gentry. '
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Although repairs and improvements to the church were undertaken
between 1859 and 1861 the churchyard by 1860 was also suffering from
overcrowding.

"Owing to the increase of population, and the crowded state

of our present churchyard, the want of increased accommodation

for interments has been sometime felt in the parish. ZThi§7 want,
however, has just been supplied by the noble munificence of the
Marchioness of Conyngham, who has not only given an adjoining

piece of land for that purpose, but paid the expenses of the
transfer and consecration, etc.< The ceremony of consecration
was performed...by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence

of a number of neighbouring clergymen, who had been invited by

Dr. Stevenson to meet his grace on the occasion. We understand
that it was the intention to open the church, which has been
re-pewed and is undergoing thorough repair, at the same time as the
new burial ground was consecrated. But as the repairs are not in
a sufficiently advanced state the re—opening has been unavoidably
postponed. It is estimated that the alterations, completed and in
progress, will cost upwards of £4,000." (100)

Devoted clergymen were held in the greatest respect and esteem by
the parishioners, as and when the residents of Bridge and Patrixbourne
said farewell, during July 1872, to their curate, the Rev. Lewis Clarke.
At the farewell ceremony the Earl of Mountcharles, as son of the Marquis
of Conyngham, occupied the chair from which he read the following address
which was "elegantly illuminated on parchment and framed":

"We the undersigned, learning with much regret that the Rev.
Lewis Clarke, Curate of Patrixbourne and Bridge, is about to
leave, desire to offer for his acceptance a silver salver and
purse containing £55, as a small token of our esteem and
regard for his zealous efforts and Christian ministration
amongst us, and we trust that every blessing may attend him
in the new sphere of usefulness in which he now enters, and
also follow him through a long and useful life." (101)

The Conyngham family displayed considerable interest in the
welfare of the villagers, seeking to improve the quality of their day
to day lives and being instrumental in the setting up of the Bridge and
Patrixbourne Schools in 1849. The laying of the foundation stone was
an occasion for considerable ceremony and celebration, and as such
warranted a lengthy report in The Kentish Gazette.

"On Friday the foundation stone of the schools was laid, on

a well—adapted spot of ground on the banks of the Lower

Stour, and behind the main street of Bridge, leading to
Patrixbourne... The stone was laid by the Dowager Marchioness

of Conyngham, to whose munificence the promoters of the laudable
undertaking are indebted for the site, as well as for pecuniary
assistance... The Marchioness having taken the place assigned to
her, and the company and the school children being arranged
round the enclosure alloted to them, the Rev. Mr. Stevenson,

the worthy and exemplary rector of the parishes reviewed
briefly and eloquently the object which had drawn them

together, closing his remarks with an appropriate prayer...

The stone was then lowered to its place, and the Marchioness
struck the stone three times with the maul. That portion

of the ceremony was concluded. The Rev. J. Stevenson once

more addressed the meeting, and a hymn, composed for the
occasion, was sung by the children and the vast assembly, the
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reverend gentleman's curate reading the words. Three
times three hearty cheers were given and a profusion of
plum buns distributed amongst the school children by Miss
Augusta Conyngham, the lovely and interesting daughter of
Lord Albert. The national anthem closed the day which
will be one long remembered in the neighbourhood." (102)

In typical fashion, being concerned with the proper display of rank,
wealth and quality The Kentish Gazette proudly noted how this
function had been attended by Matthew Bell, Esq., and his lady,

the Hon. C. Tollemache, the Rev. J. Stevenson and his lady,

Captain Winter and family, the Misses Taswell, the Rev. J. White
and his lady, the Rev. Mr. Plumptre, Mrs. Braham, H. Collard, Esq.
of Renville, and Mr. Pilcher. Readers were further informed that

"the buildings would be erected by "Messrs. Wilson, assisted by

Mr. George Homersham; the architect being Mr. Hezekiah Marshall." (103)

Landowners, farmers and agricultural workers were keen

promoters and supporters of agricultural shows and horticultural
societies. The Kent and Canterbury Cattle Show was one of the

major shows of East Kent at this time, presenting awards not only

for high quality entries but also premiums to labourers and servants

so that, whilst Richard Brice in 1847 was winning awards for the

"Best Breeding Cow of any breed, exceeding four years old" and for

the "Best Boar, under two years old", Robert Pilcher, a labourer

who was employed by G. C. Oxenden, Esq., was presented with a premium of
£3 for having "had 12 and brought up 9 children to above the age of six
years, with g;a1g7 £2. 17s. 8d. parochial relief in 1842." (104) \*

The Marquis of Conyngham was appointed President of the Bridge
Horticultural Society, whose first annual exhibition of fruit, flowers
and vegetables was held in l87l in Bridge Place Meadow, adjoining
Bourne Park. This became a permanent location and, provided
favourable weather prevailed, a large turn out from the local
population was always assured, including several gentry who were
vice presidents, and whose assistance could "always be depended
upon in such undertakings." (105) The Society confined itself
to the parishes of Bridge, Patrixbourne, Bekesbourne, Bishopsbourne,
Barham and Kingston, as "an area sufficiently wide to ensure a
considerable number of exhibitors, whilst still being confined
enough to render it a thoroughly local institution." (106)

The Kentish Gazette was loud in its praises of the show, noting
how in 1874 that

"one feature it has which is not often found in similar
societies, but which it does not require much thought to
see must have a good deal to do with the exceptional
excellence of the shows. We allude to the offering of
allotment and cottage garden prizes, which this year
attracted the competition of each of the six mentioned

villages." (107)

The poorer families of Bridge were fortunate in the provision which
was made for allotment gardens; much of the credit for which could
be attributed to Mr. Pittock, who having retired from medical
practice had lived in the village for 25 years before moving in

1868 "to the seaside for the benefit of his health." His departure
prompted some labouring men to organise "a subscription to present
him with a handsome ink stand and a splendidly bound volume of
‘Gratitude’ by Dr. Stevenson in remembrance of their thankfulness

of his extreme kindness, and the great good he has effected by
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being the instigator of the allotment gardens, and without whose
assistance this boon would not have been granted." The Kentish
Gazette derived much satisfaction in reporting that "nearly three

hundred of the labourers are among the subscribers." (108)

The only real flaw in the smooth running of this annual show
occurred in 1876 when "there was a little unnecessary confusion in
the evening consequent upon the eagerness which some competitors
exhibited to regain possession of their articles." (109)

It was the success of the Bridge Horticultural Society which
led to an annual exhibition of potatoes grown by cottagers holding
allotments in the parish of Bridge. The exhibition was held at
the Plough and Harrow Inn, where in 1874, for instance, it was
reported that "the collections of potatoes were considered by the
judges to be the most distinct and useful varieties ever exhibited." (110)

SPORTING EVENTS IN THE VILLAGE

Despite the presence of a sporting tradition in the cultural
heritage of Kent and England, reports of sporting activities in
Bridge were rather sparse, so much so that no reports of cricket
being played in Bridge appeared between 1841 and 1872, in spite of,
or perhaps because of, the proximity of Canterbury, with its
illustrious cricket week becoming the social highlight of the city's
summer calendar; and yet on Thursday 9 July 1840 a cricket match
had been played in Broom Park involving clubs from Bridge and Denton,
following which the batting performance of the Bridge team was
reported by The Kentish Gazette.

BRIDGE
First Innings Second Innings
Howard run out 0 Sherrard c by Wanstall 0
-Johnson c by Woodland 5 Collard c by do. 1
Sayer b by Newman 5 Dodd not out 17
Dodd b by do. 5 Saxby not out 10
Saxby b by Austen 3 -
Collard c by do. 0 28
Sherrard c by Newport 0
Hooker b by Newman 0
Summerfield c by Webb 7
Williams not out 14
Forth c by Newman 4
Byes 2
45

Since Denton were bowled out for 30 and 33 in their two innings, Bridge
was victorious by eight wickets; Mr. Howard took the bowling honours with
six wickets in the first innings and five in the second, whilst Messrs.
Collard and Forth, apparently taking time off from their Poor Law
responsibilities, clearly did not enjoy a very successful day. (111)

Two weeks later there was a return match at the Beverley cricket
ground between Bridge and the Canterbury Amateur Clubs, with success
going to Bridge with four wickets, still outstanding; however "as the
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first match was decided in favour of the Amateurs, with six wickets
to go down, it surely would be worth the contending parties to try
who shall be considered the conquerors." (112)

Although the Gazette happily recorded in 1841, "the eminence

which this noble game is rapidly gaining in the County of Kent," (115)
cricket so far as Bridge was concerned was no longer being reported

in the local newspapers. No doubt some respectable Bridge residents
would have witnessed the occasion during Canterbury Cricket Week in
1868 when W. G. Grace, representing the South against the North, scored
130 and 102 not out, which prompted The Kentish Gazette to remark that
"this feat of Mr. Grace's is, we believe without precedent, two innings
exceeding 100 in a first class match." (114)

The Bridge village cricket team returned rather ignominiously to

the local newspapers in July 1872, when they lost by an innings and
twenty-seven runs to Ickham, being bowled out for 27 and 67 whilst

lckham made 121, the only consolation being the form of Mr. Howard

who scored 67 runs in the match. The Bridge team on that occasion

was J. Collins, C. Howard, C. Willis, Pulley, Hyder, F, Martin,

W. Winter, Esq., W. Dutnall, E. Gibbs, E. Hardeman and Y. W. Tassell. (115)

Other reported sporting events in Bridge offered fewer opportunities
for mass participation, taking the form of challenges of some sort or
another, which the public could observe if they so desired. During
February 1872, ‘

"Robinson (the Spider) from London, walked his trial of
seven miles over half a mile of ground between Bridge and
Patrixbourne, on Wednesday afternoon. The road, being
heavy,was very unfavourable to the youthful pedestrian;
but he accomplished the distance some time within an hour.
He is matched with Ferguson to walk, on Sudbury Common,
seven miles for £25—a-side on Wednesday next." (116)

1858 witnessed a foot-race between Mr. John Verrier and Mr. R. Sherrard,
jun., with Sherrard giving his opponent a five—yards start. The first

‘ race ended in a dead heat and after a short rest the two men ran again,

with "Mr. Verrier winning cleverly by a yard." (117)

The wealthy participated in field sports; East Kent was notable
for having a number of foxhunting packs. The Earl of Guilford
hounds met occasionally in Bridge for instance on one occasion at
10.50 a.m. on Friday 18 February 1876. (118) Stag Hunts were not so
frequent judging from a Kentish Gazette report on 18 April 1854.

"A novelty was presented yesterday in an excellent stag hunt
with the Thanet Harriers in the neighbourhood of Barham
Downs. The party assembled at Mr. Hornsby‘s at Barham,

when about 20 gentlemen artook of a very excellent

luncheon, provided by thaﬁ7 worthy host. The stag

was uncarted near the Black Mill on the Downs, and after

an excellent run of 40 minutes, 30 minutes of which were

at capital pace, was ultimately taken at the back of Chartham
Park." (119) .

LIFE IN THE BIG HOUSES
For all their patronage and influence, the lives of landowners

and gentry received surprisingly little publicity in the newspapers.
Important weddings and birthdays were newsworthy items, and were
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often occasions for extensive local celebrations which were

enjoyed by many people in the village. Such was the case

during May 1849 when Lord Francis George Churchill, the eldest

son of Lord Churchill, married Lady Jane Conyngham, "the amiable

and lovely daughter of the Marquis of Conyngham,... at the

beautiful little village church at Patrixbourne.” The Rev. J.
Stevenson officiated, assisted by the Rev. M. A, Smelt, "in the
presence of a select circle of relatives and friends of both parties."
There was "a large congregation of neighbours, together with upwards
of lOO school children", while "a tastefully formed laurel bower,
interspersed with all kinds of flowers... extended from the entrance
of the churchyard to the porch." The invited guests "subsequently
partook of an elegant dejeuner at Bifrons" following which "the
happy couple took their departure for Cheau, near Richmond." Over
one hundred labourers and poorer cottage tenants, "seated under a
splendid booth, ornamented with laurel branches and gay flags",
enjoyed "a bountiful supply of roast beef and plum pudding" and

were joined by some of the wedding guests. Later on that same

day "the school children were regaled with tea and cake."
Fortunately "the weather was most propitious, which added much to
the hilarity of the joyous occasion." (120)

A somewhat humbler wedding attracted the following report in
The Kentish Gazette of 4 December 1866.

"On Wednesday our little village was the scene of unusual
excitement consequent on the marriage of Miss Kelcey,daughter
of Mr. Kelcey of this place, with Mr. Nelson Collard, jun.,

of Canterbury. The villagers, to testify their good feeling
towards the bride and her family, erected a very handsome
triumphal arch on the bridge, which was very prettily
decorated with ever-greens, flowers and flags and bore

an appropriate motto. The church was filled with numerous
friends of the happy pair and Zwith7 nearly all the inhabitants
of the village, and rejoicings in various ways took place in
the latter part of the day in celebration of the auspicious
event." (121)

The summer of 1872 saw the marriage of Miss Constance Georgina

Bell, the fifth daughter of Matthew Bell, Esq., of Bourne Park to
Major F. T. Whingates who was then commanding the Royal Artillery
who were stationed in Canterbury. This event caused the village
"to emerge from its quietude and to assume for a time an aspect

of life and festivity." Readers of The Kentish Gazette were
given some of the names of the invited guests to the wedding
breakfast, which was followed by a garden party: namely, the Earl
and Countess Mount—Charles, the Rev. H., Mrs., and Miss Hallett,
Dr. and Mrs. Stevenson, Lady Victoria and Mr. Villeries and the
Rev. C. Oxenden. (122)

Country House parties played a prominent part in the lives of
the rural upper classes as was noted by The Kentish Gazette of

5 November 1874.

"The Earl and Countess of Mountcharles have been entertaining
company during the past week at Bifrons, near Canterbury;

the house party including Viscount Neville, Viscount Grimston,
Captain and Miss Streatfield, Mr. and Mrs. Sands, etc. The
gentlemen have had excellent sport at pheasant shooting.
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The Earl and Countess entertained a numerous company

at dinner who afterwards attended the hunt ball at
Waldershare given by the Earl and Countess of Guilford

to inaugurate the hunting season. The Earl of Mountcharles,
according to his annual custom, since his residence in Kent,
has supplied the Kent and Canterbury Hospital, also the
Cottage Hospital, at Ashford, with an abundance of game,

the result of his Lordship's and Friends’ sport." (123)

Life had its sadder moments as on 29 January 1876 when the

Marchioness of Conyngham died at her residence on the Marine Parade

in Folkestone, following a short illness. Born in 1798 she had
married the Marquis in 1824 and had borne him a family of two sons and
four daughters, all of whom survived her. (124) On the following
Wednesday her remains were deposited in the vault of the Conyngham
family in the chancel of Patrixbourne Church, when the chief mourner
was the Marl of Mountcharles. Although the church was filled with
the inhabitants of Bekesbourne and adjacent villages, The Kentish
Gazette noted, however, that "The Marquis of Conyngham was unable

to attend owing to a rather severe attack of gout, and Lord Francis
Conyngham, the Marchioness's youngest son, was prevent\_i from being
present at the solemnity as he was travelling in Egypt." (125)

Landowners, no less than those lesser mortals below them were
accident prone, perhaps even more so bearing in mind certain aspects
of their social life. Few of Bridge's ordinary residents would
have suffered the sort of accident that befell the unfortunate
Mr. Bell who, while out shooting with his two sons during September
1878,

"met with a serious accident. A partridge rose and flew
back between him and his eldest son who after it had

passed some distance behind, fired at it, and Mr. Bell

having partly turned at the same time to watch the bird

was struck by two or three glanced shots, one of which struck
his left eye. Mr. Sicard of Bridge.was sent for and on
ascertaining that the shot had penetrated the eye, Mr. Adams,
chief surgeon of the County Opthalmic Hospital, Maidstone,

was telegraphed for and promptly attended. He found the
injury so serious that it was necessary to remove the

injured eye in order to save the other. This operation

was most skilfully and successfully performed... by Mr.

Adams, ably assisted by Dr. Smyth, house surgeon of the
hospital, Mr. Sicard also being present, Mr. Bell

having been previously placed under the influence of methylene.
We are happy to add that Mr. Bell is progressing as‘favoura5ly
as possible, and that Mr. Adams expresses a confident opinion
that the sight of the remaining eye will be preserved
unimpaired." (126)

OTHER NEWS AND EVENTS FROM BRIDGE

Not all the news coming out of Bridge can be categorised so
easily as has been attempted so far in this chapter, particularly
singular events or developments, as well as news of a more regular
ocazrence, yet of minor significance.

Barham Downs was on occasions a hive of activity; as a wide
open expanse it was an ideal meeting place, for instance on Tuesday,
23 April 1850, for a meeting of the East KentAgricultural Protection
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Society, when "Friends of the Principle of Protection to British
Industry" were invited by Thomas W. Collard, the Hon. Secretary,to
attend a "PUBLIC MEETING on BAR]-IAJVI DOWNS... to consider the present
state of distress of the agricultural districts of the country

and to adopt an Address to the wueen on the Subject." (127) Egg
Kentish Gazette, in its report of this meeting, described it as being

"unsurpassed in the annals of East Kent for numbers, respectability and
unanimity," (128) calculating that over 8,000 people attended. Had a
meeting of such size consisted only of agricultural labourers or the
working classes it might have been interpreted as being potentially
'revolutionary'.

Five years later The Kentish Gazette carried rumours concerning
possible ‘camps of instruction‘ on the Downs. It was alleged that
engineers were surveying possible sites to ensure that a constant and
sufficient supply of running water would be available. The camps
were expected to accommodate about 4,000 troops, cavalry, infantry, and
artillery.(l29) There was also a lighter side to military activity
in this area when later in that year "some amusement was caused during
the sham fight on Barham Downs by the appearance of a number of hares
and rabbits which are very plentiful in that spot - the animals
terrified by the mimic warfare ran in all directions among the soldiers,
who bayonetted the poor victims without mercy, and consigned them to
their haversacks in utter contempt of all game laws and game keepers." (130)

Considering that a majority of the inhabitants of Bridge earned
their livings from the land there were surprisingly few reports of
agricultural pursuits in the village. Emigration was an avenue open
to those who could not sustain reasonable livings or obtain employment.
It was during March l850 that Mr. Craig conducted an emigration party
to Herne Bay, where they boarded a steamer for London where the ship
Columbine waswaiting to conduct them to the United States. "The party
consisted of about fifty, chiefly small farmers and agricultural
labourers from the neighbourhood. Thegreater part are bound for
Cleveland, Ohio.'' (151)

One "Remarkable Occurrence" for The Kentish Gazette involved
a breeding ewe, which belonged to Messrs. Hodges and Sons. Within
a period of thirteen months she gave birth to three lambs, all at
separate times, and reared as well all the offspring, the births
being in January 1877, on 30 September 1877 and on 1 March 1878. (132)

Victorian Bridge acquired its own Fire Brigade, which was
established around 1874. mpe fire engine was presented to the
village by the Conyngham family and operated with a reasonable
degree of efficiency. Its services were demanded as early as
ll July 1874 when

"a barn at Bridge, in the occupation of Mr. Huxstep, and
the property of the Marquis of Conyngham, was struck by
lightning. Immediately it was discovered that the head

of the barn was on fire, the Bridge Fire Brigade was
summoned. They arrived in ten minutes with their

engine, under the command of Mr. Verrier and owing to their
exertions the fire was quickly extinguished, very little
damage being done." (135)

A more serious fire broke out two years later at the farm of
Mr. Collins, and was started when sparks from an engine, working
with a threshing machine blew onto the roof of a large barn,
which contained 500 quarters of corn. The Bridge Fire Brigade
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and the Canterbury Volunteer Brigade, on realising that they

could not save the barn and its contents directed their efforts to

saving threatened farm buildings nearby, and apart from the end of

one range of stabling the fire was prevented from spreading. The
buildings belonged to the Marquis of Conyngham and had been insured for
£1,000, Mr. Collins's personal loss was estimated at between £800 and £900,
a large portion of which he was unlikely to recoup. (134)

There were occasions when the fire brigade's presence was not
required, as and when,

"a fire broke out on the premises of Mr. J. S. Clayson, grocer.
Mr. Clayson had been in bed some time when he found out that a
portion of his house was on fire. Ready assistance was given
him by Mr. Harnden, builder, Messrs. F, Sutton and J. H. Verrier
and Police—constable Goldsack, and by their efforts the flames
were prevented from spreading.

The cause of the fire was entirely an accident.” (135)

In order to improve this operational efficiency the Bridge Fire Brigade
undertook drills, which tested appliances so as to discover how far

they could be relied upon in all sorts of emergencies. On one occasion
the object behind the drill was to concentrate on buildings which were
situated some distance away from sources of water supply.

"The result of the trial was very satisfactory. Within
four minutes from the word being given the engine was
at work and a jet of water from a source 450 feet away,
was issuing from the pipe. Several drills were gone
through with double deliveries, showing that in case of
need two fires could be attacked at the same time. ‘An
attempt to reach the Church was also fairly successful.
The members afterwards dined together at the Red Lion Inn." (136)

The progress of the Elham Valley Railway from the time it was
proposed in the mid 1860's to its opening in the later 1880's was

\_ reported in the Canterbury newspapers. The route envisaged proceeded

from Canterbury, past Bridge, Bishopsbourne and Barham, through the
Elham valley to Elham and Lyminge, and then by way of Seabrook to
Hythe. The Kentish Gazette of 20 March 1866 noted how "The Bill

for this Railway went before a Committee of the House of Commons,

of which Mr. Dent was Chairman, on Monday last," when the Rector of
Lyminge, the R v. R. C. Jenkins, stated under cross-examination that
Bridge, compared to Barham, Bishopsbourne and Dorringston, would derive
little benefit from the line. (137)

Although the Act to build this railway received the Royal Assent
during August 1866 the Company collapsed because it had only limited
financial resources. Eventually the Elham Valley line was built,
but not as a light railway as originally planned, but as a main line
track. The first train ran from Folkestone tola temporary terminal
at Barham on 4 July 1887. Canterbury received its first train only
on 1 July 1889. (138)

Miscellaneous snippets of news from Bridge suggest that life was
very varied. Christmas produced seasonal announcements such as the
following in 1872.
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"Mr. Hodges, butcher of Bridge, has in preparation for

the festive season a capital show of prime meat, both

beef and mutton, including the following:— Heifer,

bred and fed by Mr. John Kingsmill, Elmsted, and awarded

first prize at the last Ashford Cattle Show; prime

South Down sheep, bred and fed by the Marquis of Conyngham." (139)

Ten years previously an amateur concert was held in the school
room, the proceeds from which were paid over to "distressed Lancashire
operatives." A full house was ‘delighted' by an excellent performance
and the Gazette could not bestow

"Too much praise...Z§ﬁ7 the ladies and gentlemen who came
forward to aid so meritorious an object. The sum of £9 was
received and handed over to the worthy rector, Dr. Stevenson,
who from indisposition was unable to be present." (140)

During February 1870 Major Castle, of Bridge Hill House, travelled
down to Weymouth. During his stay on the South Coast he played a
prominent role in the Weymouth Amateur Theatricals, by acting the
character of KingC1arles II in a play bearing that titlr, The Kentish
Gazette acquired from The Southern Times a glowing review to the effect
that "the part of Charles II was borne with regal magnificence by Major
Castle, who looked all the King (at least the King he was supposed to
represent), and whose frolicsome humours he carried out with a grace
and tact that were exceedingly attractive." The Major also acted in
‘Checkmate’ and ‘Nine Points of the Law‘, in both of which he received
a most enthusiastic reception." (141)

Unhappiness rather than pleasure was the lot of an unfortunate
few some of whom achieved an exit from life in suicide, as did John
Lott who, during December 1860,

"was found hanging from a tree in a wood in this parish.

The unfortunate man was quite dead, and had been so apparently
for some time. He was about 40 years of age, and has left

a widow and five children. We understand that for some time
past the deceased has laboured under strong religious eycitement,
under the influence of which it is supposed, he committed the
rash act. The suicide was of a most determined character,

as when found the deceased's feet rested on the ground and he
had found it necessary to place himself in a kneeling position
in order to throw the weight of his body on the cord by which
he was suspended." (142)

A FITTING CONCLUSION: THE COMING OF AGE 1N OCTOBER 18 8 OF THE

EARL(E‘MOUNTCHARLES

A fitting conclusion to this chapter exists in a long report in
The Kentish Gazette of 8 October 1878, which described all the cele-
brations in Bridge associated with the coming of age of the Earl of
Mountcharles, the son of the Marquis and Marchioness of Conyngham.
Here was not only a person of note but also a memorable event which
the village celebrated as a community on a scale that is nowadays
hard to imagine. It is best left to The Kentish Gazette to recall
the festive atmosphere on that occasion:
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"On Tuesday last, the Earl of Mountcharles, son of the Marquis
and Marchioness Conyngham attained his majority. The pleasant
little village of Bridge was en fete in honour of the auspicious
event, and through the liberality of the Marquis many people,
old and young, in the village, and round Bifrons kept high
festival. The stranger entering Bridge in the morning found
the place gay with flags and bunting and a glance at some of

the houses revealed the reason, for there were various greetings
and good wishes to the young lord inscribed in a variety of
forms on the house fronts whilst the merry pealing of the church
bells told of the general joy and gladness. It was feared

that owing to the family not having returned to Bifrons, the
rejoicings on the occasion would lack eclat which the presence
of either the Marquis or Marchioness or the young Earl would
naturally bestow; but it was a most agreeable surprise to
everyone to hear that, although for a very sufficient reason,
neither the Marquis nor his son could join in them, the festive
gatherings would be graced by the presence not only of the
Ladies Conyngham who were staying at the mansion but also of

the Marchioness, her Ladyship having written that morning to

Mr. Robert Smith, the Marquis's head steward, to intimate her
intention of coming over from Ramsgate, where she had been
staying with the noble Marquis. Meanwhile the preparations

for the different gatherings had progressed under the direction
of Mr. Smith who had had arrangements made for several dinners
and other festivities.’

The first event of the day took place at the Union where
the whole of the inmates were entertained in a most liberal
manner. The rooms and wards were richly decorated, the
work of the staff of the house,and at one—o-clock the old men
and women, and children sat down in their different wards to a
substantial repast of roast beef and plum pudding with beer.

Grace was said by the Vicar of Bridge, the Rev. F. T. Vines

who was accompanied by the ReV- E- Sedd0n9 Mro R0 Smith! Mr° Sedd°n"

Mr, F, J, D, Sams, Mr. Sims, chairman of the Board of Guardians,
Miss Parker, and other Ladies and Gentlemen, all of whom lent
willing hands to the task of attending to the enjoyment of the
poor people and young children.

While dinner was being partaken of, the Marchioness of
Conyngham entered, accompanied by Lady Blanche and Lady Constance,
and went through the various rooms and wards and also the Infirmary,
the inmates of which were likewise well looked after...

At four o'clock in the afternoon the restored and greatly
extended public hall and reading room in Bridge was opened by 3
number of the work people on the Bifrons estate (40 in 311)
sitting down to a capital dinner, provided by Mr. Webb Of the
white Horse Inn, The Rev, F. T. Vine addressed a few words
to the company... and during dinner the Marchioness and Lady
Blanche Conyngham came into the room. The hall presented a very
gay and pretty appearance it having been handsomely and tastefully
decorated by the members of the Fire Brigade assisted by several
young ladies of the village. The hall, we may add,is the.
property of the Marquis, and after being restored and considerably
extended had been generously presented by him to the village.

Its dimensions are — 57 ft. long by 20ft. wide with an orchestra
20ft. by 10ft. The hall will be used for public entertainments,
meetings, etc., in addition to being used as a reading room.

\
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At the Red Lion Inn some five and twenty of the smaller
tenantry partook of a substantial meal. Here too the Marchioness
paid a visit and saw everyone thoroughly enjoying himself. From
thence, the visitors went to the schoolroom where a particularly
lively and happy scene presented itself. There amid gay and
profuse decoration were seated some 200 children with an abundance
of good things set before them, the repast in this instance being
a tea. The juveniles, who had come in their best attire and with
happy faces, were tended by a full and sufficient staff of ladies,
amongst whom was Lady Constance Conyngham, whilst the Marchioness
looked on with interest. At the conclusion of the tea the Rev.
F. T. Vine proposed a vote of thanks to the Marchioness and Ladies
Conyngham and the Earl of Mountcharles, and alluded to the many
acts of kindness of the family to the schoolchildren... The
children then went to the hill side and indulged in various school
games being led by the Ladies Conyngham. Returning to the school
as the shades of evening were gathering round they were entertained
with some drawing room theatricals by the Ladies Conyngham,
assisted by Miss Francis.

Before concluding it should be added that the workmen who are
employed in the Mansion at Bifrons, where extensive alterations and
improvements are being carried out, were likewise regaled with good
things in honour of the occasion. In fact, no one was forgotten
by the noble Marquis, who would himself have been present at the
gatherings but for his continued indisposition.

At night fall a monster bonfire was lighted on the side hill
of Bridge, lighting up the country for miles around, and there
was also a display of fireworks. The faggots for the bonfire were
kindly given by Mr. J. F. Martin. The village was illuminated
with Chinese lanterns, etc. and in Mr. Willis'syard there was a
flagpole from which hung innumerable lanterns. The day's festivities
were thus brought to a close, all who had participated in them
having passed a day that will long be remembered.

On the same day about fourteen of the Marquis's tenantry at
Minster were entertained to dinner at the white Horse Inn, and
320 of the inmates at Minster Workhouse had a similar treat to those
of the Bridge Union at the expense of his lordship." (143)
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IX:TEE ESTABLISHMENT AND EARLY ADMINISTRATION OF THE
NEW POOR LAW IN THE BRIDGE UNION

Miss J. A. Nunn

THE NEW POOR LAW

Any study of the New Poor Law must first encompass a description of
the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, which laid down the principles governing
the treatment of the poor for the rest of the nineteenth century. Prior to
1834 there was no national system of poor relief. Instead different parts
of the country administered different kinds of workhouse or provided various
payments of cash or kind, which supplemented the low incomes of the poor.
The most famous type of outdoor relief was the ‘Speenhamland System‘. As
pauperism and outdoor relief increased so too did poor rates. It was
alleged that the Speenhamland payments encouraged laziness and were a positive
disincentive to work. For these reasons it was thought advisable to devise
a new and national system of poor relief. ‘

The Poor Law Amendment Act of I854 abolished outdoor relief to the
able—bodied, who on applying for relief were to be offered maintenance in a
workhouse where their lives would be regulated and made less comfortable
than had they chosen to stay outside and fend for themselves (1). This
principle of ‘less eligibility‘ had the attraction of being a self—acting
test of destitution. Only those persons who were genuinely in dire need
would accept the workhouse rather than starvation, particularly since on

entering the workhouse they lost all the rights and privileges they were
entitled to in the outside world. Those who were not in such straits
would prefer to remain independent and thus avoid contracting the morally
wasting disease of pauperism (2).

The New Poor Lawvms seen as a positive solution to an increasing

problem of pauperism, which would work wonders for the moral character of

the working man, and reduce poor rates, since it would be cheaper to
administer than the old systems of outdoor relief. For these reasons the
Government accepted the principles of the New Poor Law even though they
involved a greater degree of bureaucratic centralisation than would have
been acceptable to them under normal circumstances. Under the 1834 act
overall responsibility for the poor law passed into the hands of three

Poor Law Commissioners at Somerset House, whose rulings were transmitted to
Boards of Guardians in different areas by Assistant Poor Law Commissioners.
The country was divided up into Poor Law Unions, for each of which a Board
of Guardians was appointed with complete control of local administration.
Each Poor Law Union was composed of several parishes. Boards varied in
terms of administrative detail and in how they interpreted the legislation

of 1834. Some stuck to the letter of the Poor Law Amendment Act, while
others proved to be more flexible. Boards of Guardians were elected annually
and each Guardian represented a constituent Parish within his Poor Law Union.

The implementation of the New Poor Law was not as uniform as its
promoters had hoped for. For a few years several Boards of Guardians in
Northern Counties merely administered the Registration Act of l836 (5), and
even when they were persuaded to assume responsibility for the poor law in
place of the parish authorities they were allowed to continue the payment
of outdoor relief to the able—bodied. Having permitted such a concession,
the central authority experienced difficulty in withdrawing it. Moreover
the workhouse test was never enforced in the industrialised Unions of
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Lancashire and the West Riding and Boards of Guardians even ignored the
stipulation that able-bodied male applicants for relief be subjected to

some form of task work. They demanded instead that their Guardians be

given full discretion to relieve their poor as they thought fit, so that
outdoor relief to the able—bodied continued, and even took the form of
allowances in aid of inadequate earnings (4). Initially the central

body lacked the power to enforce anyone to do anything, and yet much

was achieved prior to the first great administrative change of 1847, whereby
a new Poor Law Board replaced the three Poor Law Commissioners as a governing
and ministerial rather than a reforming authority (5).

For thirteen years between 1854 and 1847 the three Poor Law Commissioners,
with Edwin Chadwick as their secretary, administered the early years of the
New Poor Law, but under constant pressure from Parliament and from hostile
agitation in the industrial areas they failed to achieve national uniform-
ity in poor law administration or the abolition of outdoor relief. During
the 1840's they both formally permitted a considerable degree of outdoor
relief, even to the able-bodied, and relaxed their supervision of local
administration. Chadwick, after a number of quarrels, increasingly
turned his attention to the sanitary problems raised by his report of 1842,
and from 1847 was no longer involved in poor law administration. 1847
also produced a major scandal surrounding the Andover workhouse, where
paupers who had been so badly fed on being set to work on grinding bones
for fertiliser fou ht for any scraps of food which still clung to the
half—rotten bones %6). This case exposed a slackening of control from
the centre and promoted a parliamentary storm out of which the Poor Law
Board emerged as a minor government department. Under a new Act, which
was passed at the same time, an inspectorate was established and some
improvements in workhouse conditions were promised (7).

Inadequate levels of outdoor and indoor relief have been blamed on
the meanness of Boards of Guardians who, it is alleged,cared more for the
rates than the poor under their control. Given a failure to reform the
rating system in 1854, some of this parsimony is understandable. Prior
to 1865 each parish remained responsible for the cost of relieving its
own paupers, and until 1861 the contribution of each parish to the common
expenses of the Union was assessed on the basis of its relief expenditure
and not its rateable value; in other words, on its poverty rather than
its property. Parishes with large working class populations experienced
great difficulties in collecting poor rates in periods of trade depression,
and so were unable to meet the financial demands imposed upon them by
their Boards of Guardians, who, in turn found their financial resources
dwindling at times when calls upon them were at their greatest. Under
the Union Chargeability Act of 1865 the entire cQst of poor relief was
placed on the Union, rather than on the parish, thereby redressing an
unequal burden between rich and poor parishes within the same Union (8).

The Bridge Poor Law Union in comparison with more extreme examples
was a model union. While it did not adhere strictly to the principles
of the Poor Law Amendment Act, it was certainly more co—operative than
many unions in the North of England.

THE MINUTE BOOKS OF THE BRIDGE GUARDIANS

The main historical source for this chapter exists in the minute books
of the Board of Guardians of the Bridge Poor Law Union, of which there are
twenty—one spanning the years from 1855 to 1950. They can be consulted in
the County Archives Office in Maidstone. Entered in these books were the
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weekly meetings, decisions and reports of the Bridge Board of Guardians.
The books themselves are very large measuring approximately eighteen
inches in length and ten inches in width. One single volume can contain
entries for three years. They are all beautifully written in fine
copperplate hand—writing.

The procedure at each meeting followed the normal pattern of any
committee meeting, commencing with a list of those Guardians who were
present. Normally the Guardians turned their attention firstly to
the weekly financial accounts, as submitted by the two Receiving Officers
of the Bridge Union, which usually showed how much had been paid in Out
Relief over the previous week. Items discussed thereafter varied
from one meeting to another, but might include the acceptance or rejection
of tenders from local tradesmen, who competed with each other in supplying
provisions and other necessities to the Workhouse; petitions for out-
relief from paupers who resided in the Union; and matters of daily
routine in the running of the Workhouse, such as new appointments,
salaries, the diets of inmates and new pauper admissions. Queries on
any point of administration were sent to the Poor Law Commissioners.

The minute books provide a clear and lengthy account of the day to
day running of the Bridge Poor Law Union. They also yield much valuable
and useful information in such areas as the quarterly cost of poor relief,
or the cost of poor relief for individual parishes. Unfortunately,
however, there are gaps in this sort of information, which therefore
cannot be followed through on a year by year basis. with respect to
Bridge itself the Minute books portray the parish and village as one
part of the Poor Law Union. Intermittently figures appear which show
Bridge's share of the poor rate, or the numbers of paupers from this
particular parish who were receiving outdoor relief or staying in the
workhouse.

Despite gaps in information, lack of consistency and problems of

interpreting other people's handwriting, those minute books which have
been consulted have proved to be an interesting and informative source.

THE BRIDGE POOR LAW UNION AND THE FIRST MEETING OF THE GUARDIANS

The first meeting of the Bridge Union Board of Guardians was held on
22 April 1835, "by order and by declaration of the Poor Law Commissioners
for England and Wales dated 27 March, 1835" (9). It was held at the
white Horse Inn in Bridge. The Guardians were joined by Sir Francis Head,
as Assistant Poor Law Commissioner for the East Kent Area, and by the
following Ex Officio-Guardians: the Rev. C. Hughes-Hallett, George Gipps
Esq., and Robert Ballard-Johnstone Esq. There were nineteen Parish
Guardians: (10)

Name Parish
Richard Brice Bridge
John Bushell lckham
Henry Collard Patrixbourne
John Sankey Lower Hardres
John Marsh Hood Kingston
Stephen Fuller Harbledown
Stephen Gambill Waltham
John Howard Upper Hardres
John Harvey Bishopsbourne

Nathaniel Maynard Fordwich
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Name Parish
Thomas Byng Wickham
Thomas Sladden Adisham
Edward Collard Stodmarsh
Richard Peckham Bekesbourne
Denne Denne Littlebourne
Henry Mount Nackington
Robert Lathe Thanington
Benjamin Harrison Womenswold
Robert Owann Westgate.

There were two guardians who were absent and they represented Barham
and Petham. Thus the Bridge Poor Law Union was established on the basis
of twenty-one parishes. The first meeting was largely concerned with
settling the administration of the Union. Richard Peckham ofBekesbourne
was elected Chairman and Nathaniel Maynard of Fordwich was elected
Deputy Chairman. It was resolved that meetings should be held every
Thursday morning at eleven o'clock at the White Horse Inn in Bridge.
Herbert Collard was elected Clerk of the Union at a salary, to be
recommended to the Poor Law Commissioners, of £40 per annnm.

The Union was divided into two districts, each of which had one
Receiving Officer. Captain Samuel Beachcroft, who was a half pay
Officer of the 14th Regiment, was recommended as the Receiving Officer
for the first district at a salary of £50 per annum which had also to
be recommended to the Poor Law Commissioners. Henry Illsby was
appointed Receiving Officer for the 2nd District. The twenty one
parishes were apportioned to the two districts as follows:

1st District 2nd District
Bridge .Nackington
Womenswold Upper Hardres
Barham Lower Hardres
Kingston Petham
Patrixbourne Waltham
Bishopsbourne Thanington
Adisham Harbledown
Bekesbourne Westgate
Littlebourne Fordwioh
Ickham

Wickham

Stodmarsh

Four districts were created for purposes of medical assistance:

1st District 2nd District ﬁrd District gth District
Bridge Adi sham Nackington Harbledown
Womenswold Bekesbourne Upper Hardres Fordwich
Barham Littlebourne Pe tham Thaninston
Kingston Ickham Lower Hardres Westgate
Bishopsbourne Wickham Waltham

Patrixbourne Stodmarsh

The subject of a Workhouse was also discussed at the first meeting.
It was agreed, subject to the approval of the Poor Law Commissioners, to
provide accommodation for no more than BOO able-bodied paupers. A
committee was established to find a suitable site for the Workhouse,
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composed of Mr. Brice (representing Bridge), Mr. Maynard, Mr. Lathe,
Mr. Peckham, and Mr. Denne.

Administrative arrangements were finalised at subsequent meetings,
Mr. D. Denne was appointed Treasurer to the Union and Richard Pilcher
was appointed Auditor (11). £150 per annum was offered to the local
doctor for caring for the sick poor. In July 1855 the Guardians
accepted Sir Francis Head's request that the Parish of Chartham should
join the Bridge Poor Law Union, which was thereby extended to twenty-two
parishes, surrounding Canterbury as shown by the parallel lines on the
attached map, which has been taken from G. H. Garrad, A Survey of the

Aggiculture of Kent (1954).

THE ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF THE WORKHOUSE: THE BUILDING.

The Bridge Union Board of Guardians, who resolved almost immediately
to build a workhouse, set up a committee to find a suitable site within
one mile of Bridge which contained an acre of ground (12). The site
selected adjoined the turnpike road from Bridge to Canterbury. The
necessary land, which belonged to the Marchioness of Cozgngham (15),
was bought for £257. 10s. from Lord Albert Conyngham (14). Having
located and purchased a site, the Guardians through the medium of the
Canterbury newspapers invited builders to tender for constructing the ‘
Workhouse. A surveyor was appointed and the tender of Mr. T. F. Cozens,

a Canterbury builder, was accepted for £4,576 (15). The construction
of a Union Workhouse at Bridge was financed by a £5,000 loan from the
Exchequer (16). v

STAFF APPOINTMENTS

Within nine months of accepting Mr. Cozenss tender the Workhouse
was ready to admit its first inmates by February 1856. Already a Master
for the Workhouse had been appointed. An advertisement which appeared
in the newspapers during August 1855 offered a salary of £80 per annum (17).
Applicants whose names were short—listed were interviewed at the White
Horse, together with their wives (18). John Weeks and his wife were
appointed as the first Master and Matron of the Bridge Union Workhouse
at a salary of £80 per annum, exclusive of rent, candles and living (19).
Mr. and Mrs. Weeks resigned their appointments towards the end of
December 1855 (20) before the workhouse officially opened, thereby forcing
the Guardians to find a new Master and Matron. Early in 1856 Thomas
and Maria Cobb were appointed Master and Matron of the Bridge Union
Workhouse at annual salaries of respectively £80 and £20 (21).

A schoolmistress was appointed at a salary of £52 per annum, while
John Adams as the first porter received wages of l0/- a week (22).
Spiritual needs were provided by a Workhouse Chaplain (25), while a
medical officer was paid 950 per annum to attend on the sick in the
Workhouse.

By the time the Workhouse opened its doors the following domestic
staff had been engaged (24).

Laurance, Sarah, aged 55 — Cook

Morgan, Mary, aged 52 — Cook

Breasley, Mary, aged 57 - Cook

Brice, Sarah, aged 48 - Nurse for wards No. 7 to No. 15
Spain, Mrs., aged 29 — To give her attendance to the Boys.

Holness, Ann, aged 25 — To give her attendance to the Girls.
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Thus the Workhouse began its life with a minimum staff of twelve
persons, eight of whom were women, and over half of whom were domestic

staff.

THE INMATES

The Workhouse as constructed initially was intended to house

200 inmates, though it contained fewer than that number in its early
stages. To start with only one hundred iron bedsteads were required.
Inmates arrived from already established Workhouses, such as the
Littlebourne Poorhouse (25). On 25 February l856 the Bridge Guardians
decided to seek authority to sell the Littlebourne Workhouse (26), which
was the same Thursday when paupers from Barham and Bishopsbourne in
Elham workhouse moved into the Bridge Workhouse (27).

THE LAYOUT or THE WORKHOUSE (28)

Probationary and waiting wards were situated below and next to
the Committee Room. The Workhouse on its south and north sides contained
upper and lower wards, viz:

On the South Side of the Workhouse:

g To No. 7 inclusive = Girls under 16 years of age.

Upper Wards
) To No. 15 inclusive = Old Women and Bedridden Women.

To No. 22 inclusive Boys under 15 years of age.

)
Lower Wards )
) To No. 50 inclusive = Able-bodied Women.

On the North Side of the Workhouse:
Upper Wards — Old Men.
Lower Wards — Able—bodied men and boys l3 years of age and above.

Permission had to be sought from the Poor Law Commissioners for two
old couples to sleep together (29) but this was strictly against the rules of
the Poor Law Commission until after 1847 when some concessions were made.

The Guardians‘ minute books contain few figures relating to numbers

of paupers in the Workhouse, but during the first quarter of 1847 there were
nineteen paupers from Bridge itself in the Workhouse, whose maintenance cost
£27. 8s. 9d. (30). During the same three months fifteen paupers in Bridge
had received outdoor relief at a total cost of £16. 17s. 7d. In comparison
with the other parishes in the Union Bridge was about average. Chartham,

on the other hand, was well above average, having had twenty—eight paupers

in the Workhouse during the same period at a total cost of £45. l2s. 6d.

In the granting to outdoor relief Chartham was much above average with
ninety-seven paupers receiving outdoor relief at a total cost of £58. l5s.l%d.

THE INMATES' DIET

At a meeting which was held in 1855, involving all the Chairmen
and Vice-Chairmen of the East Kent Unions under the chairmanship of
Sir Francis Head, it was agreed to adopt one common diet for all Union
Workhouses and Poorhouses throughout East Kent (Bl):
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For the Able—Bodied: Men and Women

Breakfast and Supper. Bread and cheese or butter — 6 oz. of
bread for men, 5 oz. for women with 1 oz. of cheese of % oz. of
butter.

Dinner. Two days - Suet Puddings and vegetables — 1 lb. of pudding
for men, LO oz. for women. One day — Meat pudding with vegetables -
1 lb. of pudding for men and 10 oz. for women. Four days - Bread
and Cheese - 7 oz. of bread and 1 oz. of cheese.

For Old People

The same as for the able—bodied plus 1 oz. of tea and milk for
breakfast and supper.

For Children

Bread and milk for breakfast and supper and such proportions

of the dinner diet for the able-bodied as the Board of Guardians
shall decide.

For the Sick
whatsoever be ordered for them by the Medical Officer.
Dietary alterations which were made subsequently included

giving male inmates who worked hard a daily pint of beer,
while the breakfast diet was changed from bread and cheese to

gruel.

EXPENDITURE INCURRED BY THE BOARD OF GUARDIANS AND HOW THEY EXTENDED
THEIR FUNCTIONS

It was immediately agreed by the Board¢ﬁ'Guardians that the various
parishes making up the Bridge Union had to meet the running costs of the
union, in "such proportion of the general expenses of the union as is
lawfully chargeable to the said parishes" (32). Bridge had to pay
£27, as against Barham paying the most at £53 and S odmarsh the least
at only £6. Since the average was £22, Bridge paid something over
the average.

The Guardians also quickly agreed on the following scales of weekly
outdoor relief:

Amount without earnings

For a married man and wife 5/-
For each child 1/-
For Single men 2/6d.

At the 1855 July meeting of Chairmen and Vice—Chairmen Sir Francis Head
expressed the following views on the payment of out—relief (53):

"any fixed scale of relief is directly hostile to the
principle of the Poor Law Amendment Act. No pauper should
be able to safely calculate the amo nt of relief he should
receive and thus set store by it. Instead it should

fluctuate so much that he could never calculate what he
was to receive and therefore come to realise he had no
certain support - nothing on which he could safely rely -
but his own industry and his own providence".

It was agreed that the eleven unions of East Kent should act as uniformly
as possible. Outdoor relief was fixed at sums beyond which it was not
to be extended under any circumstances:

Amount per week

For a man, wife and six children lO/—
For a man and wife 5/-

Outdoor relief was made still less attractive when it was decided that
the maximum payment to old people should be 2/6d. per week.

Sir Francis Head further ruled that parishes within the Bridge
Union had to allocate five per cent of their average yearly poor law
expenditure towards the administrative costs of the Union, for which
purpose a report was compiled showing the annual average xpenditure
on poor relief by each parish over the previous three years after
deducting expenses for emigration (34):

£

Adisham 288
Barham 660
Bekesbourne 122
Bishopsbourne 565
Bridge l75
Chartham 884
Fordwich lO9
Upper Hardres 258
Lower Hardres 261
Ickham 594
Kingston 180
Littlebourne 528
Harbledown 496
Nackington 302
Petham 485
Patrixbourne 259
Stodmarsh l2O
Thanington 404
Waltham 751
Westgate 458
wickham 714
Womenswold lOl

Total 8,422

Bridge's share of administrative costs was £8. l5s. Compared with
several other parishes, Bridge‘s poor law expenditure had been very low.

Due to the establishment of the Workhouse there was a higher expendi-
ture on poor relief during the first quarter of l856 (35):

‘V

i. Total cost

of in—relief in the first quarter of ...
... £275. 153

r3
LA.

0 0

Unmn Road,Bndge

Looking up Union Road towards the front of the Workhouse.

.Inner courtyard of the Workhouse, now called The Close, June 1978.
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2. Total cost of out—relief in the first quarter of ...
... £765. 19s. Ogd.

Plus 5 Establishment charges of ...
... £1,459. 11s. 5d.

Had these costs continued at this level for the whole year, then total
poor relief expenditure would have exceeded £10,000, which would have been

more than the £8,492 average of the previous three years. The three
items of expenditure as far as Bridge was concerned were:

1. In-relief of £21. 7s. 10d.
2. Out-relief of £21. 11s. 5d.
3. Establishment of £30. ls. 6%d.

Had these costs also continued then the total cost of poor relief in
Bridge would have exceeded £200 for 1856. Initially higher costs were
involved in implementing the 1854 Poor Law Act with the result that poor
law expenditure increased considerably during the first year following
the establishment of the New Poor Law in Bridge. Such high levels of
expenditure, however, did not continue. By 1847 the total cost for the
first quarter for Bridge was at a much lower level and was calculated

as follows:

1. In—re1ief of £27. 8s. 9d.
2. 0ut—re1ief of 516. 17s. 7d.
5. Establishment of £5. 2s. 1d.

Lower outdoor relief and establishment costs existed alongside a higher
expenditure involved in maintaining those paupers who had entered the
Workhouse. These trends were repeated for other parishes within the
Bridge Union.

The Guardians maintained a tight control over expenditure.

Anything supplied to the Workhouse was subject to competitive tenders.

The Receiving Officers in reporting weekly to the Board stated how much
money had been spent on outdoor relief. Usually this amounted to about
£45, except on those occasions when they had to pay for the treatment of
lunatics, as on 9 April, 1840, when a weekly expenditure of £72. 7s. O%d.
was reported. The corresponding expenditures for the previous week
ending on,2 April were £41. 6s. l%d., and for the following week ending on
16 April, £41. 6s. O%d.

Initially the Guardians experienced difficulties in collecting the
parochial poor rates. In 1856 several parishes refused to acknowledge
and pay the Guardians‘ appointed Collector (56). After continuous trouble
throughout that year the Board set up a committee, consisting of five of its
members who were to examine and report on the best method of collecting the
Parish rates within the Bridge Union (57). Richard Brice from Bridge was
elected to this committee. The Guardians in addition requested the Poor
Law authorities to send an explanatory letter to the troublesome parishes
concerning the collector's right to the Parish Rate (58). Subsequently
on 27 February 1840 the Board of Guardians allowed Parish Officers to

excuse paupers from paying the Poor Rate (59).

Another financial problem which the Guardians had to face in 1840
arose out of disagreements over the payment of Medical Officers. They
sought information from the other Poor Law Unions in East Kent as to whether
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and how much they paid their Medical Officers (40). The Guardians
were facing criticism from Mr. Nix who had been a Medical Officer to
the Union since its formation. In 1840 he was continually complaining
of underpayment, but was finally satisfied in 1841 with a salary of

£50 a year for attending the workhouse, plus l2/- for each attendance
on the outdoor poor and l4/— for each midwifery case (41).

As time progressed, so Boards of Guardians’ functions were
extended and their financial affairs became more complicated. In
1847 Bridge Union became responsible for collecting those county rates
which were due from within its boundaries and had also to pay the
county clerk of the peace whatever sums were owing for judicial
administration throughout its area (42). In 1847 a cheque for
£168. Os. lOd. was paid over to Mr. Mercer, the County Treasurer,
as the amount of county rate due from the parishes within the Union.
Bridge's share of this was £9. 19s. 7d., but Chartham had most to

pay at £19. 5s. lld. (45).

The Guardians had many demands on their purse other than normal
poor relief payments. Occasionally they authorised grants to families
to enable them to emigrate, as on 27 February 1840, when "the sanction
of the Board was givento the Parish Officers of Upper Hardres to
advance the sum of £5 to Thomas Hobb's wife and child of that parish
for the purpose of their emigrating to Australia" (44). Later in
that year on 11th September the sum of £14. lls. Ed. was granted to
Thomas Fairways and his family of Chartham for their emigration to

New Zealand (45).

Payments were sometimes made to other Unions for having
incurred expenditure on a Bridge Union pauper. Whenever such
requests were received the Bridge Guardians usually paid promptly,
as on 1 December 1856 "to the Faversham Union for the upkeep, for
twenty—siX weeks, of a child belonging to the Parish of Barham" (46).

Extensions of functions in other directions can also be seen
in the Guardians‘ minutes. From 1836 onwards they were responsible
for the registration of births, marriages and deaths. They

‘apprenticed.boys to employers outside the area, so that a Canterbury

sweep, for instance, was allowed to have apprentice boys in 1840 (47).
On 11 September 1840 they agreed to vaccinate all the children who
required vaccination within the Bridge Union (48).

There was a wide range to the matters discussed and decisions
taken by the Bridge Board of Guardians. This overall conclusion
can be supported from their minute books during the 1840's. On
5 March 1840 the Clerk to the Board of Guardians was requested to
write to the Poor Law Commissionerstofind out the correct procedure
"towards Pregnant Unmarried Women requesting to lye—in in the Workhouse",
and also whether such women who appeared on a second occasion should be
punished (49). At the same time it was also decided that all bastards,
over seven years of age, who applied for relief, would be ordered into
the Workhouse.

The Union Chaplain reported to the Board of Guardians on 14 March
1842 that the internal discipline of inmates was generally satisfactory,
and that there had been particular progress in the education of the
Workhouse children (50). On 29 April 1847 the Guardians considered
moving a lunatic from Upper Hardres to the County Asylum at Barming
Heath, near Maidstone (51).

ll7.

CONCLUSION

Even from this brief study of the early years of the administration
of the Bridge Poor Law Union, it is possible to advance several conclusions.
The Guardians were very conscientious in executing their duties. They
were not particularly hard or unkind in their admininistration of poor
relief, yet this is a charge which is commonly thrown at Victorian
Boards of Guardians. Although they were careful over financial
matters, they were not always tight-fisted and did help those in
genuine need. Costs of poor relief were not always reduced at least
in the short~term. Despite condemnation of outdoor relief such payments
to the able-bodied poor continued within the Bridge Union, alongside
other types of out-relief such as funeral expenses, clothing grants and
medical aid. Within the Bridge Union the parish of Bridge appears as
a village having but a small number of paupers and an average poor-relief
expenditure.

.
,\/\/\/\,—\/3/5/\/\/\/\,\,\/\f\/\,\,1,\/\f\/\r‘/\/\/\/\/\/K/\/\/\/\/\/\/—\f\/\/\/\/\/\

118.

FOOTNOTES

E. ose, The Relief of Poverty 1854-1214 (1972), 8.
dl, Bl -

Ibid., 11.
Ibid., 11.

M. Bruce, The Coming of the Welfare State (1961), 103.
I. Anstruther, The Scandal of the Andover Workhouse (1973), 133.

Bruce, op, cit., 117.

Rose, op. cit., 42.
Minutes of Bridge Board of Guardians, 22 April 1835.

Ibid., 22 April 1835.
Ibid., 28 April 1835.
Ibid., 28 April 1835.
lhiis. 7th May 1835.

)
)
)
)
)
)
i
)
)
3
% Ibid., 6 August 1855.
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
D

M.
'1 i

Ibid., 27 May 1835.
Ibid., 25 February 1836.
Ibid., 20 August 1835.
Ibid., 10 September 1835.
Ibid., 17 September 1835.
Ibid., 27 December 1835.
Ibid., 7 January 1836.
., 28 January 1836.
., 17 November 1836.
Ibid., 10 December 1836.
Ibid., 28 January 1836.
Ibid., 25 February 1836.
Ibid., 18 February 1836.
Ibid., 10 December 1836.
Ibid., 11 February 1836.
Ibid., 1 April 1847.
Ibid., 9 July 1835.
Ibid., 21 May 1835.
Ibid., 9 July 1835.
Ibid., 21 November 1835.
Ibid., 25 February 1836.
Ibid., 14 July 1836.
Ibid., 3 November 1836.
Ibid., 3 November 1836.
' 27 February 1840.
Ibid., 27 February 1840,
Ibid., 5 March 1841.
Ibid., 12 March 1847.
Ibid., 9 April 1847
., 27 February 1840.
., 11 September 1840.
., 1 December 1836.
i ., 2 January 1840.
id., 11 September 1840.
Ibid., 5 March 1840.
Ibid., 14 March 1842.
Ibid., 29 April 1847.

\1O\U1-b\Nl\)I—JO\O(I)\1O\\DJ>\Nl\)|—J©\OCI)\'lO\\D-I>-\)~|f\)|—'

I-1

do‘
;\_a..\_-.
919-1

I-4
0"
F1.
F1’

I-4
U’
Q:

I-1
C)"

\J1\n\_‘>,\_;>\_§\_,>\_b\_§\_b\_b\_b\_p\N\N\N\N\N\N\N\N\N\Ny\)[\)|\)f\Jl\JF\)f\)f\)f\)T\)P-‘I-\*‘|—"l—’1'-'|—‘l-’I—‘I~4l—'/\/\/\/‘A/\/\/\/'\/\
|~—'CD\OG)\1O\LD-I>\Nl\)!—‘O\O(D\1O\U1-15-\NI\)b-’C)\OCD
gz \/\\_/\\_/\/\/\\_/\/\\_/\\_/\/\\_/\\_/\\_/\\_/\./\./\./\/\./\/\./ \\_/\./
|—|
O‘
F’
C14
0
o

119.

X: THE FUNERAL OF A BRIDGE FIREMAN - APRIL 1210
Mrs. P. Reilly

We realise at this stage of the Project that there is a
chronological gap between the last chapter and the next chapter
which it has proved impossible to rectify in the time available.
Undoubtedly, one of the most momentous events in Edwardian
Bridge is described by Mrs. P. Reilly in the following extract
which has been taken from The Kentish Gazette, 9th April, 1910:

The Fire Maroon Tragedy at Bridge

One of the most momentous events in Edwardian Bridge, at least,
to judge from the coverage it received in The Kentish Gazette, was
the early death of young Mr. John Fenn, of 6 Albert Terrace, second
engineer of the Bridge Fire Brigade, on 31 March 1910.

It appeared from the inquest that a fire had brtken out at Pett
Bottom. It was the job of Mr. Fenn Junior to light the maroon to call
together the Fire Brigade. On the fatal afternoon at about 12.30 he
left the ‘Plough and Harrow’ and asked his brother for a match. This
his brother provided and then went off "round the corner”. Almost
immediately there were two simultaneous explosions and Mr. Fenn's cap
was seen by a witness to ‘go right up into the air‘. The witness
hurried to the scene and found Mr. Fenn lying outside on a pile of
straw. Details of his injuries are graphic: “profuse hamorrhage
(Kentish Gazette's spelling), left eye completely gone ..." Mr. Fenn
lived for only twenty minutes after the explosion.

It emerged during the inquest that second engineer Fenn had not
fired a maroon before, and that instead of lying down to fire it, he
had stood over it and hence received the fatal blow in the face.
There seemed to be some uncertainty as to whether the maroons were
faulty, and in order to satisfy himself on this issue, a representa-
tive of Messrs. Brooks "took train to Bridge" and inspected the scene
of the accident. He subsequently declared that the maroons were of
the best quality, similar to those fired at Crystal Palace since 1865,
and asked permission to fire the remaining five. He later contended
that the maroons were not defective, thus clearing the name and
reputation of Brooks.

Mr. Fenn's funeral was a stirring and solemn occasion. According
to the Gazette: "Never before had the village of Bridge felt a disaster
so keenly ... April 3rd will stand out in the history of the village as
a day never to be forgotten ..." -

5,000 people thronged the narrow street, overflowing into the
surrounding fields. Most of the gentry were present at the graveside,
though the'Conynghams were not mentioned, presumably because they
worshipped at Patrixbourne. The dead man was given a military
funeral with a firing party from the East Kent Yeomanry. The coffin
was borne by six foremen.andfollowed by 65 members of other Fire Brigades.
"It was a mournful procession indeed as it wended its way up the hillside
and.. there were but few dry eyes..." The grave had been prepared
under the shadow of some tall trees bordering the road and "sympathetic
hands had lined it with primroses and ivy".
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At evensong after the funeral the Rector of Bridge,

Rev. H. Knight, referring to the tragic death of Mr. Fenn said that
God took us out of this world for two reasons. Either we were
well ready for entry to the heavenly Kingdom or else we were ‘so
hardened‘ that it would be futile to give us any more chances. It
was clear that the former case applied to Mr. Fenn and that the
finger of God had singled him out to lay down his life for his
friends. It is to be hoped that such fatalism afforded some
comfort to his relatives and young widow.

Funeral of Mr. J. Fenn, Bridge Fire Brigade, 1910.
Victory Outing.

3919:
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Xl: BRIDGE: A PORTRAIT OF THE VILLAGE BETWEEN THE WARS

Crispin Whiting

Any survey of the village between l9l8 and 1939 suffers from a lack of
contemporary documentation. Guide and travel books found little of interest
in the village itself, although several seized upon and romanticized about
"Old England's Hole" where, it has been suggested, Caesar battled with the
last of the resisting Britons. (1) Books specialising in architecture dwell
upon some of the local houses of interest. (2) The local historian cannot be
satisfied by the guidebooks'superficial passing overof Bridge as "an old
highway village of the coaching days."(3) He must necessarily turn to other
sources of information.

Trade directories are useful sources for the names and occupations of
villages at any one time. Invariably they describe in outline the village,
and itsservices and institutions. However, this source also has its drawbacks.
Population figures are only accurate once every ten years, and even then can
be confusing in the case of Bridge, as and when many directories failed to
make it clear whether or not their population totals included residents of
the union workhouse, in which cases a vexing game of arithmetic and assuption
must be embarked upon in order to arrive at logical, and hopefully correct,
sets of figures.

Among the local newspapers, The Kentish Gazette, provides only limited
information, in a period when flower shows, the cricket club, and meetings
of the Parish Council were by far the most documented events in the village.
It does, however, contain some interesting photographs, including one of the
Voluntary Fire Brigade in its early days. (h)

The East Kent Development Survey (5), published in l925, although not

dealing with Bridge as a separate entity, places the village in a wider
perspective with others of similar size in the area, and provides lists of
members of various comittees including,of course, representatives from
Bridge.

Since such written sources provide no more than a basic framework, some
other source is needed in order to portray the village as it really was.
The human mind offers a better and more comprehensive source than any book
or document. Personal memories and recollections add flesh to the dry bones
of written sources. The late Mrs. J. Friend, for instance, committed to
paper in 1958 her recollections of village life, which were published in
1976 on the occasion of the opening of the Bridge by-pass. (6) They reveal
much about the recent history of the village.

This concluding chapter owes much to Mr. Harry Hawking, who for the
whole of his life has resided in the village and has played an important role
in its social life. He has also recorded many of his memories, and has
passed them on to others in the form of lectures to local groups and societies.
He kindly made available his notes on the village, in the absence of which a
restricted and sdmewhat superficial study of Bridge would have been the
inevitable result. What is known of interwar Bridge is portrayed under the
following headings, namely, "Education", "Transport", "Trade and Agriculture"
and "village life in general".

EDUCATION

Most of the children attended the Public Elementary School, which although
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no longer in use today still survives as a prominent village building. It
Offered places to ll0 boys and girls and 86 infants, but was seldom filled

to capacity. In 1918 the headmaster, John George Andrews, and the infants'
mistress, Miss Constance Gwendoline Wye (7), were responsible to the Bridge
Local School Attendance Committee which met at 21, Burgate Street, Canterbury
on the first Saturday of each month at 2.30 p.m., under the chairmanship of
the Rev. Canon M.A. Nisbit from Ickham. (8) The clerk to the committee was
Thomas Louis Collard, who played a prominent role in the administration of
village affairs.

Evidence from trade directories shows that Mr. Andrews had ceased to
live in the village by 1923, but Miss Wye was still listed as "Infants' mistress,
National Schools". (9) In l92h the school was described as being under the
control of the Kent Education Comittee, and its new master was William John
Billing, while Miss M. Bell was the new infants‘ mistress. (10) By 1928
Edgar Pope had taken over as master, but the infants were still under the care
of Miss Bell, (11) who seems to have held the post for some time, and was
certainly still living in the village in 1939. (12)

Even by interwar standards the school building itself was old, it lacked
proper sanitation, and there was only one pup to raise all the water which
was required. It educated children at least up to the his of 12, some of
whom then left and wen;straight into a trade or employment. Although almost
all the village children attended from the age of four, some were fortunate
after a few years to be sent to school in Canterbury. Mr. Hawkins was sent
by his father to the fee-paying Simon Langton School in Canterbury from the
age of seven, when he used to cycle into the city each day. Fees of three
guineas a term in 1918, had more than doubled to seven by 1928, when he left.
Generally only the sons of tradesmen and farmers entered schools other than
the National Elementary, while children from the "Big Houses" were usually
sent away to boarding schools and had only minimal contact with the majority
of village children.

TRANSPORT

Even by 1918 modes of communication had changed somewhat from the des-
\_cription given by Mrs. J. Friend of transport in and around the village at
the beginning of the century:

"... Our connections with Canterbury were to walk or ride. We rode

on solid tyre cycles, sometimes a penny farthiqgbicycle, tricycles,
pony carts or horse back. Best of all was the coach with its four in
hand and post horn. This came from Folkestone to Canterbury daily and
was driven by Mr. Scott, passing through the village between 12 and

1 o'clock, and returning between 3.30 and h o'clock. (13)

Although following the first world war horse traffic was still in heavy
use, it was now the motor vehicle that was "best of all". Private cars in
the village were few and far between, owned principally by the people from
the "Big Houses". This is well illustrated by Mr. Hawkins‘ recollection that
when he wished to purchase a motor car some time in the late 20's his mother
did her best to dissuade him, on the grounds that motor cars were only for
the "Big families". She further urged that if the village draper bought one,
then as a family they might be though;by the owners of Bifrons, Bridge Place,
etc., to be too well-off by half and so could forfeit their valuable custom!

Of greater significance to the majority of villages were the motor
omnibuses and charabancs of the East Kent Road Car Co. Ltd., which provided
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regular services to Canterbury, Folkestone and Dover. While they were efficient,
they lacked much of the organisation associated with bus services today.

Mr. Hawkins remembers the bus driver actually calling for regulars who were

not outside the White Horse at the usual time. There were no timetables as

such, and buses could be hailed at any point on their route, often resulting

in bartering over fares!

Some years later, another company known as the "Cambrian Company",
competed along the same route, starting from the Plough and Harrow in the
High Street, and in effect raced the East Kent Company! Fortunately or
unfortunately, depending on how one looks at it, this practice ceased when
regular stops and timetabling were introduced.

The introduction of motor vehicles necessitated the tarring of the road
whose surface up to that time assumed the form of well trodden chalky dust.
When, during the First World War, a convoy of London buses came through the
village en route for France, the dust raised by the first dozen or so convinced
those drivers, who were accustomed to clean London streets, that the Germans
had put something on the road! (lb)

Motorized traffic increased steadily, but during the period under review
never approached the intensity of more recent years which made necessary the
long awaited by-pass in 1976. Accidents, however, were frequent, in days
when there were far fewer controls over the private motorists, yet with fewer
cars on the road the risks involved in driving home after a night at the pub
were less and this was a practice often indulged in. There was no driving
test for the would-be motorist, and Mr. Hawkins remembers that on the night
he had bought his car, for the princely sum of £12 10s 0d, he learned to drive
by motoring to a function at" Dover!

The changing nature of transport in and through Bridge is well illustrated

by a picture postcard of the High Street dating from about l920. Painted

above the front door-axeither side of the "Plough and Harrow Inn" are "Good
stabling" as opposed to "Garage". A single vehicle, a motorized delivery van,
chugs purposefully down the centre of the High Street, observed by one
pedestrian and a solitary cyclist leaning against the bridge.

TRADE AND AGRICULTURE

Bridge still supported a surprising variety of trades for a village of
its size, particularly given its proximity to Canterbury and the improvements
in transport already noted. Shopping in Canterbury, however, was not of
vital importance to Bridge housewives, since most of their basic daily needs
could be secured from within the village. The following table shows the
distribution of trades and professions listed alphabetically for 1913, 1918

1928 and 1939.

Station Master
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TRADES AND PROFESSIONS IN BRIDGE 1213-1232

1913 1918 \_1\_ggE\_3 193

Artist 1
Baker 1
Beer retailer 1
Boot dealer 1
Boot dealer and Saddler l
Boarding House 1
Brick Maker 1
Butcher 2
Builder 1
Chemist 1
Coal Merchant l
Confection and General 2
Cycle dealer 0
Dairyman l
Draper 1
Dress Maker 1
Fishmonger 0
Fly proprietor 1
Grocer 3
Hairdresser 1
Insurance Agent 2
Jobbing Gardener 2
Laundry 1
Motor Garage 1
Newsagent 0
Nurse 0
Plumber 1
Publican M
Reading-room Manager 1
Riding School 0
School Master 1

O

1

O

1

Sub-PostMaster

Transport Company
Wattle Maker

1 O
1 1
1 1
2 1
1 1
1 O
1 1
2 1
2 O
1 1
1 1
3 l
O 1
1 1
1 1
1 C
O 1
O O
3 3
1 1
2 1
1 O
1 1
1 1
O O
O 1
1 1
M h
1 1
O 1
1 1
0 1
O 1
O 1

O O

The table is not wholly accurate since some directories particularly Egg
Canterbggy and Herne Bay Blue Book for 1239, lists relatively few commercial
or private residents in the village. Where a particular trade is known to
have been in existence it has been added to the list for that year. The table
shows several changes of an obvious and minor nature. Thus, it is hardly
surprising that as early as 1918 both the wattle maker and the fly proprietor
had ceased trading, while by 1928 one motor garage had been joined by a

cycle dealer and a transport company. It is but one reflection of an
agricultural area, that a blacksmith and saddler should both survive until
the end of the period. In 1918 there were two builders in Bridge but ten
years later both had ceased trading. It is possible that increasing mobility
obviated the need for such a service in the village itself.

As well as satisfying many household needs the tradesmen of Bridge
practically ran the village. Such names as Friend, Price, Hawkins and Hogben
were associated with many committees and organisations, including the
voluntary Fire Brigade. Mr. Hawkins, whose father had been the village draper
since 1907, recollects how the tradesmen and farmers met informally and quite

125.

frequently in the back room of the Red Lion to discuss the village affairs
and trade in general.

The shop of Frederick John Hogben, the saddler and shoemaker in Bridge

Street, was usually full of villagers only some of whom were customers, as the

centre of village gossip. It was commonly known as the snob shop, from the
slang for a shoemaker. (15) The Fairbrass family kept a confectioners
business nearby, which around 1927, was being recorded as a greengrocer. The
village drapery, located at Riverdale next to the Bridge, was started by

Mr. George Hawkins in 1907, and passed to his wife on his death in 1928.

Mr. Harry Hawkins subsequently took over, branching out to become the village
newsagent from April l93h onwards, prior to which Bridge had not possessed a
paper shop. Five years later Bridge had two newsagents. The newsagency
business which Mr. Hawkins founded in l93h flourishes to this day and is run
by his son, while the drapery side only closed down three years ago. In

l93h the building of a newsagent's shop cost a mere £100!

The garage was owned by Mr. Rogers, who, before the advent of the motor
car, used to drive and work on steam traction engines and threshing machines
at the steam engineers in Laundry Lane, known now as Conyngham Lane. The
garage was unfortunately burned down, as was also the dairy which was replaced
by a fish shop in 1928.

Milk from the dairy had been delivered in churns, each house bringing
out a receptacle into which milk was ladled from a measure, but dust thrown
up from the roads made this practice somewhat unhygienic.

Union Road contained a cycle agent who later moved into the High Street.
Bicycles were a widely used form of communication between the wars, being
the only form of personal transport which was cheap to buy and cost little
or nothing to run. Bicycles were ideal for such short journeys as from Bridge
to Canterbury.

Adjoining the elementary school was a coal merchant, who supplied not
only coal, and faggots, but also hired out his trap for outings. The willage
baker baked bread in a brick oven, using faggots as fuel. The village
butchers had their own slaughter-houses and it was a common sight to see
livestock being driven throughthe village, to be sold over the counter
within the next few days. From 1913 to beyond 1918 the Misses Tutt, were
in business as dressmakers. They were local girls who had received the
necessary training on leaving school, as the daughters of Mrs. Mary Tutt
who had been a dressmaker in the village before the Great War.

Bridge had a mill which was owned by Charles Holland, who ground not
only flour, but also sold coal, which explains why the land where the mill
once stood is now owned by Corralls Ltd. The windmill was demolished some
time during the 1930's, a move which would arouse opposition in these days
of preservation and planning permission.

Sidney Gilbert was the sole surviving blacksmith between 1918 and 1939.
His forge was situated where Turner's now stands, and it was customary to
see a row of horses awaiting his attention in the street outside. He was
never short of custom, for not only was there a riding school behind the
Red Lion, but within the parish there were seven farms.

Bridge Farm was associated with lands in the village and on the hill,
where Western Avenue now stands. What is today Great, Middle and Little Pett,
was one single farm which, along with Lenhall, Renville, and Bifrons farms,
concentrated to some extent upon hops. Bifrons also kept sheep and undertook
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mixed fanning of other kinds, while Hode Fanm specialised in apples, and
kept pigs in its orchards to aerate the soil. Highland Court Farm was much
smaller than the others until the Whigham family began to develop it.

VILLAGE LIFE IN GENERAL

Class distinctions remained strong in Bridge, as in many other areas of
the country, during the interwar years. Situated close to the village were
the two major estates of Bifrons and Bourne Park, plus a smaller estate,
known as Higham or Highland Court. The owners and occupants of these big
houses were socially superior to all other people and were viewed with a
great deal of respect. They were major employers of labour, but not necessarily
from the village itself. They engaged butlers, cooks, footmen, housekeepers
and other menial domestics, such as grooms, gardeners and maids. Essentials
for their households were supplied by village tradesmen, who valued their
custom highly.

Below these aristocratic or gentry households were the highly revered
occupants of the other big houses such as Bridge Hill House, East Bridge .\_
House, Bridge Place and Field House. The next rung of the social ladder was
occupied by the farmers and leading tradesmen, such then was the social
hierarchy of Bridge which survived the 1920's and 1930's, with the Talbot
family being remembered in the village as the last of the gentry. Mr. Hawkins
recalls having to try very hard to prevent his mother from going out to the
chauffeur-driven car from Bourne Park which had sounded its horn for attention
in the road outside the draper's shop. He recollects remonstrating with the
chauffeur, informing him that in future all customers would have to come into the
shop for service.

The Conyngham family continued to be good absentee landlords. Fences
and other property were kept in good condition, and footpaths across their land
were kept clear. They owned the Reading Room and Village Hall, which they
rented to the village at the peppercorn rent of a shilling a year.

Count Zborowski derived much satisfaction from building a model light
railway up on Barham Dawns, which attracted many notable actors, novelists
and actresses, before he met his untimely end, while motor racing on the
Continent.

The joint living with Patrixbourne had been held since 1897 by the
Rev. Hubert Knight, M.A. of Christ's College Cambridge, who resided at
Patrixbourne. He was noted for being absent minded and for his fondness for
gardening, which occasioned funerals or wedding parties having to send
messengers over to Patrixbourne to fetch him from his garden, because he had
forgotten his appointmemm at the Church. He is also remembered for having
asked after the health of people whom he had buried!

Bridge has had only three doctors during the entire period that Mr.
Hawkins has lived in the village. Dr. Wilson was an Irishman who had the
unfortunate habit of gigging even when confronted with the most serious
situations. He never rose before midday, and would ask people who called
before noon to go away and come back later if they were really ill, and yet he
was quite happy to see patients at 3 o'Clock in the morning. He was followed

by Dr. Hunt who although less flamboyant, was considered to be an excellent
doctor.

The Bridge Union Workhouse was managed by Mr. and Mrs. Honney, with the
help of only two staff nurses for the female and male wards. In l9l8 the
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Board of Guardians met on every fourth Thursday at 12 noon in the Workhouse,
under the Chairmanship of J. D. Maxted Esq., of Littlebourne. (16) The
Assessment Committee met on the first Saturday of each month at 21, Burgate
Street, Canterbury. (17) The clerk to the Guardians was Thomas Louis Collard

of Bridge Hill, who is remembered for his hard hat as well as for his devotion
to committee work. His work for the Bridge Blean R.D.C. involved him in the
collection of rates, which he undertook personally, calling from house by

house, as and where the rates had not been paid immediately! Bridge had a
rateable value in l92h of £2,262 (18) divided among a population of nearly

900, although in 1918 it had been £3,hO5, when the population was 823, according

to the 1911 census. (19)

Bridge appears as a relatively healthy village between the wars. In 1922
the death rate for the Rural District was 12.1, compared to lh.O for Deal and
9.8 for Walmer. (20) The average death rate for England and Wales in 1922
was 12.9. The birth rate was quite low relative to other places nearby.
Margate had a very high rate at 19.5, while Bridge with a rate of 13.6 was
only just above the lowest, Broadstairs, which recorded 12.1. (21)

The population of the village changed but little over the twenty years
falling between 1911 and 1931. Excluding the inmates of the Workhouse, the
figures at each census are as follows:

1911 — 723
1921 - 699
1931 - 713 (22)

Allowing for the fact that 13 men of the village perished during the First
World War, (23) the discrepancy between the figures is only eleven between
1911 and 1921 as against only lh between 1921 and 1931. Overall Bridge had a
remarkably stable population, having ten fewer inhabitants in 1931 compared

to 1911.

Recreational facilities and organisations existed or developed to meet
the interests of most villagers. A Womeﬁs Instibﬂxewas established in 1919, (EH)
while a cricket club had existed intermittently since l7h8. (25) The

\_Horticultura1 Society was reformed in 1920, (26) while for younger generations
a scout troop met behind the Red Lion Public house, followed later by a boy's

club. The British Legion organised railway outings until the closure of the
Elham Valley line during the Second World War.

One organisation of vital importance was the Bridge Volunteer Fire Brigade,
whose equipment in 1918 included a Merry—Weather manual engine and about 1,200
feet of hose. The Fire engine was horsedrawn, being pulled by the same horses

.as were used for funerals and for delivering coal. The firemen were mostly

local tradesmen and at one time included two grocers, the cycle agent, a
publican, the draper,two gardeners, the coal merchant and the blacksmith. The
men were summoned by a maroon flare, and Mr. Hawkins recollects that a man

was killed around 1920 when looking over the flare, supposing it to have gone
out. There were 12 sets of helmets, tunics and axes, and if a tall man left
the force to be replaced by a short man,the latter had to endure an ill fitting
uniform. The force entered the motorised age when Count Zborowski donated a
motor appliance, registration nuber CE 1037. It was kept running largely
through donations from insurance companies, whose outgoings would have

scared but for the Volunteer Brigade's existence and devotion to duty. Mr.
Hawkins, who was captain of the force for some time, recalls how they resented
the presence at small fires of the Canterbury or Sturry Brigades, who would

be soaked on arrival! The Bridge Brigade had no ladders until shortly before
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the last war, while the early hoses were made of leather and thick rubber.
The fire brigade remained independent up until the Second World War.

CONCLUSION

Bridge developed in the same way as countless other English villages
between 1918 and 1939, but like the rest of them it had its own Characteristics.
These manifested themselves in the institutions, the people and the life style
of the village which we have looked at in the preceding chapter. Hopefully
future generations, and not only the historians will find it easier to trace
the development of the village in modern times, for there is an increased
interest in recording aspects of village life, not only by individuals but
also organisations like the Womeﬂs Institute, whose ’Count§Xside Survey‘ will

be of great assistance in assessing the changing position of Bridge in the
last decade.
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