Owen Manning, William Bray and the writing of Surrey’s county history, 1760–1832
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The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey took more than 40 years to research and thirteen to publish. It was begun in the 1760s by Owen Manning (1721–1801), vicar of Godalming, and completed in three volumes by William Bray (1736–1832) of Shere, between 1801 and 1814. But Manning and Bray did not operate alone and the work, though one of the finest county histories of its day, was fraught with difficulties. The prefaces to each volume and papers of those closely associated with the project testify to the support given to the editors by a national network of antiquaries and the industry, patience and accuracy that ensured the book’s enduring value for local historical research. This paper, drawing on the rich archive materials of Manning and Bray, the antiquary Richard Gough (1731–1809), and the printer, John Nichols (1745–1826), charts the research and production of a county history which remains a basic tool for students of Surrey’s past.

Introduction

In 1911 Henry Elliott Malden, editor of the Victoria History of the County of Surrey, admired Manning and Bray’s achievement: ‘If slips and omissions do occur in their work, it is difficult to over-estimate their industry and care, and their general accuracy is wonderful, considering especially the absence of those catalogues, indexes and printed calendars which aid the modern topographer and genealogist’.¹ The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, published in three volumes in 1804, 1809 and 1814 and reprinted in 1974, is still an invaluable reference tool for scholars from a range of disciplines; a starting point for research in Surrey’s archaeology, landscape, buildings, industry and ecology; a source for family and local historians; and an indispensable guide to the county’s religious history. This paper examines the achievement of these two early local historians within the context of contemporary antiquarian scholarship and publication. Owen Manning was a skilled Anglo-Saxon scholar (colour plate 1). William Bray (colour plate 2) was a Surrey lawyer, immersed in the records of his native county. Both of them were part of a network of antiquaries extending beyond Surrey to the wider ‘Republic of Letters’ of the 18th century academic community.

Though antiquaries have traditionally received a bad press, recent research is acknowledging the debt that is owed to their enquiries. Though Stuart Piggott and David Douglas considered that there was a decline in research standards between William Stukeley in the early 18th century and the rigorous historical discipline of Sir Richard Colt Hoare’s History of Modern Wiltshire (1837), urban and county historians, topographical artists and engravers, bibliophiles, editors of rare textual fragments and local debating societies are now acknowledged to have made important contributions to the promotion of historical research and study of the materials of the past.² Their correspondence testifies to their industry and enthusiasm and the pages of publications such as the Gentleman’s Magazine and Archaeologia bear witness to the breadth of their achievement. Their networks of friendships provided the impetus for the later foundation of county archaeological societies, natural history clubs and national and local record publishing societies. Manning and Bray – and those who helped them – shared a sense of the importance of antiquarian study in the wider sphere of their contemporary culture.

¹ VCH, 3, 113.
The antiquarian background

The writing of local history in the 18th century was rooted in the growth of the county as an administrative unit, the rise of the landed classes and the pride that people felt in their local area. Since the reign of Elizabeth, the county had become an essential tool of national government. The gentry, as justices of the peace, met regularly at quarter sessions and saw their pedigrees and title deeds as endorsements of their right to undertake their judicial and administrative responsibilities. Muniments were examined, estates surveyed and rights to property disputed. This interest often engendered local pride in the county’s history and a desire to publish it as a testament to the achievements and continuing honour of the families who ran it. In 1622 William Burton cited local patriotism as his reason for writing The Description of Leicestershire and, not to be outdone, the Warwickshire gentry opened their muniment rooms to Sir William Dugdale in order ‘to preserve the honour of their families by some such public work as Mr Burton had done […] in Leicestershire’.3 The county court of quarter sessions provided the perfect opportunity to promote this research. In 1660, John Aubrey and other Wiltshire justices planned their own county history at the Devizes sessions and in 1684 Robert Plot saw the Stafford assizes as ‘a general meeting of the greatest part of his subscribers for his Natural History of Staffordshire’.4

An interest in local history could be triggered by the need to settle legal arguments. Maps and deeds were used to settle boundary disputes or quarrels over land ownership. In 1795 Joseph Cragg asked John Nichols, who was working on his History of Leicestershire, to check Domesday for proof of his manorial rights.5 Manning’s history of Braboef manor near Guildford was written for the More Molyneux family in 1784 and survives in the Loseley manuscripts6 and, after Manning’s death, Bray was asked to check his papers to settle the disputed Compton inclosure.7 As heraldic visitations declined after the 17th century, county histories came to be used as compendiums of local property rights and were cited as evidence in courts of law. In 1835 John Bowyer Nichols, the printer who steered Manning & Bray to completion, reported to the Record Commission that ‘solicitors and private gentlemen’ continually asked him to look at the county histories he had printed in order to settle matters of litigation.8

Antiquarian study was essential to the spirit of 18th century public enquiry and part of a gentleman’s education. Performance of public service was incumbent upon all who wished to be seen as gentlemen, especially if they were unable to serve their country in the army or navy. In 1738 Francis Wise of Oxford remarked that ‘young gentlemen have been taught to reckon this study amongst their chiefest personal accomplishments’.9 Richard Gough, who was a driving force behind Manning & Bray, saw antiquarianism as a public duty, believing that study of local history and the achievements of county families would ‘equip a man for public duties, engender national identity and promote the nation’s reputation abroad’.10

Antiquarianism was closely linked with scientific discovery, being part of the contemporary zeal to identify, arrange and classify. Gentlemen filled their cabinets of curiosity with fossils, coins and wax copies of seal matrices in the same way that they collected minerals or studied local plants and insects. Gilbert White’s letters to Thomas Pennant and Daines Barrington on natural history are scattered with observations of local antiquities. This is reflected in the frequent joint membership of the Royal Society and the Society of Antiquaries. Sir Joseph Banks, the most eminent botanist of his day, was keenly interested in the antiquities of his
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3 Currie & Lewis 1994, 16.
6 SHC: LM/366 Brief history of the manor of Braboef and manor of Pickards, Compton, 1784.
7 SHC: 1617/2, f 200.
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9 Wise 1738.
native Lincolnshire and served on the Council of the Society of Antiquaries and Manning was a Fellow of the Royal Society for three years before his election to the Society of Antiquaries in 1770. Antiquaries were urged to verify and test their materials to exacting standards of accuracy. They presented them as historical evidence, leaving readers to draw their own conclusions. In stressing that an antiquary should provide full references for his sources while not allowing his opinion to cloud the narrative, the later 18th century antiquaries were laying the foundations for modern historical scholarship.\(^{11}\)

But antiquaries were not universally respected. Antiquarianism was at odds with polite taste of the 18th century. Horace Walpole sneered at the interest in England’s medieval history as a misguided insularity and dismissed Richard Gough and Owen Manning’s enthusiasm for Anglo-Saxon literature as a regrettable interest in a barbaric past. Like others who returned from the Grand Tour, Walpole looked to Classical antiquities of Greece and Rome for inspiration and read the works of Homer and Virgil in preference to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle or Domesday Book. Writing to William Cole of Milton, Cambridgeshire, in 1782, he caustically remarked that ‘Mr Gough is apt, as antiquaries are, to be impatient to tell the world all he knows, which unluckily is more than the world is at all impatient of hearing’.\(^{12}\)

### Richard Gough

However, despite Walpole, Gough remains an influence on much later 18th century antiquarian writing.\(^{13}\) His insistence on the need to rediscover the English medieval past in order to understand the present is the key to the lasting success of Manning and Bray’s history of Surrey. He was educated at Benet Hall in Cambridge, part of Corpus Christi College, where he was deeply influenced by traditions of antiquarian scholarship that had been established there by Archbishop Matthew Parker and William Stukeley. When he left Cambridge in 1756, he retraced Stukeley’s footsteps by making a tour to Peterborough, Stamford and Croyland Abbey. These tours became an annual event in which Gough was joined by other like-minded antiquaries. Let others traipse to Italy in search of historic inspiration: Gough found his amid the parish churches and antiquities of England and was pleased to admit it.\(^{14}\)

Despite his histories of Croyland Abbey (1783) and Pleshey (1803), Gough was more of an editor and energetic correspondent than a county historian. As Director of the Society of Antiquaries between 1771 and 1797, joint editor with John Nichols of the *Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica* from 1780 and chief reviewer for the *Gentleman’s Magazine* from 1786, he was at the very centre of the antiquarian network. In his *Anecdotes of British Topography* (1768, revised 1780), which includes analytical lists of published and unpublished local historical research for the whole of Great Britain and Ireland, Gough proudly announced his ‘passion for British Antiquities [and] zeal to serve the public’.\(^{15}\) His work listed public records, chronicles, heraldic visitations, maps and engravings and was a starting point for many local histories. The instructions in his preface were later fulfilled by William Bray in his completion of the history of Surrey:

> Whoever sits down to compile the history and antiquities of a county or a town, should confirm the evidence he collects from books and manuscripts by inspection of places described. The face of the county, and the monuments remaining on it, are as interesting as the progress of descents or revolutions of property.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Sweet 2000, 10.


\(^{13}\) *ODNB*: Richard Gough.
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\(^{15}\) Sweet 2004, 8, note 27.

\(^{16}\) Sweet 2004, 13; Gough 1768, p xviii.
For Gough, antiquities were a tangible link with the past. His *Sepulchral Monuments in Great Britain* (1786–9) was inspired by Montfaucon’s *Les Monumens de la Monarchie Françoise* (1729–33) but went further because Gough saw tombs and sepulchral art as an untapped source for the study of the people they commemorated, the lives they had led and the development of artistic style. In presenting his readers with a virtual museum of accurately engraved sepulchral art, Gough was laying the foundations for an art-historical analysis of style. William Blake, apprenticed to the engraver, James Basire, sketched many of the exquisite plates for this work and later traced his interest in medieval style to these early commissions. Yet Gough could get carried away. In 1771, he was present in Westminster Abbey at the opening of the tomb of Edward I and it was rumoured that he had helped himself to a macabre souvenir. Michael Tyson gleefully told William Cole that:

Mr G was observed to put his Hand into the Coffin and immediately to apply it to his Pocket: but not so dexterously but that the Dean of Westminster saw it: he remonstrated against the Propriety of it, and Mr G denying the Fact, the Dean insisted on the Pocket being searched: when they found that he had taken a Finger; which was replaced.17

Antiquaries traditionally looked to Edmund Gibson’s revision and translation of William Camden’s *Britannia* (1695) as the point of reference for their research. In 1789 Gough translated this into English anew, updating it in the light of the latest research. In doing so he visited every English county and drew on the knowledge of his extensive network of antiquarian friends. He instructed John Nichols, his printer, to send proof sheets of the work to anyone who might add something to them and the resulting volumes are a testament to the industry and achievements of the antiquarian enterprise in the later 18th century.18 Manning and Bray were part of this network but Gough was at its centre, pulling the strings of friendship to encourage antiquaries across the country to exchange manuscripts and artefacts, check references and help each other with knotty problems of palaeography. The pages of Thomas Martin’s *History of Thetford* (1779), Treadway Nash’s *Collections Towards a History of Worcestershire* (1781–2), John Hutchins’ *History and Antiquities of Dorset* (1779), John Nichols’ *History and Antiquities of Leicestershire* (1795–1812) and Manning and Bray’s *History and Antiquities of Surrey* all bear the personal watermark of Richard Gough.19

**Owen Manning**

Gough was particularly keen to rehabilitate the study of Anglo-Saxon history. Its very obscurity demanded attention but, with a Hanoverian monarchy, there was a patriotic pride in tracing the nation’s Saxon roots. However, though Gibson had traced the foundation of English law and language to a glorious Saxon past, standards of Saxon scholarship had declined after the disastrous fire at the Cotton library in 1731. Gough worked with Saxon scholars such as Edward Lye and enthusiasts like Daines Barrington to ensure that the surviving Saxon manuscripts were not overlooked by antiquaries in their search for the origins of later 18th century government and culture. This interest probably brought him into contact with Owen Manning, who had assisted Lye in his pioneering *Dictionarium Saxonic et Gothico-Latinum* (1772). In 1758, Lye had described Manning as a gentleman ‘who is fond of, and hath made a great progress in Saxon Learning’,20 and on his death in 1767 he bequeathed Manning the task of seeing the work through the press. However, just as William Bray was

17 Sweet 2004, 278, note 2. The incident was satirised by Thomas Rowlandson in his cartoon, ‘Death and Antiquaries’.
18 Nichols 1812–15, 6, 273.
to find the completion of Manning’s history of Surrey a far more complex task than he at first envisaged, so Manning discovered that Lye’s dictionary required reorganisation and additional research. The extent of his revision of Lye’s materials can be traced through his surviving correspondence with both Gough and Thomas Percy.21 He was the first to publish

the vernacular text of the will of King Alfred (from the Liber Vitae of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester) and provided invaluable assistance to Daines Barrington in his edition of the Alfredian Orosius.

Owen Manning was born in 1721 in Orlingbury, Northamptonshire, and educated at Queens' College, Cambridge. He was ordained at Lincoln in 1743 and was a Prebendary of the cathedral from 1757 until his death. In 1760, having failed in his attempt to be elected President of Queens' College, he was presented to the rectory of Chiddingfold in Surrey, holding it until 1768. In 1763 he became the vicar of Godalming and in 1769 the rector of Peper Harow.

Manning combined his academic skills with his pastoral duties. Though his first years in Surrey were devoted to the completion of Lye’s Saxon Dictionary, he rapidly became interested in the county’s history and began to gather materials relating to its past. By the late 1760s his plans to print a supplement to Lye’s Dictionary were forgotten amidst his enthusiasm for the history of Surrey. Manning’s interest in local history was typical for a clergyman of his day. Numerous examples can be found of clerics making historical collections from the registers and records in their care and the monumental inscriptions in their churches. As Peter Muilman remarked in the Morning Post in 1769: ‘Who is there, generally speaking, better qualified by education, than the clergy generally living on the spot? Who have more leisure? Or who can be better informed, being by education themselves esteemed gentlemen?’ Such study might also have a practical benefit; antiquarian research could assist an embattled cleric to assert his rights to tithes and other rights bestowed upon his living. Similarly, local historical research and correspondence with like-minded men throughout the country could provide an isolated parson with an intellectual lifeline. Those, like Manning, who enjoyed a flourishing correspondence with other antiquaries, or contributed letters to the Gentleman’s Magazine, became part of the antiquarian network and historical community, although occasionally their distance from London or a provincial city could make even this network seem remote. In 1798 William Tasker (1740–1800), poet and antiquary of Devon, complained to the editor of the Gentleman’s Magazine that, ‘confined in [his] dreary situation at Starvation-Hall, 40 miles below Exeter, out of the verge of Literature and where even [the] extensive Magazine has never yet reached.’ he was unaware whether any of his letters or poems had ever been published in it.

Manning’s interest in Surrey soon attracted the notice of other Surrey historians. When William Bray of Shere wrote to him in 1767, asking about his plans for a county history, Manning invited him to assist in his project rather than ‘co-operating with Mr H’. This was Henry Hill (1730–74), Windsor Herald and son of the Rev Henry Hill of Guildford. He had been gathering his own materials for a county history since the 1750s, largely from published works such as those of Aubrey and Salmon but also from manuscripts held by the College of Arms and other London repositories. However, although his surviving notes contain some remarkable observations on local customs, buildings and Surrey families, they were not ready for publication. Bray, who had already been assisting Daniel Lysons, the curate of Putney, in his study of the Surrey parishes closest to London, appears to have
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30 Aubrey 1718; Salmon 1736.
31 SHG: 6935/1–2.
32 Lysons 1792.
agreed that Manning stood a better chance of seeing his work into print, though at this stage he preferred to act as a consultant, rather than a partner. In January 1772 Manning thanked him for communicating details of Colonel Molyneux’s manors and warned him that troublesome enquiries would soon begin.³³ That July he asked Bray for information about court rolls in his hands and, in return, answered some of Bray’s queries about the manor of Shere Eboracum.³⁴ The friendship between the two men grew with the project and there is a playfulness in their surviving correspondence. On 28 January 1779 Manning sent Bray a long letter about the intricacies of the Bray pedigree: ‘I have been so exceedingly plagued by my Lady Magdalene Bray that, if she was not a relation of yours, I should be very angry with her’.³⁵

Manning’s knowledge of administrative history had an important impact upon his Surrey studies. Other county historians based their studies on ancient hundredal divisions and their constituent parishes but Manning approached the county through the ownership of its manors. He realised that Domesday linked Surrey’s Saxon past with the redistribution of land-ownership under the Norman kings and so looked at all the king’s manors together, wherever they lay, as the first part of his history. An account of the descent of each manor to modern times would follow. For this reason, Manning treated certain parishes, which are not mentioned in Domesday because they were not distinct manors, under the manor of which they formed a part in 1086: Chiddingfold is given under Godalming in his history because, along with its chapelry of Haslemere, it was originally part of the manor of Godalming.

Manning was determined to publish a facsimile of Domesday for Surrey with a detailed translation of the text. It was no easy task, but it was in the spirit of public service underlying so much antiquarian research. Manning’s work pre-dated the pioneering work of John Nichols and Joseph Jackson that resulted in the first printed facsimile of the Domesday Book in 1783.³⁶ Access to the Domesday manuscript in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey cost 8s 6d and 4d for every line transcribed.³⁷ Manning wished to provide his readers with their own copy, but tracing the original manuscript and copying it onto a copper plate would require a skilled craftsman and be a costly commission. The Cotton fire of 1731 had shown antiquaries and civil servants that the records of state were vulnerable. Publication provided an insurance against fire or loss and one of the leading figures in the project to publish state records was Philip Carteret Webb, MP for Haslemere, solicitor to the Treasury and energetic antiquary. In 1756, he had published A Short Account of Domesday Book, with a view to its publication and an engraved facsimile proof of the first page of Domesday annotated ‘Ph C Webb 1768 Lib Domesdai’ is preserved in Manning’s manuscript history of Surrey.³⁸ Both Webb and Gough were central to efforts by the Society of Antiquaries to encourage publication of Domesday and led debates over how best to achieve this. Should it be engraved or printed? How should the palæography be treated, or the contractions and interlineations represented? The ambitious plans of the Antiquaries to prepare a complete edition of the work in an engraved facsimile foundered upon the sheer scale of the cost. The estimate for engraving alone came to £6988 16s 0d and the further cost of copper, printing and paper would have brought the total to at least £12,681 4s 0d.³⁹ It was left to county historians such as Manning for Surrey and Treadway Nash for Worcestershire to forge ahead with engraved facsimiles of their own county sections. Again, Gough was the key player behind these projects.

³³ SHC: G85/3/4/ (19), Manning to Bray 29 Jan 1772.
³⁴ SHC: G85/3/4/ (20), Manning to Bray 16 Jul 1772. See also two letters from Bray to Manning concerning Sir Robert Clayton’s court rolls, 1772 and 1773, SHC: G85/41/1 ff 527–32. Bray clearly provided a link between the new incumbent of Godalming and various county families and their solicitors.
³⁵ SHC: G85/3/4/ (21), Manning to Bray 28 Jan 1779.
³⁶ Farley 1783.
³⁷ SHC: G85/2/7.
³⁸ SHC: 1917/1, f 86. Bray’s copy of this influential pamphlet is SHC: G52/7/12. For extracts from the public records provided by Webb to Manning, 1769, see SHC: G85/2/8/1, ff 144–74.
³⁹ Nichols 1812–15, 3, 262.
Manning’s letters to him, preserved by John Nichols after Gough’s death in 1809 and now in the Bodleian Library, show that Gough was the intermediary between Manning and the two engravers he employed. Manning lost patience with Bailey, his first engraver, finding him a ‘lazy, scuffling Fellow’. In 1773 he settled upon Benjamin Thomas Pouncy, a draughtsman and engraver who had already provided archaeological illustrations for his fellow Huguenot, Andrew Coltee Ducarel, librarian at Lambeth Palace. He had also made some of the tracings from Domesday Book for Bailey to engrave and came with the strong recommendation of Abraham Farley, the custodian of Domesday Book whom Manning needed to authenticate each plate. Pouncy’s work was excellent, but he was slow and his fees were high. In 1774 he told Gough that he was visiting the Chapter House every morning to complete the tracings from the manuscript but the work was still unfinished in 1776, and Manning was again losing patience. Not content with charging exorbitant fees for his work, Pouncy was now demanding an extra guinea for each plate of Bailey’s work that he had to correct. Though Manning complained, he admitted to Gough that ‘we are in his hands and he knows it’. Gough’s attempts to talk Pouncy down came to nothing. In October 1776 he told Manning: ‘After much conversation with Mr P I was forced to give way to his full demand. […] you will conclude that Mr P is a gentleman Artist and thinks himself at liberty to make what decision he pleases’. Manning had similar problems with Abraham Farley who, by 1775 was proving ‘indolent and backward’ in authenticating the finished plates. This time Gough managed to steer Manning away from Farley to George Rose (1744–1818), a rising star in the civil service, who owed his appointment as clerk in the Exchequer record office to Lord Sondes, who had made it a condition of his employment that he assist Treadway Nash in authenticating Pouncy’s plates of Domesday for Worcestershire. Gough assured him that, for 35 guineas, Rose would check ‘every line and stroke’ and Manning happily paid, unable to ‘bear the most distant thought of its not being a perfect facsimile in every the most minute particular’.

The resulting plates justified the fees and are seen as a landmark in facsimile publication (fig 1). The proof sheets, bound into the second volume of Manning’s manuscript of the ‘History of Surrey’, testify to Pouncy’s skill and Manning’s determination to see the project through. Gough was delighted with the result. In a letter to John Price of the Bodleian in August 1774 he had remarked that ‘it were to be wished all County Histories might have their Domesday engraved on so liberal a plan as Mr Manning has given for Surrey’ and, in 1775 (somewhat disingenuously), he had recommended Pouncy to Dr Treadway Nash of Worcestershire, who was planning a similar approach to his own county history:

> If you are not provided with a person to trace and engrave Domesday [...] I would take the liberty of recommending to you Mr Pouncy of May’s-buildings, who has just finished Surrey Domesday for a particular friend of mine. He has great merit in this art; and will, I dare say, be as reasonable for you as for Mr Manning.

Pouncy went on to specialise in the production of facsimile illustrations and is chiefly
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40 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 51, Manning to Gough, 5 Nov 1773.
41 ODNB: Benjamin Thomas Pouncy.
42 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 51, Manning to Gough, 5 Nov 1773.
43 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 76, Pouncy to Gough, 1 Aug 1774.
44 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 106, Manning to Gough, 30 Sep 1776.
45 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 107v, Gough to Manning, 4 Oct 1776.
46 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 89, Manning to Gough, 27 Jun 1775.
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49 SHC: 1917/2.
50 Nichols 1812–15, 5, 518.
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Fig 1  Proof of an engraved page of Domesday Book for lands in Surrey held by the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Winchester, bishop Osbern and the bishop of Bayeux (SHC: 1917/2 f 369). Reproduced by kind permission of Surrey History Centre.
remembered today for the accuracy of his copies of medieval manuscripts for Thomas Astle’s *The Origin and Progress of Writing* (1784).

Gough’s help to Manning was wide-ranging and extensive. In 1771 he put him in touch with Foote Gower (c 1726–80), who was about to publish his *Sketch of the Materials for a new History of Cheshire* (1771). In 1774 he forwarded materials relating to Lambeth on behalf of Samuel Denne (1730–99), author of *The History and Antiquities of Rochester* (1772), and also visited the Augmentations Office on his behalf. Later that year he offered to procure a set of the plates of Surrey churches at the sale of the effects of Mr Hill, but Manning quickly replied that he had already seen the plates and was not impressed. Gough even helped to find a curate to relieve Manning of a few pastoral duties in order that he might make more progress with his county history. In thanking him, Manning hoped that the curate was ‘a University man and not of the methodistical kind as this would for ever hurt my mind in proportion, as it would disturb those of my Congregation’. In return for this help, Manning was able to keep Gough abreast of the latest archaeological news in Surrey. In August 1781 he asked whether Gough had received the ‘exact transcript of the Bookham inscription’ which he had sent on 19 June together with ‘an account of a pipkin of burnt bones lately ploughed up on the downs near Henley Grove on the west of Guildford’.

Manning’s research was not confined to state records. He corresponded with local landowners and made field trips to Surrey landmarks. In August 1781 he cheerfully told Gough that:

> I am still in pursuit of my favorite work, and [...] I never pass a day without giving it all the attention in my power. The week your letter came to hand I was out on a visit relative to it, at Dorking and Ryegate: and last week I reconnoitred Leith Hill, Holmbury St Mary and Hansteybury Camps, of both of which I have procured an exact survey.

It is also known that Manning used a ‘mail-shot’ to the gentry and clergy of Surrey in an effort to solicit assistance and local information. The county circular or questionnaire was, of course, nothing new. Robert Plot had used one in the 17th century and Richard Rawlinson had also done so when revising the Surrey collections of John Aubrey. So many antiquaries used them for their own local studies that John Nichols included a history of the county questionnaire in the first volume of his *Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica* in 1780. Though these circulars were normally sent to the county’s gentry and clergy, it was the latter, accustomed to similar requests for local information in visitation returns, who generally made the effort to respond. Some circulars must have swamped their recipients with questions. Francis Peck’s questionnaire relating to Leicestershire and Rutland in 1729 had run to 102 questions and included queries about the management of fishponds and reports of children crying in the womb. John Nichols’ article sought to harness the questionnaire more firmly to the scientific approach to antiquities that was promoted by Richard Gough. ‘As no science is not capable of being facilitated by general rules’, he wrote, ‘so county histories may be forwarded by suggesting subjects worthy of notice’. His suggested template comprised 56 questions on local history which focused upon topics ranging from parish boundaries and
population statistics to the dimensions of churches and historic monuments, the names of previous incumbents, famous inhabitants, descriptions of local industries, fairs, markets and customs. These were followed by 55 questions relating to the natural history of the parish.

Manning’s questionnaire was more modest (fig 2). It simply announced his interest in Surrey, explained the scope of his project and enquired whether the recipient (a blank space was left for the name) was able to help. In 1801, when William Bray took up the challenge of completing Manning’s work, the same circular was used, only this time with his name substituted for Manning’s. John Nichols, who later printed the circular in his *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, preserved the manuscript in his own collections and it survives today in private hands.\(^{62}\) It is hard to assess how useful it proved. Manning’s manuscript copy of what was to become the first volume of the history contains letters and contributions by Gough but few materials from Surrey landowners and even George Onslow admitted that he was ‘the worst Genealogist in the World’ and could give him ‘very little light as to the Questions you ask me concerning my Family’.\(^{63}\)

Manning collected materials for the history of Surrey for over 30 years and, by 1796, the antiquarian community was eagerly awaiting the publication of his labours. The introduction was written and Domesday engraved and transcribed, but his voluminous notes on each parish were still undigested and he was reluctant to go to press before this part of the work was ready. The strain of such study was taking its toll and, like so many antiquaries, he lost his sight and the project was in jeopardy. In Dorset, Richard Gough and John Nichols had joined forces to see the work of John Hutchins through the press after his health failed and, by 1800, it was clear that, once again, they would need to steer a county history to completion. This was in complete accord with Manning’s wishes. In February 1800 ‘the malady of his eyes interfering with all his proceedings,’ he had placed responsibility for the entire project


\(^{63}\) Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f.137. George Onslow to Manning, 21 Jan 1781.
in the hands of Thomas Collinson of Eashing with instructions that he send the manuscript to Gough for inspection. In August, Manning’s manuscript and bundles of notes were cleared from the green table in the bow window of his study in Godalming and transferred to Gough’s house at Enfield by barge and wagon.  

Colour plate 2 Portrait of William Bray by John Linnell, 1832. Reproduced by kind permission of the owner. (Photograph by Roy Drysdale)

---

64 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 161, H Elstead to Gough, Feb 1800; f 162 Thomas Collinson to Gough, 14 Oct 1800; f 169, Jane Manning to Gough, 17 Feb 1802. The transfer of materials is discussed in Bodl: MS Eng. Lett. c. 355, ff8–82. When Manning died in 1801 Thomas Collinson asked Gough, on behalf of Manning’s widow, to prepare the obituary for the Gentleman’s Magazine, Private Collection: PC1/27/60 [NAD4757].
While Gough was happy to help, he felt too old by then to take on the project alone and John Nichols was completely occupied with his own county history of Leicestershire even to contemplate the task. Manning’s will, prepared in 1792, had recommended that the materials for Surrey be sold to Gough for £200 in order to relieve his widow and children of the task of completing the work but, a decade later, his plan did not seem so simple. Though Gough managed to secure John White of the Horace’s Head in Fleet Street to publish the work, Mrs Manning was reluctant to part with the ownership of her late husband’s work without some assurance that ‘a moiety of the profit’ would continue to be hers. Her argument that, by thus benefiting from the sales, she would ‘very considerably increase the subscription’ cut little ice with Gough who replied on 1 April 1802 to express his regret:

that you should so disquiet yourself and your friends about the disposal of the Surrey History which you seem totally to mistake. When once the ms was purchased either by me or Mr White on the terms on which it was expressly offered to me […] all further concern with it on your part immediately ceased as much as if you had sold a house or a field or any article of furniture. A subscription was never thought of and if it had there would have been too great a risk of expense while printing for any person but a Bookseller like Mr W to have run.

Still smarting from having not been involved by Manning’s family in the sale of his library and precious translation of the Caedmon manuscript, Gough wished that ‘a little conversation at the first stage of the business’ had taken place to enable this arrangement to have been properly discussed with both himself and Mr White; but his carefully chosen words suggest that he was prepared to follow Mrs Manning’s suggestion on the understanding that she must not expect to profit from further sales after the subscription copies had been distributed. He warned her that it would not be ‘easy to express what difficulties are in the way of publication […] in these dear times’, but Manning’s widow was not to be put off and on 18 April, having agreed to pay Gough the £60 he had advanced to her husband to pay for the Domesday plates, she told him that she had come to an arrangement with Mr White and would now be pleased if he would deliver the materials to his care. It is clear that Mrs Manning continued to take a strong interest in the progress of the history throughout its publication.

With these details settled, all they needed was a volunteer who would be able to complete the work. William Bray had stepped forward within two weeks of Manning’s death in September 1801 and his brief letter to Nichols in which he offered his services is imbued with the spirit of public duty that lay behind so much of the antiquarian enterprise:

The County of Surrey look to you to fulfill the hopes long entertained of seeing my friend Mr Manning’s Collections published; I flatter myself you will not disappoint. If my poor services could be of any use to you in it, I need not say that you may readily command them.

William Bray

William Bray was the ideal person to complete Manning’s history of Surrey. He was a collateral descendant of Sir Reginald Bray, the minister of Henry VII, who obtained the

66 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 176, Gough to Catherine Manning, 1 Apr 1802.
68 Bodl: MS Gough Gen. Top. 43, f 167, Gough to Catherine Manning, 29 Jan 1802.
69 Yale: Nichols Family Corresp. Box 2A [NAD3524], Bray to John Nichols, 23 Sep 1801.
manor of Shere in 1486. He was born in Shere in 1736 and had a home there until his death in 1832 at the age of 96. If Manning represented the erudite, clerical antiquary, Bray should be seen as typical of the other kind of local historian: a county lawyer whose interest in antiquities grew from his professional work for landed families and extensive familiarity with manorial courts and estate records. He had been educated at Rugby School and trained as a lawyer under Mr Martyr at Guildford; but his success as a solicitor owed as much to his personality as it did to his energy and professional skills. In 1761 he became a clerk of the Board of Green Cloth, which managed the domestic affairs of the royal household, through the patronage of John Evelyn of Wotton. Although the post required him to live in London, its light demands enabled him to develop a successful legal practice in Great Russell Street, acting for many families and charities in London, Surrey and Middlesex.

Bray had been fascinated by history from his youth and his professional advancement only served to increase his taste for travel and research. He quickly became known as a helpful and sociable antiquary. In 1767 he supplied Philip Morant, historian of Essex, with transcripts of manuscripts at the British Museum and by 1768 he was regularly dining with Sir Joseph Ayloffe and Thomas Astle, Keepers of State Papers, John Topham, librarian to the archbishop of Canterbury, Andrew Coltee Ducarel, librarian at Lambeth Palace and Craven Ord, vice-president of the Society of Antiquaries. He joined them on visits to Kenwood, Osterley Park and Strawberry Hill, making detailed notes of the architecture, fittings and art collections that he saw. Other friends included Daniel Solander, keeper of the natural history department at the British Museum and Michael Lort, professor of Greek at Cambridge. Like Gough, he made regular tours through England and Wales in search of antiquities and in 1777 these resulted in his first published work, Sketch of a tour in Derbyshire and Yorkshire, which, though sufficiently popular to be reprinted in 1783, was criticised by some observers for being ‘more solicitous to display [Bray’s] skill in tracing the history of former times, than to delineate the existing state of the country through which he past [sic]’. His next published work, a history of Henry Smith’s Charity published in 1800, was printed by John Nichols and clearly established Bray’s credentials as a local historian.

The breadth of Bray’s interests can be gauged by his many contributions to the Gentleman’s Magazine which he had been reading since c 1756. In 1785, the date of his first published contribution, its editor (known as Sylvanus Urban) was John Nichols who also printed the magazine at his office in Red Lion Passage in Fleet Street. Gough became chief reviews editor in 1786. Under Nichols and Gough the magazine became a leading forum for biographical and topographical research, occupying a central place in the antiquarian network. Though Bray’s first pieces were literary, discussing Thomas Warton’s History of English Poetry and Boswell’s Life of Johnson, from 1796 his contributions focused on antiquarian discoveries and the county of Surrey. His letters ranged from carvings found in the parsonage in West Clandon to Sir Joseph Mawbey’s ‘Letter to the Magistrates of Surrey’. A similar pattern emerges in his contributions to Archaeologia, the transactions of the Society of Antiquaries. He had been elected a Fellow in 1771 and wrote his first piece for Archaeologia in 1781. Some of his early contributions covered archaeology but later ones were based on his own research

70 See John Evelyn to Bray, 17 and 27 Oct 1761, SHC: G85/3/4 (23 and 24) and Bray’s diary for 1761, SHC: G85/1/5 September to October. Bray was a clerk to the Board of Green Cloth between 1761 and 1810. For Bray’s ‘Recollections’ relating to the Board of Green Cloth, c 1808, see SHC: G32/1/6/1. His unpublished collections for a ‘History of the Royal Household, 1639–c 1801’, based upon his work for this office are SHC: G85/2/3/1–14.
71 BL: Add. MS 34650, f 13. Bray to Philip Morant, 7 Jul 1767. Bray supplied him with extracts from British Library Harleian MS 6148, f 64.
72 SHC: G85/2/5.
73 Mavor 1798, 2, 303, cited by Sweet 2004, 368 note 71.
74 SHC: G85/1/1.
75 For further details of Bray’s contributions to the Gentleman’s Magazine, see Appendix 1.
at the Board of Green Cloth and the muniment rooms of Loseley House, Sutton Place and Wotton.\textsuperscript{76} He was Treasurer (1803–23) in succession to John Topham.

As solicitor to Surrey’s landed families, steward of Surrey manors and treasurer of Henry Smith’s charity, William Bray was uniquely qualified to complete Manning’s county history. His professional duties gave him such ready access to deeds and papers of Surrey families that his spidery hand is found ubiquitously in records of Surrey churches, charities, manors and estates now at Surrey History Centre. His familiarity with state records and easy friendship with scholars throughout the country enabled him to draw on the wider expertise of the antiquarian community.

There were, however, matters to settle before work could resume. There had to be a meeting with Gough, Nichols the printer and John White the publisher. It took place on 7 January 1802 and was recorded by Nichols’ son, John Bowyer Nichols, in his diary: ‘My Father and Mr Bray and Mr White went to Mr Gough’s about Manning’s “History of Surrey”’. From this visit originated “Manning & Bray’s History of Surrey”.\textsuperscript{77} After this, matters became more complicated. Bray was ‘extremely anxious’ to have access to Manning’s manuscript and notes but Gough was reluctant to let the materials out of his hands. John White asked Gough to bring the materials to town for Bray to see but Gough, seeing himself as the guardian of the manuscript, refused to let them out of his care. He would, though, ‘give every accommodation in his power to Mr Bray or any other gentleman who [wished] to examine it at leisure [at Enfield]’.\textsuperscript{78}

Bray may not have realised what he was letting himself in for. His prospectus for the history of Surrey (1802) implies that Manning’s notes had only to be arranged for the printer and the whole work would be published in two volumes by 1804.\textsuperscript{79} In the event, volume one did not appear until 1804 and the work stretched to three volumes that were not completed until 1814. What caused the delay? What extra work did Bray find was needed? Bray’s prefaces to the three volumes allow the charting of the course of the work’s publication and the difficulties faced. The first was the sheer scale of the project. He soon realised that Manning had only written up five parishes, ‘the rest of that Gentleman’s very extensive collections’ he wrote in the preface to volume two, ‘consisted in notes, put down as they occurred; and a reference to the original Records was necessary in many instances; in many, a search after others was indispensable.’\textsuperscript{80} Bray’s diaries and research papers provide a fascinating insight into the working methods of a county historian and the ways in which his professional life dovetailed with his own research (fig 3). While examining records at the Tower of London for a Mr Parker in 1807 he looked up references to the Uvedale family and Surrey parishes of Titsey and Chelsham. He would slip into Kingston church to transcribe inscriptions when attending the Surrey assizes and, when visiting clients in the country, would allow time to visit churches on the way. In London he would catch up on business at his office each morning before spending several hours working on Surrey records at the Tower, Rolls Chapel, Chapter House at Westminster or Exchequer Office in the Temple.\textsuperscript{81} During the summer, when legal business slowed down, he could devote most of his time to detailed research.\textsuperscript{82} He was a regular at Lambeth Palace Library and the British Museum where his friend Richard Penneck, the rector of Abinger, was librarian. The financial accounts in the endpapers of his diaries itemise the costs of his research: postage of letters; fees for consulting parish records (usually a shilling to the parish clerk) and charges for transcribing wills at Doctors’ Commons.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[76] For further details of Bray’s contributions to Archeologia, see Appendix 2.
\item[77] Private Collection: PC3/1/6 [NAD1403], pocket diary of John Bowyer Nichols.
\item[79] Bray 1802.
\item[80] Many of Manning’s research papers and letters concerning Surrey will be found in SHC: G85/2/8/1.
\item[81] Bray’s research itinerary can be traced through his pocket diaries, especially SHC: G85/1/44–57, as well as his travel diary, G85/2/5 and volumes of research notes, G85/2/6, G85/2/8 and G85/41/11.
\item[82] Sweet 2004, 46–7.
\end{footnotes}
Fig 3  Bray’s pocket diary for 25–31 July 1808 (SHC: G85/1/50). Reproduced by kind permission of Surrey History Centre.
Bray claimed to have visited every parish he described and examined the monuments in all but two churches as well as measuring windows and other architectural features. If he had more to report, such as a detailed description of the grotto at Oatlands near Weybridge or a visit to Moor Park at Farnham, he would continue in a separate travel journal. These longer descriptions testify to Bray’s wide itinerary and keen eye for detail. The account of Oatlands on 26 June 1809 includes notes on Holstein House where a Mr Hamilton had removed his business and 60 employees after his printing shop in London had burnt down. On 27 October 1809 he described a visit to a house in Bletchingley:

The very ancient farm house called Kentwines in Blechingly [sic], formerly the Cholmondley’s; the hall, now a lumber room, has part of a carved cornice, a large chimney; the floor is a mixture of chalk, made as hard as stone. The house is built with upright timbers, the interiors filled with plaisters. It was Mr Brockman’s, sold by him to Mr Kenrick. 83

Bray’s research also took him to Oxford where he worked at the Bodleian Library through the papers of earlier Surrey historians, John Aubrey and Richard Rawlinson. 84 People trusted Bray with their records because he was often their lawyer. He regularly stayed at Loseley to consult the More Molyneux family’s manuscripts and also spent much time at Sutton Place, ‘inspecting old deeds’. On 6 October 1808 he ‘rode to Esher, to [the vicar] Mr Diggle, inspected his Registers and papers for history of Esher, and he went with me to the Church, broke open the chest and lent me the Register and some papers.’ 85 Other gentlemen of the county who allowed him access to their records were John Wightwick of Sandgates, near Chertsey, Mr Lilley of Peckham, 86 Mr Shotter of Farnham 87 and Richard Corner of Southwark. Bray’s engaging personality shines through his letters. In May 1813 he apologised to Richard Corner by remarking that ‘there is an old proverb against riding a free horse to death, but you have so good a bottom that I am not afraid to try you.’ 88

Although Bray sent out Manning’s circular to canvass the clergy and gentry of Surrey for local historical details, his own letters were often just glorified questionnaires with space for considered replies to be returned to him. An example is his letter to Mr Middleton of Lambeth. 89 His usual method was to list questions on the left of the paper, leaving his recipient to write his answers on the right (fig 4). 90 One query often led to another: ‘I thought I had done plaguing you [he wrote to Middleton in August 1812] – but ’tis not so. The further I go, fresh difficulties occur, and fresh enquiries are necessary to make me understand what I find written.’ 91

Many of William Bray’s ‘professional brethren’ shared his interests. Among them were three Reigate lawyers, William Bryant, Richard Barnes and Ambrose Glover. Bryant had accumulated many materials relating to Surrey when disentangling voting rights of the

83 SHC: G85/2/5. Other Surrey excursions recorded by Bray in his travel journal include a trip to Chobham via Guildford and Perry Hill on 18 July 1809, to Windlesham on 6 Oct 1809 and Farnham Castle on 15 May 1810.
84 See, for example, his extracts from Bodl: MS Rawlinson 425 in SHC: G85/2/6, ff 153–6.
85 SHC: G85/1/50.
86 For a map of various manors in Camberwell copied by Lilley for Bray in 1811, see SHC: G85/2/6, f 182; for his help concerning coinage see G85/41/4.
87 SHC: G85/2/6 ff 595–613, notes from Mr Shotter’s deeds and papers concerning Windsor’s Almshouses in Farnham.
88 SHC: G1/1/84, Bray to Richard Corner, May 1813.
89 SHC: G85/2/4. For further letters communicated to both Manning and Bray, e 1750–e 1830, see SHC: G85/8/5/1–30. For papers concerning the history of Lambeth, prepared by Mr Middleton but presented to Bray for his county history, see SHC: G85/2/3/4– and G85/2/4/2–.
90 For example, SHC: G85/2/6, f 289, 291 and 613.
91 SHC: G85/2/6, ff 56–7, Bray to Mr Middleton, 12 Aug 1812.
Fig 4 (above and facing page) Bray’s letter to Mr Middleton with space left for Middleton to answer his queries (SHC: G85/2/6/ff 56–7). Reproduced by kind permission of Surrey History Centre.
I am perfectly at a loss how to proceed, to give me a line hence.

On looking at my cousin, I took him and gave him

now or - via.

where lived Mr. Joel Clark's Rectory House - where he

lived and his gates were a little about 20 years before

of the clock house he would estimated years

took the present to Handling, 20 and 20; a year. I think

Vestor 2 by

what because of the great rivers in the Lord's houses

I don't know

was Richard, formerly John, where it was

in vacant, where it was the Manor House, went to the

steep, this Manor was now occupied now

where it Mather Hall, where now occupied now

Distillery whose name excite their trade

from Sir Robert Stewart

12 Aug. 1812

Mannby's Hunt, Distillery belong to the

Prime of Water, and is on lease for 30 years renewable as usual. From Mannby it went
to Foreman, Smith, etc. and this lease now belongs to

Smith, a Tanner in the city.

In the Prince's Leases the place is called

Cope Hall and is all subject to a Rent of

6. 13. 4. this worth upwards of 300 J. per

annum formerly had this Mill Distillery

premises for making and working

acre 

beer and comprises the site of these premises.
borough of Reigate and made these available to Bray’s research.92 Ambrose Glover, articled clerk and later partner of Richard Barnes, put at Bray’s disposal his own history of Reigate Priory and documents relating to eastern Surrey.93 On 6 December 1806 Bray spent two days with him at Reigate working on deeds and papers and his accounts show that he also bought a box of music for Glover’s daughter. They visited churches in the east of the county together and shared an enthusiasm for archaeology. On 30 July 1808, ‘a fine day with flying clouds’, the two men rode to Walton Heath with Richard Barnes and ‘dug for Antiquities till near 5’ (fig 3). In December 1813 they rushed to Pendhill near Bletchingley on hearing news that workmen had uncovered ancient brickwork while grubbing out a hedge on the land of Mr Perkins. Glover made a sketch of the discovery (fig 5). They were worried that winter frosts might harm the hypocaust’s brickwork and so urged Perkins to get his servants to place some thatch at the end of the building to prevent the frost from penetrating and to make a drain under the roof to take water away from the foundations. The discoveries were reported in the appendix to volume 3 in 1814.94

Bray’s advice was sought to settle disputes over archaeological discoveries made on private land. In 1817 a hoard of silver Saxon coins was unearthed by workmen on George Dewdney’s property at Coldharbour, near Wotton, and knowing him ‘to be conversant in all these matters, Both as to the Coin, and the right of the Coin,’ J Warneford of Mickleham asked him whether they belonged to Dewdney or the Mr Oram who had later bought them for £5 in the Farrier public house in Dorking.95 Bray’s opinion is not known. The coins were soon after purchased by Robert Barclay of Bury Hill and presented to the British Museum.96

On another occasion a correspondent gave Bray information about Reigate and Dorking manors but, fearful of the hazy line between Bray’s legal work and historical research, concealed his name ‘lest a sinister construction should be put upon it’.97 Bray’s legal work also introduced him to surveyors able to record archaeological features on his behalf. Thomas Crawter prepared a plan of Caesar’s Camp for him for 2 guineas in 1803 and, in January and April 1804, accompanied him to Farley Green to see Roman remains.

Bray could also, of course, tap into the wider antiquarian network for further information. Daniel Lysons, now author of the Environs of London, allowed Bray to use his collections for the parishes nearest to London. Questions on coinage could be referred to Taylor Combe of the British Museum, who advised Bray on Southwark mints,98 or Rogers Ruding, author of the Annals of the Coinage of Britain (1818) and rector of Malden. William Upcott, Librarian of the London Institution, provided information about Surrey’s literary history and gave Bray a list of tradesmen’s tokens. Years later, while on a visit to Wotton, the two men would discover the diaries and papers of John Evelyn which they would be the first to bring to public attention. Craven Ord, vice-president of the Society of Antiquaries, arranged for Bray to have access to the Chertsey Abbey cartulary at the Exchequer and no doubt shared his extensive knowledge of Surrey’s monumental brasses. William Hamper of Birmingham lent Bray deeds relating to Abinger and Camberwell99 and Richard Yates, curate of Chelsea College and editor of the Monastic Remains of the Town and Abbey of St Edmunds, Bury (1805 and 1843), checked his collection of Suffolk epitaphs for the Gaynesford family.100 If Bray needed to look further
Richard Gough could provide the necessary introductions or procure them on his behalf. Not everything was returned: in 1814 Ralph Churton of Oxford asked Nichols if he knew what had happened to the Williamscot manuscript of Surrey. Although the catalogue of the Williamscot library showed that it had been ‘lent to Mr Gough for Mr Bray July 30 1804’, it did not seem to have been returned. Churton was concerned to find it listed as item 4314 in the recent sale of Gough’s manuscripts and would doubtless have been horrified to find that it was sold for 6s 6d. As late as 1829 Bray was corresponding with John Bowyer Nichols about a manuscript that Gough had acquired for him but which was now mislaid among his unpublished Surrey papers.\footnote{Private Collection: PG1/15/146 [NAD1877], Bray to John Bowyer Nichols, 6 Jan 1829.}

Gough not only influenced Bray by introducing him to owners of manuscripts but also influenced the very structure of his work, ensuring that it appealed to a wider range of readers than might have been the case if Manning had completed it alone. By the early 19th century it was clear that a county history needed to cover more than just dry pedigrees, descents of property and arcane heraldry. The landed elite, who had funded and subscribed to earlier topographies, had now been joined by successful manufacturers, merchants and enterprising farmers and the primary sources available to an antiquary now included agricultural surveys, charity returns, poor law statistics and trade figures. It was no longer sufficient to serve readers a simple diet of manorial and family history; they demanded other courses on commerce, industry, geology, bibliography, lists of topographical engravings and portraits of county
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\caption{Ambrose Glover’s sketch of a Roman hypocaust found at Pendhill, Blechingley, 1813 (SHC: G85/2/2/2/1f 381). Reproduced by kind permission of Surrey History Centre.}
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worthies. Gough and John Nichols were at the heart of this drive to broaden the appeal of local history. Population statistics from the census returns of 1801 and 1811, vivid descriptions of conditions in county workhouses and prisons and discussions of local poor relief schemes now jostled for position in the Gentleman’s Magazine among the more traditionally antiquarian articles. The result was that many county histories were now far bulkier than those of a century earlier. John Nichols’ History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester, four volumes in eight parts (1795–1812), contained about 5 million words. Bray’s history of Surrey was more modest, but was still far larger than Manning might have envisaged and much more a product of editorial compilation than the work of a single author.  

### Printing and production

It is easy to see how The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey grew into three volumes, but publication was also delayed by a damaging fire at the Nichols printing house on 8 February 1808. Fires were a common hazard in the cramped alleys and courts of London’s printing community. Nichols’ office, in Red Lion Passage, Fleet Street, was one of London’s largest. When the printing office and warehouse were razed that night, Nichols lost nearly £30,000 of stock and equipment (about £1.25 million today), the entire stock of the Gentleman’s Magazine from 1783, the last part of his own History of Leicestershire, much of Hutchins’ History of Dorset, other histories of Cheshire and Cornwall – and 330 pages of volume 2 of Bray’s History of Surrey. A week later he told Gough that ‘Mr Bray is all goodness. There will be little inconvenience (except expense) about the “Surrey”’. He had been sending Gough the Surrey sheets to proof read and now begged him to ‘lay them carefully by as they turn up without giving further trouble of hunting after them.’ By 15 March temporary presses had been set up in Nichols’ house and work on Surrey could begin again; but it had been a bad set-back and on 9 April Bray desired Mr White, the publisher, ‘to write to the Surrey Subscribers’. Bray relied on the collaboration of friends and the combined energies of Nichols and White in London and Mrs Manning from her new home on Leith Hill to drum up subscriptions. The subscription lists testify to their success. The over 400 subscribers included royalty, Surrey gentry, clergy and landowners as well as individuals and institutions throughout England.  

Manning’s manuscript of the first volume of the county history and Bray’s reworked proof sheets, that have recently come to light in the papers of the Lomax family of Shere, allow the production history to be followed in great detail and the contributions of Bray, Gough and Nichols to be assessed as to the content and appearance of the finished work. Manning’s meticulously neat manuscript, with footnotes already inserted at the bottom of each page, was annotated and revised by Bray and filled with scraps of paper containing additional notes to be inserted in the text. Nichols would send the first proofs to Gough who would then mark them with corrections and queries. Bray then checked them to iron out queries before Nichols printed the sheets again and passed them to Gough for approval. John Bowyer Nichols would then examine Gough’s approved sheets and finally Nichols himself would have the ultimate say in pulling the clean sheet off the press. In the course of this process each man subtly changed the text, adding cross-references to manuscript or published sources. Two asterisks in the final version identify many of these additions. We find, therefore, that Gough added much material relating to Merton and that John Nichols gave Bray access to his copy of the Chronicle of Bermondsey and instructed the compositor to add thirteen lines

---

102 In 1811 Bray discussed the population of Surrey with Samuel Thornton, (1755–1838), MP for Surrey and director of the Bank of England. See SHC: G52/3/2.
104 SHC: G85/1/50.
105 The subscription lists are printed in Manning & Bray, 1, ix–xii; 3, ix.
106 SHC: 1917/1–2.
107 SHC: G120/36/33.
on the mill of St Saviours that had appeared in the Gentleman’s Magazine in 1790. He provided a transcript of the will of Edward Alleyne of Dulwich and supplied pedigrees of families linked to Surrey that he had used in his own History of Leicestershire.108 Gough held strong views upon typographical layout. He insisted on footnotes at the bottom of the page, criticised Nichols for abbreviating the names of authors and pleaded that pedigrees be inserted with minimum disruption to the text.109 The fact that the same sheet would be annotated on its journey from London to Enfield to Surrey and then back to London allows one to follow the development of a text and watch as tensions rose. Bray’s wish to omit the list of John Austin’s charitable donations to Shalford was overruled.110 When Gough asked him to explain a conflict of sources used he replied that he must have used a different book at the British Museum from the one that Manning had seen. Any delay stretched the printing house which only had finite resources of types, presses and men to juggle between a host of jobs. In 1802 John Bowyer Nichols complained that ‘Mr Bray has not sent an answer about the Portraits at Loseley – we are quite at a stand for them’ (fig 6). Occasionally a sudden death demanded a last minute revision. Jane More of Loseley is shown on the Guildford proofs as ‘living and unmarried’ but Bray has cancelled this with the note ‘died unmarried 10 Sep 1802’. Dates on these proof sheets (which were themselves often franked and posted without an envelope) show that Guildford was printed between 22 August and 21 December 1802 and that a sheet of eight folios or sixteen pages took three to four days to print.

Gough’s death in 1809 left Bray with the overwhelming task of revising proofs alone while continuing his research and managing his professional duties. Then, in 1811 he lost the sight in his left eye and was forced to rely on his right eye which was itself myopic.111 However, John Bowyer Nichols, like his father, a keen antiquary, stepped into the breach with his ‘indefatigable attention and very great accuracy’.112 He later superintended the printing of most of the early 19th century county histories, ranging from Sir Richard Colt Hoare’s Ancient History of North and South Wiltshire, two volumes (1812–21) to George Lipscomb’s History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham, eight parts (1831–47).113

Conclusion

In 1809 Bray admitted that ‘the Editor of a County History undertakes a laborious task on a certainty that from the nature of his subject he can expect the applauses of few, if indeed he obtains those of any […]’. The qualifications required for a work of this kind are, industry in searching for Records and papers, patience in examining, and accuracy in extracting them’.114 His completion of Manning’s work had taken thirteen years but the subscribers and purchasers had been well served. Volume 1, in 1804, had contained Manning’s meticulous facsimile and translation of Domesday Book, with a commentary on the text, manorial and church histories and lists of incumbents to 1786. It also included returns by overseers of the poor, charity returns and recent population statistics. The second volume, in 1809, was more of an ‘historical dictionary’ for the county, with detailed parochial histories and pedigrees based on and expanding Manning’s notes. The final volume completed the parish histories and revised the population statistics after the 1811 census. It also listed sheriffs for 1805–14

108 The transcript of Alleyne’s will is filed in SHC: G85/2/6, ff 522–56.  
109 Sweet 2004, 6, citing NLS: Adv. MS 29.5.7 (II), f 48, Richard Gough to George Paton, 8 April 1787.  
110 SHC: G120/36/33.  
111 SHC: G52/1/6/2, Bray’s ‘Recollections’, 1 Mar 1829.  
112 Manning & Bray, 2, 5.  
113 Others included Robert Clutterbuck’s History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford, 3 vols (1815, 1821, 1827), Robert Surtees’ History of Durham, 4 vols (1816, 1820, 1823, 1840), George Ormerod’s The History of the County Palatinate and City of Chester, 3 vols (1819), George Baker’s History and Antiquities of the County of Northampton, 5 parts (1822–41).  
114 Manning & Bray, 2, iii.
and concluded with an appendix containing topics ranging from Surrey’s military history to descriptions of the county’s gaols, iron railway, entomology and fossils.115

Although volume 3 listed printed maps, topographical engravings and portraits of Surrey people, and some of Bray’s patrons had presented plates to the work, the illustrations proved to be the weakest feature. Many subscribers would seek to extra-illustrate their copies and so Nichols and Son included a list of Surrey engravings that they could supply. This was the great age of extra-illustration, known as Grangerising, after the Rev James Granger’s Biographical History of England (1769), which had triggered the craze. Richard Percival’s copy of Manning & Bray includes thousands of engravings and watercolours that swell the three volumes to thirty and Robert Barclay of Bury Hill, who commissioned John and Edward Hassell to provide watercolours of Surrey, collected over 2100 illustrations for his copy of the county history.116 The 1864 sale of John Bowyer Nichols’s library included Manning & Bray in six volumes with the ‘rough draught or outline for the intended History in the handwriting of the first author’ together with 1000 engravings of antiquities, houses, villas, views and ‘old transcripts’ described as having once belonged to Ralph Thoresby and then to Gough, as well as arms relating to Croydon in Andrew Ducarel’s hand.117 This suggests that John Nichols and his son had filed documents from Gough and Surrey illustrations from their own collection in their own copy of Manning & Bray. Ambrose Glover’s interleaved and annotated copy of Manning & Bray resurfaced in 1929 in the Sotheby sale of Autograph Letters, Manuscripts and Printed Books from the Collection of the late John Gough Nichols, (1806–73), son of...

---

115 See Appendix 3.
116 Pooley 1996. Richard Percival’s Manning & Bray is BL: Crach.1 Tab. 1. The Robert Barclay Collection is SHC: 4348/–.
117 Sotheby 1864 lot 1555. It sold for £39 10s to Lilly.
John Bowyer Nichols, who lived at Holmwood Park near Dorking and was an early member of Surrey Archaeological Society.  

It is not known how Manning & Bray was viewed on publication. Both Gough’s review of volume one in the Gentleman’s Magazine for 1804 and an anonymous review of all three volumes that appeared in 1816 were based on Bray’s prefaces to the volumes and said little about any strengths or weaknesses in the work as a whole. Although no further reviews in the Gentleman’s Magazine have been found, a letter signed ‘Surriensis’ in the January issue for 1805 does criticise Bray for not checking an inscription supposedly found over the door of Reigate poor house. The inscription was contributed by Richard Barnes but ‘Surriensis’ urged Bray to be more discriminating when using contributions from his correspondents. It is known that Bray was not universally admired as an historian. Joseph Gwilt (1784–1863), architect and archaeologist as well as county surveyor of Surrey between 1807 and 1846, wrote scathing criticisms of Bray in his personal copy of Bray’s Collections Relating to Henry Smith (1800). He saw Bray as ‘culpably negligent’ in collecting data and guilty ‘not only [of] ignorance but a want of inquiry unpardonable in one who professes to be an antiquary.’ Gwilt’s venom may have been based on a long-standing misunderstanding between the two families, but E S de Beer had no such axe to grind when, in 1955, he prepared a new edition of the diary of John Evelyn. Though he praised Bray for producing ‘one of the best loved books of the 19th century’, he criticised his editorial skills, finding that he had omitted sections of the diary that he considered dull or indelicate and falsified the text to improve its style. Such ‘improvements’ had debased the literary character of the text. De Beer wondered whether Bray’s close professional and personal ties to the Evelyn family had led him to excise delicate points in their ancestor’s papers. If this was so, how far did similar concerns affect his treatment of papers that other families entrusted to him for the history of Surrey? Might Bray’s work upon other sources, such as state records or lists of clergy, contain similar flaws due to haste or inattention to detail? If so, few have been found. Although, in 1914, H E Malden was able to correct and augment the lists of Surrey clergy that Manning and Bray had included in their county history, this was no more than a supplemental updating in the light of a century of scholarship. Overall, as has been seen, he considered the accuracy of Manning & Bray to be ‘wonderful’. Writing in 1994, 180 years after publication, Beryl Broad still considered the work to be ‘one of the best county histories of its period. Bray’s completion of Manning’s history of Surrey remains an extraordinary achievement that is still a starting point for much local historical research.

Bray was 78 when he completed the history of Surrey in 1814, and 82 when he published John Evelyn’s diary in 1818, and yet his zest for research was still strong. Throughout the 1820s he spent hours on the thousands of family papers that had been accumulating in the

---

118 Sotheby 1929 lot 107. It sold for £2 to Thorpe. John Gough Nichols contributed three papers to Surrey Archaeological Collections: ‘Bowyer of Camberwell’ (2, 220–54), ‘Notes in illustration of the wills of Joan Lady Cobham and Eleanor Lady Arundell’ (3, 354–6) and ‘The origin and early history of the family of Newdegate, so long as they remained connected with Surrey’ (6, 227–67). He was on the committee to form a temporary museum at a boys’ school room in Farnham for the fifth AGM of the Society at Farnham Castle in 1858 (SyAC, 2, xxiv) and gave a talk about the windows of Sutton Place at the Society’s meeting there on 7 July 1864. He was elected to the Council of the Society on 3 July 1867 and chaired the Society’s General Meeting at Cranleigh on 3 Aug 1871 (SyAC, 6, xviii).

119 de Monthuzin 2004; Gentleman’s Magazine 1804 Aug, 741. The second, anonymous review was printed in the Gentleman’s Magazine 1816 Mar, 233.

120 Gentleman’s Magazine 1805, 39.

121 This copy is now held in the library of the Society of Antiquaries, London.

122 Gwilt’s notes on p 27 of his copy of Bray 1800, held by the Society of Antiquaries of London.

123 Gwilt’s notes on p 167 of his copy of Bray 1800, held by the Society of Antiquaries of London.

124 De Beer 1955, 38.

125 Malden 1914; ICH, 3, 113; Broad 1994, 379.

126 For Bray’s notes and draft history of the Evelyn family, c 1800–30, see SHC: G52/8/9–49. For letters concerning the publication of John Evelyn’s diary, see SHC: G52/12/9 and BL: Add. MS 15951.
'Evidences Room' at Loseley since the mid-16th century. Although his work disturbed the arrangement of this important archive of county history, the articles that he published in *Archæologia* between 1817 and 1821 and the materials he made available to John Nichols for his *Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth* (1823), and its continuation, the *Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First* (1828), did much to alert scholars to their historical importance. His knowledge of the Loseley papers was indispensable to Alfred John Kempe when researching *The Loseley Manuscripts* (1835). Bray’s letters to John Bowyer Nichols show that he helped the historians of Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire where his family had once held estates. He was still contributing to the *Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1828 and, even in March 1831, aged 95 and rapidly losing the sight in his right eye, he told John Bowyer Nichols that he was ‘still alive’ to the idea of preparing a supplemental volume of the history of Surrey. Nichols made no comment.
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**APPENDIX 1**

**List of William Bray’s contributions to the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, 1785–1830**


Bray usually used a pseudonym such as ‘A.L.’ ‘A.X.’ ‘A.Z.’ ‘B’ ‘L.S.’ ‘W.B.’ ‘Y.Z.’ or ‘Z.A.’ His obituary in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* 1833, pt 1, pp 87–8 (which was largely written by Bray himself several years before his death), notes that he was an ‘occasional correspondent’ of the magazine for more than 40 years, beginning in c 1780 with a small poetical piece, ‘Avant ye noisy sons of wine’. However, as this piece has not been traced in the magazine for the years 1779–84, it may not have been accepted for publication.

**1785**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1786**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

127 For a list of documents from Loseley, annotated by Bray c 1825–30, see SHC: G52/7/3. For Bray’s ‘Collections relating to Sir Christopher, Sir William and Sir George More of Loseley […] to which is added some account of Sir James Cawarden of Bletchingley’ 1822, see SHC: LM/1654.

128 See Appendix 2.

129 Pooley 2003.

130 Private Collection: PC1/16/152 [NAD2474], Alfred John Kempe to John Bowyer Nichols, 30 Dec 1829.

131 Yale: Nichols Family Collection Box 2A [NAD3529], Bray to John Bowyer Nichols, 18 Mar 1827.

132 SHC: G52/1/6.


134 Bodl: MS Eng B 2072, f 144, Bray to John Bowyer Nichols, (c 1820).
1791
Vol 61, pt I, pp 533–4
Letter: ‘Remarks on Boswell’s Life of Johnson’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1792
Vol 62, pt I, pp 291–2
Bray, writing as ‘Z.A.’

Letter: ‘The Migration of Swallows’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1795
Vol 65, pt I, pp 375–6
Letter: Archbishop John Tillotson; ‘French Emigrants at Hastings’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1796
Vol 66, pt I, pp 298–9
Letter: ‘Relief of Curates’
Bray, writing as ‘Y.Z.’

Vol 66, pt II, p 843
Letter: ‘West Clandon’. Relating to a carving in a
parsonage in West Clandon, Surrey.
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1797
Vol 67, pt I, p 203
Letter: ‘Stag’s Horn’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt I, p 377
Letter: ‘Stone Pulpit at Magdalen College, Oxford’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt I, pp 378–81
Letter: ‘Sir Joseph Mawbey’s Letter to the Magistrates of
Surrey’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt II, p 643
Letter: ‘Lord Bolingbroke’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt II, pp 643–4
Letter: ‘Deputation from Charles I when Prince of Wales, to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham,
appointing him General of the Horse’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt II, p 914
Letter: ‘Merton College’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 67, pt II, p 1021
Letter: ‘Guildford Castle’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1798
Vol 68, pt I, p 115
Letter: ‘New Shoreham Church’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 68, pt II, pp 557–8
Letter: ‘Description of West Clandon and East
Clandon, Surrey’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1799
Vol 69, pt I, p 31
Letter: ‘Peterborough House’
Bray, writing as ‘B’

Vol 69, pt I, p 277
Letter: ‘Sir R[eginald] Bray’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 69, pt I, pp 387–8
Letter: ‘Owen Ruffhead’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1800
Vol 70, pt I, pp 112–14
Article: ‘Ockham in Surrey; Anecdotes of Lord Chancellor King’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 70, pt II, pp 606–7
Letter: ‘Family of Weston’
Bray, writing as ‘Z.A.’

1801
Vol 71, pt I, pp 493–4
Letter: ‘Mrs. Piozzi’s Retrospection’
Bray, writing as ‘L.S.’

Vol 71, pt II, p 1049
Obituary: Sir John Gresham
Bray in collaboration with Cuthbert Potts, both writing anonymously.

Vol 71, pt II, p 1088
Letter: ‘Utility of enlightening the Poor’ [taking issue with the view of ‘A Southern Faunist’ in Vol 71, pt II, pp 896–7 that it is dangerous to teach the poor to read]
Bray, writing as ‘X.Y.’

Vol 71, pt II, pp 1089–90
Letter: ‘French Bread?’
Bray, writing as ‘X.Y.’

Vol 71, pt II, pp 1097–8
Letter: ‘Pudding Stone; Pews’
Bray, writing as ‘A.X.’

Vol 72, pt I, p 37
Letter: ‘[John] Aubrey’s Surrey’
Bray, writing as ‘X.Y.’

Vol 72, pt I, pp 100–1
Letter: ‘Waltham Disguises explained’
Bray, writing as ‘X.Y.’
Vol 72, pt I, p 327
Letter: ‘Durham Cathedral’
Bray, writing as ‘A.L.’

1804
Vol 74, pt II, pp 1100–1
Letter: ‘[Daniel] Bond’s Paintings’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1807
Vol 77, pt II, p 1000
Letter: ‘Mr. [Thomas] Blore’s Works’
Bray or Richard Gough writing as ‘A.L.’

1809
Vol 79, pt II, p 623
Letter: ‘History of Surrey’
Bray, writing as ‘The Editor of the History of Surrey.’

Vol 79, pt II, pp 812–13
Letter: ‘Dr. Theophilus Lobb’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1811
Vol 81, pt I, p 634
Letter: ‘New Naming of Streets’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 81, pt I, p 300
Letter: ‘Newdegate Manor’
Bray, writing as ‘W. Bray.’

1812
Vol 82, pt II, p 209
Letter: ‘Village Poets at Chipstead’
Bray, writing as ‘W.B.’

Vol 82, pt II, pp 209–10
Letter: ‘Sir H[enry] Fanshawe’
Bray, writing as ‘W.B.’
mentioning an item that he intends to insert into his history of Surrey.

1814
Vol 84, pt I, p 376
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1816
Vol 86, pt I, p 293
Letter: ‘The late N. C. Mundy [Francis Noel Clarke Mundy], Esq.’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 86, pt I, p 602
Letter: ‘Publishing with a false Name’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 86, pt II, p 136
Letter: ‘Modern Manners’ [an attack upon the ‘licentious’ waltz and upon female ‘nakedness’ as espoused by Mme Récamier, ‘probably sent for the very purpose of debauching the minds of our females . . .’]
Bray, writing as ‘A.X.’

1817
Vol 87, pt I, p ii
Letter: ‘Boxing matches’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 87, pt I, p ii
Letter: Note relating to several items in the Gentleman’s Magazine
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 87, pt II, pp 4–5
Letter: ‘Westminster Plays’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1818
Vol 88, pt I, p 485
Letter: ‘Missionary Societies’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1819
Vol 89, pt I, p 392
Letter: ‘Oaths of Juries’
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

Vol 89, pt I, p 498
Letter: Queries about Sir John Monnes and Charles, Lord Seymour
Bray, writing as ‘A.Z.’

1823
Vol 93, pt I, pp 414–15
Letter: ‘Alderman Henry Smith’s Charities in Essex’
Bray, writing as ‘W.B.’

1828
Vol 98, pt I, pp 215–16
Article: ‘Memoir of Solomon Dayrolles, Esq. F.R.S.’
Bray, writing as ‘W.B.’

Vol 98, pt II, p 504
Article: ‘Query re status of Church property after the Dissolution’
Bray, writing as ‘Z.A.’

1829
Vol 99, pt I, pp 90–1

---

135 Bray thanked an unknown correspondent of the magazine for supplying information about Surrey deeds. A letter filed in SHC: G85/41/1, f 347 shows that this was William Hamper of Birmingham.
Obituary of Robert Darley Waddilove, Dean of Ripon (1736–1828). James Kuist and Lorraine de Montluzin attribute this to Charles Oxley but Bray’s two letters to John Bowyer Nichols, dated January 1829, suggest that, having known Waddilove, he was able to make additions and corrections to Oxley’s text.137

1830
Vol 100, pt I, p 386
Letter: Note relating to the Cherokee Indians
Bray, writing as ‘W.B.’138

On 17 August 1830 Bray, writing as ‘Z.A.’ submitted a letter to the magazine concerning a Manchester canal and the recent resignation through ill-health of Lord Midleton of Peper Harow as Lord Lieutenant of Surrey. This contribution has not been found in the magazine, suggesting that Nichols did not use it.139

1831
Bray, writing as ‘Z’, contributed an article on the subject of printing. This contribution has not been found in the magazine, suggesting that Nichols did not use it.140

1833
Vol 103, pt I, pp 87–8
Obituary: William Bray. Bray drafted his own memoir for the Gentleman’s Magazine several years before his death, supplying information upon which John Bowyer Nichols and his son, John Gough Nichols, could build for the final obituary.

APPENDIX 2
List of William Bray’s contributions to Archaeologia: or Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity published by the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1781–1832

1782

1785

Vol 7, p 178 ‘Remarks on Hayman Rooke’s article relating to Druidical Remains in Derbyshire’. Letter to Secretary. Read 18 Dec 1783.

1787
Vol 8, p 85 ‘Mr Willis’ Essay on the Ikineld-Street’. Communicated by Mr Bray to the Earl of Leicester. Read 3 Mar 1785.

Vol 8, pp 329–62 ‘An Account of the Obsolete Office of Purveyor to the King’s Household’. Read 14 Dec 1786.141

1789
Vol 9, pp 96–109 ‘Some Account of a Roman Road leading from Southampton by Chichester and Arundel through Sussex and Surrey to London, so far as the same is found in Surrey’. Read 24 and 31 Jan 1788. Bray also exhibited one of the earthen trunks and part of a figured tile mentioned in this paper, together with a brass figure supposed to be that of Æsculapius, discovered in Surrey, but in what place Mr Barnes had not informed him.


1792
Vol 10, pp 466–8. Extract from some letters written to William Bray by Mr Creswell of Edale, near Castleton, Derbyshire, in 1789.

1794
Vol 11, pp 88–96 ‘Extract from the Wardrobe Account of Prince Henry, eldest son of King James I’. Communicated by William Bray in a letter to the Secretary. Read 17 Jan 1793.142


136 Yale: Nichols Family Corresp. Box 2A Bray to John Bowyer Nichols, 1828 [NAD3567].
141 Bray’s manuscript of this paper is held by SHC as G52/7/11 (1–11).
142 SHC: G85/41/1, pp 892–9.
1796
Vol 12, pp 80–8. ‘Particulars of the Expense of the Royal Household in the Reigns of Henry VII, Henry VII, Queen Elizabeth &c’. Read 6 Mar 1794.\(^{143}\)

1806
Vol 15, pp 13–26. ‘An Account of the Revenue, the Expenses, the Jewels &c of prince Henry’. Communicated by William Bray to the Secretary. Read 20 May 1802.\(^{144}\)

Vol 15, pp 394–6. William Bray exhibited two original writs of the privy Seal, printed on paper, showing the mode adopted by Charles I early in his reign to obtain money from his subjects.

1812

1817
Vol 18, pp 281–6. ‘An Account of some Customs in Husbandry and the prices of various Articles relating thereto, in the time of King Richard II’. Communicated by William Bray in a letter to Samuel Lysons. Read 21 Mar 1816. The letter is dated 18 Mar 1816. It states that Bray drew his material from the bailiffs’ accounts of several Surrey manors.

Vol 18, pp 291–3. ‘A letter to the Mayor and Jurats of the town of Winchelsea, respecting the choice of officers in that Corporation AD1609’. Communicated by William Bray to Nicholas Carlisle. Read 4 Apr 1816.

Vol 18, pp 313–32. ‘Observations on the Christmas Diversions, formerly given by the Lord of Misrule and on the King’s Office of Revels and Tents’ chiefly from papers preserved at Loseley near Guildford, in a letter from William Bray to Samuel Lysons. Read 7 Mar 1816.


Vol 18, pp 352–8. ‘Original letters of King James I to Sir George More, Lieutenant of the Tower, respecting the Trial of the Earl of Somerset. Communicated by William Bray to Samuel Lysons. Read 20 Feb 1817. These letters were found at Loseley.


Vol 18, pp 444–6. On 30 May 1816 William Bray exhibited an impression from a seal of the nunnery of St Osyth, lately found by a labourer in a field near Colchester.

1821
Vol 19, pp 79–87. ‘Account of the Lottery of 1567, being the first upon Record, in a letter from William Bray to Henry Ellis’. Read 29 Jan 1818.\(^{145}\)


Vol 19, pp 263–9. ‘An Account of the Confinement of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, by Order of Queen Elizabeth, in 1570, first at the house of Alderman Becher, in London, and then at Loseley in Surrey, the seat of William More Esq (afterwards Sir William). Taken from original papers there preserved and now in the possession of James More Molyneux Esq, the representative of that family (1819)’. Communicated by William Bray. Read 11 Nov 1819.

1824
Vol 20, pp 575–6. 8 Jun 1820. William Bray exhibited an impression from the seal of the Carthusian Priory at Sheen, Richmond.

1827
Vol 21, p 551. 9 Dec 1824 William Bray communicated to the Society copies of two warrants from Queen Mary, 1553 and 1554, relating to dramatic entertainments at the feast of her coronation.

1829

1834
Vol 25, pp 590–1. 12 Apr 1832. William Bray, aged 96, as a last mark of respect and regard, communicated an account of a grave stone, found three years before, in the churchyard of Great Bookham.

\(^{143}\) SHC: G52/7/11 (12).

\(^{144}\) SHC: G85/41/1, pp 898–903.

\(^{145}\) This document came from Loseley and is now SHC: LM/2008.
APPENDIX 3

List of topics covered in the appendix to volume 3 of Manning & Bray’s
The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey (1814)

Of the Military Transactions in the County, pp 664–79

Ecclesiastical Matters. Societies of the Clergy for the Relief of the Families of their Distressed Brethren, p 680

Names of those appointed to enquire into the Conduct of the Clergy in Surrey in 1647, pp 681–2

Agricultural Society, 1808, p 682

Catalogue of Books relating to Surrey or individual parishes, pp 683–702


County Rates, pp ix–x

County Gaols, pp xi–xxxii

County and other Bridges, pp xxxii–xlxi

Roads, pp xli–lxiv

Navigable Canals, pp liv–lx

Railway, p lx

Abstract of the 1811 Census, pp lxi–lxiv

Entomology, [based on the work of Mr Tyton of Wimbledon], pp lxv–lxv

Botany, [based on the work of Mr Tyton of Wimbledon and Professor Martyn of Cambridge], pp lxv–lx

Peat [communicated to Bray by Mr Halsey in 1800], p lx

Fossils [based on the catalogue of the collection of the late John Smith Budgen of Dorking communicated to Bray by his son, Thomas Budgen, and augmented by notes by the son of Mr Waller, chemist of Guildford], pp lxiv–lxv

Mineralogy [communicated by John Middleton of Lambeth in 1813], pp lxxx–lxxxv

Copy from a parchment roll found in the chest of Windlesham church [communicated by Edgell Wyatt and of which Bray was shown the original by the Rev Snell of Windlesham on 23 Aug 1811], pp lxxxix–cxxii

Lists of Prints of Maps, Views and Portraits relating to Surrey as have been engraved, [based on the collections of Mr Tyton of Wimbledon and of William Bray himself], pp lxxxix–cxi

Town’s and Tradesmen’s tokens issued during the 17th century, pp cvii–cxi

List of Surrey sheriffs, 1805–1814, p clxvii

APPENDIX 4

Unpublished research by William Bray

‘History of the Royal Household, 1639–c 1801’. (SHC: G85/2/3/1–14 and G65/7/11)

‘Families in Surrey formerly possessed of Considerable Estates now broken into parts and in the hands of various persons’ 1830–1832. (SHC: G52/8/7)

‘Collections relating to Sir Christopher, Sir William and Sir George More of Loseley in the County of Surrey Knights, to which is added some account of Sir Thomas Cawarden of Blechingley in Surrey, Knight, a friend of Sir William More. From Original deeds and papers remaining at Loseley’, 1822. Bray’s presentation copy of this to the More family is SHC: LM/1654. His notes are SHC: G52/8/8.

Historical Study of Domesday Book, with explanation of terms and abbreviations, no date. (SHC: G85/2/7)
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