

SOME NOTES ON THE WESTMINSTER AND LONDON TOBACCO-PIPE MAKERS' GUILD

BY IAIN C. WALKER, M.A.

Head of Artefact Research, National Historic Sites Service, Ottawa, Canada

These notes are the by-product of work done at the University of Bath on the history of the clay pipe industry with specific reference to that in Bristol, and were already in manuscript form when J. F. V. Woodman's account of the London pipemakers' guilds appeared in Atkinson's and Oswald's study of London pipes and pipemakers¹. By a curious coincidence, the research by Woodman and that by this writer each produced findings largely un-noted by the other; it therefore seemed worthwhile to publish the latter's findings for the benefit of researchers who may wish to do further work in this field. I am very grateful to my friends A. J. H. Cooksey, R. H. Cooper and A. H. Oswald, F.S.A., for discussion and information and to Mrs. M. Tatchell for assistance with a number of the documentary sources.

For the first half of the 17th century the London area was the major centre for clay tobacco-pipe making, and it was here that a pipemakers' guild was set up. Unfortunately, references to this company are extremely confused, and many of its records appear to have been lost. Ditchfield² describes many London companies, but makes no mention of the pipemakers; Unwin^{3/4} makes only brief references to the company's existence. The following pages attempt to summarize what has been stated, however conflicting, and to include the evidence of the three 17th-century charters of the guild, in order to assist any future study. (Unwin⁵ lists the following documentary material on the company — 1619 *State Papers Domestic* cix. 160; 1620 *SPD* xcv. 53, cxv. 104, cxvi. 83; 1627 *SPD* lxxxix.12; *Privy Council Records* 19th August 1638; 1662 *SPD* lii.32, lx.9, lxi.12; 1663 *SPD* lxxii.70; 1664 *xcvii.65*.)

According to Jewitt⁶, Thursfield⁷ quoting Jewitt, and — probably quoting them without acknowledgement — T. P. Cooper⁸, the company enjoyed a monopoly of making pipes from 1601, although it was not regularly incorporated until 18 years later. This is based on a remark by Cecil, Elizabeth's Secretary of State⁹, where such a monopoly is mentioned on 24th November 1601. The context was an uproar in the House of Commons about monopolies in general, and Cecil, urging "Zeal with discretion" in protesting monopolies, advises that the Queen be petitioned. He continues "One [Member] would have had us proceed [against monopolies] by Bill, and see if the Queen would have denied it: Another, that the Patent should be brought before us and cancelled; and this were bravely done. Others would have us proceed by way of a Petition, which Course doubtless is best; but for the first, and especially for the second, it is so ridiculous, that I think we should have as bad success as the Devil himself would have wished in so good a cause. Why, if idle courses had been followed, we should have gone forsooth to the Queen with a Petition to have repealed a Patent of Monopoly of Tobacco Pipes (which Mr. Wingfield's note had) and I know not what conceits: but I wish every man to rest satisfied till the Committees have brought in their resolutions according to your Commandments." It is not clear why a petition against a pipe monopoly should be deplored when the use of a petition to the Queen on monopolies generally is extolled, but it seems quite clear that by 1601 there was a pipe monopoly, presumably on their production. (It is also unclear whether the reference to Mr. Wingfield

refers to the Member who had moved the action or to the holder of the monopoly.) No other reference to a pipe monopoly this early appears to be known.

A letter¹⁰ dated 20th August 1618, almost 14 months before the first charter was granted to the Westminster pipemakers' guild, refers to pipemaking monopolies in the following terms after mentioning various new taxes and laws: ". . . and not so much as Archie the dizzard but that hath ingrossed the making of tobacco-pipes to him his deputies or assignes, which though yt seeme a small matter, yet they say yt concerns a number of poor men." Archie the dizzard appears to be a reference to Archibald Armstrong, the Court fool — dizzard means fool — but there is no record of Armstrong getting such a monopoly and almost certainly the expression means that any Tom, Dick, or Harry could now get a document allowing him to make tobacco pipes to the exclusion of others in the same trade. This would certainly imply that quite a number of monopolies were being granted at this time.

The first charter¹¹ dated 5th October 1619, strongly implies there had been no control of pipemaking prior to that date, for its *raison d'être* is given as repairing the disrepute brought about by inexpert makers and the growing number of "loose and idle persons intruders into that trade," and to organise the trade and suppress "unskillfull" makers¹². However, the very references to intruders and inexpert makers may reflect the monopolies given to Tom, Dick, and Harry in the preceding years. It seems clear that the 1619 charter is the first attempt to organize the industry on some rational basis, which suggests that the earlier "monopolies" apparently dating to at least as early as 1601 were quite different in their application and terms of reference¹³.

As the present reconstituted company points out¹⁴ the original company was that of the Tobacco Pipe Makers of Westminster in the County of Middlesex (so 1619 charter), and was not, as is generally implied¹⁵, a London company. However, its rights extended throughout England and Wales: no person not a member of the company was to make pipes anywhere in these countries, and the company had the right to search shops, warehouses, and ships for unlawfully-imported pipes. These rights were typical of royal monopolies of the period — the Society of Soapmakers of Westminster, for example, founded in 1632, had similar privileges and was able to use them to break the Bristol soapmakers' guild¹⁶. Brown¹⁷ quotes a Royal proclamation (he dates it 20th May 1620 but Rogers¹⁸ says 27th May and this is confirmed by the *SPD*) which mentions the Westminster pipemakers' charter of the previous year — though its date is given as 6th October — and expresses displeasure that the monopoly given the company and intended to cover England and Wales was being broken. Those causing the royal displeasure are noted as being in London, Middlesex, and Surrey — they were fortifying their houses to resist attempts to stop their work, and the proclamation allowed two of the company's members, together with a law officer, to enter and search any suspected place. (There is a considerable confusion here in the literature. Robinson and Spence¹⁹ refer to these powers and give August as the month, and in fact appear to be referring to a second proclamation of 30th August²⁰. Rogers [confirmed in the *SPD*] claims the search authority was contained in the second proclamation, but Brown²¹, quoting verbatim, notes it in the earlier one. Presumably it was in both — there are no search rights specifically against non-members given in the 1619 charter, a flaw which the proclamations of 1620 were presumably designed to rectify.)

As constituted, the company comprised a Master, four Wardens, and 12 Assistants; in addition 19 other names are listed as, in effect, charter members, which gives a total — in-

cluding two Masters-elect — of 38, indicating that there were at least this number of pipemakers in the London area by 1619.

(Fairholt²² refers to the guild as having a Master, four Wardens, and “about twenty-four Assistants.” This is repeated by Jewitt²³ and Price²⁴ — both probably quoting Fairholt without acknowledgement — and by Pritchard²⁵ — who does give Fairholt as his reference. Penn²⁶ states flatly there were 24 assistants. Harley²⁷ also states that there were “twenty-four Assistants” and goes on to say, in quotation marks, that the company was “to be active in London, Bristol, Selby and Hull’ ”. Where this statement is taken from is not mentioned, but it is not in the 1619 Charter, which is where Harley implies it is. This is but one of quite a number of inaccuracies in Harley’s work.)

The company, however, had a brief existence, for a proclamation of 1621 abolished, amongst other evils, “the sole making of tobacco pipes.”²⁸

The company appears to have been backed by, or perhaps more realistically was a pawn in the hands of, four courtiers who had been instrumental in obtaining the charter and had sunk £3,000 into the venture. What follows is not clear: Unwin²⁹ talks of the Mayor and Recorder of London trying to “make friendly accord” among the four courtiers³⁰, but it is not clear whether they had fallen out among themselves or with someone else. Unwin goes on to say that soon after the accession of Charles I these financiers found their interests threatened by another court favourite (probably Sir Thomas Willoughby referred to in 1627³¹ as a rival claimant to the monopoly), and “ultimately the old charter was declared invalid and a new one granted on condition of the payment of £100 a year to the king.” This suggests the first charter, elsewhere noted as being withdrawn in 1621, continued until after Charles I’s accession in 1625, for the new charter mentioned appears to be the second, granted in 1634, as the payment noted above is that recorded in this charter. However, the 1627 SPD reference referred to is a petition from the three individuals — Thomas Warricke, Robert Maxwell, and Charles Maxwell — to whom the first charter was specifically granted asking that Willoughby not be assisted in his attempt to obtain the monopoly “originally granted by James I to the petitioners to their loss through the falsehood of the company of £3,000.” This indicates the company had foundered by 1627 but that its backers were still hoping to salvage their investment.

The second charter³² is dated 4th December 1634. It was granted to a group of 24 individuals, eight of whom appear among the names in the 1619 charter. Warricke and Robert Maxwell again play a leading part, they and Richard Mathewes and Richard Cox asking for the charter on the grounds that some of the petitioners (whether this means of these four or of the other 20 listed later is not clear) had discovered a way of firing pipes from “Seacole or pittcole” instead of wood “to the consumption and greate decay thereof.” It can thus be concluded that Warricke and the Maxwells had successfully fended off Willoughby and eventually regained their monopoly, which is not Unwin’s interpretation. The Maxwells, in view of their Scottish name, may well have been favourites of James I, who was very prone to have such courtiers. James’s favourites were very unpopular, and it may well have been that with his death there was considerable jockeying for position, such as Unwin implies, when Charles I succeeded. There is a slight suggestion that Mathewes and Cox may have been the pipemakers who had found out how to fire pipes with coal, Warricke and Robert Maxwell being their backers. By the early 17th century there was a great scarcity of good timber because so much was being used in industrial work and the promise to use no wood for firing was clearly designed to obtain royal favour (the 1619 charter specifically allowed

pipemakers to use any fuel they wished.) The company was to pay a yearly rent of £100 in two equal portions, a marked contrast to the 44s rent mentioned in the 1619 charter and no doubt indicative of the growing financial difficulties of the Crown during this period.

(Oswald³³ notes a Maxwell and one Kirk — again another Scottish name — as being granted a monopoly apparently sometime after 1619 to supply pipeclay in return for instructing pipemakers on how to fire pipes with coal — this appears to be a distorted version of the granting of the second charter. The clay monopoly is discussed below. Robinson and Spence³⁴ give the date of the second charter as 1633, but this is incorrect; to further confuse the subject they list [p. 203] an entirely different set of officials to that given in the 1634 charter. The list they give is in fact one of early 19th-century makers — most of the names can be identified from Oswald's list³⁵ as pipemakers working in the first 30 or so years of the 19th century.)

The present company's pamphlet referred to earlier³⁶ gives the date of the second charter as 10th December 1634 instead of 4th December, and also says that the title of the company was changed at that time to that of the Tobacco Pipe Makers of London and Westminster and England and Wales, but the charter in fact gives exactly the same title for the company as that given in the first charter. This source also notes that the charter was forfeited for non-payment of rent, the Civil Wars — commencing in 1642 — probably contributing to the dissolution of the company. Oswald³⁷ quotes a source indicating that the company was still active in 1643 (see below), but in fact the guild was ended by a proclamation of 31st March 1639 which cancelled the grants of incorporation to a motley group of manufacturers, including hatband, spectacle, gutstring, comb, and tobacco-pipe makers^{38 39 40}.

The third charter of the company⁴¹ was dated 20th April 1663, and here the title of the company is changed to that of the Tobacco Pipe Makers of the Cities of London and Westminster and the Kingdom of England and Dominion of Wales. As with the second charter the guild promised to use only coal for firing pipes. There was to be a Master, four Wardens, and 15 or more Assistants. The annual rent was to be four nobles, obviously a largely nominal sum, the age of monopoly-granting to gain money for a hard-pressed Crown being by now over. This charter does not give a date for the termination of the preceding charter, but it does note that the rent had not been paid and that the Letters Patent “have been long since forfeited and voyd.”

The charter prohibited the importation from overseas of any kind of tobacco pipe and also, repeating an act of Parliament of 8th May 1661, forbade the export of any pipeclay. The guild was to have rights of search, with the assistance of a constable, of shops, houses, cellars, warehouses, and ships for any imported pipes or exported clay.

(According to the present company's pamphlet⁴² the company was re-incorporated on 29th April 1663 and recognized as a City company without a grant of Livery on 2nd July. Rogers⁴³ gives a date for incorporation of 21st September 1662 [see below]. Further confusion is added by a reference⁴⁴ to a petition in the Calendar of State Papers dated 7th March 1662 [confirmed in the *SPD*] from the “Masters, Wardens, etc., of the company of Tobacco-Pipe Makers” requesting assistance against Dutch inroads in the colonial trade and “unskilful persons” making pipes for the home market, which suggests the guild was already in existence. This seems contradicted by a quotation from the same source dated 21st September 1662 [confirmed in the *SPD*] about two pipemakers, Thomas Lyddall and Mathew Warner, requesting incorporation “under such constitutions as formerly made” [presumably a reference to the previous charters], but the confusion must lie in the use of the old dating

system when the year started on 25th March: in this case 7th March 1662 would be 1663 new style. The March petition is presumably a formal application for the charter granted the following month, though its terms suggest the officials had already been elected. [The reference to these officials does not appear to relate to officers of the previous companies, for the 1663 charter's Master, Wardens, and Assistants do not include any of the names mentioned in the 1619 and 1634 charters]. Curiously, the two individuals, both pipemakers, who submitted the September petition do not appear in the 1663 charter's list of officials.)*

On 29th April 1664⁴⁵ the guild asked for a reconfirmation of its powers because so many people were flouting its authority⁴⁶. As noted above, the present Company says the company was re-incorporated on 29th April 1663 — it seems likely it has confused 20th April 1663 (the date on the charter) with 29th April 1664 (the date of this reconfirmation).

According to T. P. Cooper⁴⁷ and Oswald⁴⁸, the company, at the same time as it received its new charter in 1663, petitioned parliament to forbid the export of pipeclay to the Netherlands as Dutch pipes damaged the market for their own pipes. This, these sources say, was granted in return for a promise to use only coal for firing pipes. In fact, these points were incorporated into the new charter — this may be the petition of 7th March 1662/3 referred to above but in any case there had also been the act of parliament of 8th May 1661 noted in the 1663 charter. (Over 100 years later, when Duhamel du Monceau was writing, the export of English pipeclay was apparently still forbidden⁴⁹.) According to T. P. Cooper⁵⁰ and Lipson⁵¹ the guild asked in 1664 (the *SPD* give the date as 16th December) for their trade to be included in the Statute of Apprentices whereby only those who had served a seven-year apprenticeship could become pipemakers — they noted “their threatened ruin because cooks, bakers, and ale-house-keepers and others made pipes, but so unskilfully that they are brought into disesteem.” As all three charters were equally specific about apprenticeship it seems likely that the guild was in fact trying to refute an argument that because its trade had not specifically been included in the 1563 Statute of Apprentices pipemaking was exempt from its provisions. (In the following century it was to be held that that Statute was non-retroactive — that is, trades not specifically mentioned in it were excluded from its provisions. This applied to the growing industries in the North and Midlands in particular, though apprenticeship was normally replaced by a seven-year indenture⁵².)

(It is possibly a misreading of this reference that leads Hughes⁵³ to state that this Statute — he like Cooper miscalls it the Statute of Labourers — specifically included a reference to pipemakers when it was promulgated in 1563. MacKenzie^{53a} notes this error, but refers to a five-year apprenticeship. He also says that “years later” [*i.e.* subsequent to 1563] the London pipemakers appealed to the Statute to stop Bristol pipemakers cutting them out, but this writer has been unable to verify this statement and it is unclear on what grounds such an appeal could have been made. Bristol pipemakers certainly followed the customary seven-year apprenticeship, as the writer's present Bristol research proves.)

Robinson and Spence⁵⁴ note the new by-laws of the “Worshipful Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers, of the Cities of London and Westminster (and the Kingdom of England and the Dominion of Wales)” dated 23rd January 1805, forbidding the employment of “unskilful and unfit persons, as women and young girls” as this resulted in poor products — no women were to be employed except the widows of men who had been in the trade for at least seven years. No member of the company was to “carry or cause to be carried, any

*Atkinson and Oswald list (*op. cit.*, 225–6) the members appearing in the 1619 and 1634 charters. As, however, they do not list those appearing in the 1663 charter, these are listed in Appendix A at the end of this Article.

Tobacco Pipes about the Street . . . hawking or offering to sale [*sic*] the same . . .” By the rules and ordinances approved by the Lord Chancellor and the Chief Justices of the King’s Bench and the Common Pleas on 3rd April 1821⁵⁵ admission was by “Patrimony (Birth), Apprenticeship for 7 years, working at the trade unmolested for 7 years, or by serving His Majesty in the Army or Navy.” The charter gave the guild jurisdiction over all pipemakers in England and Wales, but the guild did not extend this right beyond 20 miles round London. Not so long before 1821 it destroyed defective moulds, and at that time officers could and did enter shops within the 20-mile radius warning any person who was not entitled to the freedom of the company and fining the master if such a person was not discharged. (This aspect of the Guild’s function, and the losing battle carried into the 1850’s by the Guild to try to assert its authority, is described by Woodman in Atkinson and Oswald *op. cit.*, pp. 175–6.)

(Hughes⁵⁶ says that after the incorporation of the guild in 1619 its monopoly was confirmed by subsequent monarchs until 1821, when George IV failed to renew it “being influenced by the makers of the more sweetly smoking briar pipes, then newly introduced.” Hughes is not a reliable source, and briar pipes were certainly not appearing until almost 40 years after 1821; Hughes also claims the guild’s monopoly dates from 1610, perhaps a misprint for 1601, but as previously noted this seems certainly not to be the case. Pritchard⁵⁷ notes that according to one source⁵⁸, the company petitioned Queen Anne for a charter of incorporation but this was not allowed. Presumably his reference is in error, for the guild was already incorporated by that date and appears to have remained so until ca.1870. Perhaps the request was for a livery.)

Between 1801 and 1833 there were 528 members admitted by patrimony or apprenticeship, though as there were only 316 members in 1833 there must have been a high attrition rate. Moreover, how many of these 316 were working pipemakers, and how many of these (if any) worked outside London, is not stated. Presumably these members included journeymen and not just masters. (The list of officers given by Robinson and Spence⁵⁹ is almost certainly that for 1821 and should fit in at the end of the seventh paragraph on p.208. The list gives a Master, four Wardens, and 19 Assistants, which last number indicates that the guild had taken advantage of the 1663 clause allowing it more than 15 Assistants if it wished.*)

The company was still in existence in 1866, but by 1875 was recorded as extinct⁶⁰. This agrees with the present company’s pamphlet⁶¹ which says the 1663 charter remained effective for just over 200 years until lack of members ended the company. (Woodman in Atkinson and Oswald *op. cit.*, 177 indicates the company became defunct in 1868 or 1869).

The present company, under the title the Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders, was formed on 24th March 1954. On 5th March 1956 it was granted a coat-of-arms based on that of the old company, with their old motto *Producat Terra*. On 20th December 1960 Livery was granted⁶².

The original coat-of-arms⁶³ differed fairly markedly in detail from the modern one. The original motto, according to all these sources, was “Let brotherly love continue,” not *Producat Terra*. A source of 1747⁶⁴ notes that the company was 78th in precedence as a City company, and that it had neither Hall nor Livery; another source of the same year⁶⁵ also notes the company was 78th in precedence.

According to Brongers⁶⁶ one of the reasons James I granted the company its charter was to control pipe production, especially the production of the so-called Raleigh pipes. These

*Officers listed in Appendix B.

were elaborately-moulded pipes with the bowl modelled as Raleigh's head and the stem in the form of a crocodile attempting to swallow him (an allusion to a story about Raleigh which claimed that on one of his expeditions he had been attacked by a crocodile which found him so impregnated with tobacco that it had let him go.) These pipes are supposed to have been produced in The Netherlands from ca.1620 based on English prototypes^{67 68 69} but as in fact they are extremely rare in England and almost all those that are known are inferior to those found in The Netherlands, it seems more reasonable to explain the few known English examples as indifferent copies of a Dutch model than to identify them as prototypes of the Dutch examples⁷⁰. While it seems reasonable to suppose these pipes may have initially represented Raleigh and that James, who was both anti-smoking and anti-Raleigh (he had disgraced Raleigh in 1603 and had him executed in 1618) would have been angry at any widespread appearance of these pipes in England, there appears no evidence to suggest his granting a monopoly for pipe-manufacture was connected with the appearance of these pipes, particularly if these pipes were not English. (Brongers and Friederich say these pipes continued to be produced until ca.1700 in The Netherlands, and one probably Dutch example at Blaise Castle Folk Museum, Bristol (plate.) is marked IONAS — the N and S being retrograde and 1683 on the stem, suggesting continuing production and an identification of the motif in this instance as Jonah and the great fish.)

It seems therefore, that there is considerable uncertainty about the history of the company, which reinforces the impression that it was never able to enforce its theoretical power — certainly not beyond the London area as the 1634 and 1663 charters implied by their grandiloquent titles. Indeed, as Oswald notes⁷¹, the existence of independent guilds at York and Bristol — the latter founded in 1652⁷² — and a guild of grocers, apothecaries, and tobacco-pipe makers founded at Gateshead in 1675⁷³ indicate that the company was not recognized there, and anything less like the guild at Gouda in The Netherlands with its dictatorial powers over every aspect of trade⁷⁴ is difficult to imagine. Brongers' source for his statement about Raleigh pipes being the major target for James's wrath is not given, and this writer has not been able to find any confirmatory evidence. However, R. H. Cooper⁷⁵ notes that a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 members of the London company visited Southampton to search out any unlicensed pipemakers, so some efforts were made to enforce the monopoly beyond the London area. One signatory of the 1619 charter, Swithin Bonham, was described in 1618 as a gentleman of Poole, a major source of pipeclay (see below), so possibly the guild had a more effective writ than generally supposed⁷⁶.

As Oswald notes⁷⁷, most of the records of the Westminster-London pipemakers' guild are lost, but in view of the variety of and the disagreement among the sources cited in the preceding pages, a re-examination of the company's history might be worthwhile.

The granting of such monopolies was standard policy in the first half of the 17th century, as can be seen from the unsuccessful attempts between 1615 and 1638 to make tobacco-importing a monopoly⁷⁸. According to Oswald⁷⁹, a monopoly to supply clay for pipemaking was granted to Messrs Kirk and Maxwell in return for their services in securing the incorporation of the tobacco-pipe makers in 1619 and for instructing them in how to fire pipes with coal. T. P. Cooper, however, states⁸⁰ that a Philip Foote of London obtained a licence in 1618 to sell clay for pipe-making for 21 years, and that a little later his brother William was granted the right as Philip had died "and bad clay [was being] sold by others."

The Foote monopoly appears to be correct, for it is noted in the *SPD*⁸¹ and referred to in at least two documents in the Public Record Office. One⁸², is a writ to find whether

"Phillipp Foote" of London, a cooper, had discovered any means "to prepare clay or earth of such Composition, temper and quality as hath benefitt and good for the use of Tobacco pipemakers to make thereof their Tobacco-pipes" as specified in Letters Patent granted him on 24th July 16 Jas I (1618); whether he had used or now uses "any mixture or art at all in the mingling or preparing of the clay or earth" for sale to pipemakers or whether he sold it as taken from the ground; whether others used the same clay as Foote had undertaken to sell and if so how long they had used it before Foote's undertaking; and whether Foote had paid the annual rent of £6 13s 4d as specified in the Letters Patent. The result of the inquiry, held in the "Towne Court House" in Westminster on 24th September 21 Jas I (1623) gave the answer no to points one, two, and four; and noted in answer to point three that on 1st May 10 Jas I (1612) and prior to that a Lambeth potter named Peter and an East Smithfield distiller called Walters (a blank is left for each christian name) had supplied and used the same type of clay as Foote had undertaken to sell. This indicates that Philip Foote was still alive in 1623, so if T. P. Cooper is correct in saying Philip's brother William continued the monopoly Philip's death must have occurred after that date. Presumably Philip was able to continue to hold his monopoly despite what seems to be an extremely adverse finding by the inquiry.

The other document⁸³ has recently been transcribed by R. H. Cooper, to whom I am grateful for information on its contents⁸⁴. It concerns an infringement of Foote's patent — which here is dated not to 1618 but to 18th July 1620 — to be the sole supplier of clay for pipe manufacture (which he was obtaining from a John Overy of Hartley, Kent) "in this Realme of England or the Domyinion of Wales." This document too gives Foote's occupation as that of citizen and cooper of London.

Presumably this Philip Foote is the same as that listed as one of the first Wardens of the Westminster pipemakers' guild in its 1619 charter. (This charter also mentions an Alexander Foote, but no William.)

According to Oswald⁸⁵ the monopoly in clay was withdrawn in 1639; this date would coincide with the end of the 21-year licence granted Foote in 1618. (The *SPD* for the years 1638–40 have several claims and counterclaims by those trying to continue a monopoly in clay and those protesting the illegality of these actions.) There is no reason why such a monopoly should not be granted before the formation of the pipemakers' guild and its monopoly, for pipemaking had been a going concern in London from well before 1600. The whole question of clay monopolies may always have been one of confusions and rivalries, however, for A. J. A. Cooksey⁸⁶ has found two agreements for the exploitation of Poole clay for tobacco-pipe manufacture during this period. One of the agreements was among three men for a four-year right and was dated 1618, the same year as the Foote monopoly; the other was a similar one for a 21-year lease made in 1625. On the face of it, these arrangements contradict the Foote monopoly — hopefully, further research will be done on the history of the Poole monopolies.

London, as already noted, was the major pipemaking centre during the first half of the 17th century. Successfully appealing against a tax imposed on pipes, the Westminster company claimed that "near 1000 poor people in London and Westminster lived in tobacco pipe making who now for want of such employment are beggars. Several thousands of other tobacco pipe makers throughout England and Wales are in like manner ready to starve."⁸⁷ It went on to claim that the pipe industry had been cut to an eighth, foul pipes were being reburnt, and the sea trade was being lost. (Oswald gives the date here as 1643⁸⁸, but this

appears to be an error, as the guild had been dissolved in 1639 — see above.) Oswald notes⁸⁹ 106 London pipemakers recorded in the period 1600–50 and 224 for the period 1650–1700, and suggests that when other as yet unknown pipemakers and the assistants likely to have worked with each pipemaker are included, 1,000 connected with the trade ca.1643 may not be so far from the mark. However, in citing a source of ca.1800 that seven Liverpool pipemakers employed 60 men and as many women as grounds for there being a considerable number of pipemakers' assistants in the earlier 17th century Oswald is juxtaposing a 19th-century industrial concern with the small family business of the earlier period, which is not valid. However, even allowing for an exaggeration in the number connected with the trade ca.1643 it seems likely there existed more pipemakers than those at present known, and if each employed four or five assistants — which seems a probable figure — there could still have been several hundred people connected with the trade at this time, to which could be added those involved in supplying the clay. Certainly Oswald's recent figures emphasize even more than his earlier ones that London was the centre of the industry in the first half of the 17th century. However, by 1660 the age of monopolies was passing and it was becoming too late for weak companies such as the London pipemakers' guild to assert their theoretical rights. The disruption of the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth had allowed Bristol to establish its own pipe-makers' guild in 1652 and during the second half of the 17th century Bristol pipemakers, aided by their city's rapidly-expanding overseas trade with the North American colonies, took over as the major export centre of clay pipes in England, a position it maintained until into the second half of the following century.⁹⁰

APPENDIX I

Officers of the London pipemakers' guild noted in the third charter, 20th April 1663:

William Browne	—	Master (to be elected annually from among four Wardens)
Thomas Cobnell	}	Wardens (to be elected annually)
Richard Humphreys		
William Allen		
Henry Thompson		
Thomas Parrett	}	Assistants (elected for life)
Timothy Trigg		
Thomas Anderton		
Uriah Debney		
Thomas Symonds		
Edward Bansborough		
John Boughton		
Robert North		
Edward Robins		
Robert Moore		
Robert Rowley		
John Micheill		
Ferdinando Hullin		
John Lockwood		
James Booth		

(There was a provision for there to be more than 15 Assistants if desired.)



The lower pipe is an almost-complete example of the so-called Raleigh pipe. It is dated 1683 on the stem and has the name IONAS (the N and S retrograde) on the opposite side of the stem. Its present overall length is $7\frac{9}{10}$ inches (the end of the stem is missing) and its bore diameter is $\frac{4}{64}$ of an inch. (Photograph copyright of the City Museum, Bristol).

APPENDIX II

Officers of the London pipemakers' guild noted in 1821 (as given in P. M. Robinson and A. L. Spence *The Robinson Family of Bolsover and Chesterfield* 1937, p.203):

John Dearden (1823-40 — as Deardon ¹)	—	Master
Sam Walker (1823-39 ¹)	}	Wardens
John Hedges (1805-11 ¹)		
Thos Duggan (1823-28 — as Duggen ¹)		
George Benson (1802-20 ¹)		
Thomas Balmer (?) (1805-40 — as Balme ¹)	}	Assistants
George Clark (1805-28 — as Clarke ¹)		
James Jones (1802-40 ¹)		
John Carter (1802-35 ¹)		
Rodger Dix Moon (?) (not found)		
George Brown (1799 ²)		
John Ford (three known: 1823-35; 1826-65; 1830-3 ³)		
Samuel Lambert (1832 ²)		
Joseph Tester (?) 1805-8; another 1823-88 ¹)		
John Jarman (1805-47 ¹)		
William Ditchburn (1832-45 ¹)		
John Brookesbanks (1832 — as Brookbanks ¹)		
William Swan (not found)		
George Bradely (not found)		
Saml Tester (1828 ¹)		
John Bishop (1817-39 ¹)		
Saml Burch (1828-36 — as Birch ¹)		
Thomas Wooten (1820-46 — as Wootten ¹)		
William Burstow (1828 — as Burston ¹)		

NOTES

- 1 B. J. Bloice in D. Atkinson and A. Oswald "London Clay Tobacco Pipes," *JBAA* 1969, pp. 216-25.
- 2 A. Oswald "The Archaeology and Economic History of English Clay Tobacco Pipes", *JBAA* 1960, pp. 55-102.
- 3 I. C. Walker [Ford Family of Pipemakers] *The London Archaeologist*, Spring 1969, pp. 47-8; this gives more recent information on the various Ford pipemakers in 19th-century London.

NOTES

- 1 D. Atkinson and A. Oswald "London Clay Tobacco Pipes", *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 3rd ser. Vol. XXXII (1969) pp. 171-227. J. F. V. Woodman's history of the pipemakers' company is on pp. 172-7.
- 2 D. H. Ditchfield, *The Story of the City Companies* (n.d.).
- 3 G. Unwin *Industrial Organization in the 16th and 17th centuries* (1904, 1957 ed.).
- 4 G. Unwin *The Guilds and Companies of London* (1908, 1963 ed.).
- 5 Unwin *Industrial Organization* . . . , p. 262.
- 6 L. Jewitt, "A Few Words on 'Fairy Pipes'," *The Reliquary* III (1863) 77; repeated in L. Jewitt *The Ceramic Art of Great Britain* . . . (1878) Vol. I, p. 295.
- 7 T. H. Thursfield "Early Salopian Pipes", *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, Ser. III, Vol. VII (1907) p. 160.
- 8 T. P. Cooper "The Story of the Tobacco Pipe", *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* (N.S.). Vol. XIII (1907) p. 104.
- 9 S. D'Ewe *The Journals of all the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1682) p. 651.
- 10 PRO ref. SP 14/98.
- 11 PRO ref. C.66/2206 Patent Rolls 17 Jas. I. 5 Oct. No. 6.
- 12 P. M. Robinson and A. L. Spence *The Robinson Family of Bolsover and Chesterfield* (1937) 200, confirmed in *SPD*.
- 13 Robinson and Spence also say (*loc. cit.*) that the company's by-laws were framed on 6th October, but this has not been confirmed.
- 14 *The Worshipful Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders* (pamphlet issued by the company).
- 15 H. W. Fairholt *Tobacco: its History and Associations* (1859) pp. 166-7, quoting Stowe; and following him, T. G. H. Price "Notes upon some Early Clay Tobacco Pipes from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries found in the City of London, in the Possession of the Author", *Archaeological Journal* LVII (1900) p. 229; J. E. Pritchard "Tobacco Pipes of Bristol of the XVIIth Century and their Makers", *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* XLV (1923) p. 167; and A. Oswald "The Archaeology and Economic History of English Clay Tobacco Pipes", *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 3rd ser. Vol. XXIII (1960) p. 40.
- 16 F. H. Rogers *The Bristol Craft Guilds during the 16th and 17th Centuries* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Bristol) (1949) pp. 156-7.

- 17 A. S. Brown "Pipes and Pipe Smoking", *Tobacco* Vol. LXXVI, No. 13 (26th July 1923) 17 and 19.
- 18 Rogers *op. cit.*, p. 165, n.2.
- 19 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 201.
- 20 Rogers *op. cit.*, p. 165, n.3.
- 21 Brown *loc. cit.*
- 22 Fairholt *op. cit.*, p. 166.
- 23 Jewitt *op. cit.*, 1863: p. 78 and 1878: I, p. 295.
- 24 Price *loc. cit.*
- 25 Pritchard *loc. cit.*
- 26 W. A. Penn *The Sovereign Herbe: A History of Tobacco* (1900) p. 26.
- 27 L. S. Harley "The Clay Tobacco Pipe in Britain", *Essex Field Club Special Memoirs*, VIII (1963) p. 12.
- 28 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, pp. 201-2.
- 29 Unwin *The Guilds and Companies of London*, p. 319.
- 30 SPD, 24th June 1620.
- 31 SPD, Charles I, p. 493.
- 32 PRO ref C66/2645 Patent Rolls 10 Chas. I. (No. 5).
- 33 Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 42, No. 5.
- 34 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 202.
- 35 Oswald *op. cit.*, pp. 55-102.
- 36 *The Worshipful Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders*.
- 37 Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 42.
- 38 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 203.
- 39 Rogers *op. cit.*, p. 165, n.4.
- 40 Valerie Pearl *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National and National Politics 1625-43* (1961) p. 87.
- 41 PRO ref. C.66/3040 Patent Rolls, 15 Chas. II. (No. 7).
- 42 *The Worshipful Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders*.
- 43 Rogers *op. cit.*, p. 165, n.5.
- 44 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 204.
- 45 Rogers *op. cit.*, p. 165, n.6, confirmed in the SPD.
- 46 T. P. Cooper *op. cit.*, pp. 104-5.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 104.
- 48 Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 43, 47.
- 49 H.-L. Duhamel du Monceau *L'art de faire les pipes a fumer le tabac* (1771) p. 10.
- 50 T. P. Cooper *op. cit.*, pp. 104-5.
- 51 E. Lipson *The Economic History of England*, Vol. III *The Age of Mercantilism* (second part) (1931, 6th ed 1956) p. 282.
- 52 T. S. Ashton *An Economic History of England: The 18th Century* (1955, 1961 ed) pp. 223-4.
- 53 G. B. Hughes "The Clay Tobacco Pipe Maker", *Country Life* 28th December 1961, p. 1663.
- 53a C. Mackenzie "Sublime Tobacco" (1957) p. 79.
- 54 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 208.
- 55 *loc. cit.*
- 56 G. B. Hughes *op. cit.*, pp. 1633-4.
- 57 Pritchard *op. cit.*, p. 168.
- 58 Given only as "Marryat" but perhaps his *History of Pottery* which is noted in H. E. Smith "Notes on Clay Pipes: Their Uses and Forms, Makers and Dates", *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* XII (1859-60) p. 212.
- 59 Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 202.
- 60 *Ibid.*, 210-1.
- 61 *The Worshipful Company of Tobacco Pipe Makers and Tobacco Blenders*.
- 62 *Ibid.*
- 63 Fairholt *op. cit.*, p. 167 and *illus.*, quoting Strype's edition of Stowe, Vol. II, p. 247 and Allen's *History of London*; Pritchard *op. cit.*, pp. 167-8, quoting C. Welch's *Coat-Armour of the London Livery Companies* (1914); Robinson and Spence *op. cit.*, p. 200, no source given.
- 64 *A General Description of All Trades . . .* (1747), p. 167.
- 65 R. Campbell *London Tradesmen . . .* (1747) p. 337.
- 66 G. Brongers *Nicotiana Tabacum* (1964) p. 35.
- 67 *Ibid.*, pp. 34-5.
- 68 F. H. W. Friederich "Pijpelogie", Pt. III *Westerheem*, Vol. XIII, No. 3 (June 1964) pp. 59-60.
- 69 I. C. Walker "Sir Walter Raleigh Pipes", *Quarterly Bulletin, Archaeological Society of Virginia*, forthcoming.
- 70 A. Oswald with J. Barber "Marked Clay Pipes from Plymouth, Devon", *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, Vol. 3 (1969) pp. 140, 141; Fig. 59: 79.
- 71 Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 47.
- 72 Bristol Public Archives 04369 (1).
- 73 J. E. Parsons "The Archaeology of the Clay Tobacco-Pipe in North-East England", *Archaeologia Aeliana* Vol. XLII (4th ser.) (1964) pp. 241-2 and Pl XIII.
- 74 G. C. Helbers and D. A. Goedewaagen *Goudsche Pijpen* (1942) *passim*.
- 75 Personal communication 29th July 1968.
- 76 Oswald, personal communication 21st July 1970.
- 77 Oswald *loc. cit.*, "The Evolution and Chronology of English Clay Tobacco Pipes", *Archaeological News Letter*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (September 1961) p. 55.
- 78 C. M. MacInnes *The Early English Tobacco Trade* (1926) pp. 52-8.

- 79 Oswald "The Archaeology and Economic History of English Clay Tobacco Pipes", p. 42, n.5.
80 T. P. Cooper *op. cit.*, p. 104.
81 *SPD* 24th July 1618.
82 *PRO* ref. E.178/4242.
83 *PRO* ref. C.2/38.
84 Personal communication 8th October 1968.
85 Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 43.
86 Personal communication 2nd January 1969.
87 Quoted in Oswald *op. cit.*, p. 42.
88 Also given in A. Oswald and R. E. James "Tobacco Pipes of Broseley, Shropshire", *Archaeological News Letter*, Vol. 5, No. 10 (March 1955) p. 187.
89 Oswald "The Clay Tobacco Pipe: Its Place in English Ceramics", *Transactions of the English Ceramic Circle*, Vol. 7, pt 3 (1970) pp. 227-8; Oswald "Tobacco Pipes", *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Antiques*, Vol. IV (1959) p. 202 gives 75 London makers for 1600-50 and 116 for 1650-1700; cf also Oswald "The Archaeology and Economic History of English Clay Tobacco Pipes", p. 42.
90 Oswald "The Clay Tobacco Pipe: Its Place in English Ceramics", p. 227; Walker *The Bristol Clay Tobacco-Pipe Industry* (Bristol City Museums pamphlet 1970).

BOOK REVIEW

London 1808-1870: The Infernal Wen. By FRANCIS SHEPPARD. Secker & Warburg. 1971. xx plus 427 pp. £4.50.

Not a work of original research but nevertheless an impressive contribution to the Secker & Warburg series *The History of London*. In this splendidly produced and well-illustrated volume Mr. Sheppard deals at great length with some of the more important aspects of the history of London between 1808 and 1870, including local government, the Poor Law, public health, trade unionism, and the transport revolution, as well as the role of church and state in education. The book ends with a useful chapter-by-chapter bibliography. Mr. Sheppard's familiarity with available primary sources is very clear.

LSS