

HAMPSHIRE AND THE COMPANY OF WHITE PAPER MAKERS

By J. H. THOMAS, B.A.

HAMPSHIRE has long been associated with the manufacturing of writing materials, parchment being made at Andover, in the north of the county, as early as the 13th century.¹ Not until some four centuries later, however, did Hampshire embark upon the making of paper, with Sir Thomas Neale (1565–1620/1) financing the construction of the one-vat mill at Warnford, in the Meon Valley, about the year 1618. As far as natural requirements were concerned, Hampshire was well-endowed for the making of paper. Clear, swift chalk-based streams ensured a steady supply of water, for use both as motive power and in the actual process of production. Rags, old ropes and sails provided the raw materials for conversion into paper, while labour was to be found in the predominantly rural population. The amount of capital required varied depending on the size of the mill concerned, and whether it was a conversion of existing plant, as happened at Bramshott during the years 1640–90, or whether the mill was an entirely new construction as was the case at Warnford and, so far as is known, the case with Frog Mill at nearby Curdridge. Nevertheless Hampshire, like other paper-making counties, was subject to certain restraining factors. A very harsh winter, freezing the water supply, would lead to a cut-back in production. A shortage of materials and the occurrence of Holy days would have a similar result, so that in 1700 contemporaries reckoned on an average working year of roughly 200 days.² Serious outbreaks of plague would also hamper production, the paper-makers of Suffolk falling on hard times for this reason in 1638.³ Though Hampshire had only one paper mill in 1620, she possessed a total of ten by 1700,⁴ and with one exception all were engaged in the making of brown paper. The exception was the set of paper mills known as Up Mills, located at South Stoneham to the north of Southampton. Powered by the River Itchen these mills were engaged in the making of white paper, and formed one of the ten or so units of production operated by the Company of White Paper Makers.

Though the story of the Company's formation and life has been told elsewhere,⁵ some of the major details can be reiterated in view of their relationship with Hampshire. The history of the Company begins in January of 1686, when a group of 15 men were granted a patent for 'the art of making all sorts of writing and printing paper, and to imprint our arms upon such paper'.⁶ Later in the same year, they were granted a Charter by James II incorporating them as the Company of White Paper Makers.⁷ Of the fifteen men, a total of nine were French Protestant refugees or of refugee origins.

¹ *Victoria County History of Hampshire*, vol. V, p. 489.

² D. C. Coleman, *The British Paper Industry, 1495–1860* (O.U.P., 1958), p. 163, n. 2.

³ E. M. Leonard, *The Early History of English Poor Relief* (2nd impression, Cass, 1965), p. 201.

⁴ See J. H. Thomas, 'The Hampshire Paper Industry in the Seventeenth Century', *World's Paper Trade Review*, vol. 170, no. 20, 14th Nov. 1968, pp. 1184, 6, 1190, 2, and 1208.

⁵ Rhys Jenkins, *Paper-making in England, 1495–1788* (reprint *Library Association Record*, 1900–2), pp. 18–21; G. H. Overend, 'Notes upon the Earlier History of the Manufacture of Paper in England, P[roceedings of the] H[u]guenot S[ociety of] L[ondon]', vol. VIII, 1906, pp. 201–17; D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, pp. 68–75.

⁶ Patent Office Blue Book no. 249.

⁷ Patent Roll, 2 Jac. 11, pt. 10, no. 17.

An analysis of these nine shows that no fewer than five of them came from Hampshire – Elias de Grouchy, Adam de Cardonnel, Nicholas Dupin, Claude Bordier and Marin Regnault. A sixth member of the Company also came from Hampshire – Robert Shales. A second bond of unity between all these men was the fact that though concerned with the promotion of paper production, not one of them was actually a paper-maker by trade.

Jersey-born Elias de Grouchy was a merchant, operating in the thriving port of Southampton. Business must have been fairly good, for in 1680 John Lowman of Winchester was taken into his service as an apprentice.⁸ De Grouchy was a man of some considerable local and social importance, serving as Sheriff of Southampton in 1677 and as Mayor some five years later in 1682.⁹ Also active and resident in Southampton was Adam de Cardonnel. Arriving in England at some point during the years 1620–30,¹⁰ a refugee from Caen in Normandy, de Cardonnel was given the rights of a denizen in August, 1641,¹¹ and by 1647 had set up in business as a London merchant,¹² probably with his brother Peter. In June 1657 he was naturalised, the first draft of the act for that purpose referring to him as 'gent'.¹³ By the late 1650s Adam de Cardonnel had moved to Southampton, where he became Collector of Customs and Customer for the port of Southampton, acquiring the patents for those posts in August 1660, and October 1661 respectively.¹⁴ In May of 1662 he was sworn in as a Burgess of Southampton.¹⁵ He appears to have been Collector of Customs at Southampton for at least 20 years, still retaining that post in March, 1682.¹⁶ His son, Adam de Cardonnel (jun.) was to carry the family name to great heights, representing Southampton in Parliament on six occasions and becoming Secretary to John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough.¹⁷

Nicholas Dupin, the third Hampshire member, was naturalised in March of 1670, when he was referred to as the son of Theodore Dupin and as having been born in the province of Auion at Somar.¹⁸ In 1685 he was described as being both a gentleman of Portsmouth,¹⁹ and a clerk of the Reports in the garrison at Plymouth.²⁰ A possible inference is that perhaps the garrison post was something in the nature of a sinecure. His relationship with his colleagues appears to have whetted his appetite for the promoting of financial ventures, for he was later to be involved with companies for white paper production in both Ireland and Scotland.²¹ Like de Grouchy and de Cardonnel, Nicholas Dupin played some part in local politics, being elected a Burgess of Portsmouth in 1681.²² Portsmouth supplied two members to the Company of White Paper

⁸ A. J. Willis, *A Calendar of Southampton Apprenticeship Registers, 1609–1740* (Southampton University Press, 1968), p. 54.

⁹ W. J. C. Moens, *The Walloon Settlement and the French Church at Southampton*, P.H.S.L., vol. III, 1888–91, p. 76.

¹⁰ E. M. Sandell, *Southampton through the Ages* (Wilsen, 1960), p. 93.

¹¹ W. A. Shaw, *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalisation for Aliens in England and Ireland, 1603–1700*, Huguenot Society Publications, vol. XVIII, 1911, p. 64.

¹² H[ampshire] R[ecord] O[ffice]: 4M60/126.

¹³ W. A. Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

¹⁴ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1660–1, p. 213; *Ibid.*, 1661–2, pp. 504–5.

¹⁵ B. W. Greenfield, 'The Heraldry and Exterior Decorations of the Bargate, Southampton', *Proceedings and Papers of the Hampshire Field Club*, vol. IV, 1898–1903, p. 116.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

¹⁷ See *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. III, pp. 949–50.

¹⁸ W. A. Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

¹⁹ H.R.O.: 8M56/116.

²⁰ R. H. George, 'A Mercantilist Episode', *Journal of Business and Economic History*, vol. III, 1930–1, p. 265, n. 6.

²¹ See below.

²² R. East, *Extracts from the Portsmouth Records* (Portsmouth, 1891), p. 365.

Makers, the second being Robert Shales. On the occasion of his first marriage, to Mary Lunn of Portsmouth, in January 1671, Shales was described as being 'purser of ye "Diamond"'.²³ Sworn a Burgess in March 1676,²⁴ and elected an Alderman of Portsmouth in 1678,²⁵ he served as Mayor of that borough for part of 1679 and again during the year 1686-7.²⁶ By contrast, very little is known about the other Hampshire members of the Company – Claude Bordier and Marin Regnault. Bordier had some connections with the French Church at Southampton; in 1688 he stood as one of the three god-parents to Marte Susanne, the daughter of André Guillemin and his wife.²⁷ Regnault, though frequently referred to as a Southampton man, is very much an unknown quantity, for no reference to him has been found beyond the fact that he was a Southampton man.

Much more complicated than the occupations of the various Company members, is the way in which they acquired the premises²⁸ of Up Mills, an operation in which neither Regnault nor Bordier appear to have participated directly. In November 1685, William Percy, a miller of South Stoneham, agreed to sell the fulling mills called Up Mills to de Cardonnel, de Grouchy and Dupin for £405, and to secure a conveyance to them from one Henry Bromfeild. In addition, Percy agreed to renew his lease of the grinding mills on the same site, which he held from the Warden and Scholars of Winchester College. On the 9th of the following month de Cardonnel and his two colleagues were granted a lease for one year of 'All ye said ffulling Mills . . . and a Moyety of ye Corne Mills (both called Upmills)'. On the following day, the reversion and inheritance of these premises were released to them for £400. What they acquired would appear to have been half of the site, for on the 1st of November of the subsequent year these same men took a lease of 'a Moyety of two Corne Mills and one Mault Mill' from the Warden and Scholars of Winchester College, for 40 years at an annual rent of 40 shillings. The day after this, the last-named granted to de Cardonnel and his associates a licence to let the premises to any person for any period of time, provided that the period in question was not in excess of 21 years. The process of acquisition, complicated though it was, sheds light on what appears to have been a certain amount of splintering within the ranks of the early makers of white paper, for de Cardonnel and his partners gained Up Mills for the 'Southampton Papermakers', presumably the name under which they were operating when they made their original request to the Crown for the right to incorporate the Royal Arms in their finished product. This body subsequently became united with 'ye . . . London papermakers' who later in October of 1689, paid de Cardonnel, de Grouchy and Dupin the original purchase price of £400.

Although it was stated in January of 1686, when de Cardonnel and his associates were granted their patent, that they had 'lately brought out of France excellent workmen and already set up several new-invented mills and engines for making thereof, not heretofore used in England'.²⁹ the buildings in which these new mills and engines were

²³ W. P. W. Phillimore and A. T. Everitt, *Hampshire Parish Registers*, vol. X (London, 1907), p. 62.

²⁴ P[ortsmouth] C[ity] A[rchives]: PE8, p. 119.

²⁵ R. East, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 315 and 316.

²⁷ *Registre des Baptêmes, Mariages et Morts et Jeunes de l'Eglise Wallonne à Southampton*, ed. H. M. Godfrey

(Lymington, 1890), p. 67.

²⁸ The details of this paragraph are based on the Abstract of Title to Up Mills, located in H.R.O.: 8M56/116.

²⁹ S. Smiles, *The Huguenots . . . in England and Ireland* (London, 1880), p. 272, n. 1, citing 'Abridgment of Specifications relating to Printing', p. 82.

installed in Hampshire were by no means new. There have been water mills on the site at South Stoneham since the time of the Domesday survey in the late 11th century,³⁰ and as early as August 1360, Robert Torold and his family received a share of a fulling mill there, along with 'a fishery passing under the wheel of that Mill'.³¹ In May of 1622 a moiety of the mills was granted to Arthur and Henry Bromfeild for £579 by Henry Cole and Henry and Roger Ludlowe.³² Some 50 years later Henry Bromfeild, grandson of the previous Henry Bromfeild, wrote to the Warden and Fellows of Winchester College a letter headed 'The Condition of Upmills and how greate a Loss I have susteyned by them since the Collidge-Lease was granted me', in which he referred to the fact that he had leased part of the property from the College in March of 1650, for a term of 40 years;³³ it was this 'loss' which explains why de Cardonnel and his colleagues obtained their lease in December of 1685, a full five years before Bromfeild's lease was due to expire. And while the premises were far from being newly built, they were also anything but small.

Before some consideration is given to the extent of Up Mills as a unit of paper production, one question needs to be answered – just how was paper made in late Stuart England? Fortunately for the layman, John Evelyn visited a paper mill at Byfleet in Surrey in August of 1678, and noted in his diary the way in which paper was made: 'Thence, to the paper-mills, where I found them making a coarse white paper. They cull the rags which are linen for white paper, woollen for brown; then they stamp them in troughs to a pap, with pestles, or hammers, like the powder-mills, then put it into a vessel of water, in which they dip a frame closely wired with wire as small as a hair and as close as a weaver's reed; on this they take up the pap, the superfluous water draining through the wire; this they dexterously turning, shake out like a pancake on a smooth board between two pieces of flannel, then press between a great press, the flannel sucking out the moisture; then, taking it out, they ply and dry it on strings, as they dry linen in the laundry; then dip it in alum-water, lastly, polish and make it up in quires. They put some gum in the water in which they macerate the rags. The mark we find on the sheets is formed in the wire.'³⁴

Having seen the way in which paper was made at this time, on what scale were these techniques put into use at Up Mills? An extant inventory of Up Mills, taken in November of 1696³⁵ gives a detailed picture of the layout of plant there, almost to the last nail. All told, there were four paper mills on the site, one of which had a specific name – Salisbury Mill. In addition, there were three working houses, two drying lofts, a salle, a sizing room, three warehouses, lodging chambers and a brewing house. The mills themselves were of considerable proportions. Each had two wheels plus stamping machinery consisting of over 30, and in one case over 40 hammers, the purpose of these being to macerate and shred the rags in the initial stages of production. The sizing room was fairly large, containing two 'Great Copper Furnashes', along with three

³⁰ I am indebted to Mrs. H. Stowell of West End for this information.

³¹ H[istorical] M[anuscripts] C[ommission]/N[ational] R[egister of] A[rchives] List, *Winchester College Muniments*, vol. 2, item no. 1545.

³² H.R.O.: 8M56/116.

³³ H.M.C./N.R.A. List, *Winchester College Muniments*,

vol. 2, item no. 1732. I am indebted to P. Gwyn, Esq., Archivist to Winchester College, for kindly supplying me with a photocopy of Bromfeild's letter.

³⁴ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. W. Bray (Everymans Library, 1937), vol. II, p. 125. For a more detailed and technical account see D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, chap. 11.

³⁵ H.R.O.: 8M56/116.

large tables, and a number of other items including a press, four forms and five stools. One of the warehouses contained 22 rag baskets, plus scales and a variety of weights. In another of the warehouses were stored '4 Grinding Stones for 2 Corne Mills' and the necessary equipment to make the corn mills function. Also found on the site were 'Several Tunnes of Stones' and a boat. So large were the premises, in fact, that it took three men four days to complete the inventory.

Besides attesting to the vast extent of Up Mills, the inventory of 1696 also shows what types of paper the Company was actually making in Hampshire. These totalled seven – Elephant, writing demy, Great Horn, morleaux, foolscap, printing demy, and Small Horn,³⁶ moulds for all these types of paper being found *in situ*. Morleaux appears to have been the most popular size, six pairs of moulds for this type being noted. For each of the other types of paper, two moulds were found, the exception being printing demy, for which only one mould was found. At the time of the inventory, only three mills were being used for the manufacture of paper. Of these three mills, however, one was devoid of a vat, the inventory noting that the work-house of 'ye upper mill' contained '2 Great Iron-hoops belong to ye fatt w[hi]ch was destroyed'. As contemporaries reckoned on an average annual output of roughly 2,000 reams of paper per vat,³⁷ Up Mills probably produced something in the region of six thousand reams of paper per year, though by 1696 this figure would have been in the region of 4,000 reams, the drop being explained by the fact that at that date only two vats were actually being used. In 1698, the Company's then Governor, Paul Dominique, claimed that the Company was selling 50,000 reams of paper every year,³⁸ and if such indeed was the case Up Mills were responsible for producing on average some 12 per cent of the Company's annual sales' figure, declining to 8 per cent by the late 1690s, always assuming that the sales figures for the Company had remained around the 50,000 ream mark.

To operate such a large unit of production, the Company would have obviously needed a fair-size labour force. The normal labour force of a late-Stuart paper mill was usually some 15 strong,³⁹ and it would appear at first sight that a unit of four mills would have required 60 hands to operate it. However, some qualifications can be made to this figure. To begin with, there would have been an inevitable duplication of tasks, involving a certain reduction of labour. As one of the mills was disused by 1696, a certain drop in the number of people employed would have taken place, depending on just when the mill became 'decayed'. The decaying must have taken place during the years 1685–97, for although the mill in question was devoid of a vat in 1696, it did at least contain all the requisite equipment for the production of paper, showing that it had been in use for at least part of the 12-year period during which the Company occupied the premises at South Stoneham. The inclusion of 'ye Lodging rooms' in the inventory implies that part of the labour force actually lived in, an idea that is substantiated by other evidence. Even so, only ten beds were noted in the lodging rooms

³⁶ The dimensions of four of these types of paper are as follows: Elephant, 28" x 23"; Writing demy, 20" x 15½"; Foolscap, 13½" x 16½"; Printing demy, 22½" x 17½". E. J. Labarre, *Dictionary and Encyclopaedia of Paper and Paper-Making* (O.U.P., 1952), pp. 255–9.

³⁷ D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 73, n. 1.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, citing P[ublic] R[ecord] O[ffice]: CO391/90.

³⁹ D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

when the three men concerned made the inventory in November of 1696. Besides the people employed directly in the making of the paper, the activities of the Company would have offered much employment of a 'middle' and direct nature. Thus rag-collectors and carpenters would have been needed, as would the services of that all-important figure – the millwright. The man thus employed by the Company for the purpose of attending to the various items of machinery was a Mr. Knight for the inventory notes that various items were returned by him, including brass pots, plates, a rug and some blankets.

While exact figures for the Company's labour force at South Stoneham are wanting, owing to the lack of extant wage ledgers, it is known that many of the workers employed there were of foreign origins. South Stoneham's parish registers contain entries for the christening of a Frenchman's daughter in July 1687, and for that of Gabriel the son of Daniel and Jane Rousillon in July 1699. There are also entries for the baptisms of two children belonging to Abraham and Perrine Guilloen in 1689 and 1695, the family name suggesting that they were probably employed by the Company. In May of 1701, Anne, the daughter of Peter and Esther Jacques 'belonging to the Paper Mills', was christened, and three years later, in June of 1704, a 'Frinch child at the paper mill' was baptised.⁴⁰ In addition, the Register of the French Church at Southampton contains entries for the christening of the three daughters of Gerard de Vaux in 1694, 1699 and 1702, de Vaux being referred to on the second and third occasions as 'demeurant paroisse de South Stoneham aux moulins à papier'.⁴¹ It was under the guidance of de Vaux that the young Henri Portal learnt the art of making paper, and it was de Vaux's son, John, who assisted Portal in his new enterprise at Bere Mill from 1718 onwards.⁴² In February of 1709 the second child of Francois and Anne Hypeau was baptised, the parents being referred to as living at the paper mills. It is interesting to note that when the first son of the Hypeaus was christened, in June of 1704, he was named Gerard and had Gerard de Vaux for his godfather.⁴³ It is very probable that some of the entries mentioned above refer to some of the 'excellent workmen' which de Cardonnel and his business partners claimed they had brought over from France. After all, what more natural than that having gone to the trouble of bringing them over, de Cardonnel and his colleagues should employ them in the mills with which they were directly and actively concerned? If so, these workmen must have been very thankful for the fact that they were in England, for such was Louis XIV's determination to destroy England's growing paper industry that he issued a proclamation, early in 1687, threatening the paper-makers of the Auvergne with confinement in the galleys if they were caught trying to quit the shores of their native France.⁴⁴ This was something of a short-sighted action on the part of the 'Sun King' for either way he stood to lose the valuable services of skilled workmen.

Along with French labour, some of Dutch origin is known to have been employed by the Company of White Paper Makers in Hampshire. In December of 1693 the child of a 'Dutchman belonging to the Paper Mylles' was baptised at South Stoneham.

⁴⁰ S[outhampton] R[ecord] O[ffice]: PR9/1/1, South Stoneham Parish Register, 1663–1713.

⁴¹ H. M. Godfrey, *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 71 and 72.

⁴² *V.C.H. of Hampshire*, vol. V, p. 489.

⁴³ H. M. Godfrey, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 and 75.

⁴⁴ H. Gazel, *Les anciens ouvriers papetiers d'Auvergne* (Clermont Ferrand, 1910), p. 105.

The registers for that parish also contain entries for the christening of three children belonging to one Nicholas Nowell, referred to on the second occasion as 'a Dutch Man att Paper Mills'.⁴⁵ As with the employment of French labour, the Company took deliberate steps to acquire skilled hands. In this case, it had sent Daniel Rousillon on a recruiting-drive to the paper mills in the Dutch province of Guelderland in 1688.⁴⁶ His mission was not without success, for in addition to the two Dutch hands employed at South Stoneham, at least five Dutch paper-makers were working for the Irish White Paper Company in the last few years of the 17th century.⁴⁷

Though both French and Dutch paper-makers were employed at Up Mills, this was not to the detriment of their English counterparts. Indeed, the whole point of employing a cosmopolitan labour force was that the foreign hands should teach the English paper-makers the skills attached to the making of fine white paper. Among the men so employed were John Foster, buried at South Stoneham in February 1693, Mathew Plyer, married there in December 1696, and a man by the name of Beal whose daughter was baptised in 1701.⁴⁸ The parish registers also contain numerous references to the Gater family, later associated with both Up Mills and Frog Mill at Curdridge, and to a family by the name of Skeet, possibly ancestors of the Skeats family associated with the making of paper at Romsey in the late 18th century. In September of 1693 Samuel Willey, Covenant-servant to the Company, was reported as having left the Company's service, the advertisement adding that he 'went from their Mill near Southampton, called Upp Mill in July last'. His skills were obviously appreciated by the Company, a reward of two guineas being offered for his return to the Company.⁴⁹ Richard Batt, paper-maker of South Stoneham, who married Margaret Sweet of Titchfield in February of 1701⁵⁰ was, in all probability, employed by the Company in the closing years of its life. Some female labour was also employed, probably for the sorting of rags after collection. Thus when Mathew Plyer and Mary Wine were married, both were referred to as being 'of Up Myll'.⁵¹

Having made the paper, the Company disposed of it through several channels of distribution, some located in Hampshire and some further afield. At least one of the surviving account books for the Earl of Gainsborough, spanning the months March to September 1688,⁵² contains paper the watermark of which is 'CDG', possibly standing for Cardonnel Dupin Grouchy'. The likelihood of this being so is borne out by several other points of evidence. The Earl of Gainsborough knew Dupin in the early 1680s, several financial transactions occurring between them during the years 1681-4,⁵³ the last three years of that period being part of the Earl's term of office as Governor of Portsmouth.⁵⁴ The Earl's steward and one of the three men responsible for the inventory of 1696 shared the same name - John Baker, while Daniel Rousillon, the Company's agent to Holland, is mentioned in the account books. An additional point to

⁴⁵ S.R.O.: PR9/1/1, South Stoneham Parish Register, 1663-1713.

⁴⁶ H. Voorn, 'Anglo-Dutch Paper Relations', (7th International Congress of Paper Historians, 1967), p. 175.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ S.R.O.: PR9/1/1, South Stoneham Parish Register, 1663-1713.

⁴⁹ *The London Gazette*, no. 2909, 25th-28th September, 1693.

⁵⁰ *Hampshire Allegations for Marriage Licences* (Harleian Society, 1893), vol. 1, p. 51.

⁵¹ S.R.O.: PR9/1/1, South Stoneham Parish Register, 1663-1713.

⁵² H.R.O.: 5M53/1177.

⁵³ H.R.O.: 5M53/1167, 1168, 1169 and 1170.

⁵⁴ R. East, *op. cit.*, p. 638.

note is that at some point during the period March to September of 1682, the sum of £2 was paid on the Earl's orders to a Mr. Garrett for 'Ye releafe of ye Protestants which Came outt of France'.⁵⁵ The Company also sold some of its paper in nearby Southampton, the material thus purchased being used for local administrative purposes.⁵⁶ Sales further afield consisted of the shipping of consignments of paper in coastal vessels from Southampton to Exeter in Devon. Between September 1697, and September 1698, some 197 reams of paper were shipped in this fashion, while total shipments of paper between the two ports between September 1697 and September 1700 amounted to 247 reams.⁵⁷ As no paper was shipped to Exeter from Southampton between September of 1698 and September of the following year, it would appear that the 197 reams formed part of a stock clearance before the Company actually disposed of the premises. At the same time, however, it should be borne in mind that some of the paper may have come from the mills at Warnford and Curdridge, both fully functional at this time.

Laudable though the Company's efforts were in the making of paper, the passage of its life was anything but smooth. Mention has already been made of the claim by de Cardonnel and his partners that they had brought over skilled French paper-makers to work for the Company. What they omitted to mention, however, were the difficulties they had encountered in securing the services of French hands. In May 1685 Dennis de Manes, the Company's emissary to France, had been caught attempting to ship three French paper-makers over to England from Normandy; for his troubles, he had been imprisoned at Caen for a period of 11 months.⁵⁸ As far as the French authorities were concerned, Manes' crime was one of double gravity. Not only was he trying to spirit French workmen away, but he was a Frenchman himself. He had arrived in England in the 1680s, if not before, and had set up two paper mills in or near Plymouth by 1684.⁵⁹ At this time it was stated that he had 'kept a manufacture of paper in France', which he had been forced to leave 'because of his religion'.⁶⁰ De Manes' intention, prior to his apprehension, was to ship the three workers concerned over to 'some works which I have with Messrs. Cardounel 'Dupain' Gruchi at Hoileton near Southampton'.⁶¹ On his release from prison, de Manes was arrested again and interned at St. Malo. Eventually returning to England, he parted ways with the Company for a while, being one of the four men summoned to give evidence against the bill to prolong the Company's life, this having been referred to a Committee of the whole House after a second reading in May 1690.⁶² Within the next five years, however, de Manes was to have yet another change of heart, being associated with Dupin in the Scots White Paper Manufactory.⁶³

There were also labour problems once the French hands had arrived in England. Basically, it was a question of how the new workers were to be kept in England.

⁵⁵ H.R.O.: 5M53/1168.

⁵⁶ S.R.O.: SC3/7/61, Nomination Book, Southampton Corporation, 1686/7 and SC/14/2/68a, Tax Assessments, St. Mary's parish, Southampton, 1696, evidence of watermark.

⁵⁷ Customs 64/59. I am indebted to E. Carson, Esq., Librarian and Archivist, H.M. Customs and Excise, London, for kindly supplying me with this information.

⁵⁸ H.M.C.: *Mss of the Marquess of Downshire*, vol. I,

part 1, pp. 157-8.

⁵⁹ Rhys Jenkins, 'Paper Making in Devon', *Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries*, vol. VIII, 1914-5, pp. 119-21.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, quoting Register of the Privy Council.

⁶¹ H.M.C.: *Mss of the Marquess of Downshire*, vol. I, part 1, pp. 157-8.

⁶² G. H. Overend, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

⁶³ D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 79, n. 2.

Reference has already been made to the desire on the part of Louis XIV to render ineffective England's nascent paper industry, and to ensure the certainty of this, the French Ambassador to England, Barillon, had been briefed accordingly. He was responsible for the bribing of Daniel Juilhard, manager of the Company's mill at Colnbrook, Surrey, and several other workmen, to return to France. On 4th April 1687, the Company complained that five of its workers had been 'lately conveyed from their mills by the contrivance of some who design totally to ruin the manufacture of white paper in England'. On the 29th of the same month a Royal proclamation was issued for 'The Encouraging and Better Establishing of the manufacture of White Paper of England'. Declaring the desire of James II to stimulate and encourage a new industry in England, it also prohibited all 'of whatsoever nation' from luring servants away from the employ of the Company. The proclamation appears to have had little of its intended deterrent effect, for Barillon was responsible for repatriating an additional five French paper-makers before 28th November 1687.⁶⁴ The French Ambassador was obviously proud of his efforts and confident of his ultimate success, for in July of 1688 he reported to his royal master that it had cost just over 1,150 livres to secure to France the return of the remaining five French paper-makers in England,⁶⁵ a somewhat exaggerated remark on his part. It should be noted that England was not singled out for attack by Louis XIV; in Holland, Count d'Avaux was pursuing a course of action similar to that adopted by Barillon.

Despite the opposition of de Manes and the three others, and despite the activities of Barillon, the Company enjoyed a marked degree of prosperity for a while. The bill of 1690 did reach the Statute Books, the Act⁶⁶ providing for the subscription of new stock, and therefore the confirming and extending of the Company's monopoly until 1704; at the same time, the Company was to be restricted to making paper worth more than 4/- per ream. *The London Gazette* frequently gave notice of sales of paper from the Company's London headquarters, located in Queen Street. By the end of the decade, however, the tide of fortune had turned against the Company. In November of 1696 the House of Commons was informed that the making of paper was not 'in so thriving a condition as could have been the case'.⁶⁷ The prime reason put forward for this was the evils attached to stock-jobbing. This was reiterated in a report on the general state of English trade which was presented to William III in 1698, when reference was again made to the 'Perversion of the Stock'.⁶⁸ Other reasons have since been put forward, one 19th century writer stating that in part the Company's failure was due to its probable use of the practice of putting up 'each ream with two quires composed entirely of sheets spoiled in course of production'.⁶⁹ Whatever the reason, and it is probable that perversion of stock was the more important, the Company was forced to sell out in Hampshire. On 2nd November 1697, the Company conveyed and released the freehold part of the premises at Up Mills to one William Sheppard, a London goldsmith, for the sum of £1,500. In the following month, Sheppard purchased 'All

⁶⁴ R. H. George, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 271, citing Barillon to Louis XIV, 16th/26th July, 1688; Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Correspondance Politique, Angleterre, 166, fol. 69.

⁶⁶ 2 William and Mary, s. 1 c. 16, 'An Act for encouraging and better establishing the Manufacture of

White Paper in this Kingdom'.

⁶⁷ *J[ournal of the] H[ouse of] C[ommons]*, vol. XI 1693-7, p. 595.

⁶⁸ *J.H.C.*, vol. XII, 1697-9, p. 435.

⁶⁹ R. Herring, *Paper and Paper Making* (London, 1863), p. 46.

the presses, Hammers, Morters, Coppers' in and about Up Mills for £100.⁷⁰ This evidence adds support to the idea that the Company was declining, to disappear soon after 1698, itself a year of general economic depression. In addition, it suggests that the Company had read the signs of the times, and had sold out while there was still some chance of making a profit on the transaction. Finally, it explains why the Governor of the Company had told the Board of Trade and Plantations, in mid-October 1696, that the Company had about 12 mills,⁷¹ though the report of 1698 states that the Company had 8 mills.

Though the Company disappears from ken after 1698, the reverse is true of the Hampshire men associated with it. Adam de Cardonnel, who had been excused from the office of Sheriff of the Town and County of Southampton in October 1690, because of his great age,⁷² lived on for another 20 years, passing away on 27th January 1710, at the great age of 90. Five days later, he was buried in the French Church at Southampton,⁷³ having been an Elder of that institution for a total of 48 years.⁷⁴ Elias de Grouchy, an Elder from at least 1702,⁷⁵ lived on until February of 1707. He died a man of sufficient means, leaving property in Southampton and Jersey to his three daughters, as well as small sums of money to his two grandchildren, and bequests of 40/- to the poor of Southampton and 20/- to the distressed of St. Lawrence, Jersey.⁷⁶ Unlike de Cardonnel, however, he was not buried in the French Church. A curious feature which bound these two men, together with Dupin, in post-Company years, was that they each retained an interest in Up Mills. Though the Company disappeared in or just after 1698, as late as 1st November 1707, these three men received a licence from the Warden and Scholars of Winchester College to grant a lease for Up Mills.⁷⁷

As was stated before, Nicholas Dupin went on to 'pastures new', with considerable alacrity. In 1690,⁷⁸ a patent for the manufacture of white paper in Ireland was granted to him, and using this as a base he soon erected an Irish Company, similar in organisation to its English counterpart. In the same year he was associated with Henry Million in the promotion of the 'King's and Queen's Corporation for the Linen Manufacture in England'.⁷⁹ An attempt in 1692 by Dupin to set up a similar concern in Ireland met with little success. The Company was based in Dublin with Dupin as Deputy-Governor,⁸⁰ a position he had held in the early days of the Company of White Paper Makers. A rival concern soon appeared at Drogheda, and relations with it and Dupin's company in London were far from smooth within a very short space of time. In September of 1696 William Molyneux wrote to John Locke: 'these quarrels and controversies—between the three concerns—grew so high, and Du Pin began to play such tricks, that all were discouraged and withdrew as fast as they could; so that now all is blown up, and

⁷⁰ H.R.O.: 8M56/116.

⁷¹ D. C. Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 74, n. 3, citing P.R.O.: CO391/90.

⁷² B. W. Greenfield, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

⁷³ H. M. Godfrey, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*; J. W. de Grave, 'Notes on the Register of the Walloon Church at Southampton and on the Churches of the Channel Islands', P.H.S.L., vol. V, 1894-6, p. 135.

⁷⁵ J. S. Davies, *A History of Southampton* (Southamp-

ton, 1883), p. 411.

⁷⁶ P. C. C. Poley 28, Will of Elias de Grouchy, dated 18th May 1705.

⁷⁷ H.R.O.: 8M56/116, Abstract of Title to Up Mills.

⁷⁸ State Papers, Domestic, Signet Office, xii, p. 354.

⁷⁹ W. R. Scott, *The Constitution and Finance of English, Scottish and Irish Joint-Stock Companies to 1720* (Peter Smith, 1968), vol. III, p. 90.

⁸⁰ G. L. Lee, *The Huguenot Settlements in Ireland* (Longmans, 1936), p. 239.

nothing of this kind is carried on'.⁸¹ Dupin was also active in Scotland, receiving in 1691 the promise of a patent for linen production in that country.⁸² By an Act of Parliament dated 10th July 1695, Dupin and partners were granted the privileges of a manufactory, plus the right to conduct business under the name of the Scots White Paper Manufactory.⁸³ In the same year he was also concerned with the promotion of a mining venture in Scotland.⁸⁴ With the coming of the 18th century, Dupin appears to have devoted some of his time and energy to the politics of Portsmouth, being present at a calling-over of the Corporation of that borough in February of 1710.⁸⁵ He voted in the polls of 1713 and 1714, casting his votes for Sir James Wishart and Sir William Gifford, and Wishart and Sir John Suffield respectively.⁸⁶ After this date, however, he disappears from view.

Of the later careers of the other Company members slightly less is known. Marin Regnault and Claude Bordier seem to have disappeared completely, no further trace being found. Slightly more is known about Robert Shales. On 8th June 1686, Shales married for a second time, his wife being a Portsmouth spinster, Anne Hedger.⁸⁷ Twelve years later, in 1698, Shales passed away, a man of considerable means. To his wife he bequeathed lands and tenements in nearby Portchester, as well as a house in Penny Street, Portsmouth. On the death of Anne, the Portchester property was to pass to Robert Shales jun., while the house in Penny Street was to pass to Mary, one of Shales' three daughters. His other two daughters were also bequeathed property by their father; Elizabeth Shales was to have a tenement in Penny Street, Portsmouth, while her sister was to receive two tenements there. Monetary bequests totalled some £1,300, including £400 each to Mary and Elizabeth. Shales left very precise instructions for the way in which his funeral arrangements were to be carried out. His widow was to invite 20 gentlemen as she thought fit, and give each of them a mourning ring to the value of 10 shillings. The bearers were to be provided with gloves, 20 shillings' worth of bread was to be distributed to the poor, and there was to be 'no Sermond'.⁸⁸

Though the Company's relationship with Hampshire only lasted for just over a decade, the years thus occupied were far from being insignificant. Considerable light is cast on the activities of the paper industry's first joint-stock undertaking, and although the Company's life was rather brief, it at least served to show that there were sufficient people who were both ready and willing to invest their money in its promotion. Secondly, the activities of the Company and its promoters emphasise the essential gain to England from the influx of Huguenot refugees. One of the three major alien immigrations into England since the reign of Edward II, the advent of the Huguenots in the 17th century injected into the national bloodstream a new brand of people, people with sufficient application, financial acumen and natural skill to work diligently, and whose labours had significant results, both for themselves and for the life of the nation

⁸¹ William Molyneux to John Locke, 26th September 1696. Quoted D. C. Agnew, *Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign of Louis XIV* (London, 1871), vol. I, p. 169.

⁸² W. R. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

⁸³ Acts of the Parliament of Scotland, ix, p. 429.

⁸⁴ W. R. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

⁸⁵ R. East, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

⁸⁶ Election Returns, 1713 and 1714, contained in P.C.A.: PE7, C. Winkworth, *An Analysis of the Records of the Corporation of the Borough of Portsmouth*, unpagged Ms volume.

⁸⁷ W. P. W. Phillimore and A. T. Everitt, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁸⁸ P. C. C. Lort 193, Will of Robert Shales, dated 25th April 1692.

as a whole. Witness, for example, the activities of Dupin and de Manes. The combined efforts of these two men show just how much could be achieved by men who were prepared to work both hard and long. The troubles suffered by the Company at the hands of France show how important the creed of mercantilism was to the men of the late 17th century. Louis XIV, greatly influenced by his able minister Jean Baptiste Colbert, was determined to destroy the English paper industry, especially that section which concentrated on the making of white paper. It was much to the credit of the Company that it laboured on despite the distinct sabotaging activities of Barillon. It was perhaps rather ironic that one of the young refugees who escaped the notice and clutches of Louis XIV's ever-watchful agents – Henri Portal – should later practise the art of paper-making with such skill and success that he could land, in 1724, the contract for making paper for the recently-formed Bank of England. Had Barillon been alive to hear such news, he would surely have regretted his remarks of 1688, for it was the failure of his mission in part, and in part only, which was to lead to England assuming such a predominant role in world economic affairs in the late 18th and 19th centuries.

NOTE: For further details on the later history of Up Mills, and on the location and history of other paper mills in Hampshire, see: A. H. Shorter, 'Paper-Mills in Hampshire', *Papers and Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club*, Vol. XVIII, 1951-3, pp. 1-11.

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks are extended to the following for their kind help and advice in the preparation of this article: Mrs. E. Cottrill, M.A., and the staff of the Hampshire Record Office, Winchester, with special thanks to Miss H. Aldred; M. J. W. Willis-Fear, B.A., and the staff of the Portsmouth City Archives; Miss S. D. Thomson, B.A., and the staff of the Southampton Record Office; Miss A. Stanley and the staff of the Literary Department, Principal Probate Registry, Somerset House, London; Misses F. M. Lanaway and L. Pegg, the Library, Portsmouth College of Technology, for obtaining material through the Inter-Library Loans Service; Mrs. M. J. Guy, A.L.A., and the staff of the Reference Section, Central Public Library, Portsmouth; P. Gwyn, Esq., Archivist to Winchester College; E. Carson, Esq., Librarian and Archivist, H.M. Customs and Excise, London; Mrs. H. Stowell of West End; N. W. Surry, M.A., Lecturer in History, Portsmouth College of Technology, who kindly read and criticised two drafts of the final article.