

# CAKE AND COCKHORSE



Banbury Historical Society

Autumn 1971

20p

## BANBURY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

President: The Lord Saye and Sele

Chairman: F. Willy, B.A., Raymond House, Bloxham School, Banbury

Hon. Secretary: J.S.W. Gibson, F.S.A.

Hon. Assistant Secretary:

G.J. Fothergill, M.A.,  
48 Wales Street,  
Kings Sutton  
Banbury  
(Tel. Kings Sutton 485)

Hon. Treasurer:

Dr. G.E. Gardam,  
11 Denbigh Close,  
Broughton Road,  
Banbury  
(Tel. Banbury 2841)

Hon. Information Officer:

A.W. Pain, A.L.A.,  
c/o Borough Library,  
Marlborough Road,  
Banbury  
(Tel. Banbury 2282)

Hon. Editor *Cake and Cockhorse*

B.S. Trinder, 90 Bretch Hill, Banbury

Hon. Research Adviser:

E.R.C. Brinkworth, M.A., F.R. Hist.S.

Hon. Archaeological Adviser:

J.H. Fearon, B.Sc.

### Committee Members

Miss C. Bloxham, A. Donaldson

\*\*\*\*\*

The Society was founded in 1957 to encourage interest in the history of the town of Banbury and neighbouring parts of Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire and Warwickshire.

The Magazine *Cake & Cockhorse* is issued to members four times a year. This includes illustrated articles based on original local historical research, as well as recording the Society's activities. Publications include *Old Banbury - a short popular history* by E.R.C. Brinkworth (2nd edition), *New Light on Banbury's Crosses*, *Roman Banburyshire*, *Banbury's Poor in 1850*, and *Sanderson Miller of Radway and his work at Wroxton*, and a pamphlet *History of Banbury Cross*.

The Society also publishes records volumes. These have included *Clockmaking in Oxfordshire, 1400-1850*; *South Newington Churchwardens' Accounts 1553-1684*; *Banbury Marriage Register, 1558-1837* (3 parts) and *Baptism and Burial Register, 1558-1723* (2 parts); and *A Victorian M.P. and his Constituents: The Correspondence of H.W. Tancred, 1841-1859*. A new edition of *Shoemaker's Window, Wigginton Constables' Books, 1691-1836*, *Banbury Wills and Inventories, 1591-1650*, *Bodicote Churchwardens' Accounts, 1700-1822* and *Banbury Politics, 1830-1880* are all well advanced.

Meetings are held during the autumn and winter, normally at 7.30 p.m. in the Town Hall. Talks on general and local archaeological, historical and architectural subjects are given by invited lecturers. In the summer, excursions to local country houses and churches are arranged. Archaeological excavations and special exhibitions are arranged from time to time.

Membership of the society is open to all, no proposer or seconder being needed. The annual subscription is £2.00, including the annual records volume, or £1.00 if this is excluded. Junior membership is 25p.

Application forms can be obtained from the Hon. Secretary or the Hon. Treasurer.

# CAKE AND COCKHORSE

The magazine of the Banbury Historical Society. Issued to members three times a year.

Volume Five	Number One	Autumn 1971
NEWS	Society Activities	2
CORPORATION RULE	R.K. Gilkes    Banbury – The Pattern of Local Government, 1554–1835 (Pt. 1)	3
OBITUARY	E.R.C. Brinkworth    Mrs Violet Gibson	18
TESTAMENTARY	Richard T. Vann    Banbury Wills in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1701–1723	18

On p.2 appears a letter from one of our more distant members who lives in New Zealand, who regrets our decision to reduce the number of issues of *Cake and Cockhorse* to three a year instead of four. While we accept his warning about the consequences of reducing services, we do not accept that the course of action which we are following amounts to a cut in standards. We have no intention whatsoever of reducing the number of pages of this journal which appear during the course of a year. To concentrate the material available in three issues instead of four simply means that we are saved the expense of printing one set of covers, and of the postage of about 400 copies. We hope that other readers will agree that this is a sensible course, but if people do feel strongly that they would like four smaller issues per year they should make their opinions known to the committee.

One advantage of producing rather longer issues is that we can now more easily print articles of considerable length, such as Mr. Gilkes's contribution to this issue. The article on the pattern of local government in Banbury before the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 was originally written for the *Victoria History of Oxfordshire*, and we are grateful to the Editor for permission to reproduce it here. The section on this subject in the *V.C.H.* will be rather shorter and less detailed. The second portion of Mr. Gilkes's article will appear in *Cake and Cockhorse* in about a year's time.

Our other principal article in this issue was contributed by Professor Richard Vann of the Wesleyan University in Connecticut, and it may be fitting here to mention Professor Vann's stay in Britain between September 1970 and June 1971 during which he made several visits to Banbury. We were delighted that he was able to attend the Historical Society's dinner in November. Professor Vann is an acknowledged authority on the social history of the Society of Friends, and we look forward to seeing in print the results of his researches into the Banbury Quakers.

---

**Our Cover:** Shows the Banbury Town Seal used in 1574.

**Acknowledgment:** We are more than usually grateful to the Banbury Borough Council for the co-operation received from the Borough Library and for permission to use illustrative material from the local collection there and from the booklet *The Borough of Banbury, 1554–1954*, by E.R.C. Brinkworth, published to mark the Quaker-centenary of the Granting of the Charter of Incorporation.

## SOCIETY NEWS AND ACTIVITIES

### *Autumn Programme*

Members will have received the Society's Lecture Card and noted the varied programme which, to the end of this year, consists of two lectures, an evening of reminiscences and the Annual Dinner.

*Tuesday, 28th September.* "Women's Lib. in the 17th Century". This is our "celebrity lecture" given this year by the Master of Balliol and eminent historian, Mr Christopher Hill. Behind the unusually topical title, there lies, no doubt, the lively treatment and profound analysis which characterize all Mr Hill's many works.

*Thursday, 21st October.* "The Oxfordshire Election of 1754". People who are cynical about modern politics might conclude after Miss G.H. Dannatt's lecture that we have made some progress towards a fairer system. Miss Dannatt has made a recent study of this corrupt and chaotic election which was by no means unique in the 18th century. Banbury figures in this quite prominently.

*Friday, 19th November.* Annual Dinner at the White Lion Hotel. 7.30 for 8.00 p.m. Members will be given more details about this shortly but are asked to book early as one or two people left their applications too late last year and the dinner was fully booked. The chief guest this year is Richmond Herald of Arms, Mr J.P. Brooke-Little.

*Thursday, 25th November.* "Reminiscences of Old Banbury". This popular event will be chaired by Dr. Brinkworth but the other participants are a closely guarded secret!

*As usual meetings are at 7.30 p.m. in the Town Hall.*

### SUMMER VISITS

We were fortunate in having beautiful weather for all our summer activities. A coach-load of members interested in Industrial Archaeology had a superb day at Ironbridge for the Open Day of this expansive site on May 2nd. The organisers of this ambitious exhibition on the early iron industry deserve great praise and we were delighted to note the part played by Mr and Mrs Trinder. On May 22nd a small party visited the famous Saxon church at Earls Barton with its impressive tower. The Annual General Meeting at Rousham Park was a great success and our thanks are due to Mr and Mrs Cottrell-Dormer for allowing us the use of their beautiful home on June 5th.

The party which visited Easton Neston House on July 3rd was treated to a brisk and most entertaining tour by the youthful Lord Hesketh. Again we want to record our thanks for his hospitality and the opportunity to see round this fine eighteenth century house and gardens. Finally on July 17th a large group of archaeologically minded members were taken over the excavation at Middleton Stoney by Mr Trevor Rowley whose five year project at this Romano-Medieval site will certainly deserve another visit. Again we record our thanks.

Suggestions for next year's programme will be most welcome and should be sent to Mr G. Fothergill (48 Wales Street, Kings Sutton) or any member of the Committee.

Dear Sir,

I have just received my copy of the Summer Issue of *Cake & Cockhorse*.

I am sorry to read from the Annual Report that the magazine is a serious burden on the Society's finances, but I am not at all sure that cutting down the number of issues to three per year is the right remedy, in fact I feel certain it is the wrong one. To cut down on services is a very retrograde step. Prices are certain to be still higher next year – what then? A further cut down will be the clear road to oblivion.

The obvious remedy and the realistic one is to increase subscriptions more in line with present day conditions – every other club to which I belong, both here and in England, has already done so. Why not the Banbury Historical Society?

Yours faithfully,

A.R.E. Messenger, Auckland, New Zealand.

Ed. note: in fact subscriptions were raised, from 50p and £1.25 to £1.00 and £2.00, in 1968.

# BANBURY – THE PATTERN OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT 1554–1835 [Part One]

Banbury, a market town at least since the reign of Stephen, and probably even earlier,<sup>1</sup> became a free corporate borough by Royal Charter in 1554 out of regard for the services rendered by the inhabitants of the town to the Queen, Mary I, in the troubled period before her accession.<sup>2</sup> Similar charters were granted to Abingdon and Higham Ferrers, both linked under burghal affiliation (a characteristic feature of English municipalities in the Middle Ages) with the mother-town of Banbury. Anxious to secure the widest possible support, particularly from suspected Protestant areas, the Catholic Queen was prepared to grant the claims to self-government, which Banbury shared in common with most English towns whose prosperity was increasing, and the representations of the town, sponsored by Lord Harry Stafford and Thomas Denton of Buckinghamshire were successful in the Charter of Incorporation, dated 26 January, 1554.

The government of the town was to be in the hands of a Bailiff (an 'honest man', William Barmesley, or Barnsley), twelve Aldermen and twelve Burgesses (also called Capital Burgesses, and all named) all chosen from 'the better and more honest and discreet inhabitants' and these were to form the Common Council; the title of the corporate body was 'The Bailiff, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough and Parish of Banbury'. The Bailiff was to be chosen annually by the Common Council from among the Aldermen; the Aldermen were to choose the Capital Burgesses, new Aldermen were to be recruited from the Capital Burgesses by co-optation, and new Capital Burgesses were to be chosen by the Council from the inhabitants of the town; both Aldermen and Capital Burgesses served for life. A Serjeant-at-Mace was to be chosen by the Council, and each year two Constables [increased later to four and to six in 1678], besides other necessary officers, were chosen.

By-laws, 'wholesome and reasonable statutes and constitutions', could be made by the Council in the interests of good government in the town. There was granted a weekly market on Thursday, and each year two fairs, one on the Eve, Feast and Morrow of St. Peter ad Vincula (August 1st), the other on the Eve, Feast and Morrow of St. Luke (October 18th). Conduct of the fairs was to be controlled by a court of Pie Powder, and all revenues arising from the fairs – stallage, piccage, fines and other charges – were to be enjoyed by the Council. The Bailiff was to be Clerk of the Market, and in this capacity, as the Crown's representative, he declared the Assize of Bread, of Beer and Wine, so that victuallers did not take 'excess lucre from them'.<sup>3</sup>

Every three weeks the Council was empowered to hold a Court of Record 'before the bailiff and two Aldermen and two Capital Burgesses and the High Steward of the Borough and Parish' to deal with all actions and debts up to the value of £5, according to the law and customs of Coventry. Twice a year – within a month after Easter, and within a month after the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel (September 29th) – the Council was to hold a law day and view of Frank-pledge for all the inhabitants of the borough 'before the Bailiff and two Aldermen and two Burgesses, and the High Steward or his sufficient Deputy'. One of the Aldermen was to be chosen annually by the Council to be Justice of the Peace in the county. The Council had power to acquire lands and privileges within the borough not held immediately of the Queen in chief, or by military service, and not exceeding the value of £20, and all forfeitures, 'waifs and estrays', the Assizes of Bread, Wine and Ale, as well as all profits of markets and fairs were to belong to the Corporation, in return for which the sum of £6 13s. 4d. had to be paid annually to the Queen's Exchequer.<sup>4</sup>

'One discreet Burgess' was to be chosen by the Bailiff, Aldermen and Capital Burgesses to serve as Member of Parliament, the costs of the election being borne by the Corporation. Fourteen additional boroughs, returning twenty-five Members, came into the representative system in Mary's reign; of these Higham Ferrers, Abingdon and Banbury were the only single-member constituencies, a constitutional novelty indicating that the Crown was not as intent on influencing the House of Commons through Borough enfranchisement as it had been in the reign of Edward VI.<sup>5</sup>



*Fig. 1.* The earliest relevant document in the possession of the Corporation is this Proclamation which was issued by the first Town Clerk of Banbury, Peter Gylle, and the first Steward, John Lovett, on the occasion of the grant of the first Charter of Incorporation to the Borough by Queen Mary in 1554. It refers to the grant of the Charter by the Queen in consideration of the support given to her cause by the inhabitants of Banbury and contains the names of those persons as a result of whose efforts the Charter was granted. (from *The Borough of Banbury, 1554–1954*, by E.R.C. Brinkworth).

The borough boundaries were defined by this Charter: from the Bridge over the River Cherwell on the East of the borough to the White Cross (which stood at the West end of West Bar, about 8 paces East of the junction of Beargarden Road and Broughton Road) outside Sugarfords Gate on the West side; thence to St. John's Gate on the South side; from there to the North Gate on the North side, and thence back to the Bridge. These boundaries enclosed only the area of the manorial borough, with a population of about 1,000; the hamlets of Neithrop, Hardwick, Calthorpe and Easington were not included, and Grimsbury, though within the parish of Banbury, was independent.<sup>6</sup> A more detailed survey, tracing the boundaries between these cardinal points, was made on September 15, 1603, and presented by a jury of fourteen appointed by the King's Surveyor, Mr Hersye, on 18 November.<sup>7</sup>

The first Court of the new Corporation was held at the Castle in 1556, with a feast to celebrate the granting of the Charter. Spice capons, conies, geese, bread, 100 pears, ale, a gallon and half of wine, a bottle of sack and a quart of Malmsey were consumed. Those who had been instrumental in securing the Charter were remembered with gifts – two couple of cheeses and three couple of capons bought in the market were sent to London to Stephen Wygatt and Richard Fearsell, and 40 shillings to Mr Kemswell.

In the town itself celebrations took the form of a pageant. Loads of timber were given by Mr Kemswell and Mr Cope, and the craft guilds – butchers, shoemakers, carpenters, barkers and saddlers, weavers, glovers, mercers, tailors and drapers, smiths, and bakers together contributed £3 10s. 10d. towards te festivities; twenty shillings were paid by the Corporation for costumes purchased at Coventry, and two shillings to Mr Gregory of Coventry, who was doubtless called in to advise on the presentation of the play, which formed part of the festivities.<sup>8</sup>

A permanent manifestation of corporate dignity and an end to the manorial associations of the Castle was the erection of a stone Town Hall with three bays in Cornhill in 1556. Punitive equipment was transferred from the Castle – the pillory, a wooden cage (probably on wheels), and the removal of which necessitated knocking a hole in the Castle wall, stocks, and the 'kockestoll' – ducking stool, and 12s. 4d. was expended on paving 96 yards of the Market Place. The cost of building the new Hall was to be met from personal loans and Corporation money, and considerable time must have elapsed before the debt was cleared; the balance of the account of the Bailiff, William Halhed, taken on December 28, 1590, – £4 7s. 8d., 'was all disposed towards charges of the Town Hall'; repayments for money loaned were still being made in 1597.<sup>9</sup>

A second Hall of timber and plaster was built early in the seventeenth century in the Market Place; but in 1800 the Corporation decided to rebuild it 'as near the present plan as may be'. Subscriptions were received from the High Steward, the Earl of Guilford and Dudley North, M.P., among others, and the estimate of £450 submitted by one of the aldermen, John Pain, was accepted on December 8, 1800. The same day a committee of the Mayor and four Aldermen was appointed to see that the work was carried out. At a Hall held on November 5, 1814, it was reported that Mr Pain had been paid in full. The present Town Hall was built in 1854 in Bridge Street, and its predecessor was moved to Lower Cherwell Street to become a warehouse, where it is still to be seen.<sup>10</sup>




Fig. 2. Detail from a view of Banbury in 1730, showing the second Town Hall with the medieval church behind, and, on the left, the gallows. (Gough Collection, Bodleian Library).

### *The second Charter*

On June 28, 1608, James I granted Banbury a new Charter confirming almost all of the clauses of 1554, but making some changes.<sup>11</sup> Banbury became a mayoral town, and the first Bailiff to hold the new title of Mayor of the Borough of Banbury was Thomas Webb. There were to be still twelve Aldermen, but only six Capital Burgesses, and these together formed the Common Council of the Borough; while there were to be thirty Assistants, who would join with the Aldermen and Chief (Capital) Burgesses in electing the Mayor, and from whom vacancies in the ranks of the Capital Burgesses were to be filled. All were chosen for life, although any could be removed on the vote of a majority of the Council.<sup>12</sup>

'One honourable man that shall and may be Baron of this our Realm, or at least a Knight' was to be elected Chief, or High Steward (William, Lord Knoles, is named); 'one honest and discreet man skilful in the laws of England' was to be elected Recorder (Thomas Chamberleyne of Gray's Inn is named). A chamberlain was to be chosen from the Aldermen – William Knight was to be the first; there was to be a Town Clerk (Nicholas Awstin), a Coroner, and two Serjeants-at-Mace to 'carry and bear the gilded and silvered maces and with the signet of our arms our heirs and successors engraven and adorned ... before the Mayor ...'. For the preservation of good order William, Lord Knoles, Richard, Lord Saye and Sele, Sir Roger Wilbraham, Sir Anthony Cope, Sir Richard Chittwood, Thomas Chamberleyne, Edward Wickham, William Knight, the Mayor, Recorder and three Aldermen named by the Council were to be Justices of the Peace, and any three of them, of whom the Mayor and Recorder must be two, were empowered to keep sessions. A gaol was to be built with the Mayor Keeper of it, while a gallows was to be set up for the execution of those convicted of felonies, murders and other misdemeanours within the borough.<sup>13</sup>

Provision was also made for a hospital for twenty-four poor and weak men and women unable to earn their own living; it was to be called the Hospital of Our Sovereign Lord James the King, or the King's Hospital of Banbury, but although elaborate arrangements were made for the appointment of a Guardian and Governors – all named – and for the exercise of their authority, it must be assumed that the hospital did not materialise as no further mention is known of it. The grant of a weekly Wool Market was made to benefit the poor, and every freeman of the borough could buy and sell wools, threads, woollens and linen, to be kept or wrought or employed by labour and industry within the borough for the shunning of sloth and idleness; any materials surplus to these requirements could be sold elsewhere in England to the limit of 2,000 tods in any one year [a tod equals 28 lbs.]. Profits of the Wool Market were to be used for the benefit of the borough and the relief of its poor and infirm inhabitants. A house for the Wool Market was built with the undercroft sometimes used unofficially for storage, and the Corporation Accounts for January 30, 1610, record payments of £30 6s. 9d. to Robert Bentley and John Pym for timber, lath and nails, and charges about the Wool Hall, and list the names of seventeen members of the Corporation who had lent 30s. apiece towards the cost of building. On April 18, 1612, the Council agreed to repay these loans, together with other debts amounting to £210 10s. 1d., incurred for 'obtaining of the Charter of this Borough, charges about the suit of the Cross and other charges, the entertainment of the King ... and other businesses concerning the Corporation', as and when the money became available.<sup>14</sup>

The second Charter also established a weekly Horse Market, to be held on Thursdays, and two fairs, one on the Eve, Feast and Morrow of the Feast of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary (March 25th), the other on the Wednesday, Thursday and Friday before the Feast of St. Nicholas (December 6th).

In the period 1625–1681 nonconforming interests had gained an ascendancy in most of the boroughs, and after the dissolution of the 'Oxford' Parliament by Charles II in 1681 'arose the audacious policy of wresting charters from corporations in order to new model them, by introducing such restrictions as might render the members from the boroughs in future Parliaments entirely devoted to the interests of the Crown'. Such interference had been contemplated in 1661, but 'quo warranto' proceedings were begun against the Corporation of London in 1682, and, as Lord Halifax wrote to Reresby, Governor of York, if they succeeded 'every other corporation would be obliged to truckle'. Judgements of forfeiture fell on many boroughs, and many more, Banbury included, voluntarily surrendered their charters.<sup>15</sup>






Fig. 3. Parts of the second Charter, granted by James I in 1608, and the third Charter, granted by George I in 1718. (from *The Borough of Banbury, 1554–1954*, by E.R.C. Brinkworth).

On a petition of the Corporation, and after the expenditure of £97 4s. 10d. by twenty-two of its members, some of whom were not repaid until 1700, a warrant for the incorporation of the borough was issued in 1683, regranting 'all the lands, hereditaments, franchises and privileges formerly enjoyed and constituting the present members officers of the corporation . . . with power reserved to the Crown to displace any Mayor &c.' 'The Mayor, the Recorder, and three eldest Aldermen, who are Justices within the borough, may be likewise within all the parish of Banbury', so that Borough jurisdiction was now extended to the hamlets of Calthorpe, Easington, Wickham, Neithrop and Hardwick, as well as Grimsbury.<sup>16</sup> But the surrender of Banbury's charters was not enrolled, and the Corporation resumed their ancient charters under the proclamation of James II in 1689 for restoring surrendered charters.<sup>17</sup>

#### *The third Charter*

The accession of George I in 1714 aroused Hanoverian and Jacobite feeling in Banbury, and the division was reflected in the membership of the Corporation; indeed, the 'Battle-royal' fought in the parish church in 1700 between rival Mayors for the chair of state may have been a pointer towards this. On the first Monday in September, 1716, as ordered by the Charter of 1608, the Mayor, Aldermen and Capital Burgesses and Assistants met to elect a Mayor for the ensuing year; in accordance with their by-law, made in 1611, the Mayor, senior and junior Aldermen, and senior and junior Capital Burgesses nominated John Allington, 'of unquestionable duty and loyalty' to the Crown (and, therefore, Hanoverian, as they were); he was rejected by a small majority, and the five officials tried altogether three times more, without success, before returning to their original candidate. The Jacobite majority among the other 35 members of the Corporation assembled there pressed the claims of their candidate, 'a person who had behaved himself with great Indecency and disrespect towards your majesty and government'. Discussion continued, after an adjournment, until midnight; and the company dispersed without the necessary election being made, and as there was no one to succeed as

Mayor on Michaelmas Day the Charter automatically lapsed. The Recorder of Banbury, Mr Painton, had held his session although the Corporation was dissolved, and the Court of King's Bench, on an information of 'quo warranto' against Mr Painton, ruled that he was not legally Recorder, as the Corporation had no legal claim to exist.<sup>18</sup>

The citizens of Banbury, therefore, petitioned the Crown for a new Charter to confirm their ancient rights and privileges, and to ensure that all persons disaffected towards the Hanovarian succession were excluded from office; if similar difficulties should ever arise over the election of Mayor, the Mayor for the time being should continue in office until a fit successor could be found, and those five officials designated by by-law to nominate candidates should be obliged to nominate no more than four of the Aldermen unless 'two partes in three att the least of the electors then present shall request the same'. A fresh start, it was suggested, should also now be made with Crown appointments to Corporation office.<sup>19</sup>

The petition is couched in patriotic, but subservient terms, and there were those in Parliament who saw such a renewal of a charter as an unwelcome opportunity for the Crown to pack the Corporation. On November 16, 1724, a bill was moved in the House 'to redress the grievances upon opinions and judgements given in Westminster Hall that corporations were dissolved or at least in a state of inactivity by mayors absenting and not holding over at the day prescribed by the charter for electing new ones, to prevent all corporations falling into the hands of the Crown, which could never be restored but by a new Charter, though there were opinions that a mandatory writ was sufficient, but others doubted it, so to put that matter out of dispute this bill is to choose a new mayor immediately if the old one absents, which may be easily obtained by corruption and ill design'. The proposal was defeated.<sup>20</sup>

The new Charter was granted to the borough on July 16, 1718; its provisions were substantially the same as those of the Charter of James I, and it remained the governing Charter until the end of the close corporation in 1835. The officers of the new Corporation were named, Francis Goodwin being appointed 'the first and modern Mayor', to serve from the date of the Charter until the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel next, and until his successor be sworn. John Allington, whose nomination was so steadfastly opposed in 1716, was named as one of the twelve Aldermen and as one of the three Justices elected by the Mayor, Aldermen and Capital Burgesses from among the Aldermen.<sup>21</sup>

### *The Corporation and its officials*


Early medieval town government was semi-democratic, but this stage soon passed; and because municipal office was generally regarded as an unwelcome burden, and because responsibility for the payment of the dues demanded by the King, or Lord of the Manor, had to be borne by an organised group (the wealthy citizens, whose property was distrained if the dues were not paid), from the sixteenth century onwards incorporation meant close bodies, councils based on co-optation, where participation in local government was restricted to the socially leading classes in the town. Until about 1700 the powers of the chief citizen – Bailiff or Mayor – were dictatorial, but the decline in his powers coincides with the realisation that membership of the governing body of a municipal corporation was a source of prestige, power and private gain, and consequently more of the administration devolved on the council as a whole.

This pattern is apparent in Banbury between 1554 and 1835. Having secured the five main gifts of incorporation bestowed on a borough – perpetual succession, the power of suing and being sued as a whole, to hold lands, to have a common seal, and the authority to issue by-laws to regulate the conduct of the officers and inhabitants of the borough, there was a civic pride and activity which steadily gave way to a much closer attachment to 'the principle . . . of a small portion of Corporators choosing those who are to be associated with them in power, and generally for life', whereby was maintained an exclusive system, which tended 'to uphold local, political and religious party feelings, and is destructive of that confidence which ought always to be reposed in those who are entrusted with control, judicial or otherwise, over their fellow-citizens'.<sup>22</sup>

The first by-laws made at Banbury on May 14, 1558, emphasised the modest dignity of the new Bailiff and Council as befitted a group of substantial men, citizens of character and standing, who were now to carry the major burden of local administration. 'On the day of St.

Michael the Archangel yearly at one o'clock in the afternoon the Aldermen and Capital Burgesses in their best apparel<sup>23</sup> shall come to the house of the Bailiff, and from there attend upon the Bailiff to the Parish Church and there kneel before the sacrament and make their prayers unto Almighty God and that done the Bailiff with all his brethren and officers shall go from thence in order into the Town Hall and there shall set themselves orderly according to their anciently in their places. And that done the Bailiff . . . shall openly declare unto the Company in manner of an oration the cause of their assembly' – to elect a new Mayor.<sup>24</sup> The new Mayor, chosen 'to be a lanthorn to them in good usage and order', having taken his oath, took from the old Bailiff and held for 'a certain time' 'the King and Queen's Mace . . . as a sign and a representment of the King and Queen's Lieutenant'.<sup>25</sup>

The original mace was in need of repair in 1651, and the sum of £32 10s. 0d. was lent by Thomas Robbins, the Mayor, and other officers, and £1 given by J. Austen to repair the old mace (which has not survived) and purchase a new one. In 1660 the second, 'Commonwealth', mace was altered to become a Royal mace; it is still in the possession of the Borough, together with the 'Georgian' mace, bearing the Royal Arms of George I, and made about 1715–16.<sup>26</sup>



*Fig. 4. (top) The 'Commonwealth' and 'Restoration' Mace, bought by the Corporation in 1651. It was a Commonwealth mace. At the restoration in 1660 it was converted into a royal mace. It is 3 ft. in length; on the foot knob are three cartouches bearing respectively the Cross of St. George, the harp and the device of the Borough. The head carries the royal badges between the letters 'C.R.' and on the flat top are the Royal Arms of the Stuarts. The shaft and head date from 1651 but the other portions and all the legal emblems are the result of the alterations made in 1660. (bottom) The 'Georgian' Mace, of silver gilt, made about 1715–16. It is 3 ft. 1¾ in. in length with a crowned head bearing the Royal Arms of George I. On the foot knob are the then Borough device and the cypher 'G.R.'. This mace and the bowls seen in the background were pawned to Lord North in 1822, and subsequently sold, but the mace was later repurchased. (Photographs, Banbury Borough Library, Case B.12; description from *The Borough of Banbury, 1554–1954*, by E.R.C. Brinkworth).*

The Council next elected other yearly officers – the Justices of the Peace<sup>27</sup>, the Town Clerk<sup>28</sup>, the Serjeant-at-Mace, and four tithing men<sup>29</sup>. The election of a Deputy Mayor is not mentioned until 1743.<sup>30</sup> Two Constables had charge of the town armour, a not inconsiderable collection, judging by the expense of mending and dressing it; an entry in the Corporation Accounts for January 8, 1605, records a payment of 9s. to Bartholomew Nayler for dressing the town harness; on January 11, 1612, he received 15s. 6d. for the same, and on January 15, 1615, it was agreed to make a permanent arrangement and the Chamberlain was henceforth to pay Nayler 10s. half-yearly; by 1620 another member of the Nayler family, Jonathan Nayler, had taken on this duty. Only '3 Cosletts. Furnished: 4 Muskets. Furnished' are noted as belonging to the Borough in 1617, but on January 13, 1629, the list reads: '4 Muskets with swords, rests, bandealers and belts; one more old musket newly stocked. 3 new corsletts. 3 headpieces. 2 swords'. (from a marginal note it appears there were others which were later put in order) '2 belts. 3 old corsletts newly furnished with 3 headpieces. 4 pike whereof 3 are armed and one bare.'<sup>31</sup>

A Constable had other duties for which he could claim payment and expenses. He could deduct his own charges for executing a warrant for levying a penalty or other sum directed by Act of Parliament by distress; persons committed to gaol for any misdemeanour had to bear their own charges, if necessary by distress. By the 13 and 14 Charles II, c.12, the Constables, with the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor could make a rate for relieving, conveying with passes and carrying rogues and vagabonds to the House of Correction. The Act 17 George II ordered these expenses to be paid out of a county rate, and, to the Town Clerk in 1797, this seemed to have superseded the earlier Act (as it is the only one providing for a constable's rate) and he therefore considered a new law was necessary to provide for the Constable's reimbursement.<sup>32</sup>

Two auditors were elected annually, before whom the Bailiff's accounts, as well as those of the Chamberlain, Town Clerk, Serjeant-at-Mace, and all other officers' accountant' were taken. The Corporation Accounts do not give a detailed picture of income and expenditure, but it appears that the revenue due to the Corporation – tolls of markets and fairs, piccage, stallage, town rents, lease of waste ground<sup>33</sup>, fines for encroachments on the waste – was often augmented by loans made by Council members to cover extraordinary charges, and not infrequently the Bailiff was out of pocket. John Haskey, Bailiff in 1585, judged it nicely, 'and by reason of divers extraordinary charges there remained nothing in his hands to be delivered unto the new Bailiff'. But Bailiff William Knight's account, taken December 14, 1601, saw £15 5s. 8d. owing to him, and in 1608 there still remained £14 5s. 2d. unpaid; likewise, Henry Showell completed his year of office the Corporation's creditor for £16 5s. 2d., and he, too, was still owed £8 18s. 6d. in 1608.<sup>34</sup>

Sometimes the boot was on the other foot, for on June 4, 1766, it was ordered that a bill in Chancery be filed against Francis Goodwin, Mayor in 1751, for repayment of money due to the Corporation and for the return of Corporation papers still in his hands.<sup>35</sup> An unusual method of settling a Corporation debt was employed in 1655: 'Whereas the Corporation are indebted to Mr Nathaniel Wheatley the sum of £14 and upwards which has been long owing to him and to the intent that he shall receive satisfaction, the Corporation have agreed, with the agreement of Mr Nathaniel Wheatley, that he shall have to his use a brown gelding belonging to them and forfeited in the time of the Mayoralty of Mr Wm. Allen (1653) in full satisfaction of his said debt and all other debts and accounts due to him from them'. Nathaniel Wheatley was Mayor in 1643, and the accounts reveal the troubled context of his year of office, for 'by reason of the distractions of the times were neither receipts nor disbursements.' 1663 proved an equally lean year under Nathaniel Hill, for his account, taken January 4, 1664, reads: 'Receipts 0.0.0. Disbursements – the like. Save only for the Queen's rents being £6 13s. 4d. and the receipts and Town Clerk's fee which he has paid and produced his acquittances which are again to him returned and he is discharged.'<sup>36</sup>

Then there were flesh-tasters, ale-tasters, and bread-weighers, searchers and sealers of leather, toll-gatherers, bridge-masters, and the two Chamberlains, elected annually, although the same man could, as in 1585, continue in office for a further term.<sup>37</sup> Only one Chamberlain was elected after the Charter of 1608 and no longer as an annual appointment; John Pain, elected

Chamberlain on November 19, 1814, remained in that office until his death in 1834, and his account book records the financial activities of the Corporation during these years.<sup>38</sup>

Refusal to serve as an officer of the Corporation was not very common in the 16th and 17th centuries, but became frequent in the 18th. A fine of £5 was agreed on September 5, 1637, if any Alderman, being elected Mayor, refused to serve, the fine to be paid to the Chamberlain for the use of the Corporation. Both candidates for the mayoralty in 1725, Richard Thompson and William Goodwin, incurred this penalty. Anthony Haines, who had already turned down the office of Mayor in 1723, was again elected in 1729 and a second time refused to serve and was fined £5, and in 1735 both the nominated candidates, Foulk Rainbow and Thomas Tokes, refused to serve when elected, but were only fined three guineas each. Three candidates – Thomas Stokes (who had first refused in 1724), Thomas Bradford, and Edward Box – elected on September 2, 1745, refused to serve and the fine was reduced to two guineas. For the same refusal John Miller, elected September 3, 1750, was fined two guineas, but the £5 fine was reimposed in 1754 on Edward Burford, on William Deale, or Deacle, in 1758, and again in 1768, and on John Lambert in 1771.<sup>39</sup>

On July 17, 1758, the Council ordered that henceforth fines paid 'for not serving the office of Mayor shall be paid and applied to the use of such Mayor who shall next accept the said office upon such forfeiture being incurred.' At a triple election on Monday, September 7, 1772, after Charles Wyatt had been elected and refused to serve and had been duly fined £5, the Right Honourable Lord North was nominated and elected by 29 votes to 3, but he refused and was accordingly fined, as he was again for a second refusal in 1791. Further refusals to serve as Mayor are recorded in 1800 (Rev. Dr. John Lamb), 1803 (Hon. Rev. H. L. Hobart), 1804 (William Judd, junior, John Pain), 1832 (Thomas Wyatt) and 1833 (Henry Tawney).<sup>40</sup>

Other offices were refused, but less frequently. William Cartwright refused to serve as Assistant in 1741, Sanderson How in 1742, and a note 'not accepts' was added to the record of the election of the Rt. Hon. Richard, Lord Saye and Sele, and Richard Wycham on September 5, 1743. When elected as Alderman, John Miller in 1745, and the Rev. Francis Wise and the Rev. John Wardle in 1753, refused; and two years following, 1734 and 1735, Thomas Stokes, who made quite a habit of refusing office, declined to serve as a Justice of the Peace.<sup>41</sup>

At the same time not all those who tried to become members of the Corporation were successful. Candidates nominated as Assistants were rejected in 1736, 1744, 1759, 1774, and 1806; and the non-election of candidates as Capital Burgesses is also recorded (some at the second attempt, including the Hon. Frederick North) in 1759, 1774, and 1806.<sup>42</sup>

While there was a sequence of offices through which a burgess must rise, there was no accepted period of apprenticeship in one before he could rise to another. Henry Clarson was simultaneously elected Assistant, Capital Burgess and Alderman at a Hall held on December 30, 1730; less than a year later he was the unsuccessful candidate for the mayoralty, and on September 4, 1732, he was elected Mayor by 22 votes to 1. Richard Wheatly, elected Assistant on September 29, and Capital Burgess on October 16, 1734, had to wait until 1742 to become Mayor; but Burrows Matthias Kirby's Corporation career was much more prolonged, as he remained an Assistant for twenty years, and then served as Capital Burgess, Alderman and Mayor in the next four. At a Hall held on July 23, 1832, John Golby Rusher, an Assistant since 1825, moved rapidly up the scale when he was granted his freedom and was elected Capital Burgess, Alderman and Justice of the Peace. And the same day Edward Philpots, an Assistant of barely one year's standing, received his freedom and promotion to Capital Burgess and Alderman. Admittance as a Freeman of the Corporation was made obligatory for candidates for election as Capital Burgesses in 1753.<sup>43</sup>

Occasionally, absence of the required quorum caused a postponement of the election of Mayor. On September 7, 1730, the day appointed by the Charter for the election, twenty-two members of the Corporation, who had been summoned by the Serjeant-at-Mace, failed to turn up, and Thomas Stokes, who had been present as a candidate, was not in fact elected Mayor until December 18, 1730. 'No Mayor could be chose' on September 5, 1737, for the same reason, so the election was made the following day, while proceedings were adjourned from the morning until three in the afternoon of September 3, 1832, when sufficient Assistants were present – twenty-three of them – to make an election.<sup>44</sup>

Sometimes, too, absenteeism prevented other Corporation business from being carried on. 1734 was a particularly difficult year in this respect for the Mayor, Edward Box. He called for a Hall on three occasions 'to consult about divers weighty affairs and matters for the good and benefit of this Corporation' – July 22, August 6, and September 23, – but there was no quorum on any one of these days, although the Serjeants-at-Mace, Richard Page and William Bloxham, testified that they had personally, or by message left at their houses, summoned members who had not come. A member, summoned by a Serjeant-at-Arms (as the Serjeant-at-Mace is sometimes called) at two days' notice to a Hall on June 3, 1725, was fined 3s. 4d. because he disobeyed the summons, and Benjamin Aplin, Town Clerk from 1748–1770, had to pay 10s. 6d. for non-attendance at the Hall held on March 4, 1758, but no fines for the defaulters of 1734 are recorded.<sup>45</sup>

Over 40 years, from 1771–1812, 98 Halls were summoned and met, on an average, between two and three times a year. Some years only one Hall was called, in others four or five, in 1771, sixteen, while there is no record of any Hall having met in either 1782 or 1810. The average attendance at each Hall during this period was between ten and eleven, out of the possible maximum of twelve. From 1825 to the end of the close corporation in 1835, 39 Halls were called, averaging three or four a year, with again an average attendance of about ten.<sup>46</sup>



*Fig. 5. 'A Prospect of the West Side of Banbury Town Hall in the County of Oxon. 1764, Drawn by J. Cheney who leased (?) the Unicorn in the Market Place, Banbury, shortly after the Date of this sketch'. The second, early 17th century, Town Hall in the Market Place. Note the stocks on the left. (Photograph of drawing, Banbury Public Library, Case B.2).*

During part of this final period some aspects of Corporation business were conducted by a small Committee, whose meetings, held at the Town Hall, the Town Clerk's Office, or the *Red Lion* (which would appear to have enjoyed a close Corporation connection) were attended by two, sometimes three, four, five, six or seven members of the Council. Thirty-five such Committee meetings were held over the years 1821–1833 for which the Minutes have survived. Much of their business was concerned with the preparation of rents for waste encroachments, the collection of chief (ground) rents, but such other matters as paying John Ariss, former Serjeant-at-Mace, 3s. a week breakdown pension, securing an increase in salary for the Postmaster, William Judd, inviting tenders for the letting of piggage and stallage, and ordering the Chamberlain to sell the Schoolhouse in the churchyard, offering it first to the parish churchwardens, were also considered.<sup>47</sup>

Now and again the Mayor would try to act independently, and then Corporation concert would be disturbed. Nine members, including the Recorder, signed a protest against the Mayor, Robert Greenhall's, action in adjourning the Hall on January 12, 1729, and in refusing to declare what business he had to propose; the protest appears to have had no effect. A protest arising from the action of the Mayor, Henry Clarson, in nominating two persons to stand for election as Capital Burgesses against the feeling of the majority of the Aldermen and Capital Burgesses present at the Hall, was, however, successful, and the election which followed the Mayor's nomination was declared void. On July 25, 1770, it was a group of seven members of the Corporation who acted unconstitutionally, when, having disagreed over the nomination of candidates to replace two Aldermen who had died, they proceeded to elect, although the Mayor had withdrawn and declared an end to the business.<sup>48</sup>

After the disturbed events leading to the granting of the third Charter, the Corporation's loyalty to the Crown remained steady. In 1786, 1795 and 1800 loyal addresses were presented to the King, George III, thankful that attempts on his life had failed; and in 1798 delight was expressed at the King's restoration to 'perfect health',<sup>49</sup> an event which afforded an occasion for illuminating the Town Hall and drinking loyal toasts.<sup>50</sup> The congratulations of the Mayor, Aldermen and Capital Burgesses were expressed on the occasion of the marriage of the strange Prince of Wales to the even stranger Caroline of Brunswick in 1795, and their condolences on the death of 'our illustrious Queen' in 1818, and on the death of George III in 1820, and George IV in 1830. In 1806 the Freedom of the Borough was offered to, and in 1808 accepted by, the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Clarence.<sup>51</sup>


The Corporation also expressed its feelings to the Crown on other matters: it stated its abhorrence of the Slave trade 'so derogatory to the dignity of man and so disgraceful to the British nation'; it applauded 'the happy restoration of peace' at Amiens in 1802, and expressed its concern at 'the present momentous Crisis of public Affairs' when war was resumed in the following year; a Corporation address recorded the Borough's and Council's horror at the news of the assassination of the Prime Minister, Spencer Perceval, in 1812, and, strangely enough as Lord North was the sitting Member of Parliament for Banbury, the Borough thanked the King for dismissing the Fox-North Coalition in December, 1783.<sup>52</sup>

Parliament, too, received petitions from the Corporation of Banbury. One, in 1793, spoke against the intended extension of the Birmingham Canal; another, in 1800, against the export of wool to Ireland, when the town joined with thirty-five other towns and the counties of Cornwall and Somerset; while a third, in 1813, protested against further and unlimited concessions to Roman Catholics.<sup>53</sup>

### *Elections and Parliamentary Representation*

Banbury's first Member of Parliament was Thomas Denton, who, by his 'labor & delygent Sewte' had assisted in securing the Borough's first Charter, and who sat for the county in 1558.<sup>54</sup> The assertion that Sir Francis Walsingham sat as Member for Banbury in the first Parliament of Elizabeth I in 1559, rests entirely upon an unsubstantiated statement in Browne Willis's *Notitia Parliamentaria*. The official lists of Members of Parliament, printed by order of the House of Commons in 1878, give no return for Banbury to Elizabeth's first Parliament, and in all probability Banbury was not represented.<sup>55</sup> Walsingham was returned to the House of Commons which assembled on January 12, 1562, by Banbury and Lyme Regis, but elected to





*Fig. 6. The third Town Hall, also in the Market Place, built about 1801, and now a warehouse in Lower Cherwell Street, where it was moved when the present Town Hall in Bridge Street was built in 1854. (Original drawing, Banbury Borough Library and Museum).*

take his seat for Lyme, and Owen Brereton sat for Banbury.<sup>56</sup> Members of the Cope family of Hanwell represented Banbury in 1571, 1572, 1586, 1588, 1592, 1597, 1601, 1603, 1614, 1620<sup>57</sup> and in 1715 and 1722; while from 1701 to 1818, with very few exceptions, the Borough was represented by members of the North family of Wroxton.<sup>58</sup>

The question of who should elect the Member of Parliament was raised on February 24, 1690, when the Mayor, John Welchman, declared Sir Robert Dashwood elected, although he had received only 10 votes, over John Hawles, for whom 140 burgesses and freemen had cast their vote; petitions were organised by Nathaniel Wheatly and John Austin on behalf of the freemen and burgesses of the town and the matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections.<sup>59</sup> Before the Committee the petitioners produced the returns of 5, 14, 28, and 30 Elizabeth, 16 Charles I, and 13 Charles II, and the evidence of John Austin; for the sitting Member the returns of 29 and 43 Elizabeth, and 31 Charles II were produced with testimony from John Tims and Samuel Tateham, who, at the age of 74, recalled elections in the reign of Charles I. The Committee's decision was that the right of election of a Burgess to serve in Parliament for the Borough of Banbury was in the Mayor, Aldermen and Capital Burgesses only. These eighteen electors continued to return the Borough Member of Parliament until the Reform Act of 1832, when the number of electors was increased to 329.<sup>60</sup>

Banbury elected a Whig, James Isaacson, as M.P. in 1698, but he was expelled from the House on February 10, 1699, because as Commissioner of the Stamp Office, he was ineligible to sit by 5 & 6 William and Mary, c.7. This episode was the prelude to a double return of Members on January 6, 1701, by the two contending Mayors. John Dormer, second son of the Duke of Ascot, a Whig, was returned by one Mayor, the Hon. Charles North, younger son of the 1st Earl of Guilford, a Tory, by the other. The Committee of Privileges and Elections considered the matter and resolved that the Hon. Charles North was duly returned as Burgess,



which meant that John West, senior, was regarded as rightful Mayor, and the House of Commons concurred in the judgement.<sup>61</sup>

A further commentary on the exclusivism of local government and the unreformed House of Commons is afforded by the Parliamentary election of March 24, 1722, when Sir Francis Page, a judge, attempted to bribe the electors to return his candidate, Sir William Codrington. The attempt failed and the judge escaped Parliamentary censure by only four votes. But the Corporation's attitude was quite clear: 'that most other Corporations made a considerable advantage of their elections, and they knew no reason why they should not do it as well as their neighbours; that they wanted to have their streets paved; an augmentation to their vicarage, and a school built; and that the person who should be chosen should be at that expense, which in all might amount to five or six hundred pounds.' Obviously, if you invite someone to be your Member of Parliament, as the Town Clerk did the Hon. Francis North, on the instructions of the Corporation, he should be prepared to do something in return.<sup>62</sup>

The political unrest felt nationally in the early part of the nineteenth century was echoed in the localities. Banbury was the centre of disturbances in 1754, when the Tories, or 'Old Interest', and the Whigs, or 'New Interest', were contesting the county of Oxford.<sup>63</sup> On March 10, 1820, a riot occurred at the hustings and the Corporation for some time were unable to leave the Town Hall, and sufficient damage was done to cause the Corporation to be still counting the cost in the following February.<sup>64</sup> There had been corn riots in 1693<sup>65</sup>; in 1830 there were outbreaks of agricultural machine-smashing; when the rioters reached Neithrop the Yeomanry moved against them, but, being outnumbered forty to one, they retreated into the town and the mob was only turned away by a strong posse of local tradesmen armed with staves.<sup>66</sup> And Banbury caught the Reform Bill fever in 1831, when feeling ran so high against the Tory candidate, Lt.Col. Henry Hely Hutchinson of West Weedon, Northamptonshire, that he was chased out of the town and across the Bridge, where, bleeding and breathless, the Colonel, who had fought at Waterloo, was only saved when the turnpike gate was closed behind him, and Mr Francillon, a resident of the town, induced the mob to abandon their pursuit.<sup>67</sup>

Bristol

R. K. Gilkes.

Part II of Mr. Gilkes's article will appear in *Cake and Cockhorse* during 1972.

## References

1. Cotton Lib., Vesp.E.xvi.fol.23.  
Alfred Beesley, *History of Banbury*, Banbury, 1841, p.70.,
2. 26th January, 1 Mary (1553-54); P.R.O. Patent Roll (Chancery), 1 Mary, part 10 membrane 34(3).  
A. Beesley, op., pp.219-222 (Abstract).  
M. Weinbaum, *British Borough Charters, 1307-1660*, 1943, pp.92-3;  
Original Proclamation of the Charter, Town Clerk's Office, Banbury.  
H.A. Merewether and A.J. Stephens, *History of the Boroughs and Municipal Corporations of the United Kingdom*, 1835, II, p.1201.
3. Original Proclamation of the Charter, Banbury MS.
4. Charter, A. Beesley, op.cit., p.221.
5. E. and A. Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons*, 1903, I, p.374.  
H.A. Merewether and A.J. Stephens, op.cit., II, p.1201.
6. Charter, A. Beesley, op.cit., p.220/254/563.
7. E.R.C. Brinkworth, *Cal.Accts.Corpn.*, III, f.23.
8. *ibid.*, III ff. 2b/3b/4/4b.

9. P.R.O. Inquisition 4th James I (1606)6, 30 July, Survey carried out by Sir Anthony Cope and John Hersey.  
A. Beesley, op.cit., p.252.  
E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, ff.2b/3b/4/9/12
10. W. Potts, *History of Banbury*, 1958, pp.106, 143-4; illustration facing p.107; also shown in drawing of Banbury Bridge, c.1730, Bodleian Gough Collection.  
Banbury Minute Book, [Banbury MSS] 1764-1812, May 19, 1800, p.146b;  
September 14, 1801, p.154b;  
December 8, 1800, p.151.  
Banbury Corporation Journal, [Banbury MSS], 1812-1835, pp.23-4.
11. P.R.O. Pat.Roll 6 James I, pt.19. no.10.  
A. Beesley, op.cit., pp.254-258.  
M. Weinbaum, op.cit., p.93.
12. Charter, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., I, f.22.
13. Charter.
14. Charter,  
E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., I. ff.24 24b/26/53b
15. E. and A. Porritt, op.cit., I, pp.392-94  
Cal.State Papers, 1660-61, 582.  
Sir John Reresby, *Memoirs*, 1813, 266.  
A. Beesley, op.cit., p.484.
16. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp. II, f.159.  
S.P. Dom., Entry Book 66, pp.306, 307.  
Cal. State Papers Domestic, December 1st, 1683, p.128.
17. Appendix to the 1st Report from the Commissioners on Municipal Corporations in England and Wales, Part I, p.9.2, 1835.
18. Letter from the Rev. J. Knight, Rector of Broughton to Lord Saye and Sale, October 3rd, 1700, Bodl. Rawlinson MS.D.892, folio 343.  
P.R.O. Pat.Roll 6 Jas.I, pt.19.no.10.  
A. Beesley, op.cit., pp.255, 259, 514-16.  
Petition of the Inhabitants of Banbury to George I, 1717, Banbury MS.  
10 Modern Reports 346; 88 English Reports 758.  
Rex v. Pasmore (1789) 3 Term.Rep. 221; 100 English Reports 542.
19. Petition of Inhab. of Banbury, 1717.
20. *The Parliamentary Diary of Sir Edward Knatchbull, 1722-30*, ed. A.N. Newman, Camden Society 3rd Series, Vol.XCIV, p.31.  
The actual decision in the Banbury Case, 1716, however, viz. that a failure to elect a Mayor causes the Corporation and Charter to lapse, was reversed by Statute in 1724 (11 George I, c.4.)
21. Appendix to the 1st Report from the Commissioners on Municipal Corporations in England and Wales, Part I, p.9.2., 1835.  
Translation of the Charter, 4 George I, July 16, 1718, Banbury MS. This translation was made in 1821 by the Rev. T.W. Lancaster, who, on February 9th, 1821 was paid a fee of 20 guineas for it (Banbury Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, p.73).
22. M. Weinbaum, op.cit., pp.xxiii-xxv.  
Report from the Select Committee on Municipal Corporations, 1833, p.iv.
23. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, ff.1b-vii, 19b.  
E.R.C. Brinkworth, *The Borough of Banbury, 1554-1954*, 1954, pp.19, 21.
24. By-laws May 14, 1558, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, f.ii; a by-law of September 2, 1573, required all the Common Council to meet at the Town Hall between 8 and 9 in the morning on the morrow of St. Matthew the Apostle to elect and choose two of the Aldermen who should stand for election as Bailiff on St. Michael's Day (E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, f.16b).
25. By-laws September 2nd, 1573, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, ff. viii, iib, 19.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, p.195. Banbury MS., for 18th century form of the oath.
26. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., II, ff.98b, 110.  
E.R.C. Brinkworth, *The Borough of Banbury, 1554-1954*, 1954, p.6.
27. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, f.viii, 1558, for oath; 18th century form of oath given in the Town Clerk's Book of Forms and Precedents, 1797, p.29, Banbury MS.
28. In existence before the Charter of 1608, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., 1558, III, ff.ii, iib; 1573, III, f.21b.
29. No more were elected after September 29, 1677 (E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., II, f.147).

30. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 29, 1743, p.164.
31. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., I, ff.19, 27b, 31b, 40, 55b.
32. 27 George II, c.3, Town Clerk's Book of Forms and Precedents [Banbury MSS], 1797, pp.52-3.  
E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., December 10, 1597, III, f.22b. January 8th, 1612, III, f.22b.
33. By-laws, May 14th, 1558, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., III, f.vii. Banbury Journal from 1722, p.46. Banbury MS.
34. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., December 20th, 1585, I, ff.8b, 15, 16, 22.
35. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 2nd, 1751, p.212.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, p.3. Banbury MS.
36. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., January 18th, 1655, II, ff.85, 105, 123.
37. Ibid., II, Nos.31, 32.  
18th century form of oaths given in Town Clerk's Book of Forms and Precedents, 1797, pp.27-8.  
By-laws September 2nd, 1573, E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., I, 8b, III, f.20b.
38. Banbury Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, pp.26, 203 [Banbury MS].  
John Pain, Chamberlain, Account Book. [Banbury MS].
39. E.R.C. Brinkworth, Cal.Accts.Corp., II, f.69b.  
Banbury Journal from 1722, September 6th, 1725, pp.39-40, 43, 47b, 48, 48b, 64b, 65, 109b, 110, 176b, 180, 206b, 207, 226b, 227, 227b, 248, 248b.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, September 5, 1768, pp.12, 12a, 13a, 30, 31.
40. Banbury Journal from 1722, p.246b.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, pp.39, 40, 41, 108b, 109, 149-150, 161, 161b, 164-66.  
Banbury Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, September 3rd, 1832, pp.174-5, 193-95, 198.
41. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 21, 1741, pp.101b, 111, 147, 152, 161b, 172b, 173, 220, 221, 221b.
42. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 2nd, 1736, pp.115b-117, 169, 255.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, pp.53-8, 58b-61b, 173, 173b, 174b, 175.
43. Banbury Journal from 1722, pp.74b, 77b, 86b, 87, 153b, 154, 155, 220b.  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, pp.66-67; 84, 87-89, 99, 101, 103, 137, 140-43, 155, 167-70.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, p.169b.
44. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 7th, 1730, pp.71b, 73, 126.  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, pp.172, 174-5.
45. Banbury Journal from 1722, September 3rd, 1733, pp.46b, 92b, 96, 98, 98b, 197b, 244b.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, September 3rd, 1770, p.20.
46. Banbury Journal from 1722, p.244b.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812.  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835.
47. Corporation Committee Meetings Minute Book from November, 1821. Banbury MS.
48. Banbury Journal from 1722, pp.68, 68b, 69, 132, 132b.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, pp.19a, 20, 22a, 23, 25, 25a, 26.
49. Ibid., pp.91b, 92; 100, 100b, 101, 101b, p.129; 1800, pp.146, 146b.
50. Extract of Letter from Banbury, March 10th, 1789, to the *London Chronicle*. Collection of Newspaper Cuttings relating to Oxford and Oxfordshire, 1757-1833, Bodl. Gough Adds.Oxf. 4 49.
51. Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, pp.126b, 171, 183, 183b, 184.  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, pp.47, 48, 64-65, 145-146.
52. Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, pp.111b, 157b, 160, 192b.  
*Wraxall's Memoirs, 1772-1784*, London, 1884, iii, pp.291-2, 11-17 February, 1784.  
*London Gazette*, 1784, No.12521.
53. Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, March 13th, 1793, p.117.  
W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, 1892, p.459  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, March 12th, 1813, pp.8-10.
54. Proclamation of the Charter. Banbury MS.  
W. R. Williams, *The Parliamentary History of the County of Oxford*, 1899, p.175.  
A. Beesley, op.cit., p.223.
55. Browne Willis, *Notitia Parliamentaria; or an history of the counties, cities and boroughs in England and Wales*, London, 1715.  
Cf. Parl.Papers, 1878, lxii, pt.i, 400.  
H. A. Merewether and A. J. Stephens, op.cit., Vol.II, 1201. Conyers Read, *Sir Francis Walsingham*, 1925, Vol.I, pp.25, 26n.
56. W. R. Williams, op.cit., p.177.  
Conyers Read, op.cit., Vol.I, p.27 & n.  
Browne Willis, *Notitia Parliamentaria*, 1750 ed., p.74.

57. Browne Willis, *op.cit.*, pp.83, 93, 113, 123, 132, 141, 151, 162, 172, 181.
58. Henry Stooks Smith, *The Parliaments of England from George I to the Present Time*, 1844, Vol.ii, pp.3, 4.  
W. R. Williams, *op.cit.*
59. Journal of the House of Commons, Monday, March 31st, 1690; Thursday, October 16th, 1690; Saturday, October 31st, 1691.
60. Journal of the House of Commons, Tuesday, December 29th, 1691. H. A. Merewether and A. J. Stephens, *op.cit.*, Vol.II, pp.1202-5.  
W. R. Williams, *op.cit.*, pp.189, 192.
61. Cal.State Papers Domestic, February 14th, 1699, p.58.  
N. Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from 1678 to 1714*, Oxford, 1857, Vol.IV, pp.482, 483, 485.  
W. Bohun, *Collection of Debates, Reports, Orders and Resolutions of the House of Commons, touching the right of Electing Members to serve in Parliament*, London, 1708(?): Bodl.Vet. A4c. 281.  
E. and A. Porritt, *op.cit.*, Vol.I, pp.206, 211-212.  
Letter from Rev. John Knight, Rector of Broughton, to Lord Saye and Sele, October 3rd, 1700, Bodl.Rawlinson MS.D.892, f.343.  
W. R. Williams, *op.cit.*, pp.181, 182.  
Journal of the House of Commons, March 13th, 1701.
62. W. R. Williams, *op.cit.*, p.183.  
C. C. Brooks, *History of Steeple Aston*, Long Compton, 1929, p.217.  
Parl.Hist., vii, 964; quoted E. and A. Porritt, *op.cit.*, Vol.I, p.161.  
Banbury Minute Book, 1764-1812, August 17th, 1792, p.114b.
63. *The New Interest Moderation; or a Short Account of some extraordinary Proceedings at Banbury . . . and at Chipping Norton*, London, 1754, Bodl.G.A.Oxon.8. 927.
64. W. R. Williams, *op.cit.*, p.188.  
Corporation Journal, 1812-1835, February 9th, 1821, p.74.
65. Greenwich Hospital News Letters, Vol.4, No.23, & Entry Book 5, pp.81-5. Cal.State Papers Domestic, November 11th, 1693, p.397.
66. *London Chronicle*, November 30th, December 2nd, 1830, Collection of Newspaper Cuttings relating to Oxford and Oxfordshire, 1757-1833, Bodl.Gough Adds.Oxf.4 49.
67. John Bull, Sunday, May 8th, 1831, Bodl.Gough Adds.4.362.

### MRS. VIOLET GIBSON

The Society owes a debt of gratitude greater than ever can be expressed to our Secretary's mother, Mrs. Violet Gibson, who died on 24th May, 1971.

With her roots and affections in Banbury and with her deep interest in its history, she was an inspiration from the very beginning. Not least, we shall remember her gracious hospitality to the Committee, which usually met at her home in Bloxham: her gaiety and charm: and the great encouragement she gave to all our undertakings.

E.R.C.B.

### BANBURY WILLS IN THE PREROGATIVE COURT OF CANTERBURY, 1701-1723

Because of the lack of an *index locorum* for Prerogative Court of Canterbury wills after 1700, no references to Banbury wills preserved there were included in the *Baptism and Burial Register of Banbury, Oxfordshire, Part Two, 1653-1723*, published by the Banbury Historical Society in 1968. It has since been possible to trace the Banbury wills in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury for these years, and the following list, in order of the burials as registered, may be regarded as supplementary to that volume. The Public Record Office shelfmark (always preceded by "Prob. 11") is given in parentheses after the citation.

		1700/1
Feb 5	WHEATLY	Mary, wid PCC 1701:106 (461)
		1702
Sep 11	WALTER	[Mr.] Robart, gent PCC 1703:44 (468)
		1703
May 21	NEULOVE	Mr. Anthony, gent PCC 1703:157 (471)
June 4	CAVE	John, alderman PCC 1703:140 (471)
Oct [29	BRADSHAW	Mrs., of Calthorpe, buried at Cropredy] PCC 1703:181 (472)
Dec 19	NIX [NICHOLLS]	[Mr.] Thomas, gent., s of wid. [Mrs.] Nix PCC 1704:46 (475) (under Nicholls)
		1704
Apr 30	YOUICK	John, [senr.], malster PCC 1704:176 (477)
		1704/5
Feb 24	GULLIVER	Samuel, wheelerite PCC 1705:50 (481)
		1705
Apr 3	DAVIS	Mr. Thomas, senr., of Hardwick PCC 1706:33 (486) (gentleman)
May 5	STYLE	Daniel, gent., at ye Unicorne PCC 1705:219 (484)
		1706
Apr [30	CATER	John, Quaker, was bur. in their grave yard] [Q.R.] PCC 1706:168 (489) (haberdasher of hats)
Sep 4	STYLE	Philip, gent., towne clarke PCC 1708:138 (502)
Sep 5	PARGITER	Mrs. Dorothy PCB 49/2/2 is a copy of PCC 1706:242 (491)
		1707/8
Mar 3	HAMS	Mr. Joseph, tallowchandier PCC 1708: 145 (502)
		1709
Apr 25	JOHNSON	Mr. Jonathan, baker PCC 1709:173 (509)
June 11	WALKER	Mr. Edward, slatter PCC 1709:184 (510)
		1709/10
Feb 3	HAWTYN	Mr. Simons, tallow-chandler PCC 1710:247 (518)
		1711
June 19	LANE	Mrs. Martha PCC 1711:156 (522) (spinster)
July [30	STONE	John, senr. QR] PCC 1711:245 (524) (joiner)
Aug 15	PERRYIN	Mr. William, sadler PCC 1711:192 (523)
		1711/2
Jan 26	MARCH	William from ye Bear PCC 1712:117 (527) (innholder)

		1713
June 19	ABRAHAM	Mr. Thomas, apothicary PCC 1713:268 (537) (under Abraham, alias Metcalfe)
Aug 26	WELCHMAN	Mr. John, senr., apothicary PCC 1714:61 (539) (gentleman)
		1713/4
Mar 5	LANE	Mrs. Frances, a kinswoman of Dr. Lane's PCC 1714:73 (539) (spinster)
		1715
Sep 14	NICHOLLS alias NIX	Elizabeth, relict of Thomas, gent. PCC 1716:211 (555) (under Nicholls)
Sep 14	THORP	Mr. George, alderman PCC 1716:40 (550) (haberdasher)
		1715/6
Feb [13*	HARRIS	Thomas. QR] PCC 1717:60 (557) (mercier)
		1716
June 13	CURFEY [CURFIE]	Edward, gent., a liftenant, of Calthorpe PCC 1717:227 (561)
		1717
Apr 10	GILKES	George, shoemaker, of Neithrop PCC 1717:232 (561)
		1717/8
Feb 17	STOKES	Mr. Charles PCC 1718:246 (566) (gentleman)
		1718
May 23	GASCOIGNE	Mary, relict of Jacob, glover PCC 1718:143 (564)
Dec 3	WHITE	Mrs. Mary, wid., midwife PCC 1719:58 (568)
		1718/9
Jan 22	OWEN	Thomas, gent., Attorney at Law & Justice of ye Peace of this Corporation PCC 1719:52 (568)
		1719/20
Feb [16	WILLS	Edward. QR] PCC 1720:126 (574) (mercier)
		1721
Aug 7	LUCAS	Mr. Henry, surgeon PCC 1722:121 (585)
		1722
Oct [19	WILLS	Mary, wid. QR] PCC 1723:200 (593)

\*This date is incorrectly given in the published *Baptism and Burial Register*. The transcript of the Berkshire and Oxfordshire Quarterly Meeting burial register kept at the Library of the Society of Friends in London gives the date of Thomas Harris' burial as the 13th of twelfth month 1716 (that is, 13th February 1716/7) and this must be correct as his will was made on 10th January 1716/7.

Richard T. Vann.

The activities and publications of some or all of the following bodies should interest readers:

- Arts Council of Banbury (Miss Rosemary Hall, Flat 33, 20 Calthorpe Road, Banbury). Minimum 21/-.
- Banbury Art Society (Hon. Sec., R. Edgson, Print's Cottage, Bloxham, Banbury) 20/-.
- Banbury Geographical Association (B.E. Little, 2 Burlington Gardens, Banbury) 10/6d.
- Bicester Local History Circle (Hon. Sec., Miss G.H. Dannatt, Lammas Cottage, Launton Road, Bicester, Oxon.). 10/-.
- Buckinghamshire Record Society (Hon. Sec., E.J. Davis, County Record Office, New Council Offices, Walton Street, Aylesbury, Bucks.). 42/-.
- Council for the Preservation of Rural England, Oxfordshire Branch (Mrs. E. Turner, Woodside, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon.). Minimum 10/-.
- Dugdale Society (publishes Warwickshire records) (Shakespeare's Birthplace, Stratford-upon-Avon). 42/-.
- Heraldry Society (59 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.). 30/-; or to include "The Coat of Arms", 50/-.
- Historical Association (59a Kennington Park Road, London, S.E.11.) (Oxford Branch: A.J.P. Puddephatt, 93, Old Road, Headington, Oxford). 20/-; or to include *History*, 35/-.
- Northamptonshire Record Society (Délapre Abbey, Northampton). 42/-.
- Oxford Architectural and Historical Society (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford). 15/- or to include *Oxoniensia*, 42/-.
- Oxford Preservation Trust (The Painted Room, 2 Cornmarket Street, Oxford). Minimum 5/-.
- Oxfordshire Record Society (Dr. W.O. Hassall, Hon. Sec., Bodleian Library, Oxford). 40/-.
- Shipston-on-Stour and District Local History Society (H.G. Parry, Hon. Sec., 8 Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour, Warw.) 7/6d.
- Warwickshire Local History Society (47 Newbold Terrace, Leamington Spa.) 10/-.
- Woodford Halse Historical Society (J.W. Anscomb, 7 Manor Road, Woodford Halse, Rugby, Warw.) 5/-.

*The Local Historian*, published quarterly is available from the National Council of Social Service, 26 Bedford Square, London, W.C.1.-single copies, 3/6d;  
annual postal subscription 21/-

Printed by Express Litho Service, (Oxford)

for the Banbury Historical Society

All articles in this publication are strictly copyright.

