

The Social Status of Landed Brewers in Britain since 1840

David W. GUTZKE

Service as a county magistrate in mid-Victorian Britain provided a litmus test for social status. According to the conventional interpretation, businessmen were eligible for such appointments only after withdrawing from commercial affairs and acquiring appropriate landed estates. Recent studies of industrial counties demonstrate that the paucity of resident gentry often compelled these strictures to be overlooked. This article adds another dimension, arguing that landed brewers, still active in brewing, became justices of the peace in non-industrial counties as well. Moreover, a significant proportion of forty-three families of brewers named as magistrates after 1840, far from corresponding to the model of third-generation assimilation into the gentry, remained in business for three generations or more.

La fonction de juge de paix en Angleterre, au milieu de l'ère victorienne, était un indice de statut social. Selon l'interprétation traditionnelle, les hommes d'affaires n'étaient éligibles à de telles nominations qu'après s'être retirés du monde du commerce et avoir acquis les propriétés foncières requises. Des études récentes démontrent que la faiblesse numérique de la gentry dans des comtés industriels rendait souvent obligatoire l'assouplissement de ces conventions. Dans cet article, l'auteur fait ressortir un élément nouveau : dans les comtés non industriels aussi, on retrouve parmi les propriétaires terriens des brasseurs qui, toujours occupés à leurs entreprises, sont devenus magistrats. D'ailleurs, une forte proportion des familles des brasseurs nommés magistrats depuis 1840 n'entrent pas dans le schéma d'une assimilation dans la gentry trois générations après avoir acheté leurs terres. Ces familles poursuivaient leurs activités dans le domaine des affaires pendant trois générations et même davantage.

The social exclusiveness of Justices of the Peace in nineteenth-century English counties has long been recognized. Well into the 1880s the gentry and, to a lesser extent, the clergy of the Established Church still dominated the county bench. Admittedly, recent studies have shown that wealthy businessmen still active in business had been joining them since the late 1830s in heavily industrial counties.¹

David W. Gutzke received his Ph.D. from the University of Toronto in 1982 and teaches in the Department of History at the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee.

A shorter version of this article was read at the Midwest Conference on British Studies held at the University of Chicago, 22 October 1983. The author acknowledges his debt to Dr. Trevor Lloyd, Dr. Jessica Gerard, Mr. Robert McCarron and Mr. Craig Horle for their helpful comments and suggestions. He is also grateful to Mr. Robert Webber (Brewers' Society), Mr. R.I. Turner (Fuller, Smith & Turner), Mr. Herbert W.J. Morrell (Morrell's Brewery) and Mr. Rodney Dennys (College of Arms) for providing information and answering questions.

1. F. M. L. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), pp. 287-88; David PHILIPS, "The Black Country Magistracy, 1835-60: A Changing Elite and the Exercise of its Power", *Midland History*, III (1976): 161-90; J. M. LEE, *Social Leaders and Public Persons: A Study of County Government in Cheshire Since 1888* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 30; D. FOSTER, "Class and County Government in Early-Nineteenth-Century Lancashire", *Northern History*, IX (1974): 48-61; John Richard KNIFE, "The Justice of the Peace in Yorkshire, 1820-1914" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1970), pp. 22, 28, 153; John VINCENT, *The Formation of the British Liberal Party, 1857-68* (London: Constable & Co., 1966), p. 132.

What has not been appreciated is that, even in counties dominated by the gentry, some particular types of businessmen managed to attain the magistracy, and the social standing it expressed, without abandoning their businesses.

This runs counter to the accepted wisdom. Throughout the mid-Victorian period, scholars generally agree, appointment as a county J.P. symbolized gentry status. It required both an appropriate landed estate—approximately 1,000 acres or more with corresponding rentals of at least £1,000—and severance of business ties. Mark Girouard further argues that the landed classes regarded even indirect association with trade as unacceptable. Gentility, he insists, demanded of an individual that he “had not only to cease working in his office or warehouse but to give up any financial stake in it. He had to sell out and reinvest the money in land. The only exception made was for bankers.” It was not mere ambition, F.M.L. Thompson suggests, that sustained these conventions. Different upbringings quite as much as social aspirations prompted withdrawal from business, usually by third-generation sons. Born and raised in country houses and educated at public schools and Oxbridge, they developed characteristics that differed materially from those of their ancestors. They had in fact acquired the country gentlemen’s outlook which found business disagreeable. Martin Wiener makes the “Gentrification of the Industrialist” central to an understanding of paradoxical changes in contemporary British society. He discerns a recurring social process in which “the vigorous, unpolished outsider achieves a business (or professional) triumph, trades his winnings for a knighthood . . . and a country estate, and soon becomes absorbed in the rituals of his new position, while his business touch slips away.”²

An examination of one business group’s social behaviour, however, indicates that these assumptions need to be qualified. Many landed brewers who became J.P.’s not only remained brewers, but so successfully instilled in their descendants an abiding interest in making beer as to ensure generations of continuity in business. Affluent brewers, in this way, showed that it was possible to acquire social status without the customary sacrifice of non-landed income.

Part I of this article describes several brewers who, notwithstanding considerable prejudice against appointing businessmen as J.P.’s, became county magistrates while remaining actively connected with their breweries. This prejudice—and the possibility of surmounting it—is illustrated by an example in Part II. Part III establishes that even if some landed brewers left their trade through choice, and others through a spectacular incapacity for business, more of them continued in brewing, often successfully, or at least kept the business in the family. Finally, Part IV suggests several reasons why brewing was especially compatible with the gentry’s style of life.

2. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, pp. 110-12, 128-32; Carl H. E. ZANDERL, “The Social Composition of the County Magistracy in England and Wales, 1831-87”, *Journal of British Studies*, XI (1971): 119-20, 124; Mark GIROUARD, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (London: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 301; Martin J. WIENER, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 147.

I

In personal correspondence, public statements and private conversations, the early- and mid-Victorian English landed classes disclosed their widespread antipathy to acknowledging "men in trade" as gentry, and thus to making them J.P.'s. Unlike appointments in most boroughs, where after 1835 elected municipal councils nominated men of primarily middle-class backgrounds, those in the counties continued to be based on recommendations of Lords Lieutenant, wealthy landed aristocrats to whose advice Lord Chancellors invariably deferred when filling vacancies on the bench. In the years 1835-55, Lords Talbot, Holland and Carrington, for example, each cited injunctions disqualifying businessmen, however suitable otherwise, from becoming J.P.'s.³ Brewers were included in the objection. Where the purity of Buckinghamshire's county bench was concerned, Lord Cottesloe and the Duke of Buckingham could be found two decades later tenaciously opposing both the principle and practice of appointing brewers as J.P.'s. Elsewhere even a justice's clerk found himself discharged from office when in 1844 Lord Fitzwilliam learned of his having become personally connected with brewing.⁴

Lord Chancellors, who had their own time-honoured way of rising into the peerage, not surprisingly expressed similar hostility towards recent purchasers of sizable landed estates who still derived some profits from mere business. Earl Cairns, Disraeli's last Lord Chancellor, betrayed bias against businessmen by reaffirming his predecessors' policy of excluding brewers from the magistracy. Brewers proposed as J.P.'s experienced discrimination later from another Conservative Lord Chancellor, Earl Halsbury, despite his subsequent disclaimer before a Royal Commission.⁵ At least one foreign visitor appreciated the ubiquity of this aristocratic conviction that entrepreneurs still associated with business forfeited claims to gentility. First-hand knowledge of England in the 1860s led Hippolyte Taine, the eminent French scholar and author, to observe that members of landed society "believe . . . that a tradesman, a financier, a man of business, constantly obliged to think of profit and details of profit all day long, is not a gentlemen and never can be". Few mid-Victorian fictional characters so exemplified these failings as Charlotte Yonge's Mr. Fulmort, distiller by trade but landowner through marriage with an obscure yet respectable gentry family. He displays his lack of gentility by his inability to understand his second son, Robert. His disappointment when Robert forsakes the firm for the Church is as intense as his disgust at his son's expenditure of a legacy on the poverty-stricken. "I could have trebled all your fortunes if that capital had been in my hands", Fulmort remarks plaintively, and then adds: "Conscience? I hate such

3. See the correspondence quoted in the following: T.C. Talbot to Lord John Russell, 19 September 1835, in PHILIPS, "Black Country Magistracy", pp. 168, 187; Danvers to Lord Clarendon, 23 December 1840, in VINCENT, *Liberal Party*, p. 133; Benjamin Disraeli to Sarah D'Israeli, 17 October 1850, in ROBERT BLAKE, *Disraeli* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), p. 307.

4. Fitzwilliam MSS., 11 January 1844, quoted in THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, p. 136; Buckinghamshire Record Office (hereafter BRO), Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Lord Cottesloe to Lord Beaconsfield, 15 September 1877.

5. Brewers' Society (hereafter BS), Country Brewers' Society Minute Book, vol. 3, p. 100, 16 July 1877; *ibid.*, pp. 108-11, T.C. Cobbold, CBS Chairman, to Lord Cairns, 6 February 1878; British Library, Halsbury Papers, Add. MSS. 56372, pp. 93-4, James of Hereford to Earl Halsbury, 12 September 1899; *Royal Commission on the Selection of Justices of the Peace, Minutes of Evidence*, in *Parliamentary Papers* (hereafter P.P.), 1910 (C. 5358), XXXVII, pp. 55-6. I should like to thank the Brewers' Society for permission to consult the Country Brewers' Society's Minute Books.

coxcombr'y". In claiming some years later that "county magistrates have never been guilty of a job", Lord Derby attested to this prejudice's persistence.⁶

Mindful of this attitude, F.M.L. Thompson and Carl Zangerl conclude that mid-Victorian landed businessmen initially became eligible magisterial candidates by discontinuing participation in commercial or manufacturing undertakings. More recently, Mark Girouard's study of English country houses advances one step further, alleging that gentry status depended not just on retirement or becoming sleeping partners, but rather on divesting all financial holdings. Since serving on the bench, as Thompson states, constituted an essential preliminary stage to entering the gentry, Girouard apparently believes that totally severing business ties was crucial for such appointments.⁷ Yet all this is difficult to reconcile with the nomination of at least thirty-nine brewers as county magistrates between 1828 and 1870, after which rigid social standards began to be relaxed (see Appendix 1). Thirty-nine is an absolute minimum, since it includes only those either appointed as of 1842 or still serving in 1887 and 1892, the dates of three Parliamentary returns of J.P.'s. None of the returns lists occupations completely, but the last two provide such information for about half of all English and Welsh counties. Even a complete figure, somewhat above thirty-nine, is not a massive proportion of the approximately 10,000 J.P.'s who served during these years. What their presence does prove, however, is that active participation in business was no absolute impediment to the bench.

Whether these brewers still guided affairs at the brewery, instead of merely drawing profits, is a more difficult question, further complicated by Victorian brewers' predilection for managers who directed the brewery's daily operation with only intermittent supervision. Nevertheless, enough J.P.'s were active brewers to prove the point. Kinship and patrimonial prospects together persuaded William Cozens to help his uncle William Hardy with brewing at Letheringsett. Following Hardy's death, Cozens inherited the brewery, and emulated his uncle in supporting the local Methodist church and sitting on the bench. Kinship was also important to John Izzard Pryor in Hertfordshire, where his son's assistance in overseeing the Baldock brewery was so instrumental that his death compelled its immediate sale. In this same county, Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton's second son and namesake resided at the country house of Easneye and commuted daily to Truman, Hanbury, Buxton and Company in London. He was unusual in undergoing the inconvenience of rail travel; more commonly, brewers outside London simply acquired estates near their breweries. For Michael Arthur Bass, the short carriage journey between Burton and Rangemore Hall facilitated his interest in superintending the brewery founded by his great-grandfather. Similarly, James Morrell, Jr., brewed beer in Oxford while residing nearby at Headington Hill Hall. Among the first brewers appointed magistrates was Gilbert Greenall, co-partner in two Lancashire breweries which (according to the firm's historian) he "controlled and guided" though he still resided at Walton Hall, Cheshire. Within a year of being nominated to Cheshire's magistracy in 1842,

6. Hippolyte TAINE, *Taine's Notes on England*, trans. Edward HYAMS (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957), p. 143; Charlotte M. YONGE, *Hopes and Fears; or Scenes from the Life of a Spinster* (1860; reprint ed., London: Macmillan & Co., 1889), p. 247; Lord Derby, quoted in "The English Gentry", *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, CXLIII (1888): 709.

7. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, pp. 110-12, 128; ZANGERL, "County Magistracy", pp. 119-20, 124; GIROUARD, *English Country House*, p. 301.

he became a Lancashire magistrate. Lawrence Wethered was no different from Greenall or Hardy or even Buxton in attending to brewery affairs and succeeding other family members onto the bench. This was also true of Thomas Osborne who managed the Writtle Brewery for his father-in-law Joseph Hardcastle. Both men had remarkably analogous careers, marrying into brewing families, representing Essex constituencies and becoming distinguished members of the Country Brewers' Society (CBS), the leading protective organization of provincial brewers.⁸

Evidence of brewer J.P.'s serving as officials in such societies proves their perseverance in brewing. Together with the CBS, the main spokesmen for the trade's interest were the Brewers' Company, composed exclusively of prestigious London brewers, and the National Trade Defence Fund, sole national body entrusted with organizing the industry's political activities. They negotiated with the Cabinet over legislative proposals, formulated strategy and mobilized support against public critics. Connected with one or more of these societies were seven brewer J.P.'s, five of whom—Hardcastle, Osborne, Alexander Hall, Sir Edmund H. Lacon and George Henty—sat on the CBS General Committee. Still other brewer J.P.'s acted as intermediators. Samuel Whitbread, for instance, became the Brewers' Company's chief parliamentary spokesman on the 1888 Local Government Bill; and Edward N. Buxton represented the Defence Fund on the Peel Commission, appointed in 1896 to investigate liquor licensing laws, and in subsequent discussions on its reports with Herbert Gladstone, Liberal Chief Whip.⁹

Two more sources illuminate the relationship of brewers to their breweries. In expressly identifying themselves as brewers in *Dod's Parliamentary Companion*, Henry Allsopp, Michael Thomas Bass, Edward Wells and others emphasized that they still thought and acted as businessmen as much as country gentlemen. That conflation of roles was equally apparent when Samuel C. Allsopp, Charles Combe and both Greenes served not in honorific posts as directors but as chairmen—usually officers with executive functions. Altogether at least twenty-two of the thirty-nine brewer J.P.'s were what Thompson and Zangerl define as genuine businessmen. Yet these landed entrepreneurs were at the same time assimilated into the gentry.¹⁰

8. Basil COZENS-HARDY, *The History of Letheringssett in the County of Norfolk with Extracts from the Diary of Mary Hardy (1773 to 1809)* (Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, 1957), pp. 82, 84, 112-13, 116, 118-19; *A Chronicle of Small Beer: The Early Victorian Diaries of a Hertfordshire Brewer*, ed. Gerald CURTIS (London: Phillimore & Co., 1970), p. 207; Jill FRANKLIN, *The Gentleman's Country House and its Plan, 1835-1914* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. 29, 260; *Dictionary of National Biography*, sub Michael A. Bass (d. 1909); J. Norman SLATER, *A Brewer's Tale: The Story of Greenall Whitley & Company Limited Through Two Centuries* (Warrington: Greenall Whitley & Co., 1980), pp. 102-3, 137, 154; BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, G.N. Vansittart to Lord Cottesloe, 8 September 1876; Thomas Osborne's obituary, *Essex Weekly News*, 11 June 1915; Essex Record Office, Writtle Brewery Co., D/DB T200, conveyance deed, Joseph A. Hardcastle to Thomas Osborne and Henry Hardcastle, 17 March 1870; James Morrell Jr.'s will (d. 1863).

9. BS, Country Brewers' Society Minute Books, vols. 2 and 3; Guildhall Library, MS. 5468, Brewers' Company Court and Trade Minute Book. Gladstone's negotiations with temperance societies and the brewing industry are explored in the author's "The Brewing Industry as a Pressure Group, 1875-1914" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1982), pp. 105-60, and in David M. FAHEY, "Temperance and the Liberal Party—Lord Peel's Report, 1899", *Journal of British Studies*, X (1971): 132-59.

10. *Dod's Parliamentary Companion*, 1880, 1883; Edward Greene's obituary, *Bury and Norwich Post and Suffolk Standard*, 21 April 1891; Sir Edward Walter Greene's obituary, *Bury and Norwich Post*, 5 March 1920; Hurford JAMES, *The Red Barrel: A History of Watney Mann* (London: John Murray, 1963), pp. 144-45; *Directory of Directors, 1887-1900*.

What is striking is that brewers served as J.P.'s in areas otherwise proof against businessmen on the bench. It is now known that active businessmen did serve in a few highly industrial or urban counties. The county magistracy in Lancashire, West Yorkshire and Staffordshire beginning late in the 1830s, and in Cheshire two decades later, contained appreciable numbers of merchants, manufacturers and other businessmen. They did not preside throughout these counties, but were appointed largely in industrialized areas, notably south and east Lancashire and south Staffordshire, where either the resident gentry's scarcity or their dislike of riding into town to confront urban problems meant that less rigorous standards prevailed when Lords Lieutenant selected J.P.'s. Middlesex, with its large urbanized population, had much earlier acquired a magistracy of still more dubious repute which provoked the epithet of "trading" justices. Although these changes varied chronologically, in each case the landed gentry had lost their virtual monopoly by the mid-Victorian period, and in at least parts of Yorkshire and Staffordshire and in nearly all of Middlesex and Lancashire they no longer constituted even a majority.¹¹ Their primacy elsewhere in the country, as in Yorkshire and Staffordshire, nevertheless remained undisputed. Indeed, Carl Zangerl's examination of England and Wales collectively substantiates this conclusion: in 1842, aristocrats, country gentlemen and clerics made up almost 99 percent of the county magistracy.¹² But only three brewers became magistrates in predominantly industrial counties. What is noteworthy is their presence in non-industrial ones where the gentry's control was otherwise hardly challenged.

II

Zangerl goes on to argue that gentry dominance declined after 1842. By 1887, when a Parliamentary return for the first time differentiated J.P.'s in fifteen counties by socio-economic status, those whom he calls middle-class, i.e., not linked to the landed classes, occupied 15.2 percent of the bench (409 out of 2,687).¹³ But his calculations overestimate the middle-class element by a third. The Parliamentary return which he analyses is neither fully accurate nor representative. It ignores the gentry status of 45 magistrates whose claim was good enough to satisfy the exacting standards of Burke's *Landed Gentry* and *Peerage and Baronetage*, where they were listed either in their own right (23) or as descendants of landed families (22). There are a further 18 middle-class J.P.'s in Zangerl's list who were classified as gentry in other of the select fifteen counties in which compilers supplied information. The subtraction of these 63 reduces Zangerl's middle-class contingent to 12.9 percent (346). It is further reduced to 10.3 percent by Burke's underestimation of legitimate

11. PHILIPS, "Black Country Magistracy", pp. 166-67, 169-70, 184-85; VINCENT, *Liberal Party*, p. 132; LEE, *County Government in Cheshire*, p. 30; FOSTER, "County Government in Lancashire", pp. 52, 57; KNIFE, "The J.P. in Yorkshire", pp. 22, 28, 153; Bertram OSBORNE, *Justices of the Peace, 1361-1848: A History of the Justices of the Peace for the Counties of England* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Sedgill Press, 1960), pp. 165-66; Frank MILTON, *The English Magistracy* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 14-16.

12. ZANGERL, "County Magistracy", p. 115.

13. *Ibid.* Zangerl's calculations give 14.9 percent (383 of 2,570 county J.P.'s); but a recalculation using the same return and his definitions produces the figures in the text.

landed families, generally accepted as being about 20 percent.¹⁴ Finally, the sample over-represents Welsh counties which contained one-third of all J.P.'s, but nearly a half of the middle-class ones. Between Welsh Glamorganshire (33.1 percent middle-class) and Carnarvonshire (24.8 percent) at one extreme, and English Cambridgeshire (5.1 percent) and Devonshire (6.5 percent) at the other, any aggregate figures are bound to be misleading. After recalculation, business magistrates by 1887 encompass only 10.2 percent of the bench in England and 18.2 percent in Wales, or 8.2 percent and 14.5 percent if adjusted for Burke's undercounting of authentic gentry. The proportion would almost certainly have been lower in 1870, before social standards for nomination became less exacting. More recently, William Lubenow has discovered that only 9 percent of magistrates newly created in Buckinghamshire between 1868 and 1888 had close business ties.¹⁵ All of this corroborates the view that businessmen, outside Wales and industrial counties, encountered formidable difficulties in becoming J.P.'s.

That brewers could meet such difficulties is demonstrated by Thomas Wethered's unremitting attempts late in the 1870s to join the Buckinghamshire magistracy, against a tenacious aristocratic denial of the social ambitions of businessmen. No aspirants were thwarted so long, probably, or so successfully as Wethered. Many brewers had by this time established themselves as J.P.'s, even if only nominal landowners.¹⁶ Indeed, Wethered's own father had attained the magistracy. However, the first Baron Cottesloe, acting Lord Lieutenant in the Duke of Buckingham's absence abroad, combined aristocratic exclusiveness with temperance leanings and resolutely enforced more rigorous standards.¹⁷ A three-year struggle ensued, with the wishes of the one to be made magistrate as ardent as the determination of the other not to satisfy them.

Wethered's supporters put forward his case persuasively. G.N. Vansittart, first broaching the subject in a letter to Cottesloe late in August 1876, stressed Wethered's standing as second largest local landowner, and the fact that his uncle Lawrence, also a brewer, sat on the bench. Infirmities and distance both deterred Lawrence from attending Marlow Petty Sessions, thereby creating the need for

14. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, pp. 112-13; *Burke's Landed Gentry* and *Burke's Peerage and Baronetage*, 1871 and 1886 editions. Burke also listed some families, about 20 percent of the total, which had fallen below the estates necessary to be accorded gentry status. This does not, of course, alter the figure, as Zangerl's middle-class J.P.'s would have been recent purchasers of landed estates.

15. William C. LUBENOW, "Social Recruitment and Social Attitudes: The Buckinghamshire Magistrates, 1868-88", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XL (1977): 263. Similar control by the gentry and clergy of the county benches in Lincolnshire (79 percent) and Shropshire (over 90 percent) seems to have been the case in the 1870s, though in the study of the latter county the author makes no distinction between landed gentry and landed businessmen. R.J. OLNEY, *Rural Society and County Government in Nineteenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln: History fo Lincolnshire Committee, 1979), pp. 101-3; *Victoria County History of Shropshire*, (n.p.: Oxford University Press, 1979), III: 136-38.

16. Appointed between 1866 and 1876, Lawrence Wethered, William Lucas, Arthur Marshall, Henry Wardle and James T. Agg-Gardner each owned less than 50 acres, while R. Radcliff and Joseph Hardcastle held between 100 and 200 acres (*Return of Owners of Land*, in *P.P.*, 1874 [C. 1097], LXXII; *Return of All J.P.'s for England and Wales*, 1888 [C. 356]; *White's History of Suffolk*, 1874).

17. The Duke's absence deprived him of the opportunity for reconciling his animus towards Wethered's appointment with his personal ownership of a brewery and several public houses which he leased. See Douglas J. ELLIOTT, *Buckingham: The Loyal and Ancient Borough* (Chichester: Phillimore & Co., 1975), p. 202.

another magistrate who would undertake to attend regularly. Wethered, Vansittart suggested, should be that magistrate. Despite Cottesloe's unenthusiastic reply, Vansittart pressed this proposal, convinced, as he would later point out, that Thomas Wethered clearly possessed the necessary "position and estate". More distinguished individuals also espoused Wethered's claims. Ironically, Lord Beaconsfield, earlier gratified to approve the Duke of Buckingham as Lord Lieutenant, now questioned the qualities which the Duke and Cottesloe thought indispensable for magistrates. Protests from the Country Brewers' Society, inspired in part by Wethered himself, disputed the legal and historical basis for such discrimination, and prompted Beaconsfield to send Cottesloe several letters in which he derided the refusal to appoint brewers. This was especially arguable, Beaconsfield commented, when the candidate was so obviously qualified, being an M.P. from "a truly respectable family". Of all the points adduced in favour of brewer J.P.'s, he saw political service as most decisive. "Every member of Parliament locally connected with his constituency", Beaconsfield avowed, "sh[oul]d be a County Magistrate. It is a distinction alike due to his constituency & to himself".¹⁸

Beaconsfield's Lord Chancellor, Earl Cairns, also felt the CBS's pressure, and though concerned less with what offices the brewer held than with the case's legal aspects, eventually recognized the injustice of opposing Wethered.¹⁹ In a letter to Cottesloe, Cairns observed that Parliament had precluded potential conflicts of interest by enacting legislation prohibiting brewers from adjudicating the licensing of drinking places. He therefore urged that Wethered be nominated as a magistrate. To avert both Cottesloe's embarrassment at having his authority circumvented and possibility of yet further obstruction, Cairns offered a sensible compromise: he, as Chancellor, would assume responsibility for appointing Wethered. Cottesloe, of course, refused. By then Wethered had gained an unexpected ally in Charles Fremantle, Cottesloe's son, who counselled capitulation. Even he found his father's intransigence untenable: "I wish you could see your way to put the man into the Commission and have done with it!" Aware that Buckingham and Cottesloe shared identical sentiments on this topic, Fremantle reassured his father that "the Duke would have yielded long ago".²⁰

Anxious to dispel Cottesloe's misgivings, Wethered meanwhile made personal appeals. Writing in April 1878, he pointedly noted that beyond the estate, his family owned numerous public houses, property which provided the Wethereds with virtually

18. BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3 G.N. Vansittart to Lord Cottesloe, 31 August 1876 and 8 April 1879; LUBENOW, "Buckinghamshire Magistrates", p. 253; BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Lord Beaconsfield to Lord Cottesloe, 13 September and 13 October 1877; BS, Country Brewers' Society Minute Book, vol. 3, pp. 101-3, Augustus Ekin, CBS Chairman, to Lord Beaconsfield (copy), 24 July 1877.

19. The CBS had successfully lobbied Cairns, who had rejected one of its members nominated for the borough magistracy, to modify his attitude towards brewer J.P.'s. Acknowledging that he had been misinformed, Cairns stated he would no longer disqualify men associated with brewing (*ibid.*, p. 100, 16 July 1877, and pp. 111-12, Lord Cairns to Thomas C. Cobbold, CBS Chairman, 9 March 1878).

20. BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Lord Cairns to Lord Cottesloe, 25 April 1879, Cottesloe to Cairns, 2 May 1879, Charles Fremantle to Cottesloe, 29 May 1879. For disqualification of J.P.'s, see 35 & 36 Vic. c. 94 (1872 Licensing Act), sec. 60.

unrivalled influence throughout Buckinghamshire.²¹ Equally pertinent, Wethered felt, was the fact that his father's brewing connection had been disregarded when Lord Carrington nominated him as a J.P. Wethered realized that it further enhanced his claims to recall that he had received Carrington's personal pledge of duly placing him on the bench, though death prevented the redeeming of this promise.

In response, Cottesloe cited both Marlow's already adequate magistracy and Buckingham's absence as reasons for denial; but in rather tactlessly appointing another magistrate who had just purchased some property nearby, he belied his own objections. What he confided to several Conservative leaders revealed his specific and implacable opposition to recommending brewers. As Cairns and Beaconsfield learned, Cottesloe believed it wholly unnecessary "to have recourse to the services of a gentleman who is a brewer", provided sufficient numbers of others existed to perform the requisite duties. Nor would such a nomination, Cottesloe intimated, be "beneficial to the neighbourhood", apparently because he considered a parliamentary career as "Wethered's chief claim for the appointment".²² Almost three years of increasingly acrimonious and fruitless correspondence had passed when, on 26 July 1879, an exasperated Wethered wrote Cottesloe a virulent letter, alleging deceit, warning of public disclosure and finally threatening to publish relevant letters. Angered at what he saw as Cottesloe's slanderous demeanour, Wethered rebuked him with a staunch defence of brewers who were in many cases, he maintained, "by education, position, & high character, as well qualified as any gentlemen in this or any county for . . . magisterial duties". With this statement the Government thoroughly concurred in Parliament when Wethered raised the matter of brewers being disqualified as prospective J.P.'s; but this admission proved meaningless for the Cabinet spokesmen disavowed knowledge of these practices.²³

This inconclusive, rancorous debate between two obdurate men ultimately ended in January 1880. Using as a pretext a memorial signed by five Marlow J.P.'s endorsing Wethered as best qualified to help them fulfill their magisterial functions, Cairns made Wethered a J.P. without Cottesloe's sanction.²⁴

III

Given the existence of attitudes such as Cottesloe's, some brewers may have found it easier to renounce their trade in order to attain gentry status.

21. Certainly Wethered's seat at Marlow, where he and T.P. Williams acted as patrons, gave this assertion considerable credibility (H.J. HANHAM, *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone* [London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1959], p. 410). BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Thomas O. Wethered to Lord Cottesloe, 11 April 1878. By 1892, Thomas Wethered & Sons owned 86 Buckinghamshire tied houses, probably many of them purchased in the 1870s (*Return of the Number of On-Licenses in Each Licensing District where the Tenant and Owner are Different*, in *P.P.*, 1892 [147], LXVIII).

22. BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Lord Cottesloe to Thomas O. Wethered, 25 April 1878; Cottesloe to Lord Beaconsfield, 15 September 1877; Cottesloe to Lord Cairns, 2 May and 7 October 1879; Wethered to Cottesloe, 3 May 1878.

23. *Ibid.*, Thomas O. Wethered to Lord Cottesloe, 26 July 1879; *Hansard*, 3d ser., CCXLIX (11 August 1879): cols. 662-63.

24. BRO, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Lord Cairns to Lord Cottesloe, 16 January 1880.

F. M. L. Thompson argues that a pattern of social mobility characterized ambitious business families: they dissociated themselves entirely from commercial affairs, ordinarily three generations after purchasing a landed estate and were then assimilated into the gentry. Public school and university educations, country houses, businesses controlled by managers, and interest in national politics all inculcated traits in this generation unfamiliar to their grandfathers. In this respect Thompson assumes that brewers were typical of other businessmen, and offers as evidence the Best family's protracted withdrawal from brewing in Kent. "It was perhaps not so much", he explains, "that this [third] generation conceived the desire to live down its origins, as that this generation was so bred that it did not acquire the taste, nor possibly the aptitude, for the world of business."²⁵ The Bests were not the only family to lose the aptitude. Loss of business talent could afflict even families which wanted to remain in brewing. Perhaps no family exemplified this more disastrously than the Allsopps, J.P.'s since the 1830s, whose Burton brewery had an output second to only one English firm in the 1870s. Two Allsopp brothers, Samuel Charles (second Baron Hindlip) and Alfred Percy, though certainly possessing the taste, patently lacked the aptitude, each personifying the third generation's failure as businessmen.

When Samuel Allsopp & Sons' stock was floated in 1887, the Allsopps, capitalizing on the boom in brewery shares, and unlike most brewing families, practically liquidated their investments.²⁶ The family still directed the firm, however, and believed that, with the name of Allsopp itself guaranteeing continued sales, they need not emulate rivals in buying public houses. This costly miscalculation soon deprived them of many outlets. By 1892, Allsopp's owned only twenty houses, compared with Greenall's 681.²⁷ Allsopp's imprudent policies engendered serious financial problems and scathing attacks. For his part, the second Lord Hindlip disclaimed blame for the decline in profits which followed. Between 1884 and 1891

25. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, pp. 129-32. Two other studies support this interpretation: Walter L. ARNSTEIN, "The Survival of the Victorian Aristocracy", in *The Rich, the Well Born and the Powerful: Elites and Upper Classes in History*, ed. Frederic Cople JAHER (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1973), p. 234; C. C. OWEN, *The Development of Industry in Burton upon Trent* (Chichester: Phillimore & Co., 1978), pp. 98-102. For additional information on the Best family, see Rosemary A. KEEN, "Messrs. Best, Brewers of Chatham", in *Essays in Kentish History*, eds. Margaret ROAKE and John WHYMAN (London: Frank Cass, 1973), pp. 237-47.

26. The Allsopps were atypical of principal brewing families in retaining only a small amount—less than 5 percent—of ordinary stock (Allsopp shareholders' meeting, *Brewing Trade Review*, 1 March 1890). See n. 36.

27. *Return of On-Licences*, in *P.P.*, 1892 (147) LXVIII; John BAXTER, "The Organisation of the Brewing Industry" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1945), pp. 219-20. The intense struggle in England for tied houses late in the Victorian period is examined in K. H. HAWKINS and C. L. PASS, *The Brewing Industry: A Study in Industrial Organisation and Public Policy* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1979), pp. 25-35; J. E. VAIZEY, "The Brewing Industry", in *Effects of Mergers: Six Studies*, ed. P. Lesley COOK (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1958), pp. 400-7; P. L. PAYNE, "The Emergence of the Large-Scale Company in Great Britain, 1870-1914", *Economic History Review*, XX (1967): 530-31; Diana M. KNOX, "The Development of the Tied House System in London", *Oxford Economic Papers*, X (1958): 66-83; Mark GIROUARD, *Victorian Pubs* (London: Studio Vista, 1975), pp. 75-88, 181-84. Scotland's dissimilar licensing system explains in part why brewers there did not vie as strenuously as their southern counterparts for tied houses. See Ian DONNACHIE, *A History of the Brewing Industry in Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1979), pp. 154-55, 194-96, 206-14; Rudolph KENNA and Anthony MOONEY, *People's Palaces; Victorian and Edwardian Pubs of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Paul Harris Publishing, 1983), p. 30.

sales fell by over one-third—almost 300,000 barrels.²⁸ At the annual shareholders' meeting late in August 1892, Allsopp's passing of dividends antagonized many investors, especially one whose speech concluded with an irreverent inquiry: "How much are you going to give us back?" The entire meeting then began intoning: "Yes, how much are you going to give us back?" Finally, the clamour abated when Hindlip, then acting Chairman, stood up in what most observers probably expected to be a move to exonerate the directors. Instead, he tersely declared: "Not a damn penny!" This defiant gesture hardly placated shareholders, whose own rejoinder was to appoint an investigative committee which ultimately forced Hindlip's resignation.²⁹

Alfred Percy Allsopp, Hindlip's younger brother and successor to the chairmanship of the firm, equally entertained ideas of himself as both landed magnate and astute entrepreneur, neither of them suitable goals for a man of his modest talents. Alfred quickly inaugurated an expansionist programme to restore the firm's reputation and precarious finances. He endorsed the belated purchase of tied houses at inflated prices, which gave Allsopp's hundreds of new outlets but compelled sales of large debenture issues, susceptible to sharp market changes. In a country in which light bitter beers, stout and pale ales were favoured drinks, he sanguinely built a lager brewery; but this, together with his unorthodox practice of buying hotels and casinos, merely precipitated yet another financial crisis and his own retirement.³⁰ A shareholders' committee attributed Allsopp stock depreciation largely to the misguided policies of the late unlamented chairman. Combining a maladroit business sense with ostentatious display of wealth, Allsopp soon faced disaster. Following his father's ennoblement in 1886, he had sought a style befitting the family's elevated status and accordingly purchased Battenhall Mount, a Worcestershire country house, which he so extravagantly renovated that the coach-house—reputedly worth £6,000—gained widespread notoriety. "During the zenith of his career", the *Brewers' Gazette* recollected in 1914, "Mr. [Alfred] Percy Allsopp was regarded as a millionaire." Some years before this comment, depressed brewing stock had cost Alfred money on some undisclosed investments and bankrupted him. Further humiliation ensued during his third term as Mayor of Worcester when he publicly confessed that his daily expenditure amounted to sixpence.³¹ By this time, the family had hardly any connection with the brewery which bore their name.

This is a dramatic case of third-generation businessmen's ineptitude. Certainly incompetence combined with social aspirations resulted in many landed brewers retiring from brewing. To Thompson's list could be added the Buxtons of Fox

28. HAWKINS and PASS, *Brewing Industry*, pp. 32-33. In 1881 Allsopps had brewed 875,000 barrels (*Economist*, 26 February 1887).

29. Sydney O. NEVILLE, *Seventy Rolling Years* (London: Faber & Faber, 1958), pp. 36-37. Apart from misdating the meeting, Neville's recollections some sixty years later seem accurate; see *Country Brewers' Gazette*, 20 August 1891.

30. John VAIZEY, *The Brewing Industry, 1886-1951: An Economic Study* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1960), p. 11; *Country Brewers' Gazette*, 30 August 1900. Despite pervasive public apathy, R. F. Graesser (Wrexham), J. & R. Tennent (Glasgow) and Meux's Brewery Co. (London) had begun brewing lager beers before Allsopps joined them in 1899. See *Royal Commission on Arsenical Poisoning, Minutes of Evidence*, in *P.P.*, 1904 (C. 1845), IX, p. 264; H. D. WATTS, "Lager Brewing in Britain", *Geography*, LX (1975): 140-41; also see E. M. SIGSWORTH, "Science and the Brewing Industry, 1850-1900", *Economic History Review*, XVII (1965): 545-46.

31. *Brewers' Gazette*, 4 June 1914.

Warren, Surrey; the Combes of Pierrepont, Surrey; the Cozens-Hardies of Letheringsett Hall, Norfolk; the Pryors of Clay Hall, Hertfordshire; their cousins of High Elms and Weston Park in the same county, whose role in Trumans had ceased even before the third generation; the Usbornes of Blackrock, Cork and Writtle, Essex; and the Walkers of Gateacre, Lancashire and Osmaston Manor, Derby. Fourth- and fifth-generation brewers who inherited country houses and abandoned brewing included Sir Thomas F. Buxton, 4th Bt.; first Baron Ardilaun (Arthur Edward Guinness); and William Younger. Altogether, 14 (including sons and brothers) out of 43 brewing families with their own country seats followed this well-known pattern (Table 1 and Appendix 2).

Table 1 Continuity of Landed Families in Brewing, Great Britain and Ireland, 1840-1940

	Families	
	N	%
I. Remained in brewing through 1940	15	34.8
II. Eldest son withdrew from brewing	14	32.5
III. Eldest son did not produce male heir	6	14.0
IV. Estate inherited by female	2	4.7
V. Estate sold while family still in brewing	6	14.0

Sources: see Appendix 2.

But there were also 15 families who saw no incongruity, and found no insuperable difficulty, in being both successful brewers and country gentlemen. As one brewer's biographical sketch in *Who Was Who* demonstrates, they shared the gentry's social interests and behaviour; under recreations he wrote: "hunting; hunted Suffolk Foxhounds, Croome Hounds, and kept harriers and stag hounds at own expense; hunted hounds 34 years; shooting". After his father's death, he duly acted as chairman of the family brewery.³² Still more illustrious were the six generations of Greenalls who adroitly managed their Lancashire breweries for two centuries and more, opportunely buying tied houses at reasonable prices, expanding land holdings to justify a baronetcy and later peerage, partaking in country life as the Master of the Belvoir Hunt and, as the first Baronet and his son demonstrated when leaving estates exceeding one million pounds, accumulating wealth worthy of their business acumen. Nor were the Greenalls unusual in regarding money making as a useful pastime for gentlemen brewers. Two Watneys left estates together of £3.5 million, two Gretttons of £5.1 and four Guinnesses of almost £20 million. In fact, the first Lord Iveagh's estate of £13.5 million was the second largest probated between 1809 and 1949.³³

Whether in London with the Barclays, Watneys and Whitbreads, in the provinces with the Bonham-Carters, Cobbolds, Fullers, Greenalls, Greenes, Gretttons and

32. *Who was Who*, 1916-28, sub Sir Edward Walter Greene; and his obituary, *Bury and Norwich Post*, 5 March 1920.

33. SLATER, *Greenall Whitley*, pp. 155-56; HAWKINS and PASS, *Brewing Industry*, p. 30; W.D. RUBINSTEIN, "British Millionaires, 1809-1949", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XLVII (1974): 208-09, 211-12, 217, 220-22.

Morrells, in Scotland with the Youngers or in Wales with the Buckleys, successive generations of elder sons inherited either over 1,000 acres or land worth £1,000 or more per annum—entitling them to envisage themselves as gentry and often be recognized as such—and in each case ensured their family's continuity in brewing, frequently to the present. Although the five generations of Whitbreads who inherited Southill Park and engaged in brewing are probably the best known, the Cobbolds of Ipswich repeated this pattern six times. Slightly expanding the definition of direct family involvement allows the Buxtons, Guinnesses, Pryors and Youngers to be included. In these families fourth-generation eldest sons did sever brewing ties; but, as other relatives remained with the firm, they did so without thereby jeopardizing the family's connection. In the Buxton family, the first baronet's second son purchased Easneye, a Hertfordshire country house situated on 1,800 acres, and perpetuated the tradition of owning land and running the brewery. So too did the sons and grandsons of Benjamin Lee Guinness's third son, Edward Cecil. This Guinness, on acquiring his older brother's share of the partnership in 1876, assumed control of the brewery, and bought Elveden Hall, located on 15,000 acres in Suffolk, where Edward VII and later George V often joined him in shooting.³⁴ Similarly, the elder sons' withdrawal in the Pryor and Younger families simply enlarged the roles of other landed relatives.

In 6 of the 43 households in Table 1, the wishes of the family cannot be determined. The country house and the brewery became separated, but this reflected the absence of a male heir, not any conscious decision. A further 6 families relinquished their claim to gentility by selling their estates while keeping their breweries. In one case, the reason was probably political. Early in the 1870s the Deakins acquired over 4,000 acres in Cornwall and Devon as a political base for the parliamentary seat of Launceston, for which James Deakin duly secured election in 1874. These political aspirations soon waned and ended in his resignation. Within four years, his own death, shortly following his father's, led the family to dispose of the estate.³⁵ The other five families sold their estates on recognizing the diminished social value of land in the Edwardian period or soon after.

In all, only 14 families (32.5 percent) support the three-generation theory according to which divorce from business interests followed acquisition of a landed estate. Nor does this model convincingly account for the fact that the other families generally either participated in trade-protective societies or retained substantial investments in their breweries, notwithstanding compelling incentives late in the Victorian period for capitalizing on conversions of private partnerships into public companies.³⁶ The evidence in fact indicates that numerous wealthy brewers never

34. Patrick LYNCH and John VAIZEY, *Guinness's Brewery in the Irish Economy, 1759-1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), pp. 193, 244; Philip MAGNUS, *King Edward the Seventh* (London: John Murray, 1964), pp. 267, 274; Clive ASLET, *The Last Country Houses* (London: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 56, 62-63.

35. *Copy of the Shorthand Writer's Notes of the Evidence taken and the Judgment Delivered by Mr. Justice Mellor, in the Matter of the Launceston Election Petition, in P.P., 1874 (250), LIII: 8.*

36. VAIZEY, "Brewing Industry", pp. 401-07. The Bass, Bonham-Carter, Gretton, Guinness, Hall, Lacon, Watney, Whitbread, Younger (Alloa) and Younger (Edinburgh) families each had eldest sons who owned landed estates while serving as officials of the Brewers' Society, Brewers' Company or CBS. Shareholdings are generally unavailable, but one newspaper did publish figures for leading breweries in the 1890s which disclosed that brewers sold preference, though not ordinary, shares. "Brewery Companies' Shareholders", *Brewers' Journal*, 15 December 1894, 15 January and 15 February 1895; DONNACHIE, *Brewing Industry in Scotland*, pp. 157, 168-76.

had to complete the transition which historians assume was so routinely made by Victorian businessmen, from business to landed society.

IV

What were the reasons for this combination of acceptance into the gentry and continuity in business? Samuel Whitbread II's latest biographer emphasizes both the unexacting duties of brewer proprietorship and its remunerative character as persuasive reasons for staying in brewing. Such considerations may well have exerted far-reaching influence, but alone, they do not explain why brewers did not dispose of their unprofitable shareholdings after 1899. However landed, even ennobled, some still thought of themselves as brewers. Reacting pragmatically to a financial crisis at Meux's Brewery, the second Lord Tweedmouth sold none of his £200,000 of ordinary stock, but rather some paintings and, more significantly, one of his country houses.³⁷

For brewing was a special type of business, more easily reconciled with gentry life than most others.³⁸ It was a traditional trade, not a result of the industrial revolution.³⁹ It allowed an approximation of the gentry's life-style, in part because of the short brewing season; rudimentary scientific knowledge confined brewing to the cooler months.⁴⁰ And intimacy with the gentry followed a mutual interest in barley. All of these enhanced brewers' social status, ensuring their position as the least objectionable of all those with non-landed wealth. Unlike brewing profits, moreover, these circumstances persisted throughout the nineteenth century.

In appointing rich landed brewers, but not other businessmen, as county magistrates and accepting their daughters as eligible marriage partners, aristocrats clearly underscored Victorian brewers' high social status.⁴¹ In addition to a second generation daughter of the Whitbreads, third and fourth generation daughters in the Best, Guinness, Hanbury, and Whitbread families married into the peerage. Daughters of the Buxton, Marjoribanks, Meux and Walker families also secured such marriages, but only after their fathers had received baronetcies. Brewers furthermore were accorded primacy when, in the mid-1880s, men with commercial and industrial wealth first began entering the peerage on a significant scale. Sir Michael A. Bass and Sir Henry Allsopp, ennobled respectively as Barons Burton and Hindlip, joined

37. *Dictionary of National Biography*, sub Sir Edward Marjoribanks (d. 1909), p. 570; *Brewers' Journal*, 15 February 1895; Dean RAPP, "Social Mobility in the Eighteenth Century: The Whitbreds of Bedfordshire, 1720-1815", *Economic History Review*, XXVII (1974): 383; also see his "Samuel Whitbread, 1764-1815: A Social and Political Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1971).

38. Several recent studies document cases of eighteenth-century merchants encountering minimal difficulty in gaining admission into landed society and becoming J.P.'s while maintaining businesses: R.G. WILSON, "The Denisons and Milneses: Eighteenth-Century Merchant Landowners", in *Land and Industry: The Landed Estate and the Industrial Revolution*, eds. J.T. WARD and R.G. WILSON (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1971), pp. 148, 158-61; T.M. DEVINE, "Glasgow Colonial Merchants and Land, 1770-1815", *ibid.*, pp. 207, 222-23, 230.

39. Peter MATHIAS, *The Brewing Industry in England, 1700-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 320-22.

40. STGSWORTH, "Science and Brewing", p. 536.

41. THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, p. 20.

two other brewers in the Lords; Barons Ardilaun (Arthur Guinness) and Tweedmouth (Dudley Marjoribanks). It was these creations which provoked widespread criticism, vividly but inaccurately expressed in the Lords' new sobriquet, "the beerage". Edward Hamilton, W.E. Gladstone's private secretary, for instance, resented as "indecent and vulgar" Marjoribank's repeated appeals for a peerage, and rhetorically asked: "What are the particular claims of Marjoribanks, except money and a certain amount of loyalty to his party?" Such hostility proved no barrier to enlarging the "beerage".⁴²

The prevalent method of inheritance, under which everything except the country estate was divided equally, further facilitated the association of both the family and the elder son with brewing. Although W.D. Rubinstein asserts that this practice among wealthy businessmen denied sons strong motives for participating in the family firm, it did guarantee that if the elder son withdrew or produced no male heir, younger brothers, uncles or even nephews could manage the family concern.⁴³ Cognizant of the former's likelihood, Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness shrewdly named two sons, Arthur Edward and Edward Cecil, co-partners with the explicit proviso that retirement would incur stringent financial penalties. Arthur nevertheless departed in 1876 after negotiating more liberal terms with his younger brother, without whose presence the brewery might have passed outside the family control. Lesser brewing families also adopted this principle. In the same year in which the Guinness brothers revised their father's will, John C. Cobbold, owner of a much smaller Ipswich brewery and nearly an octogenarian, brought two of his sons into the firm as equal partners, lest his death leave a fatherless fifteen-year-old grandson as his only heir and sole family representative. Earlier in the century, three of Edward Greenall's sons inherited the St. Helens and Wilderspool breweries, but only the youngest succeeded in involving his own son in the family business. It was relatively common for an elder son to die without a male heir, and in the Bonham-Carter, Greene and Whitbread families, younger brothers previously associated with the brewery assumed responsibility.⁴⁴

V

Historians of nineteenth-century Britain have equated entry into the landed classes with the abandonment of participation in business. According to this interpretation, the taint of trade, whether through active participation or the passive receipt of profits, was a barrier to the delights of gentry life. Developing this analysis

42. Ralph E. PUMPHREY, "The Introduction of Industrialists into the British Peerage: A Study in Adaptation of a Social Institution", *American Historical Review*, LXV (1959): 2, 7-8; THOMPSON, *English Landed Society*, pp. 19-20, 292-297; *The Diary of Sir Edward Walter Hamilton, 1880-85*, 2 vols., ed. Dudley W.R. BAHLMAN (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), I: 132.

43. W.D. RUBINSTEIN, *Men of Property: The Very Wealthy in Britain Since the Industrial Revolution* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1981), pp.135-37. Rubinstein does recognize that brewers were exceptional, but for reasons unrelated to inheritance. In explaining brewers' greater success in sustaining wealth over successive generations, he emphasizes their higher social acceptability and relative ease in forming aristocratic ties through marriage.

44. LYNCH and VAIZEY, *Guinness's Brewery*, pp. 182-84; Suffolk Record Office, Cobbold & Co., HA/231/1/3, Agreement between John C., Thomas C. and Felix T. Cobbold, 8 May 1876; SLATER, *Greenall Whitley*, pp. 103, 120-21.

further, many historians have insisted that third-generation businessmen, whose entrepreneurial fathers or grandfathers had purchased estates, relinquished the family enterprise because they had acquired the social ambitions and antithetical values of country gentlemen. No doubt all of this happened often enough. But in contradiction to both of these generalizations stand sizable numbers of early- and mid-Victorian brewers who served as county magistrates, and successive generations of elder sons who adorned both the brewery and the bench.

It is likely that brewers, while exceptional, were not unique. There may have been other business groups which had high social acceptability and were able to assimilate two apparently incompatible value systems. Instead of presupposing that all upwardly mobile families from the middle class conformed to a single pattern, historians ought to explore the varying experiences of each group. Perhaps social barriers, erected against aspiring businessmen as much by historians as by Victorian rhetoric were, for particular groups, in reality no absolute obstacle to attaining a place in landed society.

Appendix 1 **Brewers Appointed as County Magistrates, England and Wales,
1828-70**

Brewer	Year Appointed	County
Allsopp, Samuel	1836-38	Staffordshire
———, Samuel C.	1866	"
	1870	Derbyshire
Bass, Michael A.	1864	Staffordshire
	1866	Derbyshire
———, Michael T.	1836-42	Staffordshire
Buckley, James	1868	Brecknockshire
Buxton, Edward N.	1869	Essex
———, Thomas F.	1866	Hertfordshire
———, Sir Thomas F.	1859	Norfolk
	1865	Essex
Combe, Charles	1862	Surrey
Cozens-Hardy, William	1843	Norfolk
Fordham, Edward K.	1867	Hertfordshire
	1869	Bedfordshire
	1869	Cambridgeshire
Fuller, George P.	1861	Wiltshire
Greenall, Gilbert	1842	Cheshire
	1843	Lancashire
———, Peter	1836-42	"
Greene, Edward	1861	Suffolk
———, Edward W.	1869	"
Hall, Alexander W.	1865	Oxfordshire

Brewer	Year Appointed	County
Hanbury, Charles	1861	Hertfordshire
	1863	Middlesex
Hardcastle, Joseph	1850	Essex
	1869	Suffolk
Hardy, William	1836-42	Norfolk
Henty, George	1859	Sussex
Lacon, Sir Edmund H.K.	1828	Norfolk
	1849	Suffolk
Lindsell, Charles S.	1866	Bedfordshire
Meux, Sir Henry	1836-41	Essex
———, Henry	1836-42	Hertfordshire
Morrell, James, Jr.	1836-42	Oxfordshire
Phillips, John	1866	Hertfordshire
Pryor, Arthur	1859	Essex
———, John	pre- 1841	Hertfordshire
———, John Izzard	pre- 1841	"
———, Robert	1863	"
Radcliff, Robert	1869	Derbyshire
Simpson, Joseph	ca. 1852	Cambridgeshire
Thwaites, Daniel	1852	Lancashire
Usborne, Thomas	1868	Essex
Wells, Edward	1859	Berkshire
Wethered, Lawrence W.	1866	Buckinghamshire
	pre- 1862	"
Whitbread, Samuel	1859	Bedfordshire

Sources: *Return of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of All Persons Appointed to Act as Justices of the Peace in Each and Every County in England and Wales Since the 21st Day of July, 1836*, in *Parliamentary Papers* (hereafter *P.P.*) 1842 (C. 524), XXXIII; *Return Giving the Names and Professions or Descriptions of All Justices of the Peace for the Counties of England and Wales*, in *P.P.*, 1888 (C. 356), LXXXII; *Return Giving the Names and Professions or Descriptions of All Justices of the Peace for the Counties of England and Wales*, in *P.P.*, 1893-4 (366), LXXIV; Buckinghamshire Record Office, Fremantle Papers, D/FR/134/3, Thomas O. Wethered to Lord Beaconsfield, 21 October 1876; Basil COZENS-HARDY, *The History of Letheringsett in the County of Norfolk with Extracts from the Diary of Mary Hardy (1773 to 1809)* (Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, 1957), pp. 112-13; *A Chronicle of Small Beer: The Early Victorian Diaries of a Hertfordshire Brewer*, ed. Gerald CURTIS (London: Phillimore & Co., 1970), pp. 32, 47, 69, 104.

Appendix 2 Continuity of Landed Families in Brewing, Great Britain and Ireland, 1840-1940

Family	Brewery	Country House	Estate in 1872-83	
			acres	rentals (£)
I. Remained in Brewing Through 1940				
Barclay	Barclay, Perkins & Co. (London)	Bury Hill (Surrey)	1,927	2,141
Bonham-Carter	Pike, Spicer & Co. (Portsmouth)	Adhurst St. Mary (Hampshire)	5,622	6,260
Buckley	Buckley's Brewery Co. (Llanelly)	Brynaerau Castle Castell Gorford (Carmarthenshire)	1,246	1,366
Buxton	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	Easneye (Hertfordshire)	1,809	3,318
Cobbold	Cobbold & Co. (Ipswich)	Hollywells Capel Hall (Suffolk)	1,539	10,702
Fuller	Fuller, Smith & Turner (Chiswick)	Neston Park (Wiltshire)	1,749	3,407
Greenall	Greenall, Whitley & Co. (Warrington, St. Helens)	Walton Hall Daresbury Hall (Cheshire) Waltham House (Leicestershire) Commonside (Lancashire)	1,523	4,602
Greene	Greene, King & Sons (Bury St. Edmunds)	Nether Hall (Suffolk)	711	3,519
Gretton	Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton (Burton)	Stapleford Park (Leicestershire)	2,251	2,938 ^e
Guinness	Arthur Guinness, Son & Co. (Dublin)	Elveden Hall (Suffolk)	ca. 15,000	2,231 ^f
Morrell	Morrell's Trustees (Oxford)	Headington Hill Hall (Oxfordshire) Streatley House (Berkshire)	3,615	10,155
Watney	Watney & Co. (London)	Haling Park (Surrey) Cornbury Park (Oxfordshire)	2,295	4,249
Whitbread	Whitbread & Co. (London)	Southill Park Cardington (Bedfordshire) Purfleet (Essex)	13,829	21,790

Family	Brewery	Country House	Estate in 1872-83	
			acres	rentals (£)
Younger	George Younger & Sons	Leckie (Stirlingshire)	unknown	
Younger	William Younger & Co. (Edinburgh)	Benmore (Argyllshire)	ca. 100,000	— ^g
II. Eldest Son Withdrew from Brewing				
Allsopp ^a	Samuel Allsopp & Sons (Burton)	Hindlip Hall (Worcestershire)	2,522	5,159
Best ^a	Best (Chatham)	Boxley Lodge Park House Rome House Chatham House (Kent)	1,831	7,037
Buxton ^b	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	Bellfield (Dorsetshire) Runton (Norfolk)	3,160	4,769
Buxton ^b	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	Fox Warren (Surrey)	961	1,580
Combe ^b	Combe & Co. (London)	Pierrepont (Surrey)	1,500	— ^h
Cozens- ^a Hardy	Cozens-Hardy & Son (Letheringsett)	Letheringsett Hall Cley Hall (Norfolk)	2,929	3,764
Fordham ^b	E. K. & H. Fordham (Ashwell)	Ashwell Bury (Hertfordshire)	1,103	2,884
Guinness ^b	Arthur Guinness, Son & Co. (Dublin)	Ashford (Galway) St. Anne's (Dublin)	31,342	6,573
Lacon ^b	E. Lacon & Co. (Yarmouth)	Ormesby Hall (Norfolk)	1,032	1,966
Pryor ^b	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	High Elms (Hertfordshire)	851	1,468
Pryor ^a	Baldock	Clay Hall (Hertfordshire)	over 500	— ⁱ
Usborne ^{a,c}	Writtle Brewery Co. (Writtle)	Blackrock (Cork) Writtle (Essex)	4,154	5,408
Walker	Peter Walker & Son (Warrington, Burton)	Gateacre (Lancashire)	ca. 5,000	— ^j
Younger ^b	William Younger & Co. (Edinburgh)	Auchen Castle (Dumfriesshire)	2,965	3,280

Family	Brewery	Country House	Estate in 1872-83	
			acres	rentals (£)
III. Failure of Eldest Son to Produce Male Heir				
Coope	Ind, Coope & Co. (Romford, Burton)	Berechurch Hall Rochetts (Essex)	3,621	5,994
Hardy ^b	Hardy (Letheringsett)	Letheringsett Hall Cley Hall (Norfolk)	2,929	3,764 ^k
Hobhouse	Whitbread & Co. (London)	Chantry House (Wiltshire) Westbury College (Gloucestershire)	unknown	
Meux	Meux's Brewery (London)	Theobold's Park (Hertfordshire)	15,110	23,507
Morrell ^{b,c}	Morrell's Brewery (Oxford)	Headington Hill Hall (Oxfordshire) Streatley House (Berkshire)	3,615	10,155
Shaw- Lefevre	Whitbread & Co. (London)	Heckfield Place (Hampshire)	2,388	3,008
IV. Estate Inherited by Female				
Bass ^b	Bass, Ratcliff & Gretton (Burton)	Rangemore Hall (Staffordshire)	2,283	17,317
Thwaites ^b	Thwaites & Co. (Blackburn)	Freeby (Leicestershire) Billinge Scarr Woodfold Park (Lancashire)	4,569	24,828
V. Estate Sold While Family Still in Brewing				
D'Arcy	John D'Arcy & Sons (Dublin)	Clonmines (Wexford) Kilcrouney (Wicklow) Inch House (Kilkenny)	2,243	1,436
Deakin	Manchester Brewing Co. (Manchester)	Moseley Park (Cheshire) Werrington Park (Cornwall)	4,457	25,250
Hall	Hall's Oxford Brewery (Oxford)	Barton Abbey (Oxfordshire)	2,470	4,228

Family	Brewery	Country House	Estate in 1872-83	
			acres	rentals (£)
Hanbury	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	Poles (Hertfordshire)	2,351	4,280
Marjoribanks ^d	Meux's Brewery (London)	Guisachan (Inverness-shire) Hutton Hall (Northumberland)	23,246	9,146
Pryor	Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. (London, Burton)	Hylands (Essex)	3,255	4,975

Sources: *Burke's Landed Gentry*; *Burke's Peerage and Baronetage*; Edward WALFORD, *The County Families of the United Kingdom*; G. E. C., *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom* (London: St. Catherine Press, 1912); John BATEMAN, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (London: Harrison, 1883); *Return of Owners of Land*, in *Parliamentary Papers*, 1874 (C. 1097), LXXII; *Directory of Directors*, 1890-1960; *Dod's Parliamentary Companion*, 1845-80; *Financial Reform Almanack*, 1871-94; "Brewery Companies' Shareholders", *Brewers' Journal*, 15 December 1894, 15 January and 15 February 1895; *Kelley's Directory of Cheshire*, 1906. Information on specific families has been obtained from sources cited elsewhere in this article and in the author's doctoral dissertation, Appendix III. In addition, see John PUDNEY, *A Draught of Contentment: The Story of the Courage Group* (London: New English Library, 1971); Alan GALL, *Manchester Breweries of Times Gone By* (Swinton: Neil Richardson, 1982); T. Callan MACARDLE and Walter CALLAN, "The Brewing Industry in Ireland", in *Ireland: Industrial and Agricultural*, ed. William P. COYNE (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1902), pp. 451-93; H. S. CORRAN, "Brewing, Malting and Distilling", in *The Liberties of Dublin*, ed. Elgy GILLESPIE (Dublin: E. & T. O'Brien, 1973), pp. 88-92; *Victoria County History of Hertfordshire* (London: Archibald & Co., 1912), III: 203 (on the Fordham family); *Victoria County History of Hampshire* (London: Archibald Constable & Co., 1908), III: 87, 113 (on the Bonham-Carter family); Daniel Thwaites's will (d. 1888).

^a Brewery sold.

^b Brewery remained in family under direction of other relatives.

^c Country house inherited by daughter.

^d No male heir.

^e Estate purchased in 1894 (*Kelley's Directory of Leicestershire*, 1899).

^f Estate purchased in 1894 (Clive ASLET, *The Last Country Houses* [London: Yale University Press, 1982], p. 56; *Kelley's Directory of Suffolk*, 1900).

^g Estate purchased after 1883 (David KEIR, *The Younger Centuries: The Story of William Younger & Co. Ltd., 1749-1949* [Edinburgh: McLagan & Cumming, 1951], p. 87).

^h This figure appears in Hurford JANES (*The Red Barrel: A History of Watney Mann* [London: John Murray, 1963], p. 120), though the parliamentary return listed 717 acres with rentals of £577.

ⁱ Despite the estate's size, the family was accepted as gentry (*A Chronicle of Small Beer: The Early Victorian Diaries of a Hertfordshire Brewer*, ed. Gerald CURTIS [London: Phillimore & Co., 1970], p. 7).

^j Estate purchased in the 1880s (Alfred BARNARD, *The Noted Breweries of Great Britain and Ireland*, 4 vols. [London: Sir Joseph & Sons, 1889-91], II: 97).

^k The Cozens inherited the estate and brewery through marriage on William Hardy's death in 1842 (Basil COZENS-HARDY, *The History of Letheringsett in the County of Norfolk with Extracts from the Diary of Mary Hardy [1773 to 1808]* [Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, 1957], pp. 115-16).