

Elite Women and the Agricultural Landscape, 1700–1830

Briony McDonagh

First published 2018

ISBN: 978-1-4094-5602-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-57907-8 (ebk)

Chapter 3 Managing the estate

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

3 Managing the estate

When Elizabeth Allanson inherited property in Leicestershire from her father William Aislabie in 1781, she quickly appointed an agent, Christopher Hall, to manage the estates. Hall and his successor let the farms, dealt with the tenants and led improvement on the estate, all with relatively little input from Allanson.¹ She was then a relatively mature widow of 55 who also seems to have relied on a series of land agents in the management of her much larger estate at Studley Royal (North Yorkshire) (Figure 3.1), though her activities here were undoubtedly limited by restrictive clauses in her father's will relating to the felling of timber trees and the acquisition and disposal of land.² Nevertheless, Allanson was said to have 'seldom resided at Studley' but instead spent much of her time at her Twickenham villa.³ Clearly, ownership did not always equate with control, and women – like men – sometimes left the management of their estates in the hands of a steward. Other women appointed male relatives to oversee their estates and other financial dealings. When Mark Kirkby Esq. of Sledmere (ERY) died intestate in 1748 his estate was split between his one surviving sister – the widowed Isabel Collings – his nephew and his two nieces.⁴ Collings' share of the Kirkby inheritance brought her an average of just over £1,200 a year between 1751 and 1759, yet she apparently played little part in administering the estate.⁵ Her nephew Richard Sykes – who had inherited the main house at Sledmere – collected her rents, organised for repairs and invested her profits in various bonds and mortgages, including loans he made to himself and his brother. She signed off the accounts annually but took little more than an occasional £100 cash payment from the profits, eventually bequeathing most of the estate and investments to Richard and his brother the Reverend Mark Sykes.⁶

Yet while Collings clearly had no day-to-day involvement in managing her share of the Kirkby estates, significant numbers of propertied women were energetic and dedicated estate managers. Using material drawn from across eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England, this chapter charts single, widowed and married women's contribution to estate management. It explores women's role in the financial management of landed estates as well as other more 'hands on' aspects of estate management, including setting and collecting rents, negotiating with tenants about rent, tenancies and repairs, supervising home farms, managing timber resources and otherwise determining estate policy.



Figure 3.1 Studley Park, Yorkshire, by J. P. Neale, 1819–1823. The Studley estate was the property of two female landowners in succession. Elizabeth Allanson and her niece Elizabeth Sophia Lawrence held the estate for almost 65 years between them, but exhibited very different attitudes to estate management (on Lawrence, see Chapter 5).

It also investigates the division of responsibility between landowning women and their estate staff – particularly their stewards and land agents – and between the women and the men in their lives, whether they were husbands, sons, nephews or more distant male relatives.

Estate accounting

While the involvement of middle-class women in business accounting has been increasingly acknowledged in recent years, the contribution of elite women to estate accounting has received far less attention.⁷ Yet some elite women kept very detailed estate accounts, rentals and ledgers. One such woman was Lady Elizabeth Dryden, a moderately wealthy widow who managed the Canons Ashby estate in Northamptonshire between 1770 and 1791. Despite an avowed dislike of writing letters, the accounts are written in her hand and cover the entire period of her management.⁸ In one book she recorded her annual outgoings against her yearly income, including her tenants' rents and the sums she raised from the sale of underwood, bark and hay from the home farm and woods. Another book for

the same period was organised by tenant rather than by year, and recorded the rents paid to her on a half-yearly basis, along with various memoranda concerning their tenancies.⁹ Her writing became increasingly untidy as she grew older, but she still kept her accounts even as an old woman. We know from a letter written to her niece that she suffered a stroke in 1790, and the shaky, almost illegible handwriting of the final year's entry demonstrates that she wrote it after her stroke. This is testimony to Dryden's sheer determination to record and audit the estate finances, but also definitive evidence that she kept her own accounts rather than relying on her steward.

While the two account books for Canons Ashby were written by Dryden in her widowhood, Elizabeth Hood of Butleigh Wootton (Somerset) kept the accounts for her modest estate not just as a widow but also as a young unmarried woman and a wife. Aged just 18, Hood inherited the Wootton estate from her father John Periam (d. 1788) and later married Alexander Hood, a captain in the Royal Navy who was killed in command of *HMS Mars* six years later.¹⁰ The estate was a relatively small one: in 1806, the rental brought her just over £1,000 a year, plus smaller sums for bark, corn and livestock and regular dividends from her funds in stocks.¹¹ The core of the estate inherited from her father amounted to no more than 600 acres in 1772, but Hood spent more than £11,000 on purchasing land and houses in the neighbourhood, and her son's portion of the estate amounted to nearly 1,700 acres in 1846.¹² She was thus at the lower reaches of the gentry and a relatively small landowner compared with many of the women discussed in the book.

The account book which she inherited with the estate had been started by her father in 1745 and used to record his annual rental, receipts and disbursements alongside various memoranda. Periam also left her a smaller notebook in which he recorded his expenses at university and the Inns of Court in the 1730s, along with details of his purchases in the neighbourhood of Wootton and his improvements to the house and estate. Hood continued her father's account and memoranda books, keeping the receipts and disbursements until 1808 – by which time she had filled the volume and presumably started a new, now lost, account book – and adding notes about her own purchases and improvements. Her husband's poor health meant that he spent the first few years of their marriage with her in Somerset, but – having established a separate estate in her property prior to their 1792 marriage – it was her who kept the estate accounts.

Entries in the account book suggest that she had begun to keep the accounts prior to her father's death in late 1788. A rental of 1786 was written into the book by Hood, then 16, in the neat, overly elaborate handwriting of a teenager. She began keeping receipts and disbursements in August 1787, though her father continued to add occasional items to the accounts most notably in the spring of 1788.¹³ The decision to turn the account book over to Hood probably reflects her father's failing health, but presumably also the desire by an elderly estate owner – Periam was then 74 – to ensure that his young heiress knew how to manage the estate and keep the necessary financial records. Her only brother had died before her own birth and Hood was brought up as the heiress to the estate, but we can

only guess at exactly what lessons her father provided for her. She was certainly sent to Wells School from the age of 10 and given his early training in the Law, her father was presumably able to impart something of the legal knowledge necessary to run a small landed estate. Sometime later Hood wrote a few lines in the front cover of the account book, perhaps reflecting the lessons her father had taught her as a young woman:

Keep your accounts clear,
Throughout the year;
Let no mistake be made,
Either in paying, or pay'd.¹⁴

Hood's accounts were relatively simple charge and discharge accounts, but other women utilized much more complex systems of accounting in managing their estates. Elizabeth Prowse – a widow who controlled a 2,200 acre estate at Wicken (Northamptonshire) for over 40 years between 1767 and 1810 – instituted a sophisticated system of estate accounting on her modestly sized estate. The three surviving ledgers cover the periods 1768–1771 and 1774–1784, and include what might be broadly thought of as personal, household and estate accounts. They begin in May 1768, nine months after her husband's death, and the first year's entries are in a hand other than Prowse's, almost certainly that of her brother James Sharp. It was for Sharp that Prowse acted as housekeeper in London before her marriage, and it seems likely that he returned the favour by helping her to manage the estate and keep her accounts in the first year of her widowhood.¹⁵ Sharp planned the layout of the ledger, writing the headings for each section of the accounts and ruling the pages. Yet by May 1769, Prowse had assumed full responsibility for keeping the estate, household and personal accounts, and the remainder of the ledgers are written in her hand (Figure 3.2). Despite some early confusion about exactly what should be entered where, the ledgers represent a highly organised and methodical record of the estate's finances on a par with – or even superior to – many of the accounts kept by estate stewards.¹⁶

The accounts demonstrate elements of double-entry bookkeeping. Prowse referred to the accounts as 'ledgers', used the terminology of debtor/creditor and treated the home farm, stable, house and estate as separate financial entities, so that produce from the farm that was used in the house or stables appears as a debit in one account and a credit in the other. Many of the items in the accounts were carefully cross-referenced against other entries in the volume as well as with a series of cash books, only one of which now survives.¹⁷ Prowse was meticulous in ensuring that entries were made under the correct heading: when in 1776, she forgot to charge hay produced on the farm to the coach horse stables where it had been eaten, she chastised herself for her mistake, writing in her ledger that 'next year I must be more particular & have an account what is used in that stable'.¹⁸ That the accounts were organised in this way is perhaps not surprising given that it was her brother James Sharp – the owner of an

Expenses of the Farm in hand

1769			
May 22.	of new Gleed for 25 sheep in Oct. 19. 1768 -	26	6
	Cutting Chaff for the Cart Horses -	5	41
	John Green & Ed Albury Wages by the week for a Cart Horse at Newport Fair -	15	3
	Mich ^l Gayton for attending the Lamb -	12	15
	Cutting Chaff for the Cart Horses -	1	
	to the Collemaker for a new set of Collets & harness for two Cart Horses at Northampton Fair -	2	1
	To John Green a bill when out with his Horses -	10	19
	Stocking Roots -	35	12
	Cutting Chaff for the Cart Horses -		17
	for Grapeseeds -	X	8
	to M ^r Pittley for a pair of Oxen		6
July 1	to Mich ^l Green for Shaving the Sheep	31	3
	Hay Makers	6	15
	Do		11
	Do	7	7
	John Green & Ed Albury & Tho ^s Chapman wages by the week in part -	5	4
	21 To Charles Bavin for sheelching the hay Rick	4	17
	The Workmen for the Hay -	50	6
	29 The Workmens Wages for the Farme in part -	3	1
	W ^m Bavin Cutting Chaff -	5	4
August 5	Workmens wages -	7	
	Cutting Chaff -	5	8
	26 for a pair of Oxen at Northampton -	3	6
Sep 2	The Mens Wages in the Corne harvest Month	26	
	John Green for Rakes & Seales -	13	19
	Thatching the Corne Ricks -		6
	John Bavin for bird keeping nine Days -		10
	9 Workmen -		5
	16 Do -	5	2
	20 for a Horse at Northampton which M ^{rs} M ^r Mother gave for it so need not be accounted for in this place -	5	6
	23 The Workmen -	5	8
	Carry'd Forward	201	15

Figure 3.2 A page from the ledgers of Elizabeth Prowse (NRO, 364p/67). Note the page header in a different hand to Prowse's and her correction at the bottom of the page. Reproduced with permission.

iron manufactory in London – who set up her accounts and that traders were, according to accounting historians like John Richard Edwards, more likely to use double-entry bookkeeping than landowners and stewards.¹⁹

Prowse also audited the accounts kept by the estate steward, housekeeper and cook, copying the entries from their cash books into her own ledger and again cross-referencing the items against the entries in the general, cottage and estate accounts.²⁰ Rather than being professional land agents employed by a London firm, Prowse's stewards were local men who lived either in rooms above the stables or on one of the estate farms.²¹ In other words, it was clearly Prowse, rather than her steward, who had overall control of the estate and its finances, even if her senior servants regularly took over the day-to-day management of the house and estate whilst she visited friends and family in the capital and elsewhere. Thus the surviving ledgers and notebooks provide excellent evidence of the seriousness with which Prowse approached the task of managing the estate, and of her close personal scrutiny of the accounts.

Financial oversight and innovation

Both charge–discharge accounts and double-entry bookkeeping allowed the landowner to check the steward's honesty and effectiveness and thus safeguard her interests. Even where propertied women did not themselves keep the accounts, they often checked over and signed off accounts kept by their steward or land agent. Thus Olivia Bernard Sparrow, Mary Vere Hunt, Anna Maria Agar, Amabel Hume-Campbell and Elizabeth Somerset, duchess of Beaufort all audited accounts kept on their behalf by stewards or estate agents, typically adding their signature to the final page of each years' accounts.²² Careful scrutiny of the accounts helped to identify dishonesty on the part of the estate stewards and allowed women to take action against them. Thus, for example, Elizabeth Montagu dismissed her Northumberland agent in 1786 after financial irregularities were revealed in the accounts, as did Anna Maria Agar in the early 1830s.²³ Mary Clarke and Olivia Bernard Sparrow both sacked agents or bailiffs under suspicion of defrauding the estate, with Sparrow accusing one of her agents of stealing £7,000 from her and falsifying the wood and manorial accounts to cover his tracks.²⁴

Yet these financial records were also crucial documents for a second notion of accountability: they helped a female landowner to account to her heir and wider family for her management of the estate, acting as both a record of her achievements on the estate and a justification of her decision-making.²⁵ It is clear that these women intended their accounts to act as a record for future generations of landowners and stewards. As well as writing the estate ledgers, Prowse kept detailed notebooks in which she recorded various memoranda about Wicken and the neighbouring Grafton Park estate, held in turn by her mother-in-law and two sisters-in-law Mrs Mary Rogers and Lady Elizabeth Mordaunt. The notebooks were apparently written in c. 1801–1803 with a few entries added later. The longer Wicken notebook includes a list of presentations to the living and ownership

of the manor 1218–1806, as well as notes on taxes, quit rents and other payments charged on the estates, notes on common rights in Whittlewood Forest, a description of beating the parish bounds, and an account of bread and cake to be distributed by the rector on Cross Monday and Holy Thursday.²⁶ Perhaps the best example of a note made explicitly to be of use to future landowners comes from the Grafton Park notebook. Here Prowse included a memorandum about a game deputation, followed by the note that,

Tho I suppose Mr Rogers & my Sister has made Memorandums of every thing respecting this affair, I have named it here, as Grafton now Sir John Mordaunts in case, he should think it right to have any further Notice or Security.²⁷

Elizabeth Hood seems to have ascribed a similar function to the account and memorandum books she inherited from her father. Along with details of her children's education and family births, marriages and deaths, the books include notes on purchases and estate improvements, land exchanged, trees planted, land in hand, the terms of new leases, lists of commoners and an estate survey. All were clearly written for the benefit both of herself and her son, Sir Alexander Hood, who also added occasional memoranda to the books during his mother's lifetime.²⁸ Jane More Molyneux too was a committed accountant, keeping the household and estate accounts for Loseley Park (Surrey) throughout the 1770s and 1780s and writing huge numbers of notes and memoranda on a range of topics relating to the house and estate. These included lists of repairs, trees blown down, timber cut down, heriots due to her and suspected encroachments on the estate, as well as detailed instructions for maintaining the house and gardens, cleaning the paintings and sourcing food for the household. She also carefully filed the various bills and receipts that corresponded to the items entered into the account books. One volume contained 'An account of repairs done at Losely [since] it came into my possession' which she said was kept only 'for my own perusal and satisfaction', although most of the accounts and memoranda were clearly intended to be of use to future landowners and estate managers.²⁹

Dryden, Hood, Prowse and Molyneux all kept their own estate accounts, but other – often much wealthier – women also had input into the financial management of estates even where the day-to-day management of their property was undertaken by estate stewards. Thus Elizabeth Somerset, duchess of Beaufort maintained a careful oversight of finances on two large estates in the second half of the eighteenth century. The first was centred on Badminton (Gloucestershire) but included land in Wiltshire, London and elsewhere and was owned by her husband the 4th duke of Beaufort. He died in 1756, leaving her with a 12-year-old son for whom she was appointed guardian and four daughters. The estate was placed in the hands of trustees but, as guardian to the 5th duke and with her own brother as principal trustee, the duchess seems to have played a leading role in administering the estate during the minority. In her role as guardian, the duchess kept detailed accounts of her son's expenses at Westminster School as well as a more general cash book for his estate, both of which she kept in duplicate.³⁰

As part of a wider overhaul of the estate finances, the duchess also seems to have initiated a reorganisation of the estate accounts, establishing a format for the Badminton rentals which lasted well into the nineteenth century. Robert Croucher had been Badminton steward from at least 1740 but, in 1760, three years into the duchess's guardianship, the estate accounts were restructured. In deciding on the new format, the duchess apparently took advice from other landowners and two specimen rentals – one endorsed by the duchess, 'Lord Warwick's specimen of a rental' – survive in the Badminton Muniments at Gloucestershire Archives.³¹ Croucher's reorganised accounts closely followed the form of the specimen rental with the estate disbursements for each manor or township charged directly against the rents and casual profits for that place and the balance noted. This was followed by a general abstract – in effect, a profit and loss account – which collated the expenditure from the separate house, park, garden, farming and planting accounts and charged it against profits of the estate. The resulting balance was recorded and the accounts audited by the family's financial agent Thomas Conway and signed off by Croucher and the duchess.³² The wood accounts which appeared in the pre-1760 rentals were removed to a separate account book, and the steward also kept subsidiary accounts for the house and park, the workmen and garden, the home farm, the deer and his own personal expenses on estate business.³³ Thus the final, fair copies of the accounts were part of an extensive and complex system of bookkeeping which both held the stewards to financial account and provided an overview of estate finances which could be used to improve profits. Importantly, the restructured accounts of 1760 onwards allowed the duchess to see much more clearly which manors were profitable and to check that expenditure on the house, park and garden balanced against the rental income – which it often didn't. The final page of each yearly account explained any difference between the current and last rental, noting the increases or decreases in rent on individual tenanted holdings.

The restructuring of the accounts can be seen as part of a wider attempt to improve finances in the light of significant debts run up by her husband's elder brother, the 3rd duke of Beaufort. The duchess acted alongside the estate's principal trustee – her brother the 4th Lord Botetourt – to reduce debts of nearly £150,000 charged on the estate by the 3rd duke. This was achieved by the sale of property in Devon, Dorset and London as well as by auctioning horses, hounds and deer at Badminton, a programme of sales which reduced outgoings and raised cash while leaving the core of the estate intact.³⁴ The reorganised accounts gave the duchess and her agents a clearer overview of estate spending and allowed them to rein in overspending. By 1766, the estate was again running at a modest profit after 20 years in which expenditure far more often outweighed income than vice versa.³⁵ The 5th duke's estates were not finally settled on him until 1777, but the estate he then controlled was in a much better financial state than it had been in 1756, thanks in great part to the efforts of his mother.

Nor was Badminton the only large landed estate which the duchess played an important role in managing. A few years after her son came of age in 1765, the

duchess inherited the Stoke Gifford estate at the death of her brother Norborne Berkeley, 4th Lord Botetourt (d. 1770). The first few half-yearly accounts – referred to in the estate office as ‘rentals’ – were sent out to her on the Continent to audit, but by autumn 1774 she was back in London where she signed off several of the previous years’ accounts, styling herself Elizabeth Beaufort Botetourt.³⁶ By 1777, the steward was sending her a weekly account along with the relevant vouchers which she audited and sometimes annotated before sending back for him to enter into the rental. She seems to have taken an active interest in the financial management of the estate, pointing out errors and discrepancies in the weekly accounts and querying individual items.³⁷ She also carefully labelled the bills, memoranda and other loose papers sent to her by the stewards.³⁸ The duchess drew on her previous experience managing a large agricultural property and as at Badminton a decade earlier, the estate rentals were reorganised shortly after she inherited the estate. The new format was used from 1771 – the first year’s accounts drawn up for the duchess – and was based on that introduced by her at Badminton. As had been the case after the death of the 4th duke of Beaufort in 1756, the estate steward at Stoke was a long-serving employee of the Berkeley family who stayed in his job under the new landowner but adopted a revised format for the accounts.³⁹ Thus while she did not personally keep the estate accounts, the duchess did maintain a careful oversight of the estate finances as well as being responsible for changes in accounting practice on both the Badminton and the Stoke Gifford estates, themselves part of a wider attempt to improve estate finances and clear significant debts.⁴⁰

Estate management

Elite women’s contribution to the financial apparatus which allowed landed estates to function could be significant. The examples discussed here reveal a great deal about the careful supervision of estate business exhibited by propertied women as well as their solid understanding of estate matters. Bookkeeping was of course mostly something which could be done from the house or nearby estate offices: it did not necessarily require women to directly supervise the agricultural elements of estate business. Yet many elite women did involve themselves in the more practical aspects of estate management, stepping out of the house and walking over the home farm, fields and estate woodlands in order to offer hands-on management of these aspects of the estate economy. The remainder of this chapter focuses on elite women’s contribution to running home farms and tenant farms, their negotiations with tenants about issues such as rent, tenancy agreements and repairs, and their management of timber resources. It pays particular attention to their role in decision-making, carefully exploring the personal and professional relationships between propertied women and their agents, their male relatives – including fathers, husbands and sons – and their heirs.

When Anna Maria Agar (née Hunt) (Figure 3.3) inherited the Lanhydrock estate in Cornwall from her uncle George Hunt in 1798, the estate was heavily encumbered. The debts ran to around £68,000 – equivalent today to somewhere in

excess of £6,000,000 – and most of her uncle’s personal wealth was bequeathed not to her but to his sister’s family in Cheshire.⁴¹ Like the duchess of Beaufort at Badminton, Agar worked hard to clear the debts she inherited, living with her mother in London to save money and declining to support a local Whig MP because of the expense involved.⁴² Yet despite spending much of the year nearly 250 miles away in the capital, Agar was intimately involved in estate affairs in Cornwall. Within six weeks of her uncle’s death, she had issued a detailed list of instructions to the estate steward. These reveal her already considerable knowledge of the property as well as her determination to immediately gain an overview of those areas of estate policy and management with which she was not yet familiar, particularly with regards to leases and land recently sold. She was keen to maximise estate incomes – stipulating, for example, that timber not capable of improvement should be sold – but also willing to experiment in the name of improvement, specifying that 10 acres in the park were to be ploughed up ‘as a trial’.⁴³ Thereafter she maintained a regular correspondence with the senior estate steward and the Lanhydrock steward, sending detailed replies to their letters which often asked further questions and carefully endorsing the letters she received with notes on their contents.⁴⁴

Six years later, at the relatively late age of 33, Anna Maria Hunt (as she then was) married Charles Bagenal Agar, the youngest son of the 1st Viscount Clifden. Their marriage settlement ceded the Lanhydrock estate to her husband for life, but provided for £20,000 to be raised from the estate for improvements and other expenses plus £1,000 per annum to be paid to Agar independently of her husband.⁴⁵ Charles Agar paid almost £7,000 from his Kilkenny estates and savings as a first instalment on the estate’s debts, a reversal of the common situation whereby the dowry of a wife was used to pay off her husband’s debts. The remainder of the debts were to be paid from the profits of the mines in instalments determined by the trustees to the marriage settlement, and the final instalment of £4,800 was paid in 1812, the year after her husband’s death.⁴⁶ To clear such significant debts on the estate within 15 years of inheriting it was a significant achievement for Agar. Throughout her 40-year widowhood, she continued to invest in and improve Lanhydrock with a particular view to the inheritance she would eventually pass on to her only surviving son. By the 1820s, the estate was turning a regular profit, and when a £700 remittance was lost in 1840, Agar’s financial situation was so greatly improved she could afford to be fairly relaxed about it: as she noted her son, ‘I am not now at all poor ... But I should like to know its fate’.⁴⁷

Other propertied women too were intimately involved in the day-to-day management of their estates, working alongside their bailiff or steward to negotiate agreements and leases, find farmers for vacant tenancies and arrange for repairs. Mary Clarke (née Jepp) was one such woman. Her father had died when she was a small child, leaving her property in West Ham (Essex) to which her grandmother later added an annuity of £400.⁴⁸ In 1675 she married Edward Clarke of Chipley (Somerset), a landowner, barrister and MP who spent most of next 30 years in London on business. While her husband was in the capital, Mary



Figure 3.3 Anna Maria Hunt, *Mrs Agar* (1771–1861), by George Romney and Studio, 1792–1793. © National Trust Images/John Hammond.

oversaw the upbringing of their eight children, nursed his Taunton constituency and managed the Chipley estate.⁴⁹ While she was assisted by the estate steward John Spreat, the family letters nevertheless make it clear that she played a leading role in decision-making at Chipley, actively searching for tenants for the farms, negotiating with tenant farmers about converting their annual tenancies

to longer-term leases and pursuing them for their rents when they failed to pay.⁵⁰ Clarke seems to have acted fairly independently of her husband in negotiating the terms of tenancies, writing to him in 1690 to outline her agreement with the local miller, noting that 'I have made the bargin in my name which I believe you will not faile to laugh att'.⁵¹ She also organised repairs to the tenants' farms, writing to her husband in 1697 to complain about the cost and trouble of it, as well as trying to encourage the farmers to introduce improvements and adopt the latest ley crops.⁵²

The Chipley farmers seem to have paid their rents to the steward Spreat rather than directly to the Clarkes, an arrangement which was probably in place on most landed estates, whether owned by men or women.⁵³ On some estates, the tenants paid their rents at a formal audit overseen by the steward or agent, which was sometimes followed by a rent dinner. There is little in the archival materials or newspaper sources consulted here to suggest that propertied women commonly attended rent dinners.⁵⁴ In this, they acted in much the same way as their male peers, most of whom did not personally attend rent audits and dinners. That said, some women clearly chose to stay in the country whilst their audits took place. Thus, for example, Jane Ashley of Ashby St Ledgers (Northamptonshire) delayed a visit to London in 1761 in order to receive her rents and settle her affairs in the country, though it was probably her legal agent who actually collected the money from the farmers.⁵⁵ Elizabeth Prowse too was almost always at Wicken for her twice-yearly rent days, as careful cross-referencing of her account books and memoirs reveals. Prowse collected the rents from both the Wicken farmers and the tenants on her mother-in-law's estate at Grafton, carefully recording the rents received in her cash book and estate ledger as well as noting the sum which she subsequently sent to her mother-in-law at Berkeley (Somerset).⁵⁶ It was clearly the estate steward Joseph Foxley who oversaw most of the rent audits, but the rents are occasionally entered straight from the cash book to the estate accounts, thus by-passing Foxley's account and suggesting that it was sometimes Prowse herself who met with the farmers to receive their rents.⁵⁷ This, once again, demonstrates the careful supervision of estate business offered by these women.

As well as overseeing the collection of rents, women like Clarke, Prowse and Hood closely supervised the home farms on their estates. Clarke carefully questioned the bailiff about the livestock sold at market and regularly wrote to her husband to report on farm business.⁵⁸ By April 1696 she had suspicions that the bailiff was dishonest and when he was sacked at her instigation later in the year, she took on the role herself, noting in the October that 'I begin to be very busie in my new office of head bayliff and my under officer John [Spreat] is very diligent yet in setting all things in the proper place'.⁵⁹ Entries in Elizabeth Hood's account books recording the purchase of livestock, plough gear and oats along with the sale of sheep, oxen, cattle, wheat and beans reveal her intimate involvement in running the home farm at Butleigh Wootton.⁶⁰ Elizabeth Prowse too kept a watchful eye on the Wicken home farm, somewhat unusually charging herself an annual rent for the tenancy and keeping detailed accounts of her receipts and

expenditure, and itemising the money she made from the sale of butter, eggs, livestock, grain, hay, wool and tallow. Some of the produce was sold to local farmers, and the rest consumed in the house and stables, all of which was carefully charged to the appropriate accounts elsewhere in her ledgers.⁶¹ Prowse's experimentation on both the home farm and the wider estate at Wicken is discussed further in Chapter 4, but the three examples given here are indicative of the practical, day-to-day involvement in running home farms exhibited by some female landowners.

Nor was it only the agricultural aspects of estate management over which elite women maintained careful oversight. Timber and woodland too required their attention. The duchess of Beaufort was careful to preserve and protect the estate woodlands at Badminton and Stoke, while Anna Maria Agar was actively involved in woodland management at Lanhydrock.⁶² In her first instructions to the steward, Agar stipulated that the timber on the estate not capable of improvement should be sold. Two years later, there was significant planting of timber being undertaken with oak, ash and beech said to be planted wherever there was room.⁶³ Agar was apparently keen to quickly commence with the planting but the steward reigned-in her enthusiasm, insisting that it was wasteful to plant new trees while the labourers were still clearing the old timber.⁶⁴ The new plantations were part of a more general attempt to maximise estate incomes – in large part necessitated by the huge debts on the estate – and were matched by efforts to avoid paying tithes on old woodland.⁶⁵ Timber and other wood products produced a moderate but fairly reliable income for the estate: receipts varied considerably year by year, but between 1821 and 1830 sales of timber, bark and faggots produced an average of more than £118 a year.⁶⁶

Such a rapidly issued set of instructions as Agar sent can have left the estate staff in Cornwall in little doubt as to exactly the kind of engaged landowner she intended to be. Agar was extremely keen to understand the workings of her Cornish estates, and the estate steward William Jenkin was happy to instruct her in the intricacies of issuing leases for lives, writing in February 1799,

I wish to give every assistance in my power at all times, in order to thy becoming fully and completely mistress of the whole business in calculating and ascertaining the sum proper to be demanded for adding or changing lives on all tenements in thy manors.⁶⁷

Agar had not grown up on the estate, nor did she spend more than a few weeks of every year at Lanhydrock. As such, she was necessarily reliant on her stewards' local knowledge of the estate's geography and people. He also provided valuable information about local customary practice, arguing that in determining the value of leases Agar must 'conform to the accustomed usage of the different parts of the County in which such estates may happen to lie'.⁶⁸ Yet she quickly cultivated an encyclopaedic knowledge of estate matters and maintained tight control of all aspects of estate management and policy throughout her life, despite continuing to be non-resident for much of the year.

Propertied women and estate stewards

The relationships between propertied women and their estate stewards are worthy of exploring in detail here. Most landowners – both male and female – ran their estates in conjunction with either an estate steward or a land agent. Stewards often lived on the estate, while agents might be either a local solicitor who may or may not have worked exclusively for the estate or a professional man from a firm of London land agents like Kent, Claridge and Pearce.⁶⁹ The precise division of responsibilities between propertied women and their agents is often difficult to pin down, something equally true of male landowners' relationships with their agents.⁷⁰ Much of the negotiation over the respective roles of landowners and agents was probably conducted in face-to-face interviews rather than written down, but occasionally documents survive which tell us something of the division of responsibilities between them. Elizabeth Prowse's ledgers make it clear that her steward Foxley's responsibilities included managing the home farm, collecting rents, paying taxes, tithes and other charges on the estate, and overseeing and paying the workmen employed in improvements to the park, woods, estate cottages and tenant farms.⁷¹ Prowse sometimes collected the rents herself, and she certainly maintained close oversight of the estate finances, copying the accounts written by her steward and principal servants into her own ledgers. As Chapter 4 will demonstrate, it was also Prowse rather than her agent who was responsible for introducing new ideas and new technologies to Wicken and it was she who was the ultimate decision-maker on the estate.

Much the same was true at Loseley Park (Surrey) where the landowner Jane More Molyneux wrote a detailed memorandum outlining the duties of her agent. He was to receive the rents, draw up leases and let the farms, pay the workmen and arrange for repairs of the farms and two local bridges. The home farm and demesne was leased out so he had no extra responsibilities there, but when Molyneux was absent from Loseley he was to pay the servants, liaise with the gardener about his account and look over the main house to 'see if anything is likely to fall that might be prevented'. The house was clearly in a ruinous state: as Molyneux noted, 'the buildings are very old ... [and] require to be overlooked sometimes to prevent a great expense!'.⁷² There was no suggestion in the memorandum that the agent might attempt to improve agriculture on the tenant farms, and he was in fact given very little scope for decision-making except on the question of repairs.

A similar division of responsibility between landowner and estate agent was in evidence a few years later at Aynho (Northamptonshire). A memorandum written in 1801 by Robert Weston, the land agent for the Cartwright estate at Aynho, made reference to an earlier agreement between himself and Mary Cotterel, the mother of the young Cartwright heir. She was the widow of Thomas Cartwright, a MP's son whose family had held the manor of Aynho since the early seventeenth century, along with property in the surrounding townships, in Oxfordshire and in Surrey. Thomas died in his mid-thirties, leaving his widow to care for their young daughters and baby son, William Ralph Cartwright. Mary

remarried, and she and her new husband Sir Stephen Cotterel managed the estate as trustees during her son's long minority.⁷³ Weston was appointed in the year of the Cotterels' marriage and, for an annual salary of £150 and a house, he agreed to 'receive all the rents, superintend all repairs, pay & discharge all bills, state half yearly accounts of the same, and give all due attention to the Estate upon necessary occasions'.⁷⁴ As agent, he was clearly responsible for the day-to-day management of the Cartwright estates, with Mary Cotterel receiving reports from him and issuing instructions much as wealthy male landowners would have done.⁷⁵ Yet it was undoubtedly Cotterel who was the main decision-maker on issues of improvement (on which see Chapter 4).

These are just three examples of the way propertied women and estate stewards or agents worked together to manage landed estates. Both landowners and agents might bring new ideas and agricultural methods to an estate. There was, of course, a great diversity of experience. As the opening paragraphs of the chapter made clear, some propertied women had little to do with managing their estates, but women like Agar, Prowse and Cotterel were all very hands-on landowners, no less informed about and involved in estate management for being women. It is clear that propertied women sometimes knew their own estates much better than their agents did. When the legal agent and solicitor of Elizabeth Knight of Chawton (Hampshire) wrote in 1724 advising her to buy out two freeholders and enclose the common at West Dean (West Sussex), she wrote him a reply demonstrating her own intimate knowledge of her property. She thanked him for keeping her affairs in mind and admitted that the enclosure of the common was something 'poor Mr Knight [her dead husband] & I have often talked of', but said that she could not buy one of the freeholds until the title was made secure and that was unlikely to happen soon as the owner and his brother were 'surly cross fellows to deal with'. Instead she had the money ready for the purchase but would for the present 'lie on the watch to attain it'.⁷⁶

Women and their families: married women

Most of the women discussed so far have been either single or widowed women running their own estates or alternatively, widows who as the legal guardians of young sons took on the management of their son's properties. Yet the wives and mothers of landowners also made important contributions to running landed estates, typically either by acting in the landowners' stead whilst he was away on business or pleasure or by acting in partnership with him to manage the estate. Married women's activities on the estate are more difficult to uncover in the archives than those of single or widowed women, in part because under coverture, married women were a legal non-entity and as a result, their husbands' presence in the documents tends to eclipse their presence on the estate. Yet the occasional survival of a large collection of letters or other documents gives us an insight into married women's activities on their husbands' estates. This section of the chapter focuses on aristocratic and gentle women who played a significant role in estate management despite not themselves owning the property, before

moving on to examine some of the other collaborative arrangements regarding estate management and decision-making that are evidenced in the archives. In doing so, it investigates the division of responsibilities between husbands and wives, between mothers and grown-up sons and between aunts and their nephews, and begins to explore some of the ways that marital and familial relationships shaped estate policy and management practices.

As Chapter 2 made clear, as a *feme covert* a married woman could not own property, sign a contract or bring a lawsuit separately to her husband unless a separate estate had been established prior to her marriage. Some women with separate estates continued to manage their property during marriage – Elizabeth Hood, for example, kept the estate accounts for Butleigh Wootton throughout her marriage – while others maintained legal ownership but lost control. Elizabeth Knight's reference to the discussions she had had with her first husband about the enclosure of West Dean signals some of the ways married couples might work together in the management of their estates, yet the experience of her second marriage – as discussed in Chapter 2 – illustrates the difficulties women could face in maintaining control of their property and income even where a separate estate had been established. The story of Mary Eleanor Bowes, heiress of the Bowes estate in County Durham, widow of the 9th earl of Strathmore and savagely abused wife of Andrew Robinson Stoney provides another example of the intense mental and physical pressure wives could come under to give up control of their property and fortunes to their husbands. Having faked his own imminent death in a duel supposedly defending her honour, Stoney tricked Bowes into marrying him. He then forced her to revoke her arrangements for separate estate and subjected her to more than eight years of physical violence and emotional abuse before she finally escaped him and filed for divorce in the London Consistory Court.⁷⁷

Yet if married women with separate estates were sometimes forced to give up the profits of those estates to their husbands, other aristocratic and gentle women seem to have considered themselves landowners even where, under coverture, the property legally belonged to their husbands. Elizabeth Leveson-Gower, countess of Sutherland, and Jemima Yorke, Marchioness Grey, both played a major role in managing and improving their ancestral estates despite the properties legally belonging to their husbands. Both also inherited titles from their fathers or grandfathers which they continued to use in preference to those of their husbands. The countess of Sutherland, for example, inherited a vast estate in the Scottish Highlands as a child in 1771 and later married Earl Gower, himself a major aristocratic landowner from 1803.⁷⁸ Under coverture, the earl was both the landowner and the financier but the countess played a leading role in the management of the Highland estates. As Christine Lodge points out, the countess spent more time in Scotland than the earl and much of the estate correspondence was addressed to her. She also inspected the estate accounts, managed the Scottish agents and read the work of agricultural improvers like Sir John Sinclair and George Dempster.⁷⁹ She was thus a major driving force behind the Clearances which took place on the Sutherland estate from 1807.⁸⁰

Far less controversial than the Highland Clearances was the management of the Grey family inheritance in the English Midlands. In 1740 Jemima Yorke (née Campbell) inherited estates in Bedfordshire, Essex, Herefordshire, Leicestershire, and Wiltshire from her grandfather Henry duke of Kent and Marquess Grey. The previous month she had married Philip Yorke, 2nd earl of Hardwicke, and the couple lived at Wrest Park – the main family seat – for more than 50 years. Under coverture, the estate was legally the earl's, but Wrest was her childhood home and as sole heir to her grandfather's estates and titles, it was she who was head of the Grey family, a position reflected in her title Marchioness Grey. As such, she seems to have played an important part in decisions about the management of the family estates. It was Jemima Yorke, for example, who commissioned Capability Brown to work on the parks at Wrest in 1758 and 1778, as well as at the Yorke family home at Wimpole (Cambridgeshire) in 1769–1772. On all three occasions, it was she rather than her husband who met with Brown, she complaining in 1769 that

Mr Brown has been leading me such a Fairy Circle, and his Magic Wand has raised such Landscapes to the Eye . . . that after having hobbled over rough Ground to Points I had never seen before for two Hours, I return half Tired and half Foot-Sore.⁸¹

At Wrest, Brown created a number of serpentine lakes and new garden buildings in the latest fashion, at the same time as preserving the basic structure and key features of the formal gardens laid out by her grandfather in the early eighteenth century.⁸² Jemima Yorke was conservative too in her attitude towards the family's houses – making few changes either to Wrest Park or the house in St James, and this despite the fact she generally favoured modern rather than old houses – as well as in her estate policy.⁸³ She was, for example, keen to discourage tenants from exchanging land as a means of consolidating their farms and in 1796 sought to delay the enclosure of Harrold, a Bedfordshire parish in which the family owned land.⁸⁴

Yet although Yorke chose not to pursue radical improvements to the house, garden and estate at Wrest, it is nevertheless clear that it was the women who were the decision-makers in the family in both personal and estate matters. When her daughter Amabel Hume-Campbell and her husband Lord Polwarth were looking for a new house in the late 1770s, they specifically sought her advice. As Hume-Campbell subsequently reported to her husband:

The bottom of the matter seems to be that she is pleased you should ask her advice, and yet mortified at that preference over a certain worshipful lord of hers. If you cannot comprehend that, you may refer it to a jury of wives with myself as forewoman.⁸⁵

The correspondence between mother and daughter is full of discussions about the gardens, while that between the earl of Hardwicke and the estate steward Joseph

Pawsey makes little reference to the park and gardens, focusing instead on election business, the local clergy and gamekeeping, with more occasional references to the half-yearly audits, tenancies and estate staff.⁸⁶ Yet if the estate notionally fell within the earl's responsibilities as landowner, he was – like his wife – deeply conservative in his attitude towards the estate and little interested in its management or improvement.⁸⁷ It was not until some years after the deaths of Yorke and her husband that their daughter began to enclose and modernise the Wrest estate.⁸⁸

Another woman extensively involved in the management and improvement of her own childhood home was Lady Anne Grenville, the wife of William Wyndham Grenville, Baron Grenville, and the only daughter of Thomas Pitt, 1st Baron Camelford. She inherited the Pitt family estate at Bocconoc (Cornwall) in 1804 after her brother the 2nd Baron Camelford was killed in a duel. As a married woman, Bocconoc was legally owned by her husband but Anne Grenville played a key role in managing and improving the estate. The voluminous correspondence between Lord and Lady Grenville, and between them and the Cornish estate stewards, provides good evidence of their mutual interest in garden design, as well as the collaborative manner in which husband and wife made decisions about the estate. They regularly sought the other's advice on how best to improve the grounds and each relied on the other to make decisions that needed to be taken on the spot and to relay instructions about the improvements to the estate staff.⁸⁹ Thus, for example, it was her ladyship who helped mark out new plantations at the top of the Park in 1813, but after leaving Bocconoc to visit the spa at Malvern (Worcestershire) she began to have misgivings the shape of the plantations and wrote to her husband in Cornwall to ask him to check the line of the new fence.⁹⁰ Similarly, when the estate manager John Bowen sent a sketch of the new roads to be laid out in the park to Lord Grenville, he explicitly noted he had sent it 'for your Lordship's and Lady Grenville's correction'.⁹¹ At the same time, husband and wife were also improving Dropmore, a small Buckinghamshire estate that Lord Grenville had purchased in 1792 in the year of their marriage. Lord Grenville appears to have taken a lead on the design of the parkland, but his wife was the force behind the formal gardens laid out between 1800 and 1810.⁹² Thus when he wrote to her in April 1803 suggesting a change to a planting scheme, he noted that 'I do not dare do this without orders' and two days later he wrote requesting further instructions about gardens.⁹³

As the example of Lady Anne Grenville demonstrates, some married women also played a major role in estate management where the estate in question came not from their own family but was inherited – or in the case of Dropmore, purchased – by their husbands. Much the same was true at Chipley (Somerset), where Mary Clarke played a leading role in managing her husband's estate – in this case inherited from his stepmother, Elizabeth Clarke (née Lottisham) – for more than three decades at the turn of the eighteenth century.⁹⁴ Clarke recognized his wife's authority in his absence, yet he could often not resist offering his own advice on how best to arrange matters in Somerset. He wrote her detailed instructions about negotiating for new tenants, at the same time as saying he would be content to take 'what ever other summ that you, upon further consultation with

Mr Trott, shall think reasonable'.⁹⁵ When he occasionally kept her out the loop, she chided him for it, writing that she hoped that 'I may live long enough that you may have time and opportunity and inclination, to discourse me a little on these matters, and believe it would be to both our advantage'.⁹⁶

As a married woman with an absent husband who was nonetheless very interested in the management of his estate, the mechanics of Mary Clarke's administration of Chipley were complex. As *feme covert* she did not have the legal power to sign leases, yet she certainly struck bargains with local men to take on tenancies of estate land.⁹⁷ Perhaps such agreements had to be later ratified by her husband, or perhaps she simply acted as *de facto* landowner and no-one questioned the arrangement. In one letter to her husband she explained that she gave orders,

as from you, whose name I do make use of some times on these occasions without troubling you to avoid dispute; for which I hope I shall not incur your displeasure, it being nothing but what I think it your interest it should be so.⁹⁸

The quote reveals the freedom with which Mary Clarke acted in making decisions whilst at the same time drawing attention to her need to invoke her husband's name in bolstering her authority with the servants, estate staff and tenants. The position of a married woman managing an estate on behalf of an absent husband was a potentially precarious one in which the force of individual personalities might play a big role in the success of the enterprise. Yet the notion that in conducting estate business women might sometimes need to make use of their husband's name – or perhaps in the case of single or widowed women, the name of a son, nephew or brother – hints at the some of the difficulties that propertied women might face in managing estates (a theme returned to in greater detail in Chapter 6).

Mothers and sons

Thus while the Grenville letters reveal the collaborative way husbands and wives could work together to manage landed estates, the Clarke correspondence underlines how absent husbands might make their wives rather than their stewards the primary decision-makers on the estate, as well as hinting at some of the difficulties elite women might face in taking on estate management. Yet husbands were not, of course, the only male relatives on whose behalf women might manage landed estates. As Chapter 2 makes clear, aristocratic and gentle women also commonly managed property on behalf of young or absent sons, an important dimension of elite women's responsibilities as mothers and potentially just as significant as the routine care of children.⁹⁹ Several examples have already been mentioned, including the duchess of Beaufort's management of the Badminton estate during the minority of her son the 5th duke and the improvements Mary Cotterel carried out at Aynho on behalf of her young son. Several further examples of women managing and improving large estates as guardians to young sons appear in Chapter 4. Yet women also took on estate management on behalf of

grown-up sons, not least because many young men gained legal control of their property aged 21 at a time when they were still away at university or on the Grand Tour in Europe. As such, it was not uncommon for women to continue to manage estates on behalf of absent sons for some years after they came of age, an arrangement which made women *de facto* landowners whether or not they also owned property in their own right.

Dame Sarah Dawes, for example, managed the Escrick estate on behalf of her teenage son Beilby Thompson for more than a decade in the run up to spring 1763 when he came of age, then again from 1765 when he departed on a tour of Europe lasting three years.¹⁰⁰ Anna Maria Agar too continued to be heavily involved in estate management at Lanhydrock long after her son came of age in 1829. Her marriage settlement provided for her son to inherit much of the estate at the age of 21, but he seems to have played little part in estate business until he moved to Lanhydrock with his new wife in 1839 aged 31, and even in the 1840s Agar continued to be the first port of call when the stewards had questions about estate affairs.¹⁰¹ When the 6th Lord Byron (Figure 3.4) left England for the Continent in 1809, his mother Mrs Catherine Gordon Byron moved to Newstead (Nottinghamshire) as the estate's resident manager, something it had not had since the death of the 5th Lord Byron in 1798. Promising to keep 'a very strict eye over things', she reduced outgoings on the estate, had the land surveyed and tried – but ultimately failed – to raise rents on the farms. She also paid off some of the local creditors and was besieged by others whose bills for improvements to the Abbey in 1808 her son had left unpaid. Catherine Gordon Byron wrote increasingly exasperated letters to John Hanson, her son's London solicitor and land agent, who was at best fairly ambivalent about the management of the estate. Faced with an unhelpful agent, a host of creditors and annuitants who demanded to be satisfied and her son's ongoing requests for cash, Gordon Byron faced an increasingly perilous financial situation and ultimately found herself unable to balance the books.¹⁰²

The periods of estate management by women on behalf of grown-up sons at Lanhydrock and Newstead had very different outcomes. Anna Maria Agar handed on an estate in a sound financial position to her son, thanks in great part to her early and sustained efforts to improve estate finances at Lanhydrock. At Newstead, ongoing financial difficulties were followed after Catherine Gordon Byron's death by the sale of the estate, something Byron had insisted to his mother he would never do.¹⁰³ This indicates the continuing influence mothers could have on estate management, even after their sons had come into their inheritance. Mothers and older relatives more generally might be expected to have a restraining influence on young landowners. Yet one can imagine that women who had played a role in estate management during their son's minorities might be better informed about the estate and thus more forceful in their opinions than women who had never been required to take on such a role. These young men were in a peculiar position within landed society: whilst most landowners came into their estates at the death of the previous owner, landowners whose fathers had died before they were 21 and whose mothers had run their estate in their minority effectively had their predecessor on the estate alive and able to offer her opinion.



Figure 3.4 'Byron contemplating the Coliseum', by James Tilbitts Willmore, after William Westall, c. 1850 (NPG D32524). © National Portrait Gallery, London.

This may or may not have been a welcome situation. It certainly seems that the death of a landowner's mother sometimes freed him up to pursue a course of action he chose not to follow in her lifetime. Thus, for example, Lord Byron sold Newstead only after his mother's death in 1811, while Beilby Thompson replanned Escrick village immediately after his mother's death in 1773.

Nor was it only on behalf of their sons that aristocratic and gentle women might manage landed estates. Adult daughters too sometimes left their estates in the hands of their mothers rather than groups of male trustees. Lady Margaret Stanley (née Owen) inherited the Penrhos and Bodewryd estates on Anglesey in 1748. She married Sir John Thomas Stanley of Alderley Park (Cheshire) in 1763 and spent much of the rest of her life abroad, leaving her mother Margaret Owen (née Bold) to manage her Welsh estates.¹⁰⁴ Penelope Crichton, the 4th countess of Dumfries inherited her brother's estates in Scotland as a pre-teen in 1694. When she departed for the Continent in 1710, she left detailed instructions as to how her factor – as agents were known north of the border – should manage the Bute estate during her absence. She laid out the policy for renewing tenancies, left instructions for the purchase and sale of lands and listed repairs to be carried out at the house, as well as gave him authority over her servants and listed the annual and regular payments he must make on her behalf. Importantly, he was to consult the countess's mother if he had any difficulty letting the tenancies at the rate set in the rental and obtain her consent to make changes to estate policy.¹⁰⁵

Nephews

Unlike sons, who inherited under their father's wills and usually gained legal control of their estates at the age of 21, nephews and other relatives generally had to wait until the death of their aunts to inherit. Thus, for example, Sir John Turner (later Dryden) waited 20 years to inherit the Dryden property at Canons Ashby (Northamptonshire) from his wife's aunt, while Peter Pattern Bold waited almost his whole life to gain control of Bold Hall, acquiring it aged almost 50 when his aunt died in 1813 and living only another 6 years thereafter.¹⁰⁶ Propertied women occasionally passed on their estates to nephews some years or decades prior to their deaths. Thus after jointly managing the Boconnoc estate with her husband for almost three decades, Lady Anne Grenville passed it on to her husband's nephew and heir, the Hon. George Matthew Fortescue in 1833. She lived on the much smaller Dropmore estate in Buckinghamshire during her 30-year widowhood, and Fortescue inherited this only on her death in 1864.¹⁰⁷ Yet even after Fortescue took ownership, Grenville continued to take an active interest in the management of the Boconnoc estate, an attentiveness which Fortescue may or may not have conceived as meddling.¹⁰⁸ Much the same was true of Elizabeth Montagu who settled the Denton estate in Northumberland on her nephew Matthew Robinson Montagu in 1785 and shortly afterwards handed over its administration to him, but continued to take an interest in his management of the property.¹⁰⁹

The converse was also true, and women who retained ownership until their death were sometimes assisted in their estate management by those set to inherit the estate. Sir John Mordaunt, for example, assisted his sister-in-law Elizabeth Prowse in her negotiations with her tenants over tithe payments at Wicken in 1796, although in the end he predeceased her and his son inherited.¹¹⁰ Nephews too sometimes played an active role in helping their aunts to run their estates, an arrangement which both provided practical assistance to elderly property owners and helped to prepare young men for the responsibilities of landownership and familiarise them with the estates they would one day own. A good example of the collaborative management of an estate by an aunt and nephew comes from Wrest Park in the early nineteenth century. Amabel Hume-Campbell, Baroness Lucas of Crudwell (from 1797) and Countess de Grey (from 1816) (Figure 3.5) was assisted in running the Lucas family estates in Bedfordshire and elsewhere by her nephew Thomas Philip Robinson, the 3rd Lord Grantham. He was the eldest son of her younger sister Mary and already a landowner in his own right by the 1790s, having inherited the Newby estate in West Yorkshire from a cousin.¹¹¹ He was also recognised as the heir to the Lucas estates from his childhood. Decisions on the estate were delayed until his majority and his coming of age was celebrated at Wrest Park with a tenants' dinner in 1802.¹¹² He was then in Europe but from 1807 he began to take on a more active role in the management of the estate.¹¹³ He was with Hume-Campbell when she interviewed the new estate steward in September 1807 and had previously spoken with the son of the retiring steward on his aunt's behalf.¹¹⁴ He corresponded with her on estate matters including



Figure 3.5 Ladies Amabel and Mary Jemima Yorke, by Edward Fisher, after Sir Joshua Reynolds, 1762 (NPG D36261). © National Portrait Gallery, London.

drainage and the construction of a new school, shared his experiences on managing Newby and even wrote to her steward about his conduct.¹¹⁵ Hume-Campbell was, however, still intimately involved in the day-to-day management of the estate, regularly walking round the gardens, park and estate with the steward and the head gardener in order to discuss improvements to the estate, auditing her steward's accounts and corresponding with her solicitor in London about various estate matters.¹¹⁶ Yet by the early 1810s her nephew was taking on increasing responsibility for the Wrest estate and in July 1812, Grantham offered to take over the estate administration from his aunt, then in her mid-sixties.¹¹⁷ By the following autumn there was reference to the 'new administration' at Wrest and when less than a year after that the steward was sacked, it was Grantham who interviewed replacements.¹¹⁸

Yet it was certainly not the case that as a woman Hume-Campbell was incapable of running the Wrest estate without her nephew's help. Instead the Wrest estate had always been a family concern with younger members of the family – and particularly the heir to the estate – contributing to its management. As heir to the Wrest estate from her birth in 1751, Lady Amabel Yorke (as she was then) had long played an important role in decision-making at Wrest, as to a lesser extent had her younger sister Mary.¹¹⁹ At the age of just ten, her mother had written to her with detailed instructions about work on the garden buildings, and her responsibilities only increased over time.¹²⁰ She communicated her mother's directions to the estate staff – on matters including improvements to garden buildings, the location of garden furniture, the planting of trees and their removal to open up views – as well as discussing plans for the Sunday School with the steward and for the gardens with Capability Brown in 1778.¹²¹ Jemima Yorke acknowledged her daughter as her representative at Wrest, asking her to use her judgement on the spot and 'direct as you please'.¹²² By return, Hume-Campbell wrote to her mother with questions from the gardener, suggestions about walks through the grounds and reports on the improvements, sometimes travelling the eight miles from her home in Southill to give directions to the gardener about planting trees.¹²³ Thus, for example, in early 1770s she noted to her mother that she and her husband Lord Polwarth had 'jointly done all we can to execute your commissions'.¹²⁴

Other women too played a role in estate management prior to inheriting the property. As was noted in the first section of the chapter, Elizabeth Hood kept the estate accounts for Butleigh Wootton (Somerset) prior to her father's death, while Anne Lister took on the management of Shibden Hall (West Yorkshire) before her uncle died in 1826.¹²⁵ This is all good evidence for the collaborative management of landed estates, whether that was by husbands and wives, propertied women and their heirs – both male and female – or propertied men and their female heirs. While family relationships and individual personalities no doubt played an important part in determining exactly where the power to make decisions and initiate change lay – as did the legal strictures imposed by coverture – in the end, we would do well to remember that it was by no means always the men in these relationships who took the lead.

Conclusions

As this chapter has demonstrated, aristocratic and gentle women were often closely involved in the management of landed estates. This included both the careful supervision of estate finances and more hands-on management of the home farm, tenant farms and estate woodland. Rather than relying on their estate staff, women like Elizabeth Prowse, Elizabeth Dryden and Jane More Molyneux kept their own estate accounts. Each was a dedicated bookkeeper. Molyneux filled numerous volumes with detailed receipts, payments and memoranda, Dryden continued to write her accounts even after a serious stroke and Prowse produced meticulous and methodical records that were far superior to those kept by many estate stewards. Nor was it only single and widowed women who kept estate accounts. Elizabeth Hood kept the accounts for Wootton as a young unmarried woman, a wife and a widow. She had also taken on the bookkeeping prior to her father's death: a teenage apprenticeship of sorts served back on the Somerset estate after her formal schooling was complete and for which we are lucky enough to find evidence in the surviving accounts.

Those women who were not themselves responsible for the estate accounts might nevertheless offer close personal scrutiny of estate finances, maintaining an informed correspondence with their agents on financial issues and carefully labelling and cataloguing the various letters, memoranda and receipts they received relating to the estate. They might also introduce innovative financial practices as, for example, did Elizabeth Prowse and the duchess of Beaufort, initiating sophisticated systems of accounting that then established bookkeeping practice for decades to come. Many women also audited the estate accounts kept by their stewards or land agents, a practice which helped to identify ineffective or dishonest stewards and thus safeguard propertied women's interests. Carefully maintained estate accounts also provided important information which could be put to use in clearing debts or improving profits, and created a valuable record of financial practice and decision-making on the estate which could be handed on to future generations of landowners and stewards. Yet these account books also reveal the personal pride elite women sometimes took in bookkeeping – one thinks here of the accounts kept by Jane More Molyneux for 'my own perusal and satisfaction' – and by implication in estate management more generally.

Nor was it only the financial aspects on estate management in which elite women took an interest. Women like Mary Clarke and Elizabeth Prowse were active and dedicated estate managers who played a very hands-on role, negotiating directly with the farmers about taking leases, interviewing prospective tenants and on occasion collecting rents from them in place of their estate steward or bailiff. Other women, like Amabel Hume-Campbell, regularly walked over the gardens, parkland and estate farms with their senior staff, discussing estate policy and improvements, even if they then left their stewards to negotiate with the tenants about putting these changes in place. Still others maintained a regular correspondence with their estate stewards, asking pertinent questions about

spending in their absence and sending detailed instructions for their estate staff to action. Wealth and social status no doubt influenced whether elite women were prepared to deal directly with their tenant farmers, but age, health, personality and aptitude also impacted upon women's involvement in estate management. So too did women's presence or absence on the estate, although some like Anna Maria Agar retained tight control over the estate even whilst being absent from it for much of the year.

The relationship between landowners and their stewards was clearly central to estate management. Estate stewards and agents typically brought considerable experience and local knowledge to the management of estates, but many elite women too had in-depth knowledge of their estates and some had prior experience managing large landed estates. Thus by the time the duchess of Beaufort inherited the Stoke Gifford estate in Gloucestershire, she already had ten years of experience managing the nearby Badminton estate. Other women, such as Elizabeth Hood and Amabel Hume-Campbell, were brought up in the expectation they would inherit and therefore had extensive local knowledge and a familiarity with estate policy, practices and staff. There is little in the archives to suggest that the stewards or agents working on the estates of propertied women took on any more responsibility than did their peers employed to help manage the estates of male landowners. Where stewards' responsibilities were specifically recorded – as at Aynho and Loseley – their role was primarily concerned with collecting rents, organising for repairs, paying bills and taxes, keeping the accounts and perhaps also managing the home farm. Importantly, estate policy and decision-making was reserved to landowners – whether male or female – rather than estate staff. In practice, many landowners no doubt made decisions in consultation with their agents, often having also sought advice from relatives, landowning peers and professional men like solicitors and landscape gardeners. Yet female landowners were no less capable of decision-making and no more reliant on their stewards than male landowners. Instead – to borrow a line from Anna Maria Agar's steward at Lanhydrock – many propertied women seem to have aspired to be 'fully and completely mistress of the whole business'.

The final part of the chapter explores married women's role in estate management. It once again points to the diversity of experience amongst elite women, but nonetheless suggests that married women could and did subvert coverture in order to direct estate policy. The personality and personal aptitude of both the women and their husbands were important in determining the division of responsibilities between them, but some married couples like the Grenvilles clearly managed their estates as joint enterprises. Mothers of grown-up but absent sons – or daughters – also played a role in estate management. They were trusted by their offspring to keep an eye on things at home and undertook many of the same responsibilities as women who held property in their own names. Such women might also continue to be a force in estate management even after their sons came of age. Similar arrangements are sometimes evident between aunts and nephews, particularly where aunts continued to be involved and interested in estate management even after passing on the property to their nephews. Conversely,

nephews sometimes helped their aunts to manage their estates, perhaps particularly as their aunts became more elderly. All of this is strong evidence for a wider phenomenon in which the heirs of an estate were frequently involved in its management in the years or decades before they inherited, an arrangement which drew heiresses like Amabel Hume-Campbell and Elizabeth Hood into estate management just as it did the sons and nephews of propertied women.

Notes

- 1 LRO, 28 D 64/442–9, 488, 654a and b, 655–7, 1345–6.
- 2 Mark Newman, *The Wonder of the North: Fountains Abbey and Studley Royal* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press and the National Trust, 2015), 225–6.
- 3 Memorial stone, Ripon minster; inscription reproduced in John Walbran (ed.), *Memorials of the Abbey of St Mary of Fountains, Vol II, part I* (Ripon: Surtees Society, 1878), 344; Newman, *Wonder*, 233.
- 4 HHC, DDSY/107/19. Family relationships established using HCC, DDHV/79/35 and DDSY/108/3.
- 5 HHC, DDSY/107/22.
- 6 HHC, DDSY/107/23; TNA, PROB 11/898/412. Richard predeceased her, and under a codicil to her will Mark Sykes inherited the majority of her property.
- 7 On middle-class women and business, see Collinge, ‘A genteel hand’; Spicksley, *Joyce Jeffreys*; Barker, *Business of Women*; Nicola Phillips, *Women in Business*; Wiskin, ‘Business Women’; Sharpe, ‘Gender in the economy’. See also Helen Berry, ‘Prudent luxury: the metropolitan tastes of Judith Baker, Durham gentlewoman’, in Sweet and Lane, *Women and Urban Life*, 130–54 and Amanda Vickery, ‘His and hers: Gender, consumption and household accounting in 18th century England’, *Past and Present* 1, suppl. 1 (2006), 12–38 for discussions of particular gentlewomen’s contributions to household and estate accounting; Jennie Batchelor, ‘Fashion and frugality: Eighteenth-century pocket books for women’, *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 32 (2003), 1–18 and Rebecca Connor, *Women, Accounting and Narrative: Keeping books in eighteenth-century England* (London: Routledge, 2004) on female-authored account books more generally, particularly in the context of consumption.
- 8 NRO, D(CA) 1031.
- 9 NRO, D(CA) 321–2.
- 10 Copy marriage settlement of Elizabeth Periam and Alexander Hood, 1792, care of Somerset Heritage Centre [hereafter SHC]. Please enquire with the repository for more information.
- 11 Estate account book of John Periam (with additions by Elizabeth Hood), care of SHC.
- 12 *Ibid.*, Survey of Street estate, 1816 and Survey of the Wootton estate, 1846, all care of SHC.
- 13 Estate account book of John Periam (with additions by Elizabeth Hood), care of SHC.
- 14 *Ibid.*, inside cover.
- 15 GA, D3549/14/1/2 part 3 [hereafter cited as Prowse, *Memoir*], 4–5. Alongside the memoir, the main sources for Prowse are three estate ledgers, a cash book and two notebooks for the Wicken and Grafton Park estates (all preserved at Northamptonshire Record Office).
- 16 See for example NRO, 364p/67, fos 28, 36–7.
- 17 NRO, 364p/70, which covers the period from 1 May 1774 to 31 Aug 1781. The cash books were single-entry cash accounts.
- 18 *Ibid.*, fo. 10.
- 19 Mae Baker and Caroline Eadsforth, ‘Agency reversal and the steward’s lot when discharge exceeds charge: English archival evidence, 1739–1890’, *Accounting History* 16.1 (2011), 87–109, particularly 89; John Richard Edwards, ‘Accounting on

- English landed estates during the Agricultural Revolution – a textbook perspective’, *Accounting Historians Journal* 38.2 (2011), 1–45, especially 11–12. See also John Richard Edwards, ‘Accounting education in Britain during the early modern period’, *Accounting History Review* 21.1 (2011), 37–67, 49 on texts on double-entry and single-entry bookkeeping for merchants and stewards.
- 20 See for example NRO, 364p/67, fos 29, 45–59.
 - 21 Sarah Webster, ‘Estate improvement and the professionalisation of land agents on the Egremont estates in Sussex and Yorkshire, 1770–1835’, *Rural History* 18 (2007), 47–69; NRO, 364p/67, fo. 40; Prowse, *Memoir*, 37. Whilst she did not employ professional land agents, Prowse did occasionally rely on London-based solicitors. Thus, for example, a lawyer called Lally drew up the tenants’ new leases in March 1768 and later provided legal opinions and advice (Prowse, *Memoir*, 27; NRO, 364p/68, fos 200 and 207).
 - 22 West Yorkshire Archives Service, WYL150/7/8/25, 46 and 169; CRO, CL/650 (accounts for 1744 and 1749) and CL/734/70; David Spring, *The English Landed Estate in the Nineteenth Century: Its administration* (Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1963), 86–8.
 - 23 Beckett, ‘Montagu’, 156; Howells, ‘Anna Maria Agar’, 21. Elizabeth Knight also sacked her agent after becoming dissatisfied with his accounting (William Austen Leigh and Montagu George Knight, *Chawton Manor and its Owners* (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1911), 125).
 - 24 Spring, *English Landed Estate*, 88.
 - 25 On CDA as a system for personal accountability, see Edwards, ‘Accounting on English landed estates’, *passim*.
 - 26 NRO, 364p/501. The book is wrongly attributed to Elizabeth (Betsy) Mordaunt (née Prowse) in a typed note at the front of the volume.
 - 27 NRO, 364p/61.
 - 28 Account and memorandum book of John Periam (with additions by Elizabeth Hood) and Estate account book of John Periam (with additions by Elizabeth Hood), both care of SHC; VCH, Somerset IX, 82–102.
 - 29 SuHC, LM 811/1–138, 826/37 and /68–120, 1087/3/14, 1087/4/2–10 and 2060. Male landowners also produced memorandum books to hand on to sons: see, for example, Donald Woodward (ed.) *The Farming and Memorandum Books of Henry Best of Elmswell, 1642: With a glossary and linguistic commentary by Peter McClure* (London: OUP, 1984).
 - 30 Badminton House, FmK 5/1–4.
 - 31 GA, D2700/QA2/6/1. The Badminton Muniments also include an earlier specimen of household accounts for the years 1748 to 1752 written by Elizabeth Greville, Countess of Warwick (d. 1800).
 - 32 GA, D2700/QB3/1/3.
 - 33 GA, D2700/QB3/3/4–12 (for deer, garden, farming & house accounts) and D2700/QB3/2/5 (for steward’s expenses).
 - 34 GA, D2700/PB 2/1, 3/1, 3/4 and 3/5.
 - 35 GA, D2700/QB3/1/3.
 - 36 GA, D2700/QP3/1/5 (30 volumes of accounts, 1770–1795).
 - 37 GA, D2700/QP3/4/17 (weekly accounts, 1777–1798) and QP3/4/1 (for a description of the arrangements for auditing the accounts). The same system seems to have been in place for auditing the accounts of the home farm (see QP3/5/2, 5, 7, 8 and QP3/5/15).
 - 38 See, for example, GA, D2700/QP4/6/1–10 and QP8/8/1.
 - 39 GA, D2700/QP3/1/1, 4 and 5.
 - 40 The means by which propertied women might improve estate incomes – including by raising rents in the wake of enclosure, speculative development and mining – are discussed further in Chapter 4.
 - 41 Howells, ‘Anna Maria Agar’, 7.

- 42 Howells, 'Anna Maria Agar', 8–9.
- 43 CRO, CL 1309.
- 44 CRO, CL/416, 611/1 and 1305.
- 45 Howells, 'Anna Maria Agar', 14. £20,000 in 1804 is broadly equivalent to c. £1,500,000 today and the £1,000 per annum to £75–80,000.
- 46 Howells, 'Anna Maria Agar', 15.
- 47 CRO, CL 1229/1–3 and 734/71–80; 1840 letter, cited in Howells, *Anna Maria Agar*, 22.
- 48 Bridget Clarke, *The Life and Correspondence of Edward Clarke of Chipley, 1650–1710* (privately published, 2007) [hereafter Clarke], part I, 44 and 46.
- 49 Mark Goldie, 'Edward Clarke', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37290/?back=.66720>, accessed 20/11/2013]; Sara Mendleson, 'Mary Clarke', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66720?docPos=2>, accessed 20/11/2013].
- 50 SHC, DD/SF/7/1/31/9 and 20; letters, 18 Feb and 8 March 1696 (Clarke, part II, 123 and 126); letters, 29 Sept, 28 Oct 1796 and 18 Jan 1697 (Clarke, part III, 19, 30 and 54).
- 51 SHC, DD/SF/7/1/31/9.
- 52 Letters, 18 Jan 1697 and 28 Oct 1696 (Clarke, part III, 54 and 30).
- 53 SHC, DD/SF/7/1/31/20.
- 54 For female landowners who were not present at rent dinners in their honour, see: *Berkshire Chronicle* 12 Jan 1850, 2; *Leicester Chronicle* 20 June 1857, 1; *Leeds Intelligencer* 12 May 1855; *Stamford Mercury*, 25 June 1871, 4–5 and 29 July 1896; *North Wales Chronicle*, 29 Jan 1887, all available via the British Newspaper Archive. For exceptions to the rule, see Lummis and Marsh, *Woman's Domain*, 105; *Belfast Newsletter* 18 Nov 1858 and *Gloucester Citizen*, 28 Oct 1925, 11.
- 55 NRO, M(F)66.
- 56 For the Grafton rents, NRO, 364p/68, 184, 188 and 69, 172. Prowse also oversaw improvements to the farms on her mother-in-law's estate at Grafton (NRO, 364p/68, 185).
- 57 For example, in June 1779 (NRO, 364p/69, 181 and /70, 190).
- 58 Letters, 4 and 23 April 1696 (Clarke, part II, 128–9 and 131–2).
- 59 Letter, 29 Oct 1696 (Clarke, part III, 30).
- 60 Estate account book of John Periam (with additions by Elizabeth Hood), care of SHC.
- 61 NRO, 364p/68, fos 6–16.
- 62 GA, QP4/6/2 no. 4, QP4/6/1 no. 1, QP4/6/3 (letter, Jan 22, 1780) and QP4/6/4.
- 63 CRO, CL 1309; Howells, 'Anna Maria Agar', 12.
- 64 Jacqueline Collins, 'The role of the steward as shown by the correspondence between Anna Maria Hunt and William Jenkin', *Lanhydrock Journal* 1 (2001), 34–9.
- 65 CRO, CL/416, *passim*, for example no. 63.
- 66 CRO, CL734/70–94. Against this, Agar paid out small sums for planting thus slightly reducing profits. Unfortunately, the workmen's wages are not itemized so it is not possible to know whether the estate also bore the costs of cutting the timber.
- 67 Cited in Collins, 'Role of the steward', 34.
- 68 Cited in Collins, 'Role of the steward', 35.
- 69 Spring, *English Landed Estate*, 97–134; Webster, 'Land agents'.
- 70 Barbara English, 'Patterns of estate management in East Yorkshire c. 1840 – c. 1880', *Agricultural History Review* 32.1 (1984), 29–48, especially 41; T. J. Raybould, 'Systems of management and administration on the Dudley estates, 1774–1833', *Business History* 10.1 (1968), 1–11. For some discussion of propertied women's engagement with their estate staff in a much earlier period, see Ward, *English Noblewomen*, 112–5.
- 71 NRO, 364p/67, 68 and 69.
- 72 SHC, LM 825.
- 73 Nicholas Cooper, *Aynho: A Northamptonshire village* (Banbury: Banbury Historical Society, 1984), 314–5; Oswald Barron (ed.), *Northamptonshire Families* (London: Constable & Co, 1906), III, 376; NRO archive collections list.

- 74 NRO, C(A)5142.
- 75 NRO, C(A)5142.
- 76 HRO, 39M89/E/B614/5.
- 77 Wendy Moore, *Wedlock: How Georgian Britain's worst husband met his match* (London: Phoenix, 2009). See too Elizabeth Foyster, 'At the limits of liberty: married women and confinement in eighteenth-century England', *Continuity and Change* 17.1 (2002), 39–62 for examples of married women confined to private madhouses in disputes over their separate estates and Capern, 'Landed woman', 193 for the case of Arabella Alleyn.
- 78 Eric Richards, 'Elizabeth Leveson-Gower [née Lady Elizabeth Sutherland]', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/42000?docPos=1>, accessed 31/05/2011].
- 79 Christine Lodge, 'The clearers and the cleared: Women, economy and land in the Scottish Highlands, 1800–1900', (unpublished PhD thesis, Glasgow University, 1995), 43–63.
- 80 Lodge, 'The Clearers', especially 59–63. See also Karl Marx, 'The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery', *The People's Paper* No. 45 (12 March 1853) who argued that 'The person who stood at the head of this economical revolution was a female Mehemet Ali, who had well digested her Malthus – the Countess of Sutherland'. Note, however, that the Sutherlands' factor, James Loch, wrote an early biography of the Duke which attributed the changes to him rather than his wife: James Loch, *Memoir of George Granville, Late Duke of Sutherland*, K. G. (London: 1834).
- 81 BA, L30/9a, letter 19 Sept 1769.
- 82 Joyce Godber, *The Marchioness Grey of Wrest Park* (Bedford: 1968), 62; James Collett-White, 'Jemima Yorke [née Campbell], suo jure Marchioness Grey (1722–1797)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68351?docPos=2>]; Linda Cabe Halpern, 'The Duke of Kent's garden at Wrest Park', *Journal of Garden History* 15.3 (1995), 149–78. For examples of letters about Brown and his works, see BA, L30/9/60/182 and 187; L30/9a (letters, 19 Sept 1769 and 11 October 1769); L30/11/122/26, 181, 182, 189, 195 and 200; L30/21/2/7; L30/9/60/182, 187.
- 83 Godber, *Marchioness Grey*, 31 and 44. See also her letters about country-house visiting (L30/9a, 31 July 1750, 2 Aug 1750, 14 June 1754).
- 84 BA, L30/11/122/89 and L30/9/73/20.
- 85 Cited in Godber, *Marchioness Grey*, 100–101.
- 86 See BA, L30/11/73, 78, 112, 122, 152, 341, and L30/9/46, 60, 89, 233, 251 for letters between mother and daughter about the gardens; British Museum, Add MSS 35, 693 and 694 for Pawsey's letters to Hardwicke.
- 87 The estate agent suggested reorganising the farms and improving agriculture in the late 1770s and early 1780s, but nothing was apparently done (see British Museum, ADD MSS 35, 693/294 and 484, transcribed in BA, CRT100/27/3(ii), and compare the 1763 and 1807 rentals for Clophill (BA, L26/31 and L26/33). Both Lord Hardwicke and his wife considered themselves to know little about agricultural improvement and the library at Wrest was said to be ill-supplied with books on the subject (BA, L30/11/122/48; Godber, *Marchioness Grey*, 93–4).
- 88 See Chapter 4 for a fuller discussion of Amabel Hume-Campbell's role in enclosing and improving the estate.
- 89 BL, Add MS 58873, ff. 36, 61, 73 and 131.
- 90 BL, Add MS 58873, f. 73.
- 91 BL, Add MS 71594, f. 2.
- 92 Cynthia Troup, 'Lady Anne Grenville: An unsung heroine in garden history?' (unpublished MA dissertation, University of Bristol, 2004), 33.
- 93 BL, ADD MS 58873, ff. 7 and 10.
- 94 Clarke, part I, 10.

- 95 Letter, 15 Jan 1795/6 (Clarke, part II, 119).
- 96 SHC, DD/SF/7/1/31/29.
- 97 SHC, DD/SF/7/1/31/9.
- 98 Letter, 4 Dec 1696 (Clarke, part III, 42).
- 99 A similar point is made by Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, 100.
- 100 See Chapter 4 for a further discussion of Sarah Dawes.
- 101 CRO, CL/416, letter Jenkin to Agar, 9 Oct 1841; letter Jenkin to Agar, 23 Aug 1841; letter Cole to Agar, 29 Nov 1843; Howells, 'Anna Maria Agar', 21–22.
- 102 John V. Beckett, *Byron and Newstead: The aristocrat and the abbey* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2001), 143–153. See page 148 for the quote.
- 103 Beckett, *Byron*, 143–153.
- 104 See Appendix.
- 105 Mount Stuart Archives, Bute, DU/4/62/4.
- 106 Dryden of Canons Ashby collection, NRO; Patten, Peter (1764–1819), in R. Thorne (ed.) *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1790–1820* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1986), available online [<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/>].
- 107 See Fortescue, Hon. George Mathew (1791–1877), in D. R. Fisher (ed.) *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1820–1832* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), available online [<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/>].
- 108 CRO, F4/117/9.
- 109 Beckett, 'Montagu', 159.
- 110 Prowse, Memoir, 91.
- 111 G. C. Boase, 'Thomas Philip de Grey, second Earl De Grey (1781–1859)', rev. H. C. G. Mathew, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11565>, accessed 30/5/2014].
- 112 BA, L30/11/215/116 and 132.
- 113 BA, L30/11/243/4. See also Harrison's letters to Grantham, L30/11/132/12 and /14 and references to him having consulted Grantham /19, /157 and /162.
- 114 WYAS, WYL150/7/8/25, 46 and 140.
- 115 BA, L30/11/243/11–13.
- 116 WYAS, WYL150/7/8/25, 157, 161, 164 and 169. For the correspondence with her solicitor, see BA, L30/11/301.
- 117 BA, L30/11/243/25.
- 118 BA, L30/11/243/28 and 29. The new steward Thomas Brown also made reference to this joint administration in 1816 (BA, L30/11/40/5).
- 119 For an example of Mary's involvement, see BA, L30/9/54/10.
- 120 BA, L30/11/122/1.
- 121 BA, L30/11/122/73, 76, 78 and 265. See also L30/9/60/55 and 88; L30/11/122/181, 189 and 343; L30/9/60/325.
- 122 BA, L30/11/122/112 and 120. See also L30/9/60/49.
- 123 BA, L30/9/60/31, 50 and 251; BA, L30/11/60/47 and 334.
- 124 BA, L30/9/60/51.
- 125 Jill Liddington, *Female Fortune: Land, gender and authority. The Anne Lister diaries and other writings, 1833–36* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1998), 20.