

THE HAMPSHIRE ELECTION OF 1734

By NIGEL SURRY

NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLITICS IN THE 1730's

AFTER 1688 English politics were largely dominated by the aristocracy and landed gentry. Desire for a seat in the House of Commons for prestige, profit (or both) was a major force behind electoral contests. The English counties each returned two members, elected by the forty shilling freeholders. The borough franchise was far less uniform, and it was here that corruption was often most blatant and influence most apparent at election times. After 1716 Parliament was chosen every seven years, and therefore candidates were prepared to spend a great deal of money and effort to gain victory at the polls. But what otherwise might appear to be mainly a competition for office and its spoils could assume a more dramatic quality on rare occasions when a national issue captured the imagination of the politically active section of the community. The General Election of 1734 was overshadowed by the aftermath of the Excise Crisis, which had left Walpole's ministry shaken by the opposition that the scheme had aroused. Moreover, in Spring 1733 the Whig leadership in Hampshire was in serious disarray, for the Duke of Bolton had resigned from office and gone into opposition. Nor was he personally well disposed towards John Wallop Viscount Lymington, who succeeded to most of his places, including the Governorship of the Isle of Wight (Lee and Stephen 1885-1900, XV, 550-53, XX, 612-13).

In March of the same year seven Hampshire M.P.'s voted against the government on the question of the Excise. Of these, three including Lord Nassau Paulet the Duke's brother and a member for Lymington, normally supported the ministry and of the remainder only one, Joseph Taylor of Petersfield could properly be described as a Tory (*Historical Register* 1733, XVIII, 307-11).

It was against this background of discord and disunity that preparations were made for the General Election, although Parliament was not finally dissolved until the end of March 1734. Already, on 23rd of January, 1733 a meeting had been held at Winchester where 'The Gentlemen as well as Clergy and others and Freeholders of the County... Unanimously...' agreed... 'to Nominate' Anthony Chute a barrister with estates at Sherborne St. John, and Lord Harry Paulet, a lord of Admiralty and second son of the erring Duke of Bolton as candidates for the ministerial interest (HRO 31M57/831; Sedgwick 1970, I, 553; Namier and Brooke 1964, III, 314). They were opposed by Sir Simeon Stuart, a Baronet whose family had held lands at Hartley Maudit since 1614, and who had represented the County in Queen Anne's reign, as a Tory, together with Edward Lisle M.P. for Marlborough since 1727 and of similar political views, whose properties were scattered across the County from Wootton on the Isle of Wight, to Ellingham in the New Forest and Crux Easton near the Wiltshire border (Burke 1882, 951; Sedgwick 1970, II, 218-19).

PATRONAGE AND ELECTORAL ORGANISATION

In all Eighteenth Century General Elections a great deal depended not only on ministerial patronage, but also on the local influence of the candidates themselves and their allies, as landowners, Justices of the Peace or borough proprietors. The use of such influence particularly in the months prior to an election (and indeed immediately after) could be crucial in persuading laymen and clergy to act as agents in the most positive and effective manner. Initially the Duke of Bolton had proved helpful, Francis Chute informing his

brother that 'The Duke made me great Assurances of Heartyness said he had ordered Treats in the Forest and all was well.' In the very next sentence he adds, 'Mr. Knollys has ordered his Bayliff to go round to the people abt. Rumsey', a course of action no doubt prompted by such distinguished endorsement of Chute's candidature (HRO 31M57/919-20, 20-24 Feb. 1733). Four of the clergy proposed as agents on behalf of Chute and Paulet held livings in the patronage of the Bishop of Winchester, and Hoadley who took formal possession of the See in September 1734 was the most zealous of Whigs. Another Cleric, Richard Widmore, owed his living to the Jervoise family of Herriard, one of whom Thomas Jervoise was to be a Whig agent in the Basingstoke division of the County (HRO 31M57/848; Willis 1964-65, II, 22, 23, 48, 53, 82, 97). Henry Roberts, agent for Arretton and Brading, was nominated to the important post of Comptroller of Customs at Southampton, 'at the request of Lord William Powlett,' on 24th July, 1729 (*Cal.T.B.&P.* 1729, 120). Thomas Morgan, agent for Freshwater and Yarmouth, whose electoral control of the latter was undisputed, caused no fewer than four of his fellow agents to be admitted burgesses of the town between November 1732 and October 1733, and one of them Maurice Bocland, an army officer, the agent for Newport, was chosen as an M.P. for Yarmouth on Morgan's interest in 1733, and again in 1734. Morgan himself was also a Justice of the Peace, served as Sheriff of Hampshire in 1733, was Mayor of Yarmouth on ten occasions between 1717 and 1741, as well as being a Burgess of both Lymington and Newtown (Sedgwick 1970, I, 257, 467; Yarmouth Town Trust, *Corporation Minutes* 1710-85, 1-48; HRO Q.O./11-12, 1725-39 *passim*; Berry 1883, X; St. Barbe 1848, 12; Isle of Wight County Record Office, *Swainston Mss.* 316A, 1729). The three other burgesses admitted in these months were Samuel Chandler, attorney and agent in Portsmouth, Thomas Lewis an M.P. for the town, and John Shephard, Receiver General for Land Tax in Hampshire (1736) an agent for Winchester in the forthcoming election. Nathaniel Clerk, described as a

'Keeper' and agent for the New Forest Hundred, acquired a further keepership in December 1735, possibly as a reward for zeal in the Election, and the elevation to the bench of John Gringo, agent at Fareham, may equally have been in part a recognition of services rendered (HRO 31M57/848; HRO Q.O./12, 16 Dec. 1735, 115; HRO Pec. Wills 1773; PCRO S2/24, 9 July 1734). And the fact that on 2nd June 1734 Lymington wrote to Newcastle suggesting at least nine agents for Deputy Lieutenancies illustrates the same tendency at work in the wider field of county administration (B.L. Add.Mss. 32, 689 ff. 255-58).

The Whig campaign began with the drafting of a list of possible agents and assistants, the drawing up of a schedule of Clergy to be circulated, and the collating of names of the outvoters in the London area to be canvassed (HRO 31M57/848, 849, 858; Appendix I, below). This was no mean task in a County which in 1713 had contained some 3,620 freeholders including 847 'outliers' (Speck 1970, 20). By 1734 this number had risen to about 5,200 and at least 121 outvoters from London together with the neighbouring Counties of Kent, Surrey and Middlesex were prevailed upon to vote, together with others from as far away as Lichfield and Devon (Sedgwick 1970, I, 248; *Poll for Hants.* 1734, *passim*). Agents were particularly asked 'to take Care That none of our Friends stay at home by providing Horses, Coaches and Waggon for such as are not able to Come without...' In practice this could mean organising transport over considerable distances by land and sea for in the 1734 Election the ministerial candidates polled at Newport appealing for the attendance of 'Such Freeholders of this County who attend Mr. Pelham as have not polled...' (HRO 31M57/848; B.L. Add.Mss. 32, 689 f. 235 9 May 1734). Despite the importance of personal canvassing by the candidates, it was the agents in the various divisions who were expected to undertake this task and to give general impetus and direction to the campaign. There was also the final responsibility of not only getting voters to the polling booths

at Winchester and Newport, but also the checking of the activities of polling inspectors and clerks, safeguarding the voters from hostile mobs, and providing them with drink and other entertainments (Smith 1969, 13-33; Porritt 1963, I, 185).

Who were these agents, these 'friends of the present Happy Establishment'? The surviving list among the Chute papers provides a basis for closer examination, but no comparable document appears to have survived naming their counterparts who acted on behalf of Stuart and Lisle. Initial analysis broadly confirms Oldfield's view of the overwhelming strength of government influence in the County. Oldfield correctly ascribed this to the presence of large numbers of 'customs officers and others . . .' and continued . . . "The intercast arising from this connexion as well as from the dockyard at Portsmouth is so great as to supersede aristocracy itself" (Oldfield 1816, II, 60). Certainly in the Portsdown division fourteen out of twenty agents had either official connections or close links with the Navy, Customs or Treasury and several held seats in the House of Commons. The Alton division provides a sharp contrast with only one agent holding an official post, the remainder being independent country gentlemen, together with a cleric, attorney, butcher and shopkeeper, and the New Forest agents included a Purveyor to the Navy, a tanner, several attorneys, clerics and two Members of Parliament, one of whom Joseph Hinxman, was also Chief Woodward and Keeper of the New Forest (Appendix II, below). Regardless of the behaviour of the electorate it is quite clear that by 1734 the Whigs had secured in Hampshire widely based support at least amongst the propertied and professional elements in the County. And a comparable analysis for Yorkshire reveals that they drew similar active support from agents who were 'clergy, justices, excise officers and post-masters', as well as 'many independent gentlemen.' Here as elsewhere, the support of attorneys was of growing importance since they often acted as 'paid professional agents . . . who frequently combined a legal practice

with the stewardship of a great landowner's estate' (Collyer 1952, 53-82).

THE CAMPAIGN

The activities of the Opposition candidates have been mostly gleaned from records relating to the campaign itself. An early Whig appeal for 'the cause of Liberty and Honesty' forms part of a manifesto addressed 'to the Freeholders of Basing' in which Lisle and Stuart are castigated 'as common Enemyes to the Nation in Generall and to you in particular', and 'friends of the Pretender' (HRO 31M57/878). But the Opposition could offer far more trenchant slogans to the electorate as Chute was informed by a correspondent describing a visit to Portsmouth by Stuart and Lisle in January 1734: 'when they whaire hear they had a mobish Crue Felows of the Beaser Sort surpassing any mountibank that Ever I saw Crying out Liberty and Property No Excise but Lille for Ever it seemd to Draw almost all Peoples harts After them . . .' (HRO 31M57/834, 23 Jan. 1734).

Throughout the County the electors were wooed with entertainments and other inducements. A bill records '2.17.0' spent 'at Rodger Jennings at Arnwood the Day my Lord Harry Pollet and Mr. Choot was there' (HRO 31M57/833). Another of Chute's correspondents reminded him that 'The Tithing of Winkton in the Parish of Xchurch has above 20 Freeholders and have had nothing as Mr. Parnell sayes' (HRO 31M57/833). A certain 'John Wavell of Key Haven' is described as 'A Man of very Good Substance but forc'd at present to abscond to Ireland very proper to be a Keeper, and will come over upon ye least Notice, one very well acquainted in ye Forest and Capable of Making Interest Wibberley Walk lyes near his own Estate which is better than 60 l. pr Annum' (HRO 31M57/831). Sometimes the voters were reluctant to make a definite commitment to vote for any candidates; as John West made clear in this note to Chute written from Tadley on 19 March 1734: 'I have talked with my Neighbour, Pryor and Brotherinlaw Prior Concerning

giving your Worship their vote and they tould me that they were desired by a messenger from Mr. Wither of Manydounne to give their vote for Mr. Lisle and they have been at a feast at his Charg before they knew that your Worship would try for it: but it hepening soe they semes to be for staying at home... (HRO 31M57/832, 19 March 1734).

In August 1733 a somewhat premature estimate gave the ministerialists 'a majority of six hundred and fifty' over their opponents, but the recipient of this confidence, Dr. Alured Clarke, Rector of Chilbolton, a prebend of Winchester and a close friend of Lord Lymington's doubted this, adding, 'and if we have the odd fifty, I think the victory will be a surprising one, considering all the disadvantages we be under' (Thomas 1847, II, 219, 18 Aug. 1733). Whatever thoughts Chute and Paulet had on the matter they set off to canvass the County on the 11th of September, visiting many towns, and stopping off at the homes of agents and well wishers. '... To Titchfield 21st Lord Harry went into ye Forest 23d I went to Mr. Conduits and met Ld Harry at Southampton ye 24th...'. On October 7th they visited the Island and on the 12th were back at Lymington. 'The 14th being Sunday I came home' (HRO 31M57/856). According to Lady Paulet, 'My Lord has been randing (i.e. canvassing,) these five weeks, but often returned to Lord Lymington's, which is his headquarters, and where I have been all the time. He is now in the Isle of Wight, but I expect him tomorrow, and then we go to Edinton for a few days, ... and accordingly, we shall take our route either to London or else into the upper part of Hampshire, to Norton Powletts near Winchester, for all that part of the county my Lord has still to rand' (Thomas 1847, I, 320-21 10 Oct. 1733).

On October 30th Lisle and Stuart set out to canvass Hampshire in a similar manner (*Craftsman* 27 Oct. 1733). Rumours that they met with an indifferent reception at Alresford were quickly repudiated by the '*Craftsman*': 'They were met two miles off by numbers of

the Freeholders, Gentlemen and Clergy, who with a Spirit of Liberty, and a Resolution to support the *Country Interest* and Those, who opposed the *Excise*, conducted them with the greatest Applause to the Place. The Populace shewed their Regard by repeated Huzza's for Liberty and Property; the Freeholders their Integrity and Regard for their Country, by giving these worthy Patriots Assurance of their Votes and Interest; and the general Joy at their appearance shews how regardful the People are of *those Gentlemen*, who with unbiass'd Zeal pursue the Good of their Fellow-Subjects, and oppose the Designs of a *bad Projector*' (*Craftsman* 17 Nov. 1733). Their journey ended on the 15th of December, both men having met with 'the repeated Acclamations of the People of all Ranks and Distinctions' (*Craftsman* 22 Dec. 1733). Further evidence suggests that this hard fought campaign went on to the eve of the poll. On March 28th 1734, Paulet and Chute paid an elaborately staged visit to Basingstoke, where they led a formal procession into the town, later dining the Corporation and Freeholders at 'The Maidenhead', and providing 'a good dinner and Plenty of Drink for the Populace ... and at more of the Public Houses in the Town' (*Daily Courant* 3 April 1734). As late as April 18th, Chute himself appealed to the Duke of Newcastle to bring influence to bear on a 'Mr. Collins of Corhampton', who it was claimed, 'will only give his Vote and Interest Single to Lord Harry Powlett wthout a Command from your Grace' (BL. Add.Mss. 32, 689 f. 198).

PUBLIC OPINION AND PARTICULAR INTERESTS

On May 9th the Poll was adjourned to Newport, at the request of the hard-pressed ministerialists and voting took place there on May 14th. At the final count Edward Lisle headed the poll with 2,669 votes, followed by Lord Harry Paulet with 2,575. Sir Simeon Stuart came third with 2,573 and close at his heels the unfortunate Anthony Chute with 2,491 votes (*Poll for Hants 1734*, see also Table I below). A breakdown of voting

TABLE I
Summary of Poll for Hants. by Divisions, May 1734

	Powlett	Chute	Stuart	Lisle
Andover	340	330	338	355
Alton	314	203	396	399
Basingstoke	289	288	310	316
Fawley	184	168	181	196
Kingsclere	165	157	291	290
New Forest	309	303	440	454
Portsdown	852	855	453	471
Isle of Wight	190	185	174	178
Totals	2,573	2,489	2,563	2,659

by divisions shows that in only one, Portsdown, did the ministerialists have a comfortable majority, and that in four, Alton, Basingstoke, Kingsclere and the New Forest, they were in varying degrees defeated. The defection of the Duke of Bolton helps to explain their defeat in Basingstoke (HRO 31M57/856 14 April 1734). Likewise the strength of the Admiralty interest makes their victory in Portsdown intelligible. And it is arguable that the influence of Sir Simeon Stuart in the overwhelmingly rural division of Alton hastened the collapse of the Whig cause in that part of the County. But the more positive role of public opinion cannot be discounted. True, various sectional interests were scarcely shaken, even amidst the uproar and controversy produced by Walpole's scheme. Hampshire dissenters remained overwhelmingly loyal to the administration as the voting record of Quakers from Alton and Ringwood shows, and is reinforced by the solidarity for the Whigs displayed by the Portsmouth Presbyterians (HRO QS/5/2 1723; PCRO 257A/1/9/1 10 April 1732; Speck 1970, 25). The Opposition were aware of this as is shown by their realisation that French refugees of Huguenot origin were active supporters of the ministerialist candidate at Southampton, John Conduit (*Craftsman* 11 May 1734). Conversely, the majority of the Anglican Clergy, men of robust prejudices, remained hostile to the Whigs, some 55 voting for Stuart and Lisle as against 43 for their opponents.

Early opposition to the Excise Scheme had been dominated by mercantile and trading

interests throughout the Country, and Southampton Corporation was but one among many throughout England who lobbied its M.P.s and petitioned Parliament against Walpole's proposals in February 1733 (Langford 1975, 55-57, Appendix A 172). Despite a sharp decline in its overseas trade, Southampton was still in 1715 among the first six importers of wine (Temple-Patterson 1966, I, 4). The Mayor in 1735 was Richard Taunton a wine merchant, and a leading local opponent of the Excise Scheme, reflecting a national trend in this respect. Taunton split his vote between Chute and Lisle possibly because of business connections with the first Duke of Chandos, whose cousin George Brydges, a pro-ministerialist was not only an M.P. for Winchester, but also an agent for Paulet and Chute in that division. Another member of the Corporation, Francis Cabot, also a wine merchant who dealt with Chandos, though hostile to Taunton's political activities, cast one vote for Paulet only (*Poll for Hants. 1734*, 143, 145; Collins Baker 1949, 190; HRO 31M57/848; Sedgwick 1970, I, 499). Following the withdrawal of the Scheme in April 1733, 'there were great Rejoicings... such as Bonfires, Illuminations, a publick Meeting at the Tavern, and *somebody* (Walpole?) carried round the Town in Effigie, and then thrown into the Fire' (*Craftsman* 21 April 1733). At the same time there were demonstrations similar in spirit at nearby Portsmouth (*London Magazine* 14 April 1733, 213).

There were equally serious divisions of opinion and interests at Lymington, between the proprietors of the Salterns, who in 1726 paid £40,000 to the Treasury in revenue, and the Corporation, many of whom enjoyed the benefits of place and profit at the Salt Office and usually supported the ministry. At the General Election of 1710, one of the proprietors, William Forbes, had unsuccessfully contested Lymington as a Tory, and out of twelve proprietors who can be identified as voters in 1734, eight supported Lisle and Stuart, showing that an extension of the salt excise was feared should Walpole triumph

(King 1966, 164–66; *Poll for Hants. 1734*, 62, 89, 90, 96, 102–4, 106). This concern was by no means illusory; true, the salt tax had been abolished in 1730, but financial problems forced Walpole to reintroduce it in 1732, and its revival was 'a vital part in his excise plans' (Langford 1975, 34–40).

Popular prejudice, religious opinion, economic and political self interest all clearly played their part in influencing the Hampshire electorate, as of course was the case in other Counties. In Northamptonshire, the Excise Crisis, 'determined the tone of the election', but, 'had less to do with the progress of the election than aristocratic dissensions' (Forrester 1941, 54–5). There is little to show that the issues were widely discussed among the rural voters of Yorkshire, who largely followed the lead of their landlords, but the evidence suggests that the freeholders in the woollen districts of the West Riding, and the tanners and shoemakers of towns such as Beverley were influenced by the critical stance of the 'Craftsman' (Collyer 1952, 63–4). The tendency of the rural voters at this period to follow their landlords on political matters is further emphasised in a study of the Nottinghamshire Election of 1721 (Wood 1949, 62–70; Langford 1975, 155–6, 169–71). Rural voting patterns for the Portsdown and Alton divisions of Hampshire in 1734 did not diverge in this respect, yet only in one town, Portsmouth, did the ministerialists have an overwhelming majority: they were narrowly defeated in Southampton, Winchester and Newport, achieving slender victories in Alton and Basingstoke, showing that urban opinion in the County was generally more difficult to predict or to effectively control (*Poll for Hants. 1734*, 16–20, 24–7, 42, 45, 68–73, 143–6, 155–7, 160).

CONCLUSION

In his unsuccessful Petition to the Commons on 21st January 1735, Chute claimed that he had been defeated through the agents of the opposition 'procuring several Hundred Persons to vote for the said Mr. Lisle, and also

for Sir Simeon Stuart, who had no right of voting in the said County'. In contrast Stuart accused the Sheriff, Richard Jervoise, 'His Deputys and Clerks... being Influenced by the said Lord Harry Powlet have willfully omitted to insert in the Poll Books the names of Great Numbers of Legal Voters who polled for your Petitioner...' (HRO 31M57/845, 846; *J.Hse of Commons XXII*, 506–7). Chute was prepared to spend up to £1,600 if necessary to secure the success of the Petition, and it is clear neither Whigs nor Tories had spared expense in this and other County Elections (HRO 31M57/842, 3 Feb. 1735). In neighbouring Sussex, the Duke of Newcastle is believed to have spent £6,000 in electioneering costs, and in Yorkshire, Lord Malton was reckoned to have laid out £15,000 on the County Election of 1734 (Williams 1897, 477; Collyer 1952, 71). Certainly the Hampshire Election of 1734 was a close, bitterly fought contest, with few scruples shown by men on either side. 'In ye hous' (wrote Richard Taunton), 'they seem desperat... they don't Care (Even our own Members) What damages they do the body so they Can but Gratifie their own Rash tempers and Covetous desires In trade posts profitts and things which men of a Genoerious Soul would abhor' (SRO T/C Misc. Box 6, 11 Feb. 1735). This seems a fitting verdict not merely on the temper of the Hampshire Election of 1734, but in a wider sense on the general characteristics of political life in the age of Walpole, when increasing government influence particularly in the boroughs, could be certain to bring ultimate triumph at any general election, and where the opinions of the electorate, even in the counties became less important except on rare occasions when popular passions were aroused, as was the case in 1734.

Dating: New Style has been used throughout the article.

Acknowledgements

I should like to thank the Staff of the British Library for their valuable assistance

and for permission to reproduce extracts from documents in their possession. Thanks are also due to Staff of the following institutions: Guildhall Library, London, and Southampton University Library.

Acknowledgement is made to Miss M. E. Cash, County Archivist of Hampshire, and Miss S. D. Thomson, Archivist of Southampton, for permission to publish extracts from their collections. Mr G. F. Smith, Chairman of the Yarmouth Town Trust, Mr G. Webster, County Archivist of the Isle of Wight, and

Mr N. Yates, Portsmouth City Archivist, also very kindly made their records available for examination.

Particular thanks must be expressed to Mrs C. Addison of Portsmouth Central Library; to Mr D. Francis and Mrs F. Littlefield of Portsmouth Polytechnic Library; to Miss M. L. Robertson, Associate Curator Mss. Dept., Huntingdon Library, California, U.S.A.; and to Mrs P. Miller-Burkett and Mrs P. Parsons who typed the article.

APPENDIX I

Taken from 'A List of Freeholders that live in London and thereabouts' (HRO 31M57/858). Fifty-eight names are given. Below are those indicating occupations, in order of their appearance in the document.

- Mr Samuel Vanderplank merchant in token house Yard Lothbury.
- Thomas Mason. The Kings Coachman, a vote at Whitchurch.
- Capt John Opie, upon Bread Street Hill.
- Mr Brooks, stationer upon London Bridge.
- Mr Wallinger Merchant.
- Charles Aymands Esq., Kings Surgeon.
- Mr Joseph Smith, a grocer in Cannon Street just by London Stone.
- Wm Leg a distiller just by Holburn Bar.
- Mr Samuel Hall hatter in Tuley Street near London Bridge.
- Silvester Grey Carpenter in St. Anns Lane Westminster.
- Mr Meacham Landwaiter.
- Mr Jno: Snow Inspector of the River } Custom house London
- Mr Jno: Merch Tidesurveyor }
- Mr Richd: Gibbs Tidesman }
- Mr Edward Raggett Foreman of the Joyners } Deptford Yard
- Mr Jno: Blake Shipwright }
- Mr Ricd. Hounsell „ (?) } Woolwich Yard
- Mr Thomas Bassett Porter of the Yard }
- Mr Jno: Henslow Master House Carpenter }
- Mr Henry Peek Shipwright }
- Mr John Russell first Lieut: on Board His Maj:tys ship Newcastle.
- Capt David Hannett in New George Street Spittle Fields.
- Richd Taylor of the Isle of Wight India House.
- Mr Player in the Navy Office.
- Mr John Carlton of Greenwich Cooper to the Ordnance.
- Mr Edward Horner Herald at Arms. A freehold at Walth.
- Jam: Baker letter Carrier.

APPENDIX II

This List of proposed Agents for the New Forest Division of Hampshire is taken from HRO 31M57/848.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Part of Division</i>	<i>Occupation &c.</i>	<i>Source(s)</i>
Baker, Geo	New Forest Hundred	Esq.	HRO 31M57/848
Barrey, Ric..	Fordingbridge Town and Hundred	—	

<i>Name</i>	<i>Part of Division</i>	<i>Occupation &c.</i>	<i>Source(s)</i>
Barrey, Tho.,	Fordingbridge Town and Hundred	Cordwainer	HRO C/10/ 440 Consistory Court Case, Horsey v Pinhorn, 1727.
Caverley, Tho., Clerk, Nathaniel	Fawley New Forest Hundred	Cleric Keeper & Yeoman	Willis 1964-5, II, 53. HRO 3IM57/848; Moens (ed) 1893, I, 153.
Dale, Wil.,	Christchurch Town & Hundred	Gent.	Moens 1893, I, 204.
Farr, Wil.,	Westover Hundred	Gent.	Burke 1842; General Armoury, London.
Hinxman, Joseph	Christchurch Town & Hundred	Chief Woodward and Keeper of the New Forest; Barrister; M.P. Christchurch, 1727-40 Sheriff, Hants. 1719	Sedgwick 1970, II, 147; Berry 1883, x. Sedgwick 1970, II, 147; Berry 1883, x.
Hooper, Edw.	Westover Hundred	Barrister; M.P. Christchurch, 1734-48; Sheriff, Hants. 1720	Berry 1883, x.
How, John Hussey, Naphali	Lymington Town New Forest Hundred	Gent. Curate of Minstead	Moens 1893, I, 403. HRO C/10/A 217, Consistory Court Case, Cull v Moody, 1729. HRO QO/12, 1731, 4.
Mansfield, John	Ringwood Hundred	J.P., Hants. 1731 Attorney	Lee & Stephen 1885-1900, XII, 976.
Martyn, Joseph Parnell, John Powlett, Ric. Southerland, Owen	" " " New Forest Hundred Redbridge Hundred Lyndhurst	Tanner Keeper 'of Grays Inn' Purveyor to Navy, Portsmouth.	Moens 1893, II, 15. HRO 3IM57/848. HRO QO/10, 1721, 10. Cal. TP 1715, 102.
Stanley, Hobby	Redbridge Hundred	Clerk	BL Add.Mss., 35, 600 f. 210, Lymington to Hardwicke, 1739.
Troath, John	Redbridge Hundred	Attorney	HRO C/10/A 394, Consistory Court Case, Hasker & Harris v Gregory, 1756.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

BL	British Library
HRO	Hampshire Record Office
PCRO	Portsmouth City Record Office
SRO	Southampton Civic Record Office

Sources in the HRO

C/10/A	Consistory Court Cases 1727, 1729, 1756
Pec.Wills.	Peculiar Wills 1773
Q.O./11	Order Book 1725-1731
Q.O./12	Order Book 1731-1739
QS/5/2	Declarations, Quakers, Midsummer 1723
3IM57/831-878	Political Papers relating to the Candidature of Anthony Chute . . . in the Election of 1734

Original sources in print

- Cal.T.B.&P.* *Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers preserved in the Public Record Office* (ed. W. A. Shaw) London, HMSO, 1898-1903, 5v.
- Cal.T.P.* *Calendar of Treasury Papers preserved in the Public Record Office* (ed. J. Redington) London, HMSO, 1868-1889, 6v.
- Craftsman* } *Burney Newspapers 1732-1734*, British Library
- Daily Courant* }
- J.Hse.Commons* *Journal of the House of Commons*
- Moens* *Hampshire Allegations for Marriage Licences granted by the Bishop of Winchester 1689 to 1837* (ed. W. J. C. Moens) Harleian Soc., London 1893, 2v.
- Poll for Hants. 1734* *An Exact List of the Names of the Gentlemen and other Freeholders That Voted for Knights of the Shire of the County of Southampton &c.*, London 1736.

Other references

- Berry, W 1883 *County Genealogies*, London.
- Burke, J B 1882 *A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage*, London.
- Collins Baker, C H and M I 1949 *The Life and Circumstances of James Brydges, First Duke of Chandos*, Oxford.
- Collyer, C 1952 *The Yorkshire Election of 1734*, *Leeds Philosophical and Literary Soc. Proc.* 7, 53-82.
- Forrester, E G 1941 *Northamptonshire County Elections and Electioneering 1695-1832*, Oxford.
- King, E 1966 *Old Times Revisited in the Parish and Borough of Lymington*, Winchester.
- Langford, P 1975 *The Excise Crisis*, Oxford.
- Lee, S and Stephen, L (eds) 1885-1900 *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63v., London.
- Namier, L B and Brooke, J (eds) 1964 *The House of Commons 1754-1790*, 3v., London, History of Parliament.
- Oldfield, T 1816 *An Entire and Complete History, Political and Personal of the Boroughs of Great Britain*, 3v., London.
- Porritt, E 1963 *The Unreformed House of Commons*, 2v., New York.
- St. Barbe, C 1848 *Records of the Corporation of the Borough of New-Lymington* (privately printed).
- Sedgwick, R (ed) 1970 *The House of Commons 1715-1754*, 2v., London, History of Parliament.
- Smith, E A 1969 *The Election Agent in English Politics, 1734-1832*, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 84, 13-33.
- Speck, W A 1970 *Tory and Whig: The Struggle in the Constituencies 1701-1715*, London.
- Temple-Patterson, A 1966 *A History of Southampton* (Southampton Rec. Series), 2v.
- Thomas, Mrs 1847 *Memoirs of Viscountess Sunden*, 2v., London.
- Williams, B 1897 *The Duke of Newcastle and the Election of 1734*, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 12, 449-88.
- Willis, A J 1964-65 *Winchester Ordinations 1660-1829*, 2v., Folkestone.
- Wood, A C 1949 *Nottinghamshire Electioneering in 1720-1*, *Thoroton Soc., Trans.*, 52, 62-70.

Author: Nigel Surry, M.A. (Oxon), Department of Historical and Literary Studies, Portsmouth Polytechnic.