

John Johnson Collection: pre-1960 ephemera

Fourdrinier Papers

Index created by SJS 01/95

This section has not been catalogued or digitised.

Fourdrinier Papers Henry and Sealy (c. 1790 - 1830)

Legal papers relating to the business dealings of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier's wholesale stationary business (the first in Britain), the development of the Fourdrinier Patent Paper making Machine and the subsequent legal battles between the family and their many business partners.

These papers were acquired by John Johnson in the mid-1930s from Birrell & Garnett Limited, who in turn had acquired them through an intermediary from the estate of Joseph Wright of St. Neots, Huntingdonshire. Wright had been the manager of the Twogood Brothers paper mill. A description of these papers was produced in 1934 by H G Pollard, while they were still in the hands of Birrell & Garnett. This handlist remains essentially unchanged except for a few minor alterations and additions.

Although, essentially copies of documents which were kept by the Court of Chancery, they relate to the many disputes between the Fourdriniers' and their many business partners (there are a small number of original documents). These papers deal with the creation and dissolution of a number of partnerships involved with the Fourdriniers Paper Making Machine and Wholesale Stationery business (the first in of its kind in Britain), the legal battles of various members of these partnerships to recover venture capital and debts, the bankruptcy of the Fourdriniers and the financial problems caused by the development of the Paper Making Machine and the subsequent patent payment squabbles.

The papers themselves have been flattened, more clearly numbered (numbering relates to the Item Number, not a foliation sequence) and re-boxed. Bundles relating to the same item number have been paper-clipped together. Please do not remove the paper clips or alter the order of the items in this box in any way. Due to the poor physical condition of many of the papers, photocopies of any items will be strictly limited. Readers are asked to take care when handling these documents.

Other Fourdrinier material located at:

The Newbery Library, Chicago, USA
Public Record Office, Kew.
Hertford County Records Office

Henry's sister, Jemima, was the mother of Cardinal Newman, and papers relating to her correspondence with her son can be found at **Ms.Eng.lett.d.101**.

The Introduction of Machinery into English paper making as shown in the Fourdrinier-Twogood Papers, 1803 - 1838

by H G Pollard, 1934

Contents:

- 1] Introduction
 - a) The provenance of the papers
 - b) St.Neots Mill
 - c) The Fourdrinier Firm
 - d) The Patent
 - e) Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier
 - f) The Twogoods
 - g) The exhibition value of the Paper
 - h) Their historical importance
- 2] The affairs of the First Partnership
- 3] The affairs of the Second Partnership
- 4] The affairs of the Third Partnership
- 5] William Bloxam's attempts to recover his capital
- 6] The patent fees for working the Fourdrinier Machine
- 7] The later affairs of Henry Fourdrinier
- 8] The affairs of the Twogoods
- 9] The Parliamentary grant of compensation
- 10] Later papers of Joseph Wright
- 11] Unidentified papers (4 items)

1] Introduction:

1a] Provenance:

The papers listed below were acquired by Birrell & Garnett Limited through an intermediary from the estate of the late Joseph Wright of St.Neots, Huntingdonshire, manager to the Twogood Brothers at their paper mill at St.Neots. When they gave up the mill in October 1887, he retired and devoted the remainder of his long life to the accumulation of miscellaneous printed and manuscript material relating to printing, papermaking, philately and Huntingdonshire. These collections he stored in his comparatively small cottage in St.Neots, and refused access to them o all enquirers. In the Spring of 1934, when Joseph Wright was between ninety and one hundred years old, his cottage caught fire and he was burned to death. These papers were salved from the ruins.

1b) St. Neots Mill:

This mill was rebuilt as a corn mill worked by water power in 1799, but about 1804 it was taken on lease by Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier in partnership with John Gamble. They converted it into a paper mill and installed one of the first machines erected in England for the manufacture of paper. The Fourdrinier interest in the lease was assigned in 1809 to Matthew Twogood Senior when he withdrew from the partnership in the London wholesale stationary business of the Fourdriniers, in consideration of his leaving the capital of about ,30 000 in that business. Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier had encumbered the mill with a mortgage and an annuity, and they guaranteed Matthew Twogood against these charges, but he nevertheless has to meet them when the Fourdriniers became bankrupt in 1810 and thus became a creditor of the Fourdrinier estate. John Gamble retired in 1811, and Matthew Twogood became sole proprietor. He died in 1830, and left the mill to his sons Edward, Frederick and Alfred. The youngest son, Alfred, sold the mill to the St. Neots Paper Company, who closed it down.

1c) The Fourdrinier Firm:

I [sic. H G Pollard] do not know when the firm started, but it is clear that it was already a prosperous concern in 1790 the earliest date mentioned in these papers. On September 29th of that year a co-partnership was formed between Henry Fourdrinier (the Elder) (2 shares), his sons, Henry and Charles (2 shares) and William Bloxam (4 shares) to carry on the business of wholesale stationers and rad merchants in London. In September 1797, Sealy Fourdrinier was admitted into the firm and took over one of William Bloxam's shares. Henry Fourdrinier (the Elder) died in January 1799, and his two shares went to Henry and Charles Fourdrinier. In 1800 the firm is said to have been the leading house in the wholesale stationary business, and its' annual profit was about ,14 000.

William Bloxam retired from the firm on June 30, 1803, because he disagreed with the policy of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier in developing the paper machine. He was to receive (a) an annual annuity of ,1000 and (b) his capital of ,16 000 was to be repaid before June 30, 1815 and was in the meantime was to bear interest at 5%.

At what date and under what conditions Matthew Twogood Senior and Matthew Twogood Junior entered the firm I am unable to say, but it is possible that they were admitted into the partnership to secure the advances made by the banking firm of Langston, Twogood, Cazalet & Amery.

Matthew Twogood Senior retired from the firm in November 1809 taking the lease of the St Neots Mill as security for his capital left in the firm. Joseph Brook Hunt William Abbott and Francis Morse were then admitted into the partnership.

Henry Fourdrinier and Sealy Fourdrinier retired from the firm in October 1810, and were made bankrupt in the following month. They assigned their assets to the remaining partners. Matthew Twogood Junior withdrew from the firm on June 1, 1814, after which the firm was known as Hunt

and Fourdrinier. It was still in existence under this style in 1837.

1d] The Patent:

The principal of substituting for the mould used in papermaking an endless roll of wire netting first occurred about 1798 to Louis Hobert, who worked in the paper mills at Essonne. He sold the idea to his employer, Leger Didot, who introduced it to John Gamble, who took out English, Irish and Scottish patent for it in 1801. Gamble sold the patent to the Fourdriniers who employed him at a salary, altogether Didot received nearly, 15 000 for the invention.

The original design of the machine was not successful and a considerable sum, states at, 60 000 (a gross exaggeration) was spent on its improvement; much of this went to Bryan Donkin for his experiments. The machine was not perfected for sale until 1807 when the Fourdriniers applied to Parliament for an extension of the terms of the patent. They were granted a further seven years, making a total of twenty-one from the date of the original patent of 1801. Under this patent they granted licences to work machines to thirteen firms in 1807.

After the bankruptcy of the Fourdriniers in 1810, the right to the patent dues was in dispute between the various creditors; who did not come to an agreement on the subject until after the patent had expired. Some of the users of the machine paid their arrears but others successfully disputed the claim on the ground that the original specification was technically defective.

1e] Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier:

Their original connection with the firm of wholesale stationers has already been explained, but something must be said of their subsequent careers. It is clear that the original purchase of the patent and the large sums spent of bringing it to perfection was entirely due to them; and that their persistence in this course drove out of the firm the first Bloxam and then Matthew Twogood Senior. It appears that the money spent on these experiments was largely drawn from the capital which should have been employed in the wholesale stationary business; and from a very important note in #6, that this money was withdrawn without the consent of the other partners in the firm. Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier went bankrupt on November 8, 1810; they appear to have had speculations outside their interest in the wholesale stationary firm (#12), and it is possible that they were embarrassed by the bad hop market of the previous winter (#18 - #20). But whatever the reason for their bankruptcy Henry Fourdrinier seems to have retained Batchworth Mills and to have been able to raise a loan on it before he was discharged from bankruptcy (#43; 44) which was in 1822 (#45).

1f] The Twogoods:

Some account of the connection between Matthew Twogood, father and son, and the Fourdrinier

firm has already been explained, as also their connection with the St. Neots Mill. These papers all derive from the various litigation in which they became involved as a result of their participation in the partnership. They had three interests at stake : 1) the claim to the lease of the St. Neots Mill, 2) the claim against Henry Fourdrinier for failing to meet the charges with which he had encumbered the mill; 3) the rebuttal of claims made against them as partners in the Fourdrinier firm before the bankruptcy of the Fourdriniers. Their solicitors' bill of costs (#54) is an invaluable guide to the involved litigation, much of which was settled out of court. In spite of the size of their bill (,432) they succeeded in building up at St. Neots what was probably the leading business in England for the supply of fine writing papers.

1g] The exhibition value of the paper:

As these papers are largely copies made for legal purposes, and not originals, their exhibition value is not nearly so great as their historical importance. Nevertheless, the note in #6, the private ledger of the Fourdrinier firm, which shows that balance of the Fourdrinier's debt to the partnership was only made out on the eve of their bankruptcy, would be a great exhibit although it is only a copy; and the circular letter asking for support for the Parliamentary grant of compensation (#56) is of interest. But the finest document both in appearance and intrinsic value is the original engrossed and re-sealed indenture on vellum by which Henry Fourdrinier was given his final release from bankruptcy proceedings by his creditors (#45).

1h] The historical importance:

The introduction of machinery into English papermaking is the most important landmark in its development. Hitherto the story has been derived entirely from the Parliamentary Report of 1837 (#55); but I strongly suspect that the application for the grant of compensation was made conjointly by the interested parties; that is to say that the four groups interested in the original Fourdrinier bankruptcy (William Bloxam, the assignees who were the remaining partners in the firm, the Twogoods, and Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier) combined to make the application. The first two are clearly supporting the application from the evidence given, and the presence of the papers among the Twogood documents lends colour to the idea that they also were interested in it. The suggestion that the grant was divided among these four interests receives some confirmation from the fact that there was also a private collection for the Fourdriniers at a later date; and this would hardly have been likely if these two old gentlemen of over sixty years had received the whole of the ,7000 granted to them in 1838. But whether this interpretation is correct or not, these papers show that by no means the whole story was told before that Parliamentary inquiry.

These papers throw no light on the technical details of the machine, but they are of paramount importance in showing the way in which it was exploited and the financial arrangements by which this was done. They show the persistence of the Fourdriniers in developing the machine, their concealment of the withdrawal of capital from the firm for these experiments, the distrust which this caused in their partners and the consequent withdrawals from the firm. When the partners

withdrew, the guarantees which they required for the ultimate repayment of their capital, which they could not withdraw, still further weakened the resources of the business. The sale of the machine and the terms upon which these sales were made are shown as well as the total inability of the rival claimants to agree on their respective shares until it was too late. The ledgers show the customers and extent of the wholesale stationary business and the shares and drawings of the partners. It is no exaggeration to claim that these particular papers are essential to any complete history.

Box 1

2] The Affairs of the First Partnership:

1) Bond of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier to William Bloxam. This bond was the source of nearly all the extensive litigation that followed the bankruptcy of the Fourdriniers. After giving some interesting details of the origin of the business in 1790, it provided for Henry and Sealy to pay William Bloxam an annuity of ,1000 on his retirement.

[dated: June 30, 1805; paper watermarked 1810]

4 pp. Folio

2) Bond of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier and Joseph Walker to William Bloxam for the payment of interest and eventual repayment of a capital sum of ,16 000 left in the business.

[dated: June 30, 1803]

2pp, folio

3) Bond of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier to Joseph Walker of Indemnity against a possible failure to repay the capital sum of William Bloxam.

[dated: September 9, 1803; paper watermarked 1810]

3pp, folio

4) a: 11 bills for varying sums drawn on the Fourdrinier firm by William Bloxam between July 4, 1807 and October 9, 1809

[dated: various]

b: Cheque from Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier, together with the bill that it met.

[date: March 8, 1808]

12 items

5) Private ledgers. Joseph Walker's account with the Fourdrinier firm from September 1799 to December 1809. Walker was an original employee of the firm of wholesale stationers prior to the involvement of the Fourdriniers. He appears to have retired in March 1808 on condition that he received an annuity of ,500 per year from the Fourdriniers and interest on about,7000 capital left in the firm. After the bankruptcy he disposed of his interest to William Bloxam

[dated: September 1799 - December 1809; paper watermarked 1807]

8pp, folio.

6) Private Ledger of the Partnership, from June 1807 to December 1809. This crucial document contains the accounts of Henry Fourdrinier, Sealy Fourdrinier and their joint account with the partnership. A number of items are marked as not agreed by the partners, and an important note shows that, 13 204 was withdrawn on their joint account for their patent experiments without the consent of the other partners.

[dated: June 30, 1807-December 30, 1809; paper watermarked 1815]

64pp, folio.

7) [Water damaged title]. Ledger entry of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier's account.

[dated: c. December, 1807]

2pp.

8) *A bill for prolonging the term of certain letters patent assigned to Henry Fourdrinier and Sealy Fourdrinier for the invention for making paper by means of machine*

[dated: Parliamentary session 1806 - 7]

10pp, folio.

9) *Minutes of proceedings of the committee to who was referred the bill entitled "An "act for prolonging the term of certain letters patent assigned to Henry Fourdrinier and Sealy Fourdrinier for the invention for making paper by means of machine*

[dated: August 10, 1807]

16pp, folio.

10) *Act for prolonging the term of certain letters patent assigned to Henry Fourdrinier and Sealy Fourdrinier for the invention for making paper by means of machine.*

[dated: 1807]

10pp, folio.

11) Memorandum of the dissolution of partnership, signed by M. Twogood Junior, Sealy Fourdrinier and Charles Fourdrinier.

[dated: October 20, 1809]

12) Memorandum of dissolution of partnership, signed by Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier and James B O'Sullivan of Cork.

[dated: November 28, 1809]

12 a) Marcha verses [Fourdrinier], Twogood and others. Bill of complaint in Chancery for money

owed to William Marcha by the partnership. William Marcha was a French paper merchant [?] to whom the Fourdriniers were indebted after various transactions up to 1804. Marcha later sued the third partnership for the balance of the debt.

[dated: 1818; paper watermarked 1815]

16pp, folio.

12 b) Notes on the margin of the bill of William Marcha (item 12a). Apparently a rough draft of the defence to be put forward by Henry Fourdrinier in this action.

not dated]

12 c) A more elaborate draft of the answer of Henry Fourdrinier to the bill bought by William Marcha (Item 12a).

[not dated]

4pp, folio.

12 d) The answer of Matthew Twogood Junior, William Abbott, Francis Morse and Joseph Brooke Hunt to Marcha's complaint.

[dated: May 21, 1818; paper watermarked 1815]

15pp, folio.

3] The affairs of the second partnership:

November 27, 1809 - October 26, 1810

Members: Henry Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood Junior, Charles Fourdrinier, Joseph Brooke Hunt, William Abbott and Francis Morse.

13) Indenture. Assignment of the rights in the co-partnership of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier, Charles Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood Senior and Junior to Henry Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood Junior, Joseph Brooke Hunt, William Abbott and Francis Morse. With annotations in the margin by Matthew Twogood.

[dated: November 27, 1809; paper watermarked 1808]

5pp, folio.

14) Copy of Item 13.

[dated: November 27, 1809; paper watermarked 1815]

9pp, folio.

15) Another copy of Item 13.

[dated: November 27, 1809; paper watermarked 1823]

6pp, folio.

16) Indenture. Articles of partnership between Henry Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood Junior, Joseph Brooke Hunt, William Abbott and Francis Morse to the conduct the business as Stationers dealers in rags and paper making machines.

[dated: November 28, 1809; paper watermarked 1807]

18pp, folio. Engrossed.

17) Memorandum from Henry Fourdrinier to William Abbott and Francis Morse. This was made on the re-arrangement of the partnership and it sets out the debts of the previous partnership which were due to Henry Fourdrinier alone, and the sums for the payment of which he alone was responsible. It throws a good deal of light on the firm: I suspect that the debts due were very dubious.

[dated: November 28, 1809]

18) a: Autograph letter. Edward Russell to Henry Fourdrinier.

[dated: November 26, 1809]

b: Autograph letter. Edward Russell to Henry Fourdrinier.

[dated: December 6, 1809]

c: Autograph letter. Edward Russell to Henry Fourdrinier.

[dated: December 6, 1809]

d: Autograph letter. Edward Russell to Henry Fourdrinier.

[dated: February 20, 1810]

4 items.

19) Two draft financial statements from Edward Russell

According to Pollard original index this section should contain 4 draft statements and a copy of a bill, but only two items have been identified.

[dated: 1809]

20) Two statements and two valuations of hops consigned to Messrs Fourdrinier by Edward Russell, together with a bill for freight and wharfage on the same. Edward Russell appears to have been a paper maker and hop grower at Maidstone, and to have been advanced considerable sums by the partnership. He tried to repay some of the debt by consigning his crop of hops to the partnership to sell, but the subsequent sale failed to realize a sufficient profit to clear Russell's debt.

His last letter is written after he had become bankrupt, due largely to his failure to repay money owed to the Fourdrinier partnership. I suspect this may have had something to do with the partnerships' subsequent bankruptcy.

[dated: 1809]

21) Bills receivable. Messrs Fourdrinier, Twogood, Fourdrinier and Hunt. Account totals ,18 172. Gives ledger references, date, drawer, on whom drawn, period, date due and amount.
[dated: December 31, 1809]

3pp, with annotated wrappers.

22) Copy. Statement of debts owed to and by Messrs Fourdrinier, Twogood, Fourdrinier and Hunt. Many well known names of printers, country newspapers etc occur. The Clarendon Press only owed them, 5,14,6. Ledger copied in May 1824, with the balance sheet at the end.
[dated: December 31, 1809; paper watermarked 1822]

80pp.

23) Balance sheet.
[dated: December 31, 1809]

24) Draft assignment, Henry Fourdrinier to Matthew Twogood Junior, Joseph Brooke Hunt, William Abbott and Francis Morse. This is one of the preliminary arrangements necessitated by Henry Fourdrinier's approaching bankruptcy.
[dated: 1810; paper watermarked 1809]

13pp, folio.

25) Agreement between William Bloxam and Fourdrinier, Twogood, Hunt and Co and Joseph Walker. This relates to the security arrangements originally made to the capital left in the business in 1803 on the retirement of Bloxam. These would have become operative on the bankruptcy of the Fourdriniers.
[dated: January 12, 1811; paper watermarked 1811 - 1813]

8pp, folio.

Box 2

4] The affairs of the third partnership:

October 27, 1810 onwards

Henry Fourdrinier had withdrawn just before he became bankrupt on November 10, 1810.

Matthew Twogood Junior withdrew on June 1, 1814.

26) Original balance sheet of the Fourdrinier firm
[dated: June 30, 1811; paper watermarked 1807]

2pp, folio.

27) Payments on account of the firm, Fourdrinier, Twogood, Fourdrinier and Hunt. Apparently relates to the winding up of the dissolved partnership.
[dated: 1809 - 1812; paper watermarked 1821]

8pp, folio with annotated wrappers.

28) Paid on account of the firm, Fourdrinier, Twogood, Fourdrinier and Hunt. Ledger with a few identifiable names. Account totals, 80 450.
[dated: December 31, 1813; paper watermarked 1821]

12pp, folio.

29) Owing to Charles Fourdrinier, Twogood and Hunt & Co. Ledger containing some well known printers (e.g: John Bell, The Star, The Pilot etc). Account totals, 63 564.
[dated: December 31, 1813; paper watermarked 1821]

32pp, folio.

30) Particulars of cash received. Messrs Fourdriniers, Twogood, Fourdrinier and Hunt. 1810 totals, 69 126; 1811 totals ,6817; 1812 totals ,2675; 1813 totals ,1114. Names mentioned include John Bell, Cadell, Drury Lane Theatre, Whittingham etc. These accounts clearly refer to payments due to the partnership of 1809 collected by their successors.
[dated: 1810 - 1816; paper watermarked 1821]

48pp, folio.

31) Statement of account owing by the firm on 1809 to the firm of 1810, with the auditor's certificate dated October 26, 1814.
[dated: January 1, 1814; paper watermarked 1823]

32) Notice of Matthew Twogood Junior's withdrawal from the co- partnership, signed by all the partners.
[dated: 1814]

33) Agreement between Charles Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood Junior, Joseph Brooke Hunt, William Abbott & Francis Morse and John Davis & Nathaniel Hooper. This and the following document probably relate to debts due to the Sherbourne Lane house from which Matthew Twogood Junior retired in 1814.
[dated: March 11, 1818; paper watermarked 1817]

34) Agreement by which the partnership transfers to George Capron for the sum of, 500, their rights in a debt of ,1600 owed to them by John Davis and Thomas Lyttleton Holt.
[dated: March 25, 1818; paper watermarked 1817]

5pp, large folio.

5] William Bloxam's attempts to recover his capital:

Bloxam was originally the largest partner in the wholesale stationary firm from 1790 to 1803. In that year he retired owing to disagreement with the Fourdriniers' project fro the development of the machine. The guarantees for his capital left in the firm, on which the following proceedings were based, have been listed above (Items 1 - 4).

35) Bill of complaint in Chancery of William Bloxam and Henry Hollingsworth, assignees of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier, bankrupts against Twogoods and others. This portion gives the interrogatories on one side and the answers opposite. It consists of folios 48 to 107 only, and the earlier portion, which must have been separately wrapped, is missing. It is nonetheless a document of considerable interest.
[dated: 1816; paper watermarked 1815]

120pp, folio.

36) Objections to the claim of William Bloxam of ,16 000 against the estate of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier Bankrupts, to be made by Messrs Williams, the Creditor of the said Bankrupts. Together with the particulars William Bloxam's claims and the particulars of Joseph Walker's claim. These papers were submitted by the Twogoods' solicitors to counsel fro their opinion, which is given on the 1st leaf.
[dated: May 16, 1818; paper watermarked 1815]

15pp, folio.

37) The joint and several answers of ... [4 of the partners in the later Fourdrinier Firm] to the Bill of Complaint of [the assignees of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier].
[dated: 1816; paper watermarked 1817]

62 leaves, large folio

6] The Patent fees for working the Fourdrinier Machine:

The Twogoods and the assignees of Henry Fourdrinier both claimed these sums of money and there was an unsettled dispute. A full list of the machines is given in #55. This section is very important for the history of paper-making in England.

38) Copies of letters relative to the payment of the machine rents or patent dues on the Fourdrinier machine.

There was a dispute between Matthew Twogood and the Assignees of the Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier (that is William Abbott and Francis Morse) as to who was entitled to the patent dues from the Fourdrinier machines erected on licence. The result was that the money was not collected and the patent expired on August 14, 1822. The payment of the arrears of money was resisted by some of the papermakers using the machine, notably Richard Elliott of Chesham Mills, on the grounds that the original specification was incorrect. Some account of the result of this litigation will be found in the 1837 report (Item #55). The present correspondence deals with the attempts to secure agreement between the two claimants of the money, and mainly relates to the payments by Ibbotson and East of Colnbrook Mills.

[dated: 4 letters between 1819 - 1820]

39) Case for the opinion of Mr Rope on the question of proceedings against Ibbotson and East for their arrears for working the Patent Paper Machine. This document gives information of considerable interest. The payments had been made to Fourdrinier's Assignees, although they had not been pledged as security to indemnify the Twogoods against the discharge of the mortgage on the St. Neots Mill which they had purchased of the co-partnership.

[dated: May 3, 1819; paper watermarked 1818]

13pp, large folio.

Box 3 - Labelled Fourdrinier Papers 36-4, 50-60

40 a: Copy of the agreement reached by Matthew Twogood and the assignees of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier relative to the payment of the patent dues.

[dated: November 20, 1822]

b: Copy of a letter relating to item 40a

[dated: December 22, 1822]

c: Original letter from one of the appointed receivers, George Banes, apparently relating to the item 40a.

[dated: March 26, 1825]

3 items

41 a: Copy of draft agreement of item 40a
[dated: November 6, 1822]

b: Copy of letter relating to Item 41a
[dated: November 23, 1822]

2 items

42 a: Original letter from John Buttershaw and Sons of Hampton Hills relating to calculating payment for patent dues on the Fourdrinier machine.
[dated: October 21, 1823]

b: Original letter from John Buttershaw and Sons of Hampton Hills relating to calculating payment for patent dues on the Fourdrinier machine.
[dated: November 20, 1823]

c: Original letter from John Buttershaw and Sons of Hampton Hills relating to calculating payment for patent dues on the Fourdrinier machine.
[dated: November 28, 1823]

d: 5 slips of paper containing calculations for services rendered
[dated: various]

e: Copy of the receipt from payment of patent fees for use of a Fourdrinier Machine.
[dated: ?, 1822]

9 items

7] The later affairs of Henry Fourdrinier:

43) Valuation of Batchworth Mills (Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire), by Jno [?] Hall of Dartford, giving details of the equipment of the paper mill.
[dated: October 27, 1817]

44 a: Copy of a proposal by Henry Fourdrinier to raise a loan of, 2000 on the security of the mortgage on Batchworth Mills.
[dated: November 11, 1817]

b: Original note from Henry Fourdrinier to J. Teasedale stating that both his sons will insure their lives for ,1000 each and make that policy as additional security.
[dated: November 13, 1817]

2 items.

45) Indenture between Henry Fourdrinier, William Pugh and W H Hudson, issuing final release from bankruptcy by his creditors. On two large vellum skins, with wax seals and original autographs
[dated: October 20, 1822]

8] The affairs of the Twogoods:

When Matthew Twogood Senior retired from the partnership in 1809, he took as security for his capital retained within the company the lease of the St. Neots Mill, on which was a mortgage and annuity amounting to, 550 per annum. Henry Fourdrinier's failure to meet the guaranteed payments initiated the Twogoods claim against his assignees.

46) *The London Gazette* with notice of the withdrawal of Matthew Twogood Senior from the partnership and the entry into it of Joseph Brooke Hunt (located at 1713, column 2).
[dated: October 31, 1809]

4 unbound leaves of single issue.

47) *The London Gazette* with notice of the withdrawal of Henry Fourdrinier from the firm (located 1719, column 2).
[dated: October 30, 1810]

4 unbound leaves of single issue

48) *The London Gazette* with notice of dissolution of the partnership of John Gamble and Matthew Twogood concerning the St. Neots Mill.
[dated: July 2, 1811]

6 unbound leaves of single issue.

49 a: *The London Gazette* with notice of withdrawal of Matthew Twogood Junior from the partnership (located 1277, column 1).
[dated: June 21, 1814]

b: *The London Gazette* with notice of dissolution of partnership of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier, William Bloxam and Charles Fourdrinier (incomplete, 2 pages only).
[dated: c. April, 1804]
2 items (6 unbound leaves)

50) Mr S Best advise on three questions relating to charges encumbered on the St. Neots Mill by Henry Fourdrinier.

[dated: June 13, 1810; paper watermarked 1806]

51) Letter from Joseph Walker to Matthew Twogood Senior concerning a promissory note for ,1000 given by Matthew Twogood Junior (written by a clerk, but signed by Joseph Walker).

[dated: June 3, 1816]

52) Opinion of Frederick Robinson concerning the liability of Matthew Twogood Senior on unpaid debts dating back to the Fourdrinier partnership in 1809.

[dated: October 23, 1823; paper watermarked 1823]

53) Copy of Item 52.

[dated: October 23, 1823]

3pp

54) Bill of costs of the defendants Matthew Twogood the Elger and Matthew Twogood the Younger, 1816 - 1825, in the suit of the assignees of Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier verses Matthew Twogood Senior, William Abbot, Francis Morse, Joseph Brooke Hunt, Charles Fourdrinier, Matthew Twogood the Younger and John Gamble. The case was eventually settled out of court.

[dated: Michaelmas Term 1816 - Hilary Term 1825]

20pp, bound with green ribbon.

9] Parliamentary grant of Compensation:

55) *Report from the Select Committee on Fourdrinier's Patent with the minutes of evidence and appendix*, ordered to be printed by The House of Commons.

[dated: June 1, 1837]

56) Extract from Item 55, recommending compensation. Circular letter sent to Hon. Edward Baines, M.P, by Henry and Sealy Fourdrinier requesting his presence to vote for the Bill in the Commons on 15 June.

[dated: June 14, 1837]

57) *A brief extract of the substance of the evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, showing the benefits the public have derived and will continue to derive from the introduction of the Paper machine by the Messrs. Fourdrinier, the sacrifice they have made in perfecting it, and the ground on which they hope for a favourable consideration...*

[dated: June, 1838]

3pp,

58) Original letter from Henry Fourdrinier to John Teasedale making an appointment to see Matthew Twogood.

[dated: May 31, 1839]

10] Later papers:

59) Memoranda by Joseph Wright (former Foreman at the St. Neots Mill) relating to:

- i) The Paper duties;
- ii) Government Paper duty labels;
- iii) Paper makers labels
- iv) Chronology of the ownership of the St. Neots Mill

Important unpublished information regarding paper making.

[undated]

5pp.

60) a: Reproduction of the drawing for the Improved original Fourdrinier Paper Machine as made by Bryan Donkin & Co, 1808. (2 copies) in *Supplement to the Paper Trade Review*.

[dated: December 7, 1888]

b: 'The invention of the paper-making machine..' in *The World's Paper Trade Review*.

[dated: December 24, 1897]

3 items.

11] Unidentified papers:

The four items in this section do not appear on Pollards original handlist. These items are unnumbered and cannot be adequately identified with any of the previous descriptions, although they related directly to the legal positions of the various partnerships until 1816. These items may relate to the contents of the envelope at the end of the section marked '4 papers for incorporation', addressed to Mr D S Wrycroft, St. Neots.

61) Letter to Messrs Langston & Co from J Weston, regarding drawing of money against security deposited with Messrs Langston & Co by the Fourdriniers.

[dated: September 1, 1809]

62) Promissory note from Matthew Twogood Junior to Joseph Walker, promising to pay Walker, 1000, six years after the date of the original signing of the note.

[dated: November 30, 1810]

63) Promissory note from William Bloxam to Messrs Fourdrinier, Twogood and Fourdrinier, promising to pay,450 two months after the date of the original signing of the note.

[dated: July 5, 1808]

64) Letter from Henry Fourdrinier to Matthew Twogood Junior, regarding the conditions of repayment of two promissory notes should Fourdrinier obtain the lease to Two Waters Mill.

[dated: May 21, 1812]