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Few scholars have contributed more to the history of social welfare in England than Richard Smith, and his research and publications on the history of old age have been central to that contribution. Richard is, amongst many things, a medievalist, and he has some very interesting thoughts on the maintenance of the elderly poor in later medieval England, invoking a demographic imperative to explain why English parishes started to play a fuller role in the relief of the poor in the fifteenth century. While tenancy arrangements had long made provision for elderly ex-tenants, the low expectation of life by the late fifteenth century resulted in an increase in the setting up of maintenance contracts with non-kin, often endorsed in manorial courts, as well as the growth of charitable provision, which included almshouses among other devices.1 But Richard is very difficult indeed to keep inside a chronological box, and his articles on ‘Charity, self interest and welfare’, ‘Ageing and well-being in early modern England’ and ‘The structured dependence of the elderly’ encompass all centuries since the late middle ages, offering interpretations that are, distinctively, fully informed by the broad sweep of English demographic and social history.2

Equally well known is Richard’s fascination with the historical geography of poor relief, and the relationship between this and economic structure and development. Richard is quite clear that there was an identifiable historical geography of English poor relief, with far more generosity in the more developed agricultural areas of southern and Midland England, and this has been endorsed by the work of Steve King and others.3 Furthermore, he has identified a clear shift of concern, away from the urban focus of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and towards rural England and its agricultural labour force, in this respect England

---

1 R. Smith, ‘Situating the almshouse within demographic an familial changes 1400-1600’, lecture delivered to The Almshouse Conference, University of Hertfordshire, St Albans Campus, 22nd September 2007.
presenting a marked contrast with France, and creating in consequence a far more effective, parish-based, poor law regime, which in turn had economic implications.\textsuperscript{4} We look forward to the publication of Richard’s big book on the geography of English poor relief in due course.

The paper we are offering today is concerned with the foundation of almshouses, one in particular in Berkshire, and is thus inspired by Richard’s concern with both the elderly, and the geography of social welfare. Its focus, however, is on private philanthropy rather than formal, state-sponsored poor relief, a dimension of the history of social welfare that is crying out for far more systematic treatment than it has received to date. This paper will offer a small step forwards towards achievement of that understanding, but at the same time will attempt to uncover both the mechanisms of, and the inspiration that lay behind, the foundation of almshouses in early modern England.

By the end of the fifteenth century almshouses, so often shrouded in terminological confusion and of uncertain purpose in the earlier middle ages, had emerged in their modern form: as privately endowed establishments, specifically intended to provide accommodation for local, elderly people who had fallen into poverty on account of their age or ailing health. Marjorie McIntosh has identified a total of 1,005 hospitals or almshouse \textit{operating at some point} between 1350 and 1599, their number rising to a peak in the 1520s, followed by a dramatic fall in their number as a consequence of the Dissolution, and steady recovery thereafter. McIntosh’s research ends at 1600, but the labours of W.K. Jordan allow us to estimate that there were perhaps 1,000 in existence by the later seventeenth century, and hence at this date approximately 10 per cent of English parishes had ready access to accommodation for the elderly poor.\textsuperscript{5} Of course their incidence, and their contribution to the social welfare of the elderly poor, was very patchy indeed: Ian Archer’s analysis of 17 parishes and towns in possession of almshouses for various years within the period 1589-1710, which defines the ‘at risk’ population as those aged over 60, concludes that only 3 per cent could be accommodated in London’s almshouses in 1598, but as many as 23 per cent in Bray.

\textsuperscript{4} R.M. Smith, ‘Some epidemiological implications of the outdoor relief provisions of the Old Poor Law in comparative perspective’, lecture delivered to the Local Populations Studies Society Autumn Conference, \textit{Local Populations and their Institutions}, Cambridge University, 21 November 2009.

\textsuperscript{5} N. Goose. ‘The English almshouse and the mixed economy of welfare: medieval to modern’, \textit{The Local Historian}, Vol. 40, no. 1 (February 2010), pp. 7-8.
Berkshire, in 1640, while most parishes in his sample stood closer to a figure of 10 per cent. And, of course, circa 90 per cent of English parishes had no access to an almshouse at all. The precise historical geography of almshouse foundation, however, remains to be discovered.

This serious gap in our knowledge of the history of social welfare for the elderly led in 2005 to the establishment of the Almshouse Project, a research initiative proposed by Nigel Goose, adopted by the Family and Community History Research Society, and seed-corn funded by the Economic History Society. The project, which has involved a team of over 60 volunteer researchers coordinated by a project manager, Anne Langley, was supposed to last for one year: it is still continuing six years on. Its aim is to establish an on-line gazetteer of almshouses founded between circa 1300 and 1914, as well as encouraging complementary research and publication on the history of almshouses, to which end a collection of essays is currently in preparation. This project has attracted support from, inter alia, Sue Lambert, whose MPhil on seventeenth-century Berkshire almshouses was awarded by the University of Reading in 1997. But apart from the formidable research efforts of its volunteers, the project has also inspired research into hitherto largely untapped sources, prominent amongst which are the Digests of Endowed Charities, compiled by the Charity Commission and focusing mainly upon the years between 1861-1875, which are published among the parliamentary papers. These are far more systematic, more comprehensive than the better-known, earlier, Brougham Commission reports, and give breakdowns of the amount of endowed charity dedicated to different uses. Even though by the early Victorian period endowed charity may have been giving way to ‘associational’ or ‘subscription’ charity, the sums involved remained significant. What is more, they record the accumulated charitable endowments of several centuries, and are therefore of as much relevance – perhaps more – to early modern England as they are to the nineteenth century which spawned them.

---

8 They have been introduced at a number of academic conferences, most recently N. Goose, ‘The historical geography of philanthropy in England and Wales to the Victorian era’, Economic History Society Annual Conference, Robinson College, Cambridge, 1-3 April 2011. and are presently being systematically analysed with a view to publication.
What can these sources tell us about Berkshire? Let’s start with the Digests of Endowed Charities. The Charity Commissioners’ Digests for 1861-76 indicate a total annual charitable spend from endowments slightly less than £2.2 million and, as our best ‘guesstimates’ suggest that total charitable expenditure was by now well in excess of £7.5 million, the proceeds from endowed charities stood well below the sums raised by subscription. Charitable giving by endowment had far from ceased, however: comparison of the Brougham Commission totals which relate to the period 1819 -1837 with the Digests’ data relating to 1861-1876 show an increase of just under £1 million – partly due to the discovery of hitherto invisible charities, partly to the growth of income over time, but also due to the establishment of new endowments, the number of which was 4,805 producing additional income of £226,952 per annum. If we assume a rate of return on capital of 4 per cent, this represents additional endowments to the value of £5,673,800. In 1895 the Charity Commission confirmed their continuation, recording 13 new trusts of over £100,000 each during the two previous decades, and an average of 500 new endowments each year. Nevertheless, between the eighteenth century and the mid Victorian period voluntary charity has overtaken charity by endowment, and as population growth in the respective English counties varied so widely between the late eighteenth and late nineteenth centuries, we must be very wary in estimating relative levels of generosity from these data.

For Berkshire the total annual return from endowments in the period 1862-3 when its Digest was compiled was £26,994, and of this total £9,683 was devoted to the support of ‘almshouses their inmates and pensioners’. Thus almshouse charities accounted for almost 36 per cent of total charitable endowments, which compares to just 27 per cent for England as a whole, or 26 per cent for England and Wales. Berkshire was thus particularly rich in almshouse endowments, standing in joint 7th place amongst all English and Welsh counties. Almshouses were now to be found in 28 different localities in Berkshire, representing 20 per cent of all localities in the county identified in the Digest, which compares to just 12 per cent nationally.

---

11 Counting the East Riding of Yorkshire as a separate county.
12 This does not indicate that there were 28 almshouses in the county, for individual foundations are not identified in the Digest, merely the total spend under this heading. As the larger towns are very likely to have possessed more than one almshouse, this total is a minimum one.
Another way of analysing this data is to calculate per capita giving, to provide a measure of relative generosity, but given the reservations we have already expressed about the viability of such a procedure in view of the relative shift in the form of charitable giving and differential population growth between counties, two calculations have been made, one based on population totals given in the census nearest to the year in which the relevant Digest was compiled, and another based upon population totals in the later eighteenth century, as recently calculated by Tony Wrigley.\textsuperscript{13} Employing the proximate census population total, Berkshire’s annual return from its endowed charities stood at £0.15 per capita, which compares with £0.80 for England as a whole, and £0.70 for England and Wales. Expenditure on almshouses per capita of the ‘at risk’ population – that is, those aged 60 plus – stood at £0.62, which compares with just £0.28 for England or £0.26 for England and Wales. If we take our base population as 1761, to allow for the relative decline of giving by endowment and the rapid population growth experienced by the industrialising counties, Berkshire’s endowed spend per capita rises to £0.27 per capita, but now stands much closer to the national total of £0.24. For almshouses alone, however, per capita expenditure stood at £0.10, still substantially above the national total of £0.06, and ranking it in joint 6\textsuperscript{th} place amongst all English counties. So, Berkshire was relatively well endowed with funds dedicated to almshouses and their pensioners, and this was true of the county both in the mid Victorian period, as well as in the mid-later eighteenth century.

For the seventeenth century Sue Lambert has identified 20 almshouses in Berkshire founded during that century alone, situated in 13 different localities. If the number of discrete places was the same as those identified in the Victorian Digest for the county, then a minimum of 12 per cent of localities supported at least one almshouse, and this would suggest that Berkshire was better endowed than the average for the counties included in W.K. Jordan’s sample.\textsuperscript{14} Of these foundations, 6 were endowed by merchants, 4 more by tradesmen or artisans and one by a member of the professional classes – John Hall, apothecary, of Reading. Many of these, and particularly the merchants, had close connections with London, and apparently were resident there when they made their will. James Smith, for example, who endowed an almshouse in Maidenhead, described himself as ‘of London, esquire’, and was a member of

the Company of Salters. William Goddard, ‘sometime a citizen and fishmonger of the City of London’, was living in Westminster when he drew up the letters patent that founded an almshouse for 40 residents in Bray, known as Jesus Hospital, and he made the Company of Fishmongers trustees and governors of the charity. But of particular interest for our present purpose are the Raymond almshouses in Newbury founded by Philip Jemmett.

Our story begins with a local-boy-made-good who returned to the area of his childhood and erected an almshouse in his birthplace and endowed it handsomely. Its subsequent history was as a family concern until, perhaps due to a lack of male heirs, it was granted to the Corporation of Newbury in 1763 to ensure that the institution and its charity would continue in perpetuity. Could one argue that this was an act of commemoration for the family? Certainly as we will show, commemorative monuments were a feature of their legacies. Yet the almshouses do not bear the name of their founder, Philip Jemmett, but that of his heir, Raymond.

Philip Jemmett was born in Newbury in 1616, the son of a brewer. In 1635 he was apprenticed to Josias Centre citizen and brewer of London and successfully completed his apprenticeship in 1642. He appears to have been a success as a brewer, had apprentices of his own, and was active in the Company holding various offices including steward in 1659, auditor and renter warden; but appears to have avoided acting as master of the Company as in 1668 he was excused serving, and in 1671 paid a fine for another to replace him. Meanwhile he was active in the City serving as Alderman of Dowgate between 21 March and 7 May 1667 when he paid £420 as fine to be discharged; and Common Councilman for Portsoken 1666-7. He had taken on lease several properties including, in 1662, houses at Garlickhithe in Thames Street for which he paid a large entry fine of £1,300 to the Company. These properties were subsequently damaged in the Great Fire, and in 1667 he attempted to re-negotiate the terms of his lease as the houses had been burnt. Indeed in 1671 he was

15 Ibid.
16 Baptised 8th September 1616 as son of Phillip Jemmett. BRO, Newbury Parish Register.
17 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5445/16, Court 17th December 1635. Phillipp Jemmatt the son of Phillipp Jemmatt of Newbury brewer.
18 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5446/1, No. 1: 7, 81; No 2: 3, 4, 93, 431. Additionally he acted as auditor 1675-1677. Apprentices bound to him in 1662, 1664, 1667, 1669.
20 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5446/1, No. 1: 112, 124.
21 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5446/1, No. 2: 52. MS 5445/20 court 5th November 1667.
acquitted of arrears of rent whilst the house remained unbuilt. Nevertheless, in the same year he was buying up several large landed estates in Berkshire and may have had cash flow problems, rather than being impoverished.

During his lifetime Jemmett amassed a sizable landed estate. In addition to the London properties already mentioned, in 1663 he bought copyhold and freehold estates in Hornsey in Highgate Middlesex. In 1669 he purchased properties in Hertfordshire and also between 1674-5. He began buying lands in Berkshire in 1669, that is, Henwick in Thatcham and other estates from John Winchcombe with final conveyance two years later in 1671 when he also purchased Farnborough. In this same year he purchased the large manor of Kintbury Amesbury and resided there. Together these formed the basis of the family estate and would pass to his only surviving child, his daughter Anne as heir.

Jemmett’s interests now included those of a country gentleman and in 1674 he was made High Sheriff of Berkshire and the Brewer’s Company presented him with a brace of bucks to mark the occasion. Other offices included Farmer of Irish Revenues between 1669 and 1675.

Meanwhile his involvement in the Brewers Company had declined, for example in 1670 he was fined for absence from the Brewer’s court. Nevertheless he maintained his London connections and was chosen as the Company’s auditor in 1675, 1676, 1677. Indeed, in a deed of endowment of the Raymond Charity he was referred to as being “Philip Jemmett late of the parish of St Buttolph without Bishopsgate London esquire deceased”.

It is within this London-Berkshire context that we turn now to his charitable activities. In 1663, together with fellow brewer William Carpenter, he administered the gift of a friend and
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22 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5446/1, No. 3: 53, 196.
23 VCH Middlesex VI, pp.146-9.
24 Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies, E1806, DEGA/36395.
26 VCH Berks IV, p.207.
27 Jemmett had married Elizabeth daughter of Lancelot and Anne Grimshaw of St Mary Aldermary London and it was their daughter Anne who married Sir Jonathan Raymond in 1661. Boyd, Citizens of London, 15781.
28 Brewers’ Company, MS. 5446/1, No. 3: 334, 337.
29 Woodhead, Rulers of London, p.98.
30 Brewer’s Company, MS 5446/1, No 2: 341, 348.
31 Brewer’s Company, MS 5446/1, No 3: 442, No 4: 1, 65.
32 BRO, N/QR1/1/1-2.
established a charity that would provide money for stockings and shoes for two poor London brewers. Jemmett’s own benefaction for poor brewers is viewed in the context of a Company in decline, along with many other livery companies, and adversely affected by the Great Fire of 1666 which destroyed their Brewer’s Hall. By his will of 1676 he bequeathed £100 to the Company for its stock, and an additional £100 to be invested to pay £6 p.a. to four poor freemen or women of the Company at 7s 6d each per quarter. These doles were distributed from 1679 being paid from the profits of various houses belonging to the Company in Shoe Lane.

Newbury had been a successful town manufacturing cloth in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries but had fallen on hard times and was a town experiencing economic decline in the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, there was a longer history of almshouses and other provision for the poor of the town; so philanthropic activity was not reserved solely for times of hardship. Indeed, over the seventeenth century two or three almshouses were founded or re-founded per decade.

Prior to writing his will in January 1676 Jemmett had built “at his own proper costs and charges” twelve almshouses with their appurtenances in Newbury. These he bequeathed to his grandson Jemmett Raymond in trust to house 12 poor people of Newbury (unmarried) chosen by his grandson or his heirs and for each to receive 12d a week from income derived from lands, including the Globe Inn in Newbury. In addition Jemmett bequeathed £600 to his son in law Jonathan Raymond to be invested in lands and tenements, income from which would be used to increase the dole to 2s per week. Thus we have the beginning of the family charity and almshouses which they would administer and maintain until 1763. Jemmett died at Kintbury in 1678 and was buried, along with his wife, in what was to become the family vault with a memorial erected to him in the chancel of the parish church.

---

33 Brewer’s Company, MS 5462 f.33.
35 Brewer’s Company, MS 5445/22 ff. 127-8, 194, 325, 428. An indenture of covenant was drawn up between the Company and Phillip Jemmett’s daughter and executrix Anne on 23rd June 1679 ratifying this bequest. MS 5462A, ff. 182-4.
37 BRO, N/QRI/1/1. This will does not survive and details have been taken from the various indentures related to the charity.
38 BRO, N/QRI/1/1.
39 BRO, D/P78/1/1, 26th June 1678. Amongst the parish documents is a plan dated 1753 of the family vault in the chancel providing details of the persons buried and position of their coffins, including Philip Jemmett and his wife, but not the location of the entrance to the vault.
Phillip Jemmett’s daughter Anne, acting as executrix, ensured her father’s wishes were carried out in both charitable contexts. In June 1679 she settled by indenture of covenant the £200 on the Company to fulfil his wishes to establish that charity. She was active with her husband and son in setting up two trusts related to the Newbury almshouses. Furthermore by her will of 1709 she left an additional legacy of £400 to her son, the said Jemmett Raymond, to purchase lands and from this income to pay each of the twelve poor people of Newbury an additional 6d each weekly, and to provide for further expenses whenever necessary, particularly as payments for fuel to the almspeople. She died at Henwick and was buried at Kintbury in 1709 next to her father in the family vault as requested in her will.

Jemmett’s son in law, Jonathan Raymond, was also a master brewer and had been described by Le Neve as “a very weak silly man but gott a great estate”, presumably through his marriage to Anne. He was knighted 20th October 1679 where described as of Barton Court and Kintbury, and sheriff of London; Brewer 1681-96 and master 1679-80; MP for Great Bedwyn 1690-5; Alderman for Bishopsgate 1681, 1683, 1685. He was discharged 24th September 1696 on the plea that his affairs required him to reside wholly in the country. Indeed, the parish documents record his active participation in events in Kinbury such as when acting as allower or auditor of the churchwardens’ accounts in 1684, and again in 1699.

Jonathan Raymond fulfilled his late father in law’s wishes and invested the £600 in lands and tenements in Newbury and probably also in two bonds of £100 each in the East India.

---

40 Brewer’ Company, MS 5462A, ff.182-4.
41 TNA, PROB 11/511. Anne Raymond’s will mentions two indentures to set up trusts of 24th Nov 1703 and 18th Apr 1705 which relate to the Newbury almshouses and charity. The charity commissioners refer to a lease and release of 9th Sep 1707 between Jonathan and Jemmett Raymond and Roger Geater of Barton regarding the endowment, but Anne not involved in this action. BRO, N/QR1/1/1.
42 TNA, PROB 11/511.
43 BRO, D/P78/5/1.
44 Beaven, Aldermen of London II, p.192.
48 Beaven, Aldermen of London I, p.42.
49 BRO, D/P 78/5/1.
At this time the income from the impropriate tithes of Kintbury were added to the charity together with rents from various properties in Kintbury parish. As a result, the cash dole to the almspeople was increased to 2s, and became 2s 6d in 1709 as a result of Anne’s bequest. Moreover, each almsperson was to be provided with a new blue cloth gown each year. A grant of 40s was made annually to the vicar of Newbury, which would subsequently increase to £5, who would find and pay a suitable person to read prayers to the almspeople twice a week. Jonathan Raymond died in 1711 and was buried at Kintbury. The family lands and estates, including the almshouses and charitable trust, descended to Jemmett Raymond (the elder), their son. As a result of Anne and Jonathan Raymond’s activities the family charity had been increased significantly.

Phillip Jemmett’s grandson, Jemmett Raymond the elder, was born in 1662 and had been the recipient of the family almshouses and charity along with other landed estates. His principal residence appears to have been at Kintbury as, from 1686 onwards and whilst his father was still alive and active, his name appears in the parish records when acting as counter signatory to various accounts, he was examiner of the accounts of overseers of the poor in 1690, and his signature often appeared at the head of lists of signatories, and above that of the vicar. He was knighted in 1680 in London and a year after his father. He married for the first time in 1687 the heiress Elizabeth Brown from whom he acquired Woverton in Hampshire, but she died in 1688 aged seventeen, nine days after the birth of their only son, also Jemmett. He married, for the second time in 1704, Elizabeth Skylling daughter of Henry Skylling of Draycot in Wiltshire by whom he had several sons and daughters who pre-deceased him; except for a daughter Elizabeth who married Rev John Craven. The second Elizabeth died in 1754 and was buried at Kintbury. His will was made in 1743 and proved in 1755 in which he left the estates at Henwick, Shaw and Harwell to his wife for life and then to his daughter Elizabeth; the remaining estates (unspecified but would have included the almshouses and charity) to his son and executor Jemmett the younger. Jemmett Raymond the elder wished to be buried in the parish church of Kintbury in a private and decent manner.

---

50 BRO, N/QR1/1/1 and income from the bonds are mentioned in the charity’s ledger BRO, N/QR3/1.
51 Their monument in Kintbury parish church states that they were married 11th June 1661 and had six sons and five daughters, although not all survived to adulthood.
52 BRO, D/P78/5/1.
54 VCH Hants IV, pp. 270-2.
55 Details taken from monument in Kintbury parish church.
56 BRO, D/P 78/1/2.
57 TNA, PROB11/815.
He and his two wives are commemorated in a monument erected by order of his son and by the latter’s widow. The monument records that “Sir Jemmett lived in great hospitality and esteem to the 93rd year of his age.”

He was succeeded by his son, Jemmett Raymond the younger (1688-1767) who died childless. Perhaps it was in recognition of the end of the Raymond line and to perpetuate the charity that he granted the family’s almshouses and endowments in trust to the Corporation of Newbury on 18th March 1763.58

At this point it is possible to see the full extent of the charity and its endowments. In summary they included:

- The 12 almshouses with their gardens and fuel sheds;
- Grounds containing over an acre of land lying to their south;
- The Globe inn;
- Lands in Newbury purchased from the borough by Jemmett Raymond and formerly the church almshouses;
- Improprate tithes from Kintbury;
- Income from rents from lands there;
- A garden ground in Newbury on the Island with the profits from the associated watercourses in the vicinity of the weaving shops;
- Meadows in Speen.
- Two bonds of £100 each of the East India Company.59

The almshouses and charity were to be administered by a Receiver and Treasurer elected annually by the mayor, aldermen and capital burgesses.60 They would take over the responsibilities previously undertaken by the family, including, and in association with the vicar, the selection of suitable persons of Newbury to be almsmen and women. It was anticipated that there would be surplus income derived from the investments over and above the maintenance of the almshouses and their residents. He ordered, therefore, that a fund of no less than £400 principal money be maintained against future eventualities. And this would

58 BRO, N/QR1/1.
59 BRO, N/QR1/1. The properties are described in great detail.
60 BRO, N/QR1/1.
be employed subsequently to fund the erection of additional Raymond’s almshouses by the Corporation.

The charity and almshouses had been actively managed by the family and Jemmett Raymond the younger continued to do so for the rest of his life appointing the almspeople (six men and six women) and managing the finances as his activities relating to income and expenditure are recorded in the charity’s ledger, including a one-off payment of £1.6.0 in May 1763 for a dinner for the almspeople; perhaps to celebrate the grant of the charity. The ledger demonstrates his active involvement with records of his payments of the land tax, collection of rents and tithes, payment for repairs to the almshouses of timber, bricks, and for labour, payments of the cash doles to the almspeople, the cloth for their gowns, and an annual delivery of fuel. Between his death in 1767 and her own in 1771, his widow Elizabeth was active in fulfilling her husband’s wishes. She signed off the charity’s account in October 1767 which was balanced at £2,196 6s 1½d.

Jemmett Raymond the younger appears to have been infatuated with the widow Elizabeth Craven who he eventually married at some point between 1755 and 1756. In the codicil to his will of September 1763 he bequeathed (amongst other things) £200 to Mr Thomas Henshaw of Chieveley his heir and executor to be paid out of his personal estate for the erection of a monument in Kintbury church to the memory of his father and his two wives with three busts; unless in the meantime he and his wife had undertaken the work. His charitable concerns included bequests of £20 to the poor of Kintbury, £15 to the poor of Thatcham, £10 to the poor of Wolverton and £5 to the poor of Farnborough. Was this in proportion to the size of the estates in these places?

Jemmett’s widow, Elizabeth Raymond, the daughter of John Staples of Ash Park Berkshire, married in 1719 for the first time Charles Craven esq (1682-1754) previously Governor of South Carolina with a marriage portion of £6,000 given by her father. They had a son Rev

---

61 BRO, N/QR3/1.
62 BRO, N/QR2/1.
63 BRO, N/QR2/1.
64 In his first will of 1755 he was described as of Wolverton and made bequests to Mrs Elizabeth Craven a widow; by the first codicil of 1756 he had married her; in the second codicil of 1763 he was described as of Barton and Wolverton and she was his dear wife; in the final codicil of 1765 he was described as of Wolverton and Barton. The will with codicils was proved 13 October 1767 by Elizabeth Raymond formerly Craven executrix. TNA, PROB11/933.
65 TNA, PROB 11/573.
John Craven.\textsuperscript{66} She remarried within a year or two of being widowed. As Elizabeth Raymond widow she continued various acts of charity and commemoration. She had put 13 children to school at Kintbury and in her will bequeathed a guinea to each of them; she also made provision for the poor in the parishes where they held lands.\textsuperscript{67} She left a further £200 this time to erect a monument with two busts commemorating her husband and herself. She died in 1771 and was buried at Kintbury.

In addition to the family charity and almshouses, the family were commemorated in lavish monuments in the parish church of Kintbury. Pevsner describes that commemorating Philip Jemmett in the chancel as “cartouche with beefy cherubs and cornucopias”.\textsuperscript{68} That to Jonathan Raymond may contain work by Grinling Gibbons.\textsuperscript{69} However it is the monuments by the Flemish sculptors Peter and Thomas Scheemakers that dominate the parish church and originally stood on either side of the east window and a focal point for worship. They contain life-size classical portrait busts of white marble of all five figures following the instructions contained in the wills of Jemmett and Elizabeth Raymond.\textsuperscript{70} It is unusual to find monuments on the scale and artistic achievement of the Raymond’s in a rural parish church. Their need for commemoration was strong, and they chose to identify themselves where they were buried rather than elsewhere where they had interests. They had ensured the perpetuity of their name in the charity and its almshouses and their presence in the parish church.

In conclusion, we have identified a number of features whose significance lies beyond the confines of Berkshire:

a. how the Raymond almshouses reflect a tradition of charitable giving in general, and almshouse foundation in particular, that appears to have captured the imagination of the great and the good of Berkshire

b. how connexions between those born in the 'home counties' and London helped both to create the wealth and the inspiration for acts of charity of this kind

c. how those making such endowments were often actively involved in the day to day administration of the charities which bore their name

\textsuperscript{66} Who married another Elizabeth Raymond.
\textsuperscript{67} TNA, PROB 11/967.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
d. and this therefore suggests that commemoration was only part of their concern. The other aspects were a strong association with place and a real concern to ensure the maintenance of the deserving poor

e. how this charity shows that it is difficult to strictly demarcate private philanthropy from public provision, as the corporation ended up administering it

f. how this charity also demonstrates the ability of such charities to persist through time, and to reinvent themselves as and when it became necessary - a feature also strongly demonstrated by the history of Doughty's Hospital in Norwich.71

Richard Smith's concern with the historical geography of English poor relief is mirrored in our concern with the historical geography of philanthropy. Of course, the study we have presented today is far more circumscribed than Richard's nationally-focused research, but we do feel that if we are fully to understand the mainsprings and mechanisms of philanthropy and how these varied across space and time, we will need many more studies of Jemmet and his ilk, to allow the particular to inform the general, as well as the general informing the particular.