

To be SOLD by AUCTION
By ROBERT OSBORNE,
 On Wednesday, October the 11th,
 At the late Dwelling House, in Orford,
 Of Mr. GEORGE CULHAM, dec.

THE Household Furniture, Farming Utensils, &c.
 consisting of good featherbeds, bolsters, pillows,
 bedsteads, with cotton, Manchester, and other furni-
 ture, tables, chairs; washing, brewing, and dairy
 utensils; about 8 tons of good clover; new half load
 tumbrel, plough, a pair of harrows, sundries of cart
 and plough trace; likewise a large open boat, with
 mast, yards, &c.  Sale begins at Ten o'clock..

Announcement of the sale in the Ipswich Journal 1797

When it came to Culham's creditors and debtors things became more complicated. There were bonds and promissory notes due to the deceased to the value of £281, but £200 was believed to be part of the purchase money of 'an estate' in Orford, payable by Mark Farley Wade, still unsettled and therefore excluded by Rush from the account. Bills relating to a 'new house' were unpaid, including brickmakers from Snape and Chillesford, a Playford bricklayer and an Orford glazier and blacksmith. Culham owed a boat builder from Dover £19 19s 6d and had purchased a chaise cart from Norwich for £25 10s 0d.

It was not until July 1798 that Rush claimed expenses for looking over the new house and advising the auctioneer, Mr Osborne, about selling it. However no auction notice appears in the *Ipswich Journal* in the following months, suggesting that it was sold privately, perhaps to Mark Wade whose promissory note was found by Rush.

Adventures at sea

Culham's legitimate trading activities meant he owed James Bullock of London £320 8s 4d for demurrage connected with a vessel named the *Mary Ann*. However Rush was not convinced that a claim by Captain Remeger of London for about £150 was genuine. The *Mary Ann* had recently been lost on a voyage to Hamburg, and it was said that the deceased was entitled to £400 insurance money. Again, Rush was not convinced, believing the vessel had been 'fraudulently foundered at sea'.

It was the alleged activities of Culham's other vessel the *Daphne* that caused Rush the greatest difficulty. He believed that Culham was the owner of the 'privateer'², which had taken a valuable Dutch prize, although the High Court of Admiralty had not yet declared it a legal prize, therefore its value was unknown. Since taking the Dutch ship, it was said that the *Daphne* had been 'condemned for illicit practices'. This must have been for smuggling, in which case the boat had probably been destroyed. It is unlikely in these circumstances for the Court to reward him.

Activities inland

There were items listed by Rush that are intriguing. Culham owed money to three attorneys in Harwich, Saxmundham and Eye, the latter charging as much as £160. This was probably to do with Culham's claim in connection with the Dutch vessel. Apart from Orford tradesmen, there were bills submitted by an Earl Soham thatcher, a Cretingham blacksmith and a Martlesham publican. Two men, Joshua Cook and Matthew Wayman claimed between £3 and £5 for 'housekeeping'. Were these men looking after safe houses where captains could lie low between smuggling runs? Earl Soham, Cretingham, Easton and Brandeston are all within a short distance of each other, and the Earl Soham surgeon, William Goodwin, who kept a diary from 1785, made special mention of the large amounts of spirits that passed through his village (see Bulletin 8, p7).