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Abstract

Examining the businesses of a number of inns in Leeds and York, this study explores the role played by innkeepers and their inns in the economic and cultural life of two very different cities. Using evidence from the local press and directories this study argues that innkeepers played an important role in the urban economies of both cities, developing credit and transport networks and providing venues for a variety of meetings, auctions and sales. These networks, and the provision of hospitality and stabling for large numbers of visitors, placed the inns at the centre of the developing service sector that was vital to the economies of Leeds and York.

Using advertisements in the local press, this study maintains that the adoption of the language and manners of polite society by innkeepers, not only promoted themselves and their inns but also encouraged the adoption of those ideals by the middling sort, thus encouraging the development of urban society.

Unlike previous studies, this study provides a rare insight into the day-to-day business of innkeepers. The innkeepers’ account and daybooks used for this study show the range of food and drink and services provided by innkeepers, and the staff employed. Drawing on probate and insurance records this study argues that many innkeepers had substantial business interests and were often owners of significant amounts of property. Diversifying into other areas of the economy, including agriculture, carrying and coaching, innkeepers not only amassed considerable wealth, they also provided significant employment opportunities for men and women in both Leeds and York. Through the identification of significant numbers of female innkeepers and large numbers of female servants and traders this study maintains that far from being an innkeeping ‘fraternity’, inns were more feminised spaces than had previously been suggested.
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Introduction

For centuries, inns have been part of the urban and rural landscape. Along with the church, they were part of everyday life of people across the length and breadth of Britain. This comparative study examines urban inns, their innkeepers, and their role in the day-to-day economic and social life of the cities, assessing their role in the disparate transformation of Leeds and York in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Inns were undoubtedly significant in the development of both Leeds as a major industrial town and of York as a centre of polite and civilised society for the northern aristocracy and gentry. This study also explores the businesses of innkeepers and the ways in which they supported business and trade. It further examines how innkeepers employed changing ideas of politeness to promote their business and how that helped effect social change in the local community.

Despite the centuries old prevalence of the inn in English daily life, the historiography of innkeeping prior to the 1970’s was very patchy, veering from a quixotic view of the inn influenced by literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to total neglect. Interest in inns first appeared in the late Victorian period when, despite coaching services running until the 1860s, there was already a nostalgic celebration of the inns associated with the coaching era. In Tom Bradley’s history of coaching in Yorkshire, *The Old Coaching Days*, published in 1897, the first four pages are given to a substantial quote from Dicken’s *Martin Chuzzlewit*. This romanticised view of the coaching experience reflects Bradley comparisons of ‘the delights and pleasures of the good old coaching days’ with the ‘carbon-snorting steam horse’ of the railways and ‘the shrill shriek of its demon whistle’\(^1\). This exemplifies the anecdotal style which idealised a ‘days gone by’ nostalgia for the days before the railways and the industrial revolution overwhelmed the lives of many people. This sets the tone for the remainder of Bradley’s book. Bradley describes a scene at the White Swan Inn at York:

> A visit to the yard of the White Swan on a market day will carry one back by easy transition to the bustle and turmoil of the old coaching days, when the lads and gossips used to sit on Ouse Bridge\(^2\)

Also describing the mail coaches in Briggate in Leeds, Bradley wrote:

---


\(^2\) Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 66.
when the constant winding of the guards’ horns awoke the echoes of the old street, or the enlivening strains of “The White Cockade” or “Rule Britannia”, issuing from some cleverly-manipulated keyed-bugle, heralded the approach of a crack coach – when the Royal Mails came swinging down Briggate at full gallop.

of traders and merchants before the introduction of coach services, Bradley says:

> On horseback before daybreak and long after nightfall these hardy sons of trade pursued their object with the spirit and intrepidity of the foxchase, and the boldest of their country neighbours had no reason to despise their horsemanship or their courage.

This anecdotal style of writing continued into the twentieth century. A. E. Richardson and H. D. Eberlein’s book *The English Inn Past and Present*, is a case in point. Primarily London-centric, it dismissed any thoughts of inns outside London and claimed:

> No account of the English Inn could, or should, be allowed to begin from any other centre but London.

And

> it is to London we turn as the true inn centre.

The introduction of Richardson and Eberlein's book, was written as a walk through London, with a significant amount of its content related to the changing building styles, inn signs and ‘touring’. There is little written regarding the everyday life of an inn and the people who lived and worked there.

The style of these books on inns, often placed them within a local context, as part of a wider local history. Interest in local history was nothing new. Local history studies have been popular since the eighteenth century, often written by local people. Ralph Thoresby’s history of Leeds, *Ducatus Leodiensis*, published in 1715 and Francis Drake’s history of York, *Eboracum*, published in 1736, are just two examples of local studies.

---

4 Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 140.
7 Ralph Thoresby, *Ducatus Leodiensis: Or, the Topography of the Ancient and Populous Town and Parish of Leedes, and Parts Adjacent in the West-Riding of the County of York. With the Pedegrees of Many of the Nobility and Gentry… Extracted from Records, Original Evidences, and Manuscripts*, 1715.
8 Francis Drake, *Eboracum or the History and Antiquities of the City of York from its Original to its Present Time*, 1736.
These studies tended to be patriotic and although initially aimed at local people, they were also used as a means of promoting the local area to outsiders. Personal in nature, eighteenth-century local studies provided facts about the locality, historical events and information about a town’s leading families. This style continued into the nineteenth century.

In the early twentieth century, little attention was paid to the study of eighteenth-century towns. Prior to the 1970s, local studies concentrated on town development prior to the Civil War and on specific events during the period of the Civil War or the Industrial Revolution. Interest in inns and the licensing trade in general, was neglected, whilst the contemporary historiography was dominated by concentration on the economic and social aspects of industrial production, mills and factories. Urban histories tended to focus on London, with smaller towns only identified through their relationship with the metropolis. Towns were seen as places where specific incidents occurred and there was no real examination of how towns functioned, either as individual entities, or in terms of their economic or social interaction with their hinterland.

The emergence of urban history in the 1970s focused research attention on the development of towns. A number of urban historians expanded their scope of interest into the service sectors of towns, reviving interest in the inn as part of that sector. For example, Peter Borsay’s work on the development of urban culture, first published in 1977, placed the inn within the development of urban leisure. This was typical of most work carried out on inns at the time; they were always part of a bigger study. The first attempt at a systematic study of the inn as a distinct entity, was by Alan Everitt, in 1973. In his essay, “The English Urban Inn, 1560-1760”. In that essay Everitt claimed:

> there is no serious, systematic study of the functions of inns, or what exactly went on within them, and of why ..... they became the centres of so much of the social, political and economic life of the nation.

Everitt decried earlier literature about inns, as full of sentimentality, ‘facetious humour and irritating errors’. He offered his insight into the functions of inns and the ‘innkeeping fraternity’ in Northampton, as a stimulus for further studies across the country. Tracing

---


12 Ibid
the numbers of inns, their ‘siting’, the development of coaching and the activities carried out by innkeepers, Everitt argued that by the eighteenth century, the scale of inns had increased significantly along with the ‘social status’ and ‘wealth of the leading innkeepers’\textsuperscript{13}. He highlighted the importance of the inn as a space for trading, both as a venue for auctions and sales, and also as an indoor market for the trade in hops, seed, corn, malt and cloth\textsuperscript{14}. Commenting that the developing provincial cultural life had been ‘neglected’, Everitt claimed inns regularly provided a place for social interaction and entertainment, in the form of assemblies, horse races, feasts and novelty acts\textsuperscript{15}. It is clear from Everitt’s work, that inns were heavily involved in all aspects of day-to-day life for towns and he claimed that inns were a place where people from all levels of society would meet and as a result, ‘reflected innumerable facets of English life’\textsuperscript{16}.

Everitt presented his information about the functions of inns as a series of facts; the inn was not placed within the wider context of what was happening in society at the time. In part two of his aforesaid essay, Everitt turned his attention to the ‘innkeeping fraternity’, implying that an innkeeper was intrinsically male. Describing innkeepers as an ‘amorphous group of people’, Everitt claimed it was ‘possible to detect certain outstanding characteristics’\textsuperscript{17} of the ‘innkeeping fraternity’, which he identified as mobile, hierarchal and dynastic. By concentrating on these aspects of innkeeping, he failed to consider innkeepers as individuals. They were seen as part of something larger. Predominantly using probate evidence, Everitt focused on the wealth and property of individuals. He identified James Bordrigge as the innkeeper of the George in Northampton, he used Bordrigge’s inventory to describe the size of the George, the value of furnishings, silver and stock; great detail is given about the amount of kitchenware, including numbers of different types of plates and dishes, furniture and wall hangings in the inn. There was no information regarding Bordrigge himself, or any attempt to relate the contents of the inn with him or his abilities as an innkeeper\textsuperscript{18}. Everitt did however, maintain that innkeepers played a prominent role in the cultural and economic life of Northampton and stated that:

Northampton innkeepers played an enterprising and decisive role between the Restoration and the Reform Bill\textsuperscript{19}.

\textsuperscript{13} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 103.
\textsuperscript{14} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 104-107.
\textsuperscript{15} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 114-118.
\textsuperscript{16} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 137.
\textsuperscript{17} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 120.
\textsuperscript{18} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 124.
\textsuperscript{19} Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 120.
As a local study of innkeepers, Everitt's work is a good starting point, but further local studies need to be examined in order to contrast and compare the role played by inns in the urban economy.

Studies undertaken after Everitt's, placed inns within a wider framework. For instance, the studies of J.A Chartres, examined inns within the context of the transport revolution, those of Peter Borsay as part of the ‘Urban Renaissance’ and those of Rosemary Sweet, as an institution within the English town.

In 1977, John Chartres, published his study “The Capital’s Provincial Eyes: London’s Inns in the Early Eighteenth Century”. During the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, inns were primarily ‘transport centres’. Chartres examined the importance of the connection between transport trades and inns, in the formation of provincial links with London and claimed inns ‘remained central features of the transport system until at least the 1840s’. Through their involvement in servicing carrier wagons and drovers and by operating as owners and servicers of the stage coaches, innkeepers established links between the London inns and provincial towns. These links provided a valuable communication network for news and information to and from the capital. Regional connections forged by London inns, enabled the capital to monitor what was going on in the provinces. In addition the flow of information from London, also fuelled economic development and urbanisation. London developments thereby set a precedent for urban development in other towns across the country.

According to Chartres, London inns were also ‘mixed business complexes’. That business mix was facilitated by the layout of inn yards allowing a mixture of workshops, ‘in-filling houses, shops and warehouses’. In effect innkeepers were subletting property. Everitt focussed on the inn as a venue for economic activity provided by the innkeeper, whereas Chartres implied that the ‘physiognomy’ of inns with its yards and courts, and the subletting of workshops and warehouses, enabled the innkeeper’s influence to extend outside the four walls of the inn. By providing accommodation for a variety of small businesses, inns enabled the development of the local economy. Chartres’ study placed the inn not only at the centre of local economies, but as a key element of the transport

industry and its regional connections. Inns acted as a catalyst for urban change across the country. Chartres implied that urbanisation was the result of London’s influence on towns and that the development of towns was stimulated by a desire to emulate the capital.

In the 1980s, the work of Penelope Corfield and Peter Clark changed the focus of attention from London to the English provincial town as an agent of change. Whilst the social and economic changes that took place in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had previously been seen as a product of the Industrial Revolution, Corfield took the view that towns had influenced those changes. In her book, *The Impact of English Towns 1700-1800*, she argued that English towns were part-agents and part-product of the economic and social changes of [the] urban and industrial revolution.

This view is supported by Clark, who claimed that whilst the ‘economic, social and other structures’ of provincial towns were fundamentally changed following a period of ‘accelerating innovation and adaptation’ during the eighteenth century, they also provided a major “impetus to economic growth”. These studies signalled a move to a more interdisciplinary approach to the study of urban history, comprising not only economic study, but also demographic, political, social and environmental considerations. It was within this context that the study of inns was positioned.

Peter Borsay’s work, *The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in The Provincial Town 1660-1770*, published in 1989, placed the inn and the innkeeper, squarely in the centre of urban development. Borsay’s study examined urban transformation as a response to seventeenth century ‘expansion in commerce, industry, and the demand for social and consumer services’. Borsay claimed that the physical transformation of towns and a demand for ‘high-status leisure’ during the late seventeenth century, prompted a ‘parallel transformation’ of cultural life in towns. Developments in the provision of leisure facilities, including entertainments and sport, further transformed the physical environment of the towns and effected changes in the behaviour of society, as socialising and ‘personal display’ became culturally important. Borsay placed innkeepers at the forefront of the progress in urban leisure at this time, stating:

---

31 Peter Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance*, 150.
Among the entrepreneurs of leisure, two groups deserve a special accolade: urban innkeepers and town councils.....they sponsored or accommodated virtually all the developing forms of urban leisure. Their role was particularly important in the early years of the Urban Renaissance, before the emergence of specialist promoters and purpose-built premises.

Borsay argued that culture was an important factor in the transformation of towns and society, positioning innkeepers at the centre of the development of leisure and thus the cultural life of towns. He thus afforded them a degree of agency in the economic and urban expansion of the eighteenth century. The placing of inns at the centre of all aspects of urban life was reiterated by Rosemary Sweet in her book *The English Town, 1680-1840*, published in 1999.

Using her study of towns as a means to explore changes in government and society, Sweet acknowledged the role of the inn in all aspects of urban life, stating inns were ‘the focal point of the community’, being used by a range of administrative bodies, including corporations and improvement commissions, for meetings or for ‘more informal, relaxed proceedings afterwards’. Inns were also used for political business and for a range of entertainments. Sweet claimed:

> there was little in the cultural, administrative, economic and political life of the town which did not have some connection with the inn.

According to Sweet, inns had ‘lost some of their multifunctionality’ by the beginning of the nineteenth century, due to developments in urban culture and the arrival of purpose-built entertainment venues, such as theatres and assembly rooms. However, the evidence put forward in this study shows that inns continued to be used as venues for meetings, sales and auctions well into the nineteenth century. The economic and cultural diversity of towns meant that the timing of cultural developments varied from town to town. A sense of tradition, history and identity remained important to provincial towns and it was through these, that ‘cultural innovations were mediated and modified’. As a traditional element of urban society, innkeepers and the services they provided may have influenced the cultural identity of towns. A comparison of the inns in Leeds and York will ascertain if the differences between the two towns were reflected in the business of the inns.

---

34 Ibid.
The scarcity of scholarly literature on inns, caused by a decline in scholarship from c.1995, can be contrasted with the growing amount of literature on seventeenth and eighteenth-century alehouses and coffeehouses\(^{38}\). In Chartres' review of Clark's book, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830*, (a review published in *The Economic History Review* in August 1985), John Chartres, described it as:

> the first successful scholarly monograph on an institution arguably at times more important in English social history than the parish church\(^{39}\).

Clark's book provided an in depth history of drinking establishments, predominantly alehouses, and he claimed that prior to 1800, inns were heavily dependent on their role as commercial and social centres\(^{40}\).

The studies of Clark, Peter Haydon and Paul Jennings traced the development of public drinking houses, exploring the variety of drinking establishments including alehouses, taverns and inns. They examined their place in society and changes within the industry. The role of alehouses and inns as venues for a range of services, entertainments and trade, over many centuries have been systematically analysed\(^{41}\). All those three studies acknowledge the urban inn as the top of the hierarchy of victualling premises and their links with trade and transport. It is evident from those studies and those of Michael A. Smith, and Tony Collins and Wray Vamplew\(^{42}\), that drinking houses, whether they were classified as alehouses, beerhouses, taverns, inns, ginshops or public houses, were ubiquitous, and their influence permeated through all levels of society.


\(^{40}\) Peter Clark, *The English Alehouse*, 8, 9.


More recently, interest in inns has again fallen away, as historical focus has shifted towards the public sphere and coffee houses as places for political debate, clubs and societies. Furthermore, interest in the inn has been overshadowed by interest in shopping and advertising. The work of Jon Stobart on the growth of consumerism, has placed the ‘shopping streets’ at the centre of the local economy\textsuperscript{43}. In the eighteenth century, shops were part of the growing service sector which included inns. The development of leisure facilities in marketing centres led to a rise in the number of ‘luxury shops’\textsuperscript{44}. Urban historians identified shops and shopping as a ‘major leisure activity’\textsuperscript{45} and consumerism a key feature of the urban renaissance, changing the ‘landscape, society and culture’\textsuperscript{46} of towns. These studies have stimulated further research into changes in retailing and the social development of shopping, examining its effects on the physical environment and the evolution of advertising\textsuperscript{47}. In more recent work, the multi-sensory experience of shopping has been incorporated into the study of the urban environment and eighteenth-century consumption\textsuperscript{48}.

It is the contention of this study that inns and innkeepers played an important role in the economic and cultural life of towns. Exploring the practical ways in which inns supported and encouraged the development of the local economy, this study will argue that, contrary to literature published on coffeehouses, inns played a far more significant role than coffee houses in the development of the local economies of Leeds and York. As a comparative study of very different towns, this study illustrates how inns were involved in shaping provincial identities through the services they provided. It can also be used in conjunction with the work of Everitt and Chartres for future studies exploring the experiences of innkeepers across the country.

\textsuperscript{44} Peter Borsay, “The English Urban Renaissance: The Development of Provincial Urban Culture, 1680-c.1760”. In \textit{The Eighteenth Century Town 1688-1820}. (Harlow: Longman Group, 1990), 164.
\textsuperscript{45} Joyce M. Ellis, \textit{The Georgian Town}, 81.
\textsuperscript{46} Jon Stobart, “Shopping Streets as Social Space: Leisure, Consumerism and Improvement in an Eighteenth-Century County Town”, 6.
What has become clear in this study, is that in order to understand the role of inns during the 'long' eighteenth century, it is necessary to combine both urban and women's history. This study demonstrates that inns were far more feminised places than had been previously acknowledged, and places women in the centre of the urban economy throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This study also shows that substantial numbers of women were involved with the innkeeping trade, either directly or indirectly through trading networks, and that there is evidence to show that the contribution made by women to local economies and business networks, has been severely under-represented. Previous studies have underestimated the role of women in maintaining local trade and credit networks, and have failed to acknowledge the business acumen of women by classifying certain areas of work as 'women’s work'.

This study examines two cities, which though geographically close, were very different. York, an ancient corporation town, was an important visitor centre for the gentry and middle classes during the eighteenth century; Leeds, a centre of the West Riding woollen trade in the seventeenth century, experienced rapid industrial and demographic growth and became a major manufacturing town in the nineteenth century. Using a range of primary and secondary sources, the day-to-day business of innkeepers as providers of accommodation and refreshment for travellers and as service providers for trade, administration and leisure is examined. This study also provides an insight into the people who lived and worked within the inn environment, from the innkeeper down to the servants. Was Everitt correct when he depicted innkeepers as a ‘fraternity’ or was this an example of the chauvinistic discourse prevalent in the early 1970s?

The diverse histories of Leeds and York, provide valuable comparisons for a study of the contribution made by innkeepers and inns on the cultural and economic life of diverse towns and is the main reason for using these cities for this study. York, as a well-established administrative and ecclesiastical centre, had a long history of providing services for visitors. During the eighteenth century interest in its ancient history dating back to the Romans, provided the impetus for the town’s recovery from a period of stagnation during the previous century, its future built on an appreciation of its past. In comparison, Leeds was a relatively new, forward looking, fast developing manufacture and trade town which embraced the laissez-faire attitudes of the nineteenth century. The very different characters of the towns meant that the type of people visiting them also varied significantly, Leeds provided services for manufacturers and merchants whilst York provided services for the agricultural hinterland, for the professions, gentry and aristocracy. This differentiation of the types of visitor provides an opportunity to examine the ways in which innkeepers adapted to the needs of their clientele.
Although a close examination of the history and development of Leeds and York highlights significant differences between the two cities, it also highlights similarities in the ways in which inns not only supported the local economies but also social and cultural developments in the cities. By studying Leeds and York and placing them within the context of the work carried out by Everitt on Northampton and Chartres on London, it provides an insight, not only into the workings of inns, but also any regional variations in the ways inns operated. The use of Leeds and York as study towns highlights the contrast between the old county towns and the new industrialised towns and the role of the inn in the changing urban landscape of not just Yorkshire but the north of England as a whole.

The primary function of an inn has always been the provision of hospitality, however, innkeeping was often part of much bigger business. Chapter two examines the day-to-day life of inns, making use of day books and account books belonging to contemporary innkeepers, exploring the variety of ways in which innkeepers supplemented their income. Using insurance records, this study demonstrates that inns were substantial businesses and innkeepers were holders of significant property interests.

Chapter two also considers the personality of the innkeeper, and the skills and the previous experience required to run a successful inn. It demonstrates how, by adopting the language and behaviour of polite society, innkeepers not only promoted their business, but also promoted ideas of civility and politeness.

Whereas chapter two focuses on the innkeepers and their business interests, chapter three considers the use of the inn as a venue for a range of business and cultural activities. Taking into consideration the work of Everitt and Borsay this study analyses the importance of inns in Leeds and York as venues for sales, auctions, meetings and entertainment. Using the local press and directories, it questions the validity of claims by historians regarding coffeehouse and suggests that inns remained predominant in the cultural life of both Leeds and York.

Chapter four examines the role of women within the inn environment, as innkeepers and as servants. It challenges Everitt’s notion of an ‘innkeeping fraternity’ by providing evidence of significant numbers of women linked with the management of local inns. Using a range of primary sources in the form of insurance policies, probate records and local press, in conjunction with the work of Leonore Davidoff, Catherine Hall and Hannah Barker, it demonstrates that women innkeepers were far more common than initially
suggested. Local census returns illustrate the employment opportunities offered by inns with evidence of a greater proportion of female servants employed than male, suggesting that far from being male bastions, inns increasingly became feminised environments over the period examined by this study.

But first, however, we need to look at Leeds and York. Chapter one examines the history of both places in order to provide a context within which subsequent chapters can be placed. Exploring the very different experience of Leeds and York, this study begins by comparing the early histories of both towns, setting the scene for the developments and changes which were to take effect during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The numbers of inns in each of the towns is explored along with their involvement in the transport industry and the development of passenger transport. A comparison of urban development and demographic changes in each town reflect the changing fortunes of Leeds and York and indicate how Leeds’ identity as a manufacturing town and York’s as an entertainment centre, were reinforced during the nineteenth century.
Chapter One: Leeds, York and their Inns.

This chapter compares and contrasts the early histories of Leeds and York and then outlines the changes which affected both, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It shows how demographic change, transport developments and urban physiognomy, affected the position and status of both towns. The counterpoint of Leeds, (a fast growing, industrial and marketing centre), and York, (a high status communication and service centre), is used to analyze the development of the inns and their businesses.

The comparison of Leeds and York is nothing new. Contemporary writers contrasted the two towns from the early eighteenth century. One of the first, Celia Fiennes, a woman of independent means, travelled through every English county between 1685 and 1710 writing about her travels in her diary. Following her visit to York in 1697, Celia Fiennes commented:

..it makes but a meane appearance, the Streetes are narrow and not of any length, save one which you enter of from the bridge, that is over the Ouse ......the houses are very low and as indifferent as in any Country town, and the narrowness of the streets makes it appear very mean..... the buildings look no better than the outskirts off London Wappen ...... the Pavement which is esteem’d the chiefe part of town, where the Market house and Town hall stands, is so mean that Southwarke is much befo;

It is clear Fiennes was not particularly impressed with the city of York, especially when compared to her comments of Leeds following her visit in 1698:

Leeds is a large town, severall large streetes cleane and well pitch’d and good houses all build of stone, some have good gardens and steps up to their houses and walls before them; this is esteemed the wealthyest town of its bigness in the Country, its manufacture is the woollen cloth the Yorkshire Cloth in which they are all employ’d and are esteemed very rich and very proud

Almost thirty years later, Daniel Defoe visited both towns whilst undertaking his tour of Great Britain. His description of Leeds, corresponds with that of Fiennes, describing Leeds as a ‘large, wealthy populous town’ and the High-street, otherwise known as
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Briggate, as a ‘large, broad, fair and well built street’. Impressed by the cloth market, Defoe gives an in depth description of the market, trade and merchants. His comments regarding York, however, are diametrically opposed to those of Fiennes. He describes York as:

a pleasant and beautiful city..... the lines and bastions and demolished fortifications, have a reserved secret pleasantness in them from the contemplation of the public tranquility and

.. (York) ‘tis risen again, and all we see now is modern; the bridge is vastly strong .... it is, without exception, the greatest in England.

Defoe’s appreciation for York’s old buildings and historical ruins, reflected the change in attitudes towards ancient and modern. Whereas Fiennes decried the old as ‘meane’ and ‘indifferent’ she celebrated the newness of Leeds houses, showing the contemporary ideals of new, clean and modern housing influenced by developing ideals of politeness. It was the move towards an ‘appreciation of old ruins and weatherbeaten medieval buildings’ and subsequent development of domestic tourism, which effected a transformation in York’s fortunes.

The Eighteenth Century

During the eighteenth century, England experienced extensive urbanization. In 1700, eighty percent of towns in England had a population of less than 2000, with only sixty-seven towns with ‘between 2500 and 100,000 in habitants’. By 1801, this had risen to 187 towns. The percentage of the national population living in towns increased by twelve and a half percent; a significant factor in this process was population increase.

Analysing the demographic changes that took place in Leeds and York during the period of this study, provides an insight into how population fluctuations affected the towns. In 1670, York had a population of 12,000, the fourth largest urban population in the country behind London with 475,000 and Bristol and the county town of Norwich, both with 20,000. By 1700, the population had remained the same, but York had only the sixth
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largest urban population, surpassed by Bristol, Newcastle and Exeter\textsuperscript{58}, indicating increased urbanisation across the country and a period of stagnation in York\textsuperscript{59}. The central township of Leeds in 1700 had a population of only 6000, although the thirteen outlying villages and a number of hamlets which made up the borough of Leeds, contained a further 5000 inhabitants\textsuperscript{60}. Leeds township was the centre of its own manufacturing region, providing distribution and financial services for ‘industrial villages’ like Armley and Holbeck which were part of the borough\textsuperscript{61}. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Leeds township was already the centre of the West Riding cloth trade, its markets impressing both Fiennes and Defoe. The expansion of the textile trade and the general growth of Leeds, meant that in 1700, Leeds and York were already very different places. Their disparate economies are evident in the writing of Defoe, who says of York, ‘here is no trade indeed, except such as depends upon the confluence of the gentry’\textsuperscript{62}. In contrast Defoe gives four pages to describing the market and industry at Leeds:

A noble scene of industry and application is spread before you’re here, and which, joined to the market at Leeds, where it chiefly centres, is well worth the curiosity of a stranger to go on purpose to see; and many travelers and gentlemen have come over from Hamburgh, nay, even from Leipsick in Saxony, on purpose to see it.\textsuperscript{63}

So how had Leeds and York become so very different, how had their economies of 1700 been shaped by their past?

By 1700 York had a long and well documented history. York had been an important cloth manufacturing town and regional centre for administration, commerce and trade reaching its economic peak during the medieval period. It had been a temporary home for royalty, Government departments and the permanent home of the Council in the North of England. In the early years of the seventeenth century, the large numbers of people attending the church courts and the court of the Council in the North, made a significant contribution to the wealth of the city.\textsuperscript{64} York also serviced the large numbers involved in
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the courts, for example lawyers, officials and clerks as well as servants and cooks, who in turn provided high levels of revenue to the local economy through trade and services\textsuperscript{65}. The abolition of the Council in the North in 1641 and the reduced status of church courts, (even after their restoration in 1660), meant York lost some of its national status as the judicial and administrative capital of the north of England. However, it retained the assizes, which continued to bring large numbers of visitors to the town. York also remained politically important as the principal city of Yorkshire and the county’s largest urban centre. Its population of approximately 12,000 meant that, not only was it one of the biggest cities, but it also had the ‘eighth largest borough electorate’. Seen as the ‘most prestigious of the county’s boroughs’, six general elections and one by-election were contested in the city between 1701 and 1741\textsuperscript{66}.

Unlike York, the history of Leeds before the Domesday Book in 1086 is far less certain. The town received its borough charter in 1207 from Maurice Paynel, the lord of the Manor. It was established within the Manor of Leeds specifically to increase the revenues of the Manor through manufacture and trade so not to be reliant on agriculture. Unlike York, which had a well-established system of guilds and trading privileges, the Leeds charter ‘stipulated that the burgesses should be personally free’\textsuperscript{67}.

Set out along a wide street, still known as Briggate, thirty burgage plots on each side of the street were offered for a fixed rent with each burgess given a burgage plot and half acre of land on the outskirts of town. The burgesses were allowed to subdivide, lease or even sell their lots if they so desired. Houses were built facing on to Briggate with gardens behind; workshops built at the back of the plots were rented out to craftsmen. The burgess plots provided perfect sites for inns; the inn would often face on to Briggate with stables, warehouses and extra rooms built in the yard behind. Access to each end of the yard made it easier for coaches and carriers to enter and exit the confined yards\textsuperscript{68}.

The advantageous positions of Leeds and York between the Pennines in the west and the agricultural areas of the East and North Riding, meant that both were well placed as marketing and service centres. The status of Leeds and York as seventeenth century service providers for significant numbers of visitors is evident in the figures taken from \textit{The Return for the Accommodation and Stabling for Yorkshire Market Towns} and shown in
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Table 2. That return was a national survey of inns and alehouses carried out by the War Office in 1686, which established the numbers of beds and stables available in towns and villages for the billeting of troops and militia\textsuperscript{69}. That survey showed that, despite the decline of York after 1660, it continued to be the most significant provider of stabling and accommodation in the region, with stabling for 800 horses and double the guest beds of second placed Wakefield. York’s position on the great North Road, linking the south of England with the north and Scotland, and the amount of stabling and accommodation signal the importance of York as an important staging place for travellers taking a break and resting or changing horses. The substantial amount of stabling also suggests inns were providing horses for coaching and carrying services.

Based on the amount of stabling available Leeds was placed fifth of the fourteen market towns, with stabling for 454 horses. However, when considering the number of guest beds available, Leeds was second only to York with 294 guest beds, suggesting that prior to 1700, there were a large number of established inns providing accommodation and services for visitors to both Leeds and York.

The figures in table 2 show that both Leeds and York were already well-established service centres. However, unlike York, Leeds was conceived as a manufacturing and trade town, its charter actively promoting the development of industry, a key factor in the diverse economies of the towns. The well-established cloth, coal and iron industries of Leeds in the fourteenth century, laid the foundations which made it possible for Leeds to take advantage of the growth in the textile trade, which took place in the subsequent centuries\textsuperscript{70}. Historian G.C.F. Foster claimed, that although York had been at the centre of the cloth industry, Leeds had a number of advantages:

Easier access to wool supplies, cheaper food and labour, opportunities for agricultural by-employment a multiplicity of fast-flowing streams, and the absence of guild restrictions.\textsuperscript{71}

All these factors enabled Leeds to surpass York and by 1700, it was a significant manufacturing and cloth finishing town\textsuperscript{72}. According to C.W, Chalkin, Leeds was one of
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only four regional towns which did not rely on the provision of services, but had its own manufacturing industries to boost its economy; the others being Coventry, Birmingham and Manchester. Growth in the trade and industry of Leeds continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century, a legacy of its original charter. Meanwhile York remained the administrative centre and county town for Yorkshire and its reputation as a ‘high status regional service centre’, providing access to luxury shops and crafts, meant the northern gentry continued to take advantage of the business and entertainment offered, shaping the economic landscape of the city in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The physical environment of the two towns was very different. York remained largely within its city walls whilst Leeds, a large open ‘multiple estate’, consisted of a number of ‘distinct areas of habitation and activity’. In York, the city’s walls did not impede a number of construction projects throughout the century. The popularity of the city with the gentry, led to the building of a number of large private houses, built in the popular classical style. The presence of the elite and the rise of a ‘civic consciousness’, stimulated a period of public building and improvements in the city. In response to the need for entertainment venues for visitors, a number of public buildings, including the Mansion House (1726), Assembly Rooms (1731-2), a theatre (1746) and a new walk (1730’s), were constructed. Throughout the eighteenth century, a series of programmes of street widening, paving and street lighting accompanied the new buildings, in order to make the city more attractive to visitors. The provision of entertainment facilities and of environmental improvements were key features in the urban renaissance, as indicated by Borsay who also argued that public building projects in York, were a ‘conscious policy’ of the authorities to ‘capture the growing market in polite leisure’. From the early years of the eighteenth century, York provided a winter season of entertainment, including assemblies, concerts, card-playing and plays, encouraging members of the gentry to spend the winter there. Across the country there was an emerging interest in classical
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architecture and ancient civilisations prompted by the large numbers of people taking part in the Grand Tour of Europe. Hallett claimed York took advantage of a new form of ‘domestic tourism’, promoting its historic sites to a public increasingly interested in its Roman and Medieval history. The city adopted a ‘distinctive, cultural and economic identity as a ‘historic' urban centre’.

An important factor in York’s success as an entertainment centre, were the improvements in transport. In 1678, a York to Hull coach ran in the summer only, whilst in 1683, regular coach services ran from London to York via Tadcaster and Doncaster. The road improvements, which resulted from turnpiking, were the main reason for the expansion of the coaching industry and improved transport links across the country. Armstrong suggests that improved transport links with London, led to the gradual fall in the numbers of aristocracy visiting York, however, road improvements made it easier for people from across the north of England to visit York.

In contrast, by the early eighteenth century, building in the central township of Leeds had increased dramatically in response to increased trade and industry, providing workers housing, workshops and warehouses, as well as larger houses for the well to do. The absence of city walls meant that the town could spread out in all directions. However, building remained within the original foot print of the town, with no new streets laid between 1634 and 1767. Although the Leeds township remained clustered around Briggate and was still surrounded by open fields, building had spread along nearby streets and the wealthy had begun to move to the outskirts of the town. By 1700, many of the yards behind the houses on the main streets had been infilled with housing and workshops. The open fields at the back of the burgages provided pasture land, orchards and gardens which provided hay, fresh fruit and vegetables for the inns. By this period the original low built timber framed houses on Briggate had been replaced by the ‘well pitch’d and good’ stone built houses as described by Celia Fiennes on her visit to Leeds in 1689.

Whilst in York the population in 1750 had fallen to 12,000, the population of Leeds township had increased to about 16,000 and in a local census carried out in 1775, the
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population of the Leeds borough was recorded as 30,609. In 1767, a new ‘West End’ was established in response to overcrowding, pollution and congestion caused by the growth of industries in the town. Substantial houses for the wealthy were constructed upwind of the smoke pollution which blighted the town. The construction of five cloth halls (1710-11; 1755-56; 1756-58; 1775-76; 1792-93), the Lodge and Arthington Bank (1750), Leeds New Bank (1777), Leeds Commercial Bank (1792) and a newsroom (1768) shows the growth in public building in the town, indicating increased prosperity throughout the century. Also at this time, a ‘middle-class culture’ began to develop, with concerts taking place in the Assembly Rooms as early as the 1720s. The introduction of subscription concerts (1762), new Assembly rooms (1777), a Philosophical Society (1783), a number of subscription libraries (1767), books shops and theatres (1771) all encouraged people to visit Leeds and indicate the influence of ideas of polite and civil society on Leeds’ developments.

The success of Leeds as a marketing and service centre was remarkable, bearing in mind that it heavily depended on road transport. Antiquarian, Ralph Thoresby, described some of the local roads as ‘routher than a ploughed field’ and local manufacturers complained that during the winter months, roads were ‘virtually impassable’ for wagons and carriages. This caused major problems regarding the carriage of important freight such as ‘coal, corn, lime and woollens’. In 1758, the appalling state of the roads led to the first railway in Leeds. Charles Branding laid railway lines between his coalmine at Middleton, south of Leeds and the township, transporting the coal in wagons pulled by horses. In the same year, complaints regarding heavy wagons damaging the Leeds to Wakefield road, resulted in the passing of the Leeds, Wakefield, Barnsley, and Sheffield Turnpike Road Act.

The Turnpike Acts were special Acts passed by Parliament and gave independent groups of trustees the authority to set up Trusts to charge tolls for using roads in order to raise the
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necessary capital to fund road improvements. The payment of tolls meant that turnpikes were often unpopular, but despite countrywide riots against them, they became increasingly widespread. By 1800 there were 1600 turnpike acts nationally, facilitating improved transport links between towns across the country.

Turnpike Trusts often held their meetings in local inns, placing notices announcing the forthcoming meeting in the local press. On Thursday 5th December 1774, the Trustees for the Leeds to Wakefield Turnpike Road held a meeting at the Old King’s Arms, at which an auction took place for ‘tolls arising from several toll-gates erected upon the said road’. In January 1775, at the same inn, the tolls for the Tadcaster and Selby turnpike roads to Leeds were to be let. In some areas innkeepers appeared on subscription lists with four innkeepers investing in the Oldham – Ripponden Trust in 1795, and a further four innkeepers among the investors of the Banbury – Barchester Trust in 1804. By providing accommodation for trustees, advertising meetings in the local press and funding the turnpikes, innkeepers actively promoted the Turnpike Trusts.

Turnpike Trusts not only improved road surfaces, they also often straightened or improved the course of roads, reduced slopes and built and repaired bridges. All these improvements resulted in more reliable transport system all year round, leading not only to an expansion of passenger transport services across the country, but also to faster journey times for both passengers and freight.

Following the introduction of the turnpikes in the 1760s, the travel time between York and London in 1774 was cut from four days to two days. By the 1820s this had been cut further to one day. The development of the turnpike network of roads around Leeds in the 1740s and 1750s, improved road conditions and relieved the pressure placed on the existing transport system by rapid population growth and increased levels of manufactures and trade in the region. The first direct regular coach service from Leeds to London was in 1760, the second commenced in 1765 as a direct result of the Leeds, Wakefield,
Barnsley, and Sheffield Turnpike Road Act of 1759\textsuperscript{106}. This was relatively late in comparison to York, where direct coaches to London had been running for almost a century, probably due to York’s proximity to the great north road. The success of Leeds as a trading centre prior to the introduction of the turnpikes and its development as a major transport centre by the middle of the nineteenth century supports Chartres’ view that the town:

was the fundamental node of the West Riding, and eighteenth-century improvements consolidated the position\textsuperscript{107}.

**The Nineteenth Century**

Following a period of stagnation in the previous century, the population of York rose again during the latter half of the eighteenth century, reaching about 16,000\textsuperscript{108} at the time of the 1801 census, a rise of sixty-eight percent over the century. In Leeds, the 1801 census recorded the population of the borough at 53,276, a rise of seventy-four percent in just twenty five years. During the early nineteenth century, the population of the Leeds township almost doubled; from 48,603 in 1821, to 71,602 in 1831 and to 88,741 in 1841\textsuperscript{109}. Table 1 compares the rate of demographic change experienced by Leeds and York in the first half of the nineteenth century, showing the rate of increase in Leeds township far outweighed that of York between the years 1801 and 1841.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Borough of York</th>
<th>Leeds Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>% growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>16,846</td>
<td>30,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>19,099</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>21,711</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>26,260</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>28,842</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 Population Growth in Leeds and York 1801-1851**

The period of rapid growth for both Leeds and York between 1821-31 coincided with a period of high migration. Leeds experienced in-migration of sixty six percent between the
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years 1821 to 1831\(^{110}\) whilst York experienced a substantial net gain of about 5000 people for the same period\(^{111}\). The lower figures for Leeds for the years 1831 to 1851 reflect a decrease in the immigration numbers\(^{112}\). However over the fifty-year period between 1801 and 1851, York experienced a total population increase of only 112%, compared to the growth of 225% experienced by Leeds. A significant figure in the table for York is for the period 1841-51, which coincided with the introduction of railways to the city.

Leeds continued to build on its success during the nineteenth century, experiencing significant development and growth. The number of industries in the town had risen to 150\(^{113}\) by 1800 and during the first half of the nineteenth century Leeds experienced a dramatic increase in new and expanding trades. It is estimated that in 1797, there were approximately 1,076 small firms in Leeds, by 1817 this had increased to 2,546 and by 1842, over 7,000\(^{114}\); these consisted of small industrial workshops, shops and inns. The importance of textile manufacture to the Leeds economy encouraged developments in a range of industries, including engineering and the chemical and dyestuff trades\(^{115}\). These developments and the subsequent expansion of craft workshops, stimulated the economic expansion of Leeds\(^{116}\). The majority of these industries were based within the many yards off Briggate, which became increasingly mixed use. For example, in 1861, William Tanfield - a binder, Allen & Co - Founders, Henry Lazenby – a foreman, J. Stead – coffee roaster, S. Gledhill – a joiner, and S. Ashley – billiards, all shared the Rose and Crown yard with the Inn run by Joseph Binks,\(^{117}\), revealing a development similar to that of the yards of London inns as described by Chartres\(^{118}\).

Connell and Ward attribute much of the success of Leeds as an ‘industrial centre’ to the population of the town, who they claimed had the necessary ‘entrepreneurial skill and labour force’ \(^{119}\). They also claimed:
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The story of the industrial revolution owes much to the men of vision and enterprise who risked capital in the pursuit of profit and wealth.\textsuperscript{120}

The laissez-faire attitude prevalent in Leeds during this period, facilitated innovation which stimulated both industrial and economic growth. In York, however, the ancient system of guilds, the restrictive rules on only freemen owning a business and the system of ‘formal apprenticeship’ in skilled trades continued into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{121} The lack of expansion of traditional crafts and the absence of modern industry meant that the York economy increasingly relied on its role as service provider. Armstrong argued that York’s prosperity was ‘determined largely by the prosperity’ of the agricultural classes which the city serviced.\textsuperscript{122}

The introduction of the railways were to have a huge impact on towns and cities across the country, placing long distance coaching and travelling services under a great deal of pressure. In 1834, the Leeds-Selby railway line opened and was based at the first railway station in Leeds on Marsh Lane. The line was extended to Hull in 1840.\textsuperscript{123} By 1856 there were a further three railway stations, one of which catered for five railway companies.\textsuperscript{124} In 1839, the York and North Midland Company was set up in response to concerns about railway development in Leeds taking visitors and business away from the city. The line between York and Leeds met up with the North Midland Line connecting York to the whole of the West Riding of Yorkshire, the Midlands and London.\textsuperscript{125} Expansion of the rail networks and the establishment of the Great North of England Railway in 1841, extended York’s links north to Darlington and Newcastle.\textsuperscript{126}

Railways encouraged new developments in the travel industry with the publication of guidebooks and from the 1840’s books, promoting the city’s attractions and shopping, led to an increase in visitor numbers to York.\textsuperscript{127} The railways also brought additional benefits to the York in the form of employment both from the construction of infrastructure and with the railway itself.\textsuperscript{128} The rapid population growth in the early years of the railways illustrated by Table 1 is indicative of the opportunities it brought to the city. The introduction of the railways in York was important to its economy as it ‘re-asserted the
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city’s ancient importance’ as a communications centre, between the north and south and the east and west\textsuperscript{129}.

Although the railways had little effect on coaching services running from the inns during the 1830s and 1840s, later railway expansion had a negative effect on long distance coach and carrier services. The Turnpike records show that between 1846 and 1850, income from tolls on the Leeds-Elland road fell by over eighty percent for stagecoaches and by seventy-eight percent for common carriers\textsuperscript{130}. A key feature of the landscape of both cities throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were inns. They supported transport developments and demographic growth.

**The Inns of Leeds and York**

It is problematical getting systematic information regarding inns during the eighteenth century and it is therefore, difficult to be specific about the number of inns in Leeds and York at any given time, due to variations in the definition of the word ‘inn’ when describing businesses. Sometimes the term was used to describe alehouses as well as principal inns and inns. In the early nineteenth century, inns were increasingly described as hotels. In order to be completely confident, there would have to be a systematic review of licensing records, which it has not been possible to do. Some help is offered by the War Office survey of 1686, which gives an indication of the accommodation in Leeds and York at the time. Table 2 shows that there were substantial numbers of beds and stabling in both York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Town</th>
<th>Stabling for horses</th>
<th>Guest beds</th>
<th>Market Town</th>
<th>Stabling for horses</th>
<th>Guest beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Thirsk</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Accommodation and Stabling at Inns and Alehouses in Yorkshire Market Towns 1686.**\textsuperscript{131}
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and Leeds, indicating a significant number of establishments. Directories and guides show that, in the late eighteenth century, there were seventeen inns in York, and seventy in Leeds\(^{132}\). In Leeds these included The Golden Lion, the Rose and Crown and the Old King’s Arms on Briggate and the White Horse Inn on Boar Lane, all close to the market centre of town. In York, the principal inns, the Black Swan and The George, were situated on Coney Street, whilst the York Tavern, which horsed the mail coaches, was close to the post office on St Helen’s Square, an area which housed large numbers of wealthy inhabitants\(^{133}\).

Variations in the definition of the term ‘innkeeper’ also causes problems when identifying the number of inns. In the directories of the late eighteenth century, innkeepers in Leeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>1790 Inn-keepers</th>
<th>1797 Inn-keepers</th>
<th>1829 Inns &amp; hotels</th>
<th>1837 Taverns</th>
<th>1829 Hotels, Inns &amp; Public Houses</th>
<th>1837 Beershouses</th>
<th>1829 Taverns</th>
<th>1837 Hotels, Inns &amp; Public Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briggate, Back of Shambles, Market Place</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar Lane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinegate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishoptgate Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 Inns, Public Houses, Taverns in the Old Township of Leeds**

and York were listed in an alphabetical list of inhabitants of the towns. Table 3 shows the numbers of innkeepers in Leeds in the 1790 and 1797\(^{134}\) directories. Although directories can give a sense of the numbers of inns, the classification of innkeeper can be

\(^{132}\) Henry Sotheran, Sotheran’s York Guide; including a description of the public buildings, antiquities, &c. &c. in and about that ancient city. (York, 1796); The Leeds Directory for the Year 1798.


\(^{134}\) The Leeds Directory 1790; The Leeds Directory 1797.
problematic as it can vary from directory to directory. As shown in Table 3, there are a considerable number of innkeepers listed in 1797, far exceeding the seven inns listed in 1829. Moreover, the listings for inns and hotels for 1829 and 1837 show only the ‘principal inns’, with smaller inns included within taverns and public houses. I will show in chapter two, that the small number of principal inns was compensated by their bigger size.

Inns were crucial to the success of Leeds and York as service centres, providing good quality accommodation and stabling. They also acted as venues for merchants to carry out their business and for the provision of entertainment.

At a time when markets predominantly took place in the open air, inns sited in the market place often became private indoor markets, attracting large numbers of merchants and manufacturers. In Leeds, Defoe shows the importance of the positioning of inns close to the markets on Briggate. He described how clothiers arrived early in the morning and waited in the ‘inns and public houses’ until the market bell rang at seven o’clock. As the bell rings, the clothiers take their cloth out to the market, Defoe commented:

> Everyone takes up his piece, and has about five step to march to lay it upon the first row of boards, and perhaps ten to the second row; so that upon the market bell ringing, in half a quarter of an hour the whole market is filled.

The large number of inns in the vicinity of the markets and cloth halls where merchants, clothiers and businessmen concentrated their business demonstrated by table 3, with twenty-three innkeepers listed in Briggate and the surrounding streets in 1790, increasing to fifty-two in 1797. This may have been due to changes to the style of listing in directories, but the apparent increased numbers of inns did coincide with the opening of a fifth cloth hall showing the continued success of the cloth trade in Leeds.

Leeds directories also show an increase in carrier services resulting from transport and industrial developments in Leeds in the eighteenth century. Carrier services, transporting goods and materials, were often based in the inn yards, off Briggate. For example, in 1773, the New Inn (previously known as the New King’s Arms), was used by the Leeds to London carriers transporting freight by slow coaches. Whilst the Bull and Mouth Inn on

---

138 Daniel Defoe, A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain, 501.
Briggate and the White Horse Inn on Boar Lane, were both known as centres for heavy luggage ‘waggons’ and stage ‘waggons’ long before becoming coaching inns. An auction notice for the Bull & Mouth Inn in The Leeds Mercury in 1777 provides a sense of the size of the wagons use by carriers and the types of goods coming in to Leeds. The auction was of a consignment of foreign china and furniture that had recently arrived from London, and weighed ‘upward of five ton’. This shows that substantial amounts of middle class goods were being transported into the town by carriers.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the number of carrier firms based in Leeds inns and warehouses increased substantially from twenty-five in 1781, to one hundred and eighty in the 1820s. In 1781, sixty local and national freight link services ran each week from Leeds to London, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, York and Sheffield and the Leeds Directory of 1798, advertised daily ‘waggons’ from the White Horse Inn to London and York with ‘waggons’ to Liverpool running every Wednesday. In the 1820s, the number of main freight services had quadrupled and were supplemented by local services. I have been unable to confirm the numbers for York at the end of the eighteenth century, but the 1823 directory showed carriers from seventy-four villages and towns over the north of England using inns in the city, predominantly the White Swan, the Elephant and Castle and the King’s Arms. In 1855, there were 107 carriers listed in York, using twenty-nine inns servicing ninety-one villages. Evidence that, despite the expansion of the railways, local carrier services continued to expand.

The expansion of the railways coincided with a change in the type of visitor to York. Although it retained its reputation and status as a high class resort, the aristocracy were no longer prominent visitors to the city. The census returns for the years 1841 to 1861 show how the type of visitor changed over the years. They reveal information about the type of business carried out by inns and illustrate illuminating differences in the numbers and types of visitor and of live-in servants. Unfortunately, inns do not appear on census search forms and are not always identifiable on the census returns. Examination of the returns on microfiche may have uncovered more inns but this was not possible due to time constraints. The 1841 and 1851 returns do not always include the inn name within the address, individuals are listed as innkeepers but the name of their establishments is

---

140 Tom Bradley, The Old Coaching Days, 188, 168.
146 Alan Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town, 39.
not given, making the identification of inns difficult. The identifiable sample in tables 4, 5 and 6 are used to give a sense of the numbers and types of visitors staying at the inns at the given time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITORS</th>
<th>1841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Inn</td>
<td>Commerce Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Horse Inn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leeds</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swan Inn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Inn</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Castlegate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Pavement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total York</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Leeds and York</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Extract from 1841 Census showing types of visitors

Table 4 shows that in 1841\(^{148}\), half of the people staying at the two inns in Leeds were commercial travellers, the other half comprising two military personnel, two of independent means, one banker and one wife. In York, more than half of the visitors staying at inns were men or women of independent means and just over seven percent, were clergy. The types of visitor reflect the identity of the two towns, York as an entertainment venue for the wealthy and an ecclesiastical centre and Leeds a manufacturing and trading centre.

By 1851 there had been a significant change in the type of visitor staying in York with a substantial number of commercial travellers appearing on the returns for the first time. Table 5 shows that in the sample for 1851, two thirds of visitors were commercial travellers, whilst the number of those of independent means had fallen to about a quarter. This change may be due to the expansion of the railway network, encouraging new trade links and an influx of commercial travellers interested in supplying the high status trades in

York, at a time when the numbers of aristocratic visitors was falling. The inclusion of an attorney, clergyman, master tailor and coachmaker in the visitor list for York, indicates that the city retained its high status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITORS</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Inn</td>
<td>Commercial Travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leeds</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Inn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Inn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Inn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Hotel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total York</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Leeds and York</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Extract from 1851 Census showing types of visitors\(^{149}\)

In Leeds, more than three quarters of visitors were commercial travellers, the numbers of which staying at the White Horse Inn, more than doubling. This is indicative of the continued growth in manufacturing and trade. Table 5 also shows that, whereas the number of visitors to York over all had fallen, the number of visitors to Leeds had increased, closing the visitor gap between the two cities that was identifiable in the 1841 census.

Further changes are evident in 1861\(^{150}\) and are illustrated in table 6. In Leeds, whilst the number of commercial travellers had fallen to two thirds, when the number of merchants is


factored in, commercial visitors still accounted for more than three quarters of visitors. In York, commercial travellers and merchants represented only half of visitors. The appearance of members of the legal and finance professions and actors reinforce the importance of Leeds as a commercial and cultural centre; the two civil engineers suggest a period of urban change in the form of improved railway links, road widening and public building projects. Although the numbers of visitors to York remained roughly the same, the number of visitors to Leeds surpassed those of York by more than a third, reflecting the stagnation of York.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITORS</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Hotel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull &amp; Mouth Hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
<td>5 2 1 3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Hotel</td>
<td>13 4 1 2 1 1 3 0 0 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Leeds</td>
<td>24 0 6 0 0 2 0 2 1 1 3 0 0 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Inn</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Hotel</td>
<td>10 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Station Hotel</td>
<td>2 1 1 1 1 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total York</td>
<td>10 3 2 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 2 1 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Leeds and York</td>
<td>34 3 8 1 1 1 3 1 2 1 2 3 2 1 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Extract from 1861 Census showing types of visitors

Visitors to Leeds are predominantly linked with commerce, trade and manufacture. The doubling of visitor numbers and the threefold increase in the number of commercial travellers are indicative of the economic success of Leeds during the period 1841-1861. In York, although commercial travellers became dominant, numbers of the members of the professions and of those of independent means were maintained.

The inclusion of a number of visitors’ wives and children in York, identify it as place of resort, whereas their absence from Leeds indicates it was a place for business and lacked the entertainments available in York.

The effect of demographic change and transport improvements can be seen in the number of inns and eating-places in Leeds and York shown in Table 7. The 1848
directories show the numbers of refreshment providers increased substantially following
the introduction of the railways in the 1830s with a fifty-seven percent increase in Leeds
and forty-seven percent in York\(^{151}\). The continued growth of Leeds is reflected in the
increased numbers of taverns and public houses and coffee and eating-houses in the
town. The increase in those alternative establishments did not have a detrimental effect
on the numbers of inns and hotels, which remained relatively constant. This was probably
due to the changes in the ways the principal inns operated in the later nineteenth century,
focusing on providing accommodation and not the provision of drink for the local
populous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEEDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YORK</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1818-20</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1818-20</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inns &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taverns &amp; Public Houses</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee &amp; Eating Houses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperance Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 Food & Drink Providers in Leeds & York**

In comparison, the number of food and drink providers fell slightly in York, signalling a
period of economic stagnation during the later years of the century. The appearance of
temperance hotels in both Leeds and York and the reduction in the numbers of taverns
and public houses in York, suggest rising concerns regarding alcohol consumption
amongst the lower orders.

Despite the negative effect the railways had on long distance transport, they also offered
new opportunities for innkeepers, as they introduced local services for the railway stations
and the growing suburban population\(^{152}\). For example, in 1839, Thomas Lee, innkeeper of
the Golden Lion Hotel, ran buses to meet the trains from the stations in Leeds\(^{153}\).

In York, the census of 1841 identifies John Holiday as an innkeeper of an un-named inn
on Castlegate, York, employing nine live-in servants. Following the introduction of the
railways Holiday became the innkeeper of the Railway refreshment rooms, employing ten
members of staff. A decade later, in 1861, Holiday is the Hotelkeeper of the Royal
Station Hotel, employing nineteen live in servants, and undoubtedly a significant number

\(^{151}\) The Leeds Directory 1848; The York Directory 1848.
\(^{152}\) R. W Unwin, "Leeds Becomes a Transport Centre", 137.
of others who did not live on site. These figures show that Holiday was able to progress from running what can be assumed was a traditional style inn, to being operator of a substantial, new built modern hotel providing accommodation, food and drink for those arriving in the city by train. The numbers of servants identified in Table 8 indicate the substantial size of these establishments and the increasing numbers of visitors for whom Holiday catered for.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holiday, York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Castlegate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Rooms, Railway Station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Station Hotel, Railway Stn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Extract from Census Data 1841-1861

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, both Leeds and York experienced significant changes. In Leeds, industrial and demographic changes and the resultant increase in wealth meant the city continued to grow and develop. In York, the railway stimulated demographic increase and reinforced its role as a communications and service centre. However, although the resident members of the legal, medical, clerical and military professions ensured its high status, the gentry and aristocracy were no longer prominent visitors. The development of the inn during this period supported the economies for both towns and provided employment for substantial numbers of servants. Chapter two looks at the role of the innkeeper and the individuals who were behind the development of the inns.
Chapter Two: The Business and Character of Innkeepers

This chapter considers the role of the innkeeper, and the people involved in the business as both innkeepers and employees. It demonstrates that innkeepers adopted the language and behaviours of politeness and civility to promote their business, reinforcing the aspirational nature of eighteenth-century polite society. The extent of an innkeeping business is explored, as is the range of activities carried out by innkeepers.

The Business of Innkeeping

Before considering innkeepers and the innkeeping business it is important to ascertain, what was expected of an innkeeper. In his book written circa 1909 and republished in 1985, local historian and author Frederick William Hackwood, claimed innkeepers had to be congenial, have a good knowledge of food, ale and wine, and employ and organise staff efficiently, to provide clientele with good quality efficient service\(^\text{154}\). However, innkeepers also had to be fully aware of licensing and legislative requirements of the business. In 1797, a lawyer of the Inner Temple, Henry Davenport, published *The Publican’s Lawyer*, promoted as ‘A PLAIN AND EASY EXPLANATION OF ALL THE LAWS NOW IN FORCE’. It provided detailed explanations of the laws and penalties relating to licensing, drunkenness, gaming, swearing and the billeting of soldiers and militia.

Having described innkeepers as a ‘useful and necessary body of people’\(^\text{155}\), Davenport stated that the principal duty of an innkeeper was:

> the entertaining and harbouring of travellers, finding them victuals and lodging, and securing the goods and effects of their guests\(^\text{156}\).

He also claimed that innkeeping was a public calling and as such, innkeepers were obliged to serve the public and were responsible for the actions of those they employed:

> A person who takes upon himself a public employment, must serve the public as far as his employment goes; therefore an innkeeper shall not only answer for his


\(^{156}\) Henry Davenport, *The Publican’s Lawyer*, 81.
own neglect but also for the neglect of those who act under him, though he should expressly caution against it\textsuperscript{157}.

As a public servant, action could be taken against an innkeeper who refused to take in a traveller or who refused to ‘receive a horse’ in his stable. However, English law protected an innkeeper’s reputation. Anyone spreading stories or false rumours about inns in order to draw away customers could face legal action. This indicates the importance of reputation to the innkeeper’s business\textsuperscript{158}.

This study has already established the main purpose of an inn was providing hospitality for travellers and their horses. But there are few detailed accounts of the actual day-to-day work carried out by innkeepers with which to discover more about the business of innkeepers, to achieve a sense of the scale and scope of the enterprises. However, the daybooks and account books of seven innkeepers from between 1809 and 1841 for York provide a rare insight into the lives and business of innkeepers. Providing details of day-to-day expenditure and customer accounts, they show innkeepers were providing a range of services and a substantial range of food and drink\textsuperscript{159}. Those daybooks are part of the York Corporation – Debtors Prisoners’ Account Books archive, held at the York City Archives. The innkeepers to whom these books belonged, all spent time in the Debtors Prison at York Castle, unlucky for them, but fortuitous for us.

There are three daybooks and eight account books along with a few tradesmen’s bills. They are a rich source of information. Presented at court hearings, these accounts are evidence of the debtor’s full disclosure of his estate to the court at York Castle. By making a full disclosure, the debtor could be discharged at the next Quarter sessions. They are extremely difficult to use in a simple quantitative way, because they are not systemised, just waste book jottings. However by examining a one sample week of what was being purchased, we can establish what kind of undertaking these businesses were.

The daybooks list the daily outgoings of the innkeeper, including purchases of food, sundries, accounts he has paid and staff wages. A breakdown of the expenditure for week commencing the 18 March 1839, shown in Table 9, shows innkeeper John James

\textsuperscript{157} Henry Davenport, \textit{The Publican’s Lawyer}, 81.
\textsuperscript{158} Henry Davenport, \textit{The Publican’s Lawyer}, 81-82.
Anderson expenses included purchasing newspapers, writing paper, cigars and posting letters. The daybook also lists the range of food Anderson was purchasing including fish, chicken, pears, chocolate, bread, tea and coffee, showing that he was catering to middle class tastes, not just providing tobacco, but cigars as well, along with chocolate, tea, coffee and newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and number of purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigars (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco (3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9 Purchases of John James Anderson for week commencing 18 March 1839.**

As well as the purchase of pears in March, Anderson’s accounts also show he was providing peaches to guests in April and May, suggesting he had access to imported fruits or a hothouse and was responding to middle class demands. There is no way of knowing if the letter postage and newspaper were for guests, but the account books do give evidence of these items on a number of guests’ accounts. Anderson’s outgoings for week commencing 18 March, also showed money paid to a number of individuals, including staff wages and settled accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settled Butcher account</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing (4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George’s wages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessy’s wages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Johnson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr W Vaile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Rollinson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Bingley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Harland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10 Payments to individuals made by John James Anderson week commencing 18 March, 1839**

The expenses shown in Table 10 indicate, that washing was carried out on four different occasions within the week, suggesting that several guests were staying more than one night. The book also shows a total of eleven pounds, six shillings and sixpence paid out to six individuals, Brown, Johnson, Vails, Rollinson, Bingley and Harland (all listed in table

---

10) though there is no reason given for these payments. This was a substantial amount of money to pay out in one week; regrettably, it has not been possible to confirm if these were creditors of Anderson, or if he was providing a credit facility for guests as suggested by Everitt\(^\text{161}\).

Although it is possible to achieve some sense of the expenditure from the daybooks, the account books are much harder to quantify, with sales listed under the names of customers and not in any order. Often just scribbled down, with no clear dates, it is difficult to get a sense of the weekly income achieved from the business. However, the accounts do indicate that it could be months before a bill was settled, therefore, it is questionable whether Anderson’s weekly income was sufficient to cover the amount of his weekly outgoings.

The account books show, that part of an innkeepers’ client base were repeat visitors. For example, the account book for John Harrison,\(^\text{162}\) indicates that a Mr J Story attended the inn on fifteen occasions between November 2, 1822 and January 30, 1823, charging rum to his account on each occasion. Entries on November 24 and January 15, indicate Harrison took in Story’s cows at night for several weeks, running up a total bill of seven pounds, three shillings and a penny. Harrison delivered the bill on February 3, but there is no indication of when the bill was paid\(^\text{163}\). We can surmise that Story was dealing in livestock, his regular visits suggesting he was visiting the markets. This shows how innkeepers were supporting local commercial activity, Story staying at the inn, whilst visiting the market, then returning to his farm.

The account books show that inns adopted a middle class material culture. The bills for Nathaniel Smith show he purchased a silver teapot, coffeepot and candlestick worth a total of one pound, fifteen shillings and six pence, from John Harrison, a manufacturer of silver goods from Sheffield. Because tea was very popular by the 1830s, increasingly drunk by all levels of society, it is not surprising that tea was being served by innkeepers. However, serving tea from a silver teapot sets a standard above the ordinary, an example of material culture adopted by Smith, to impress his middle class clientele\(^\text{164}\).

\(^\text{161}\) Alan Everitt, “The Urban Inn”, 109.
\(^\text{164}\) Annie Gray, “A Moveable Feast: Negotiating Gender at the Middle-Class Tea-Table in Eighteenth – and Nineteenth-Century England”. *Food and Drink in Archaeology* 2 (2008), 47.
Further evidence of this material culture, is seen in the range of services, food and drink, offered by innkeepers. Amongst the charges for accommodation, breakfasts and dinners being served to guests, letters were being posted, horses being hired and newspapers and cigars being provided. Innkeepers provided an extensive range of alcoholic drinks including ale, porter, wine, sherry, brandy, rum and gin as well as tea and coffee. Anderson’s accounts for April and May 1839, indicate that the meals he served, included beef steak, fish, duck, poultry, lobsters, cheese and cakes, along with a variety of fresh fruit and vegetables including asparagus, oranges, and lemons\textsuperscript{165}. This shows Anderson was providing an impressive menu; these are not foods which would have been affordable for ordinary workers. The books show that innkeepers were supplying significant amounts of food and drink and were trading on a regular basis with a large number of specialist traders, supplying the middle class market.

We can also see innkeepers were trading over a wide regional network. Nathaniel Smith of the Spotted Cow Inn, York, bought gin, ale and brandy from suppliers in Leeds, Scarborough and York, whilst York innkeeper, James Wilson traded with brewers and distillers from Hunslet, Leeds and London. The large amounts of ale and spirits shown on tradesmen’s bills as supplied, indicate that some inns were substantial concerns. The bills issued to Smith, (summarized in Table 11), suggest the Spotted Cow was a large well attended inn purchasing substantial amounts of port, brandy, gin and ale\textsuperscript{166}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Bill</th>
<th>Supplier and Goods Supplied</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dec 29 1835 | Richard Hood & Sons, Importers of Wines and Spirits  
4 Doz. Port Wine @ 36 shillings  
2 Doz. Sherry Wine @ 36 shillings  
4 Gallons French Brandy @ 30 shillings | £16.16.0 |
| Jan 7 1836 | J & W Cadman, Distillers and Wine Merchants, Leeds  
9\(\frac{3}{16}\) Gallons best old strong cordial Gin @ 10/6 cask | £5.11.6 |
| Aug 16 1837 | Phoenix Brewery, Scarborough  
36\(\frac{3}{4}\) Gallons of Ale  
111\(\frac{1}{4}\) Gallons of Ale | £9.3.0 |

Table 11 Bills issued to Nathaniel Smith, Innkeeper of the Spotted Cow, York.


Although the accounts indicate inns were extensive businesses, as indicated in chapter one, they do not give an indication of the size of the inn or the number of guests. By analysing the occupation evidence from census returns of 1851 and 1861\(^ {167}\) it is possible to get an indication of the number of servants employed and the work they carried out. The census returns only give details of the servants who 'lived in', and who, no doubt, were on hand to deal with guests’ requirements at any time of day or night. The work of servants at inns was comparable to that in most households and the majority of servants who worked in inns, but did not live in, often worked for other employers as well.\(^ {168}\)

Tables 14, 15 and 16 provide a snapshot of the variety of work carried out by male and female employees 'living in' at the inns, at the time of the census. The jobs highlighted in both census tables, indicate a definite gender bias. Men were more involved with the care of the visitor through personal service. Cleaning boots was solely the occupation of men, as were porters, employed to carry guests’ luggage. Men were also employed as waiters and general servants. The majority of women working as servants in inns, were more involved with housewifery tasks, for example, cook, kitchen maid and laundry maid, with only chamber maids working above stairs. This evidence is indicative of how the gendered roles in inns and the victualling industry as a whole reflected the roles of servants within houses of the gentry; they served not only the innkeeper but also the guests\(^ {169}\). The role of providing food and a clean, comfortable environment, also echoed the housewife role of women in the home\(^ {170}\). Despite an increase in the number of barmaids, from one in 1851 to six in 1861, the percentage of women identified as working in the bar remains low, at eleven percent of the sample, compared to fifty-eight percent of men. An examination of the role of women in the innkeeping trade, is offered in greater depth in chapter four.

Because some of the major inns were big, there may have been many local people employed who did not appear on these census returns, and it is therefore impossible to get a true picture of the numbers of staff involved. However, the stabling of large numbers of horses, (as discussed in chapter one), indicate the necessity for significant numbers of grooms, ostlers and even coachmen working at the inns. It is clear from the low number


\(^ {169}\) ibid.

of those employees listed as involved with stabling, seven in 1851 and one in 1861, that the numbers employed at inns are understated. Nevertheless, these returns give an indication of the types of services provided to customers.

In addition to stabling of horses, food provision was an important factor in the inn trade, with an average of just over thirty percent of women in the sample, employed in the kitchens of inns.

The success of an inn often depended not only on its level of service and facilities to its guests, but its location and the diversity of the business. As well as servicing trades and providing entertainment, (which is explored in chapter three), the innkeeping element was often part of a much bigger business, indicative of inns being commercial institutions, as argued by Chartres. Innkeeper account books provide invaluable evidence that they were heavily involved in an extensive variety of economic activities, from large-scale food and drink provision, agriculture, and transport and credit networks.

Wealth and the Associated Business Interests of Innkeepers

This section introduces further evidence of the wealth of innkeepers and the value of inns using insurance records and wills. It also shows businesses diversified into other sectors of the economy. The evidence from the thirteen Sun Fire Office policies associated with the inns reveal that their yards contained workshops and warehouses, like London inns as discussed by Chartres. The full table in Appendix 1 lists the policies of a number of innkeepers. A number of policies for merchants have been included for comparison purposes.

The diversity of an innkeeper’s business could provide increased wealth for the innkeeper. A marriage announcement in the Leeds Mercury of January, 1774 indicates the wealth and status of local innkeeper, George Ash:

On Thursday was married at the Parish Church, Mr Samuel Vincent, maltster in this town, to Miss Ash, eldest daughter of Mr George Ash, at the Golden Lyon in Briggate, an accomplished young lady with a handsome fortune.

171 Alan Everitt, “The Urban Inn”, 97.
On the death of Ash, Vincent took over as innkeeper of the Golden Lyon. The use of the terms ‘accomplished’ and ‘handsome fortune’ confirm Ash as a wealthy successful innkeeper.

Probate and insurance records, show that some innkeepers owned land and substantial amounts of property. For example, the will of Robert Consett, a York victualler who left his estate to his wife, under instructions that on her death, the leasehold property was to be left to his eldest son John. His younger sons were to receive twenty pounds each, two daughters were to receive forty pounds each, with a third daughter receiving fifty pounds. These were substantial amounts of money for the time, indicating Consett was a very successful innkeeper\(^{175}\). In 1811, the Will of John Greaves, innkeeper of ‘The Hotel’ in Leeds instructed that on the death of his wife, all eight children, three of whom were from his wife’s previous marriage, were to be given £700 each when they reached the age of 21. Any excess was to be divided equally between the children. The success of Greaves’ business can be seen when considering that by current day values each child would be receiving approximately £30,000\(^{176}\).

**Relationship to Agriculture**

As seen in chapter one, the inn played a significant role in transport and communication networks, offering innkeepers opportunities to expand their business interests. But research has uncovered a number of ways in which innkeepers also extended their business interests. A search of probate inventories for details of the innkeepers estates, identified innkeeper John Rivis, who in July 1755 was also a brewer and farmer. Not only did Rivis own four horses, he also kept cows, sheep and hogs and grew crops. his inventory includes brewing equipment, the sign, sign post and pump as well as over £110 worth of malt and liquor. This was a substantial estate with his household goods and chattels and liquor totalling £243\(^{177}\). Unfortunately no detail is given regarding the goods and chattels.

Sometimes innkeepers were involved in very diverse businesses. For example, in the notice regarding his bankruptcy in 1790, Leeds innholder, William Tea is also listed as a

---

\(^{175}\) Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Robert Consett, victualler, 1766. Microfilm Reel 1254.

\(^{176}\) Abstract and Administration of John Greaves, Vintner and Innkeeper of Leeds, November 19, 1811. The National Archives Website: Discovery: Ref IR 26/435/296.

\(^{177}\) Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of John Rivis, Innholder & Yeoman, North Grimston, 1755. Microfilm Reel 1253.

Well into the nineteenth century, there is evidence that innkeepers continued to diversify. The 1861 census return for York, identifies John Holiday, former innkeeper, as ‘Hotel Keeper and Farmer employing about fifty farm labourers’, indicating he operated a substantial agricultural concern. Agriculture was important to both Leeds and York throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

As a marketing centre for the agricultural hinterland, the facilities offered to farmers and drovers by inns had an important role in the local economy. Armstrong claims that York during the nineteenth century was reliant upon the economic prosperity of the farming community. Innkeepers who were farmers, or who had land for grazing, were able to offer services to those transporting livestock to markets. At a time when farmers and drovers had to walk livestock to markets, innkeepers often provided grazing and accommodation for the animals, allowing them time to recover from their journey and achieve a better price at market. When a new fortnightly fair began in Leeds in 1780, Joseph Hindle, of the Rose & Crown, advertised he had thirty acres of land ‘advantageously situated for pasturing cattle’ claiming it would be ‘convenient’ for those attending the new fair.

In York, The Spotted Cow Inn could stable twenty-seven horses and had sheds which provided shelter for up to sixty head of cattle. The daybook of Nathaniel Smith, the innkeeper of The Spotted Cow, indicates the sheds were used to house cattle, sheep and lambs on a regular basis in the 1830s. Between 23 February and 11 May 1833, Smith hired out men and horses on thirteen separate occasions to carry out ploughing, harrowing and ‘rowling’ for a number of individuals. Innkeeper, John Harrison also had a wide-ranging business taking in horses and cattle, selling hay, turnips and sheep, as well as supplying other innkeepers. Between 14 October 1820 and 12 February 1821, Harrison supplied Roger Kirby, an innkeeper with five gallons of brandy and six gallons of gin. A substantial part of Kirby’s business, however, involved hiring out horses, carts and wagons; there is also evidence of him working for the improvement commissioners.

---

179 The Leeds Directory 1797, 3.
180 Alan Armstrong, Stability and Change in an English County Town, 195.
181 The Leeds Mercury No 713 Tuesday, September 19, 1780, Extracts from the Leeds Intelligencer and The Leeds Mercury, (1955), 141
delivering road stones on odd days throughout 1817\textsuperscript{184}. By offering specific services to farmers and supporting the market economy, innkeepers in Leeds and York not only assisted the agricultural economy of the North and West Riding, but also promoted urban economic development.

**Relationship to Carrying Trade**

A number of policies for The Old King’s Arms Inn in Leeds, reveal its innkeeper, John Hicks, was running a significant carrier business and demonstrates the scale and status of the inn\textsuperscript{185}. In 1788, John Hick took over the most prestigious of the old inns in Leeds, The Old King’s Arms\textsuperscript{186}. The introduction of the first London to Leeds coach in 1760 reinforced its significance as the first coaching inn in Leeds\textsuperscript{187}. Whilst in charge, Hick introduced a further five coaches and developed the carrying business\textsuperscript{188}. As can be seen from Table 12, in 1789, Hick took out an insurance policy with the Sun Fire Office, covering his household goods and contents of the Kings Arms Inn. The values insured give a good indication of the scale of the business. The cover not only included £580 for his household goods, but £300 for ‘utensils and stock’ and £100 for plate. Descriptions of the premises and the amounts insured, show the extensive scale of Hick’s carrying business. The ‘utensils, stock and goods in trust’ held in his stables, sheds and offices on the north and south side of his yard were insured for up to a total of £400. Stock and goods held in a barn, sheds and yard on a property known as Squire Pasture near Leeds were insured for a further £200. The total insurance cover under the policy was £1600\textsuperscript{189}.

The expansion of the carrying business is evident when Hick renewed the policy in November 1791, increasing its value by fifty-five percent to £2100 and taking out a second under the name John Hick & Co., for ‘utensils, stock and goods held in trust’ at his warehouse, the Post Waggon Warehouses in New Street. The amount insured was £500\textsuperscript{190}. The total amount insured under these two policies was £2600, this equates to a current day value of almost £175,000. Bearing in mind that these policies insured only contents and goods, not the buildings, they indicate the level of success of his coaching and carrying business, with goods in transit being stored in a warehouse, barn and sheds.


\textsuperscript{185} Alan Everitt, “The Urban Inn”, 100.

\textsuperscript{186} Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 151.

\textsuperscript{187} Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 151.

\textsuperscript{188} Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 155.

\textsuperscript{189} London Metropolitan Archives: Sun Insurance Office MS11935/364/561018, 23 September,1789

\textsuperscript{190} London Metropolitan Archives: Sun Insurance Office MS11935/381/592549, 22, November 1791.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy Holder</th>
<th>Property insured</th>
<th>Value of insurance on property (£)</th>
<th>Household goods, utensils and stock (£)</th>
<th>Stock &amp; goods held in trust in warehouse or yard (£)</th>
<th>Total Value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>561018</td>
<td>23/9/1789</td>
<td>John Hick, Innholder</td>
<td>The King’s Arms Also stables and sheds at Squire Pasture farm</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582167</td>
<td>11/4/1791</td>
<td>Richard Mosley Atkinson Esq of Pontefract</td>
<td>The King’s Arms Inn in the tenure of John Hick, Innholder. Stables, sheds, offices on the north side of yard. Stables, sheds, offices on the south side. House &amp; offices at Burmantofts in same tenure</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160 80</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582168</td>
<td>11/4/1791</td>
<td>John Hick, Innholder</td>
<td>Household goods in dwelling house, kitchen and offices adj to King’s Arms. Also stables and sheds at Squire Pasture farm</td>
<td></td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592549</td>
<td>22/11/1791</td>
<td>John Hick &amp; Co of Leeds Innholder of King’s Arms Inn</td>
<td>Post Wagon Warehouses, New Street, Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561757</td>
<td>12/10/1789</td>
<td>William Howson Innholder</td>
<td>The White Swan Inn, Market Cross, Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601330</td>
<td>11/6/1792</td>
<td>Joseph Dearnley, inholder of Ship Inn, Mortgagor and Thomas Charlesworth, woollen draper and Mortgagee</td>
<td>House on north side of yard in tenure of Dearnley House on south side of yard Stables &amp; office 4 Cottages in Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 200</td>
<td>225 275 30</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602168</td>
<td>2/7/1792</td>
<td>Edward Markland Park Lane, Merchant</td>
<td>Dressing, Press and Workshops adjacent in Park Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561513</td>
<td>23/9/1789</td>
<td>Timothy Rhodes Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Sun Insurance Policies for the Old King’s Arms, Leeds

191 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561018, 23 September , 1789
192 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/582167, 11 April, 1791
193 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/582168, 11 April, 1791
194 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/592549, 22 November, 1791
195 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561757, 12 October, 1789;
196 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/388/601330, 11 June, 1792
197 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/602168, 2 July, 1792,
198 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561513, 23 September , 1789
and several stables to house the large number of horses which were required for his business. As was discussed in chapter one, the large amount of stabling at inns defined its size and status. The value of Hick’s policies rose from £600 in 1789 to a total of £1050 in 1791, an increase of seventy five percent. This suggests that, the profits from the carrying business alone, could be substantial.

In comparison, William Howson of the White Swan had insurance cover for £300 worth of stock and goods held in trust. The policies shown in Table 12 show the scale of Hick’s business at the Old King’s Arms. Taken out by Hick and Richard Mosley Atkinson Esq. the owner of the inn, they reflect not only its size and importance, they also give an insight into Hick’s business diversification. The records show that Atkinson insured the property, including the inn and the stables and sheds in the yard, for a total of £1800, the modern day equivalent would be approximately £130,000. The policies for £1000 and £1550 taken out by Hick for household goods, contents and stock, indicate that the rank of the King’s Arms was far above other inns on Briggate, including the White Swan Inn with contents of £200, and the Ship Inn with contents of £530. In 1802, Hick’s tenancy of the inn expired, having suffered from financial problems, which are discussed later in this chapter, he sold all the contents of the King's Arms inn and moved his coaching and carrying business to the yard of The Royal Hotel. No longer an innkeeper, Hick concentrated on the carrying business199, retaining what can be assumed, was the most profitable area of business.

A comparison of the value of Hick’s policies against similar policies taken out by merchants, Edward Markland and Timothy Rhodes (policy amount £600) and innholder, William Howson (policy amount £500), as seen in Table 12, indicates the substantial size of Hick’s business. In 1983, L. D. Schwarz and L.J. Jones’ study of occupations within the Sun Fire Office policy registers, highlighted the policy values of London victuallers. Using their figures and my own research, it is possible to compare not only the value of innkeepers’ policies against those of other businesses but those of Leeds and York against London policies, placing the Yorkshire inns within a national context.

Table 13 indicates that the policy of ninety-seven percent of victuallers in London was below £1000, with seventy-four percent being £500 or less. The limited number of policies identified for Leeds and York innkeepers, means an accurate comparison to London is not feasible. However, it is interesting to note that of the policies identified, forty-two percent of policies identified as relating to inns, were valued at more than £1000 as compared to three percent of all London policies. The remaining fifty-eight percent of policies for Leeds and York were valued at £600 or lower, compared to eighty-four percent in London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of policy values at</th>
<th>£300 or less</th>
<th>£500 or less</th>
<th>£600 or less</th>
<th>£800 or less</th>
<th>£1000 or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victuallers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Distribution of Sun Fire Policy Values for London Trades

Schwarz and Jones acknowledge the drastic fall in numbers of policies valued at the higher levels for victuallers in London. They suggest that although ‘the large victualler or innkeeper may have assumed great importance in many parts of eighteenth-century England’; this was not the case in London. Although it is not possible to achieve a definitive comparison, the figures indicate that innkeepers in Leeds and York had more opportunities to increase the value of their business.

**Relationship to Credit**

Inns often provided important financial services to the community. Everitt claims innkeepers occasionally provided a basic banking service. Money would be deposited with the innkeeper and when the businessman returned at a later date, he would use his credit with the innkeeper for local transactions. In the York account books, there is no evidence of quasi banking activity, perhaps because it already had banks. It does show, as Margot Finn leads us to expect, that credit lay at the centre of an inn's business. The accounts and day books of York innkeepers appear to suggest they were providing a basic level of financial service with clear evidence of lending cash to customers and staff.

---


Credit networks were an important part of the everyday business of inns during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with lending and borrowing money common practice amongst innkeepers, artisans and merchants. Margot Finn claims that not only was sociability central to encouraging and maintaining commercial relationships, but that the inherent obligation caused problems when it came to settling accounts for goods and services\textsuperscript{205}. Innkeeping, as with all forms of trade in this period, was based upon social relationships, personal negotiation and extended credit. The prevalence of retail credit meant that the fostering of mutual trust through 'sociable behaviours' was important and credit contracts were considered to be more than contractual agreements, they were part of a much wider relationship\textsuperscript{206}.

The reciprocal nature of these networks is revealed in the account books. For instance, between October 6 and 22 1839, the account for Mr Park, a coal supplier, indicated he owed John James Anderson fifteen shillings. On October 24, Anderson added two shillings to the balance and annotated it 'cash to balance for coals', indicating he gave Park two shillings in cash. He then noted that seventeen shillings was 'taken by coals', thereby allowing Park to clear his account by supplying Anderson with coal. A similar arrangement existed with Mrs Robinson, the poultry supplier.

For those innkeepers offering more than just drink and accommodation, the amounts of the bills outstanding could be substantial. In October and November 1818, John Harrison sold over fifty sheep and two gallons of spirits to the value £107. 4s to Benjamin Wood. On February 13 1819, Wood paid fifty pounds towards the bill, leaving an outstanding amount of over fifty-seven pounds; there is no indication as to whether the remainder was ever paid\textsuperscript{207}.

Finn maintains that traders offering 'complementary services and courtesies' to their customers, was an attempt to reinforce the contract in response to infrequent payments\textsuperscript{208}. This explains why innkeepers, such as Nathaniel Smith, lent cash to customers who already had accounts outstanding. Smith’s accounts indicate that despite Mr Booth’s account for 1834 being in arrears to six pounds, he not only gave him a room for an evening on October 31 1835, but Smith also lent him six shillings in cash. Four years later, in 1838, the balance outstanding was still in excess of five pounds twelve shillings, for which a bill was delivered on May 17 1838\textsuperscript{209}. In 1840, James Wilson,

\textsuperscript{205} Margot Finn, \textit{The Character of Credit}, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{206} Margot Finn, \textit{The Character of Credit}, 95, 98.
\textsuperscript{208} Margot Finn, \textit{The Character of Credit}, 97.
another York innkeeper, listed his ‘bad and doubtful debts’ which totalled sixty-one pounds, nine shillings and seven pence, equivalent to £4296 in modern day terms. One debtor, Moses Bell, lodged with Wilson for twenty one weeks, renting warehouse space from Wilson for the same period. Despite his unpaid bill of six pounds, fourteen shillings and three pence, Wilson lent Bell a further nine pounds and ten shillings over the following months. It is not surprising that Anderson, Smith and Wilson were to spend time in Debtors Prison at York Castle.

Bearing in mind that the first Leeds bank, the Lodge and Arthington, did not open until 1758, it is likely there were similar credit arrangements made by innkeepers in the city. I have been unable to find similar evidence for Leeds, however, given that all the daybooks examined provided a very similar picture, the experience of Leeds innkeepers was probably comparable.

**Relationship to Mail Coaches**

As seen in chapter one the development of coaches and carrying services during the eighteenth century had a significant effect on Leeds and York. They also offered many opportunities for innkeepers interested in developing their business into coaching inns. The availability of horses and the position of inns along the major roads of the country meant that Innkeepers were also ideally placed to play an important role in the development of mail coach services. In 1784 John Palmer contracted five innkeepers along the London to Bristol road, to provide horses for the inaugural mail coach on 2 August 1784. The first London to Leeds mail coach ran via Sheffield, Barnsley and Wakefield and began on July 24 1785. This daily coach ran from the Old King’s Arms and became known as the Leeds Royal Mail. In November 1786, a daily mail coach to Newcastle also began running from the same inn. By 1786, daily mail coaches were well established and coaches became increasingly common. The 1797 Leeds Directory indicates that two of the main inns were involved in running mail coaches. The London Mail ran from the Old King’s Arms, whilst the Liverpool to Hull mail, (which travelled via York), ran from the Rose and Crown. In York the principal posting inn was The George, where post-horses were stabled as early as 1700. However, it was the York Tavern from

---
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213 The Leeds Directory 1797 p.58 Mail from London arrives Old King’s Arms every morning at 3 – departs for London every evening at 10 pm. The Liverpool to Hull mail, sets off from the Rose and Crown for Liverpool at 4 am, calling at Halifax and Manchester. The mail from Liverpool arrives at the Rose and Crown every evening at 6pm then proceeds to York the same evening and arrives at 10.30 pm. It returns to Leeds the next day at 4 am on way to Liverpool,
which the mail coaches ran to London, Scarborough, Hull and Liverpool\textsuperscript{214} The improved communication of news and information provided by the mail coaches supported the expansion of trade and industry.

**Innkeepers as Owners of Property**

Probate and fire insurance records also show that a number of innkeepers in Leeds and York, often owned several properties, and rented out homes and business premises to the local community. In 1760, the will of York innkeeper Robert Hepingstall, indicated that, in addition to his own residence, (which included stables, a yard and courts), he also owned a house with a cow house and yard, which he rented out to Samuel Lund, and a coach house rented to Thomas Bond. All the property, along with goods and chattels with a value of forty pounds and two shillings, were left to his wife\textsuperscript{215}.

This was the case with several other innkeepers in both Leeds and York. Robert Consett, a York victualler who was also a man of property, had his ‘dwelling houses’ on Petergate, and rented out a house adjoining this to Robert Fisher. He also rented out a stable to John Graves\textsuperscript{216}.

The 1811 will of John Greaves, a Leeds vintner and innkeeper, indicates that he owned ‘The Hotel’, where he and the family resided, a house on Call Lane, and a property at the end of the hotel yard (which had its own stables and yard and other buildings). He had also ‘contracted’ to buy two further properties from Elizabeth Forrest for £1350. Greaves left instructions for the estate, including stock in trade, household goods, furniture and personal property, to be held in trust. Anything not required by his wife was to be sold, his wife to receive money for the ‘maintenance of herself and the children and the children’s education’\textsuperscript{217}.

**The Innkeeper as a Public Figure**

As can be seen from this chapter, in order to be successful, an innkeeper clearly needed a good head for business, with an ability to adapt to the needs and requirements of an often-diverse clientele. The growing importance of polite society, discussed in chapter three, meant that in order to develop and maintain his clientele, a successful innkeeper

\textsuperscript{214} Tom Bradley, *The Old Coaching Days*, 72.
\textsuperscript{215} Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Robert Hepingstall, Innholder, Monkgate, York, 1760. Microfilm Reel 1253.
\textsuperscript{216} Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Robert Consett, Victualler, 1766. Microfilm Reel 1254.
not only had to be trustworthy and of good character but he also had to be aware of changing ideas of sociability and contemporary modes of behaviour. By adopting recognised ideals of polite behaviour, a trader or innkeeper could be compared favourably with his ‘more genteel peer’218. To succeed in business innkeepers had to exhibit their ‘honesty, simplicity and a genuine interest in others’ to attract customers219. These principles are evident in this quote from the publication *Farrago* (1792):

> Politeness is the assimilation of our behaviour to the practice of all those qualities that form the most refined pleasures of social intercourse, the appearance of universal benevolence, generosity, modesty, and of making our own happiness spring from the accommodation of others220.

This quote illustrates the reciprocity of politeness and could have been written specifically as a guide for innkeepers.

By promoting their good character and observing contemporary notions of polite society, innkeepers provided an environment which offered opportunities for the middling sorts to come together with the gentry. Ideas of respectability and refinement were also reflected in the material culture and furniture of the period. The furnishings of the inn and the polite social graces of the innkeeper provided a safe comfortable environment, in which polite social interaction could develop.

The language of politeness, respectability and civility is found in the press notices and advertisements. The following advertisements for inns appeared in *The Leeds Intelligencer* dated Tuesday, April 25, 1775:

> Bowling - Green - House, AT CHAPEL-TOWN. The said House being now in Possession of Mr JOHN COWLING will be by him continued to the First Day of May next; after which Day the same will be Continued by JOSEPH ATKINSON; where all Gentlemen, Ladies, and Others, may be assured of the best Accommodation, and every possible Attention to please all who shall Favour him with their Company, by *Their most humble servant*

> JOSEPH ATKINSON, (Late servant to Mr George Oates.)
> MARY ATKINSON, (Late Housekeeper to Edmund Barker, Esq)
> POST-CHAISE, with Able Horses, and careful Drivers, on the Shortest Notice.221

---

And

*Kirkby-Lonsdale, Westmorland, April 9th, 1775*

JOHN HOLMES, (Formerly Butler to JOSEPH BROCKHOLES, Esq; who lately kept the BATHING-HOUSE at Heysham by the Sea) BEGS Leave to acquaint his FRIENDS and the PUBLIC, That he is removed to the RED-DRAGON, in KIRKBY LONSDALE, lately kept by Charles Knowles, deceased; which House he has fitted up in a genteel Manner for the Reception of the Nobility, Gentry, Tradesmen,&c. and has laid in fresh Stock of WINES, and other LIQUORS. Neat POST-CHAISE, with Able HORSES, and all other necessary Accommodations. All those who please to favour him with their Calls, may depend on his Endeavors to oblige, being *Their most obedient Servant, JOHN HOLMES*.

At first glance, the deferential language of both these advertisements suggest an element of servitude on the part of the innkeeper. But if we consider contemporary ideas of politeness and respectability, these advertisements were as much about promoting the innkeeper as the inn itself. By announcing their former service to named members of the gentry, they presented themselves as able and respectable people. By naming his wife, Atkinson traded on her reputation as Housekeeper to Edmund Barker, Esq. By promoting the accommodation as suitable for the gentry and nobility, both innkeepers were not only offering an invitation to those members of society, but also using the aspirational nature of polite society to promote their services to the middling sorts looking to be a part of that society.

In his work "Selling (Through) Politeness", published in 2008, Jon Stobart claimed the middling sorts were the ‘real target’ of these advertisements. Although Stobart’s work is predominantly concerned with provincial shops, the language and style of their advertisements is identical to that of the inns. The promise to focus his ‘attention’ and ‘endeavours’ on visitors and the use of the terms ‘beg’s leave’, ‘most humble servant’ and ‘most obedient servant’, demonstrated the modesty and decorum of the innkeepers. As already discussed in the previous chapter, these qualities along with displays of generosity, benevolence and accommodation were key aspects of civil society, placing these innkeepers not in a position of servitude, but in the centre of polite society. It is clear that through their advertising, innkeepers not only promoted themselves and their businesses, they also promoted the ideals of civil society.

---


223 Jon Stobart, “Selling (Through) Politeness”, 315. ‘Reading these advertisements, the middling sorts could imagine themselves to be part of a wider grouping comprising the nobility, gentry, merchants and ‘others’. In short, they could position themselves within polite society.’

224 Jon Stobart, “Selling (Through) Politeness”, 324. “…it is possible to see some eighteenth century advertisements as representations of politeness. They symbolized polite culture through
Innkeepers often publicised their links with local militias, the military and with the war effort, in order to promote their respectability. The local press and directories reveal that innkeepers had often been in service and were often members of the local militias or retired soldiers. Thirteen of the one hundred and one innkeepers listed in the 1797 Leeds directory, are shown as members of the Leeds Volunteers, whilst William Carrett, (innkeeper of the White Hart) is also listed as Sheriff’s Officer and Sergeant in the Volunteers. Following his death in 1798, Richard Crossland, a well-respected innkeeper and member of the Leeds Volunteers since their conception in 1782, was buried with full military honours. In York, Thomas Nicholson, the landlord of the Light Horseman on the Fulford Road, was an ex-Troop Sergeant Major; he was discharged from the army after being wounded at Waterloo. These snapshots provide evidence of how innkeepers promoted themselves through links with the state and through their membership of the military and militias.

During politically sensitive times such as the Jacobite rebellions, the French Revolution, the Luddite and the Chartist movement for political reform, promoting an association with the local militia or the military, demonstrated the innkeeper’s loyalty to the state. It was also a means to promote the inn as a place free from ‘radicals’. An expensive inn offering modern comforts and promoting contemporary ideals of politeness and respectability with an innkeeper who had served with the military, conveyed to the gentry, that the inn was politically a safe place.

The management skills required and the ability to identify and interpret the changing ideas of polite society and its cultural activities, indicate a certain persona was required of the innkeeper; politeness, affability and being politically respectable were key traits for the successful innkeeper. Evidence indicates that some innkeepers had previous experience of aristocratic service or links with city elites; through these connections, innkeepers acquired skills in managing and organising staff and knowledge of the behaviour and expectations of the nobility and gentry. The running of an aristocratic house provided excellent training for dealing with the significant numbers of staff required for large inns, whilst the society connections offered good business opportunities. However, inns also provided opportunities for those wanting to leave service and move to the towns. Census data in Tables 14, 15 and 16 show the job opportunities available, especially for women.

.... their allusions to polite sensibilities and tastes ... and their collaging of polite material culture, behaviour and values.’

225 The Leeds Directory 1797, 15.
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as inns grew in size. The role of women in the day-to-day running of the inns is examined in depth in chapter four.

In her book, *Daily Life in Eighteenth Century England*, Kirstin claims that a third of servants, (a disproportionate number of them men), became tradesmen or innkeepers after leaving service. Their experience in domestic service, especially those working for the nobility and gentry, and the money earned, enabled them to gain social mobility. A good example of this, is the ways ex-servants were identified in the local press. In the marriage announcement of Leeds innkeeper, John Cowling to the widow Mrs Smith in September 1770, the bride was identified as the ‘housekeeper to Jeremiah Dixon, of Gledhow, Esq’.[229] Dixon was a prominent Leeds Merchant who had been High Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1758, ‘under-taker of the Aire and Calder Navigation and deputy receiver of the West Riding land-tax’. In 1764 Dixon bought an estate at Gledhow, to the north of Leeds and commissioned the prestigious architect John Carr to build a new house. A substantial house in the popular classical design, requiring a number of servants under the watchful eye of the house-keeper, Mrs Smith; it would have provided excellent experience in the skills required for running a popular inn. Mentioning the high status of Dixon told readers that the future Mrs Cowling was of good character. In April 1775 a number of notices appeared in the *Leeds Intelligencer* which indicate the prevalence of servants becoming innkeepers. Two weeks after the announcement by Cowling that he was leaving the Bowling Green House at Chapel-Town to take up the New Inn on Briggate,[231] Joseph Atkinson announced he was taking over the Bowling Green House. The announcement, on April 25, identifies Atkinson as the ‘late servant to Mr George Oates’, a member of a leading family of Leeds Merchants, and his wife, Mary Atkinson, ‘late housekeeper to Edmund Barker Esq’.[232] Directly beneath this is an announcement by John Holmes, the new innkeeper for the Red Dragon Inn in Kirby-Lonsdale, who describes himself as ‘formerly Butler to Joseph Brockholes’,[233] a member of an old Lancashire family.

---


Their previous contact with the aristocracy and gentry meant it was not uncommon for innkeepers to enjoy aristocratic patronage. In 1788, John Hick became landlord of the Old King’s Arms, the most prestigious of Leeds inns in the eighteenth century. On May 20, 1788, two announcements appear in the Leeds Intelligencer, one from John Hick merely announced he had entered the inn. The second, placed by Mrs Wood, thanking the public for ‘their many favors conferred upon her late deceased husband’, describes John Hick as ‘for several years servant to the Most Noble the MARQUIS of ROCKINGHAM’. Although having left his service, Hick continued to have contact with the Marquis, for at least the next thirty years.

Rockingham of Wentworth Woodhouse, near Rotherham was Prime Minister both in 1765 – 1766 and at the time of his death in 1782. Records in the Sheffield Archives suggest that Hick had previously been a jockey at the Earl’s racing stables. The Marquis had been passionate about horseracing and was a well-known horse breeder. He organised (and his horse won), the inaugural St Leger’s race at Doncaster in 1776. It is therefore highly likely that Hick rode for the Marquis. Between the years 1793 and 1820, Hick corresponded on a number of occasions with the 4th Earl Fitzwilliam at Wentworth House, the Marquis’ nephew and heir, regarding financial problems with his business. There is a suggestion that Fitzwilliam loaned money to Hick on a number of occasions, over a period of several years. On 1 March 1802, Hicks wrote to Fitzwilliam informing him that he was surrendering the lease for the Old Kings Arms and that the sale of the property would enable him to pay his debts but that he was continuing with the coaching and wagon business. In 1802 Hick removed the carrying and coaching part of the business to the yard of Greaves’ Hotel on Briggate.

This chapter has established that the innkeeping trade comprised far more than just providing food and accommodation. Innkeepers provided an array of services and functions for their guests. By promoting themselves and their businesses as respectable and as part of polite society, they were able to develop trade and credit networks, expand their businesses and amass significant wealth and property. Chapter three now takes a closer look at the ways in which inns were assimilated into the urban economic and social spheres through their use as venues for business and social interaction.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull &amp; Mouth Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
<td>F 3 6 M</td>
<td>1 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old George Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Hotel</td>
<td>F 2 7 M</td>
<td>4 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Inn, Briggate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>M 3 6 M 2</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swan Inn</td>
<td>M 3 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Inn</td>
<td>M 1 3 M 1</td>
<td>1 1 3 1 1 1 1 2 1 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 1 1 3 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Castlegate</td>
<td>M 5 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Pavement</td>
<td>M 4 7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>M 5 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Inn</td>
<td>M 2 3 W</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Hotel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Rooms, Railway Station</td>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>3 4 2 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Station Hotel, Railway Stn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 52 0 3 2 4 6 3 6 1 25 1 4 4 8 1 6 15 9 1 2 1 1 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Employment Data taken from Census Returns for 1841 and 1851
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Hotel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Horse Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull &amp; Mouth Hotel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old George Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Inn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Inn, Briggate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Employment Data taken from Census Returns for Leeds in 1861.239

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swan Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Inn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Castlegate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Inn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Hotel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 3 5</td>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Rooms, Railway Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Station Hotel, Railway Stn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4 4 3 1 2</td>
<td>1 1 6 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1 9 13</td>
<td>4 1 2 1 2 1 9 1 2 1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Employment Data taken from Census Returns for York in 1861

---

Chapter Three: The Inn as a Venue for Business and Social and Cultural Interaction

This study has so far shown that in the eighteenth century, Leeds and York were vibrant commercial and economic centres and that innkeepers were not only providing accommodation, food and drink, but diversifying into other areas of business. Chapter three examines the role played by the inn and innkeeper in the wider community, as a venue for business and recreation.

Following an examination of literature concerning the coffeehouse’s role in urban society, this study argues that although coffeehouses may have played a significant role in London, there were only a small number in Leeds and York and they were conspicuously absent from local newspapers. In comparison, notices from the same newspapers, show how inns were venues for a wide variety of meetings, auctions and dinners and not only promoted urban commerce, and sociability but also had an important role in party politics. Finally, this study will argue that inns were fundamental to the development of urban leisure, at a time when large numbers of people visited towns to attend the assemblies and horseracing. Without the substantial amounts of accommodation, stabling and services provided by inns, these forms of entertainment would not have been viable.

According to Borsay in 1990, economic historians had effectively ignored the ‘service sectors’ and their role in the urban economy. In the twenty-five years since his book was published, however, the importance of service provision to an urban economy’s success has been recognised. In 2005, Andrew Hann argued that long established market centres, with a ‘well developed service infrastructure’, were able to respond to urbanization and industrialisation demands by exploiting the status of their service provision. This supports Borsay’s argument that the growth of the service sectors in towns was of ‘vital significance’ and played a fundamental role in the substantial growth of the urban economy over this period. Moreover, by linking urban commercial and service sectors through supplying or accommodating services, inns and shops were integral to the economic success of a town, an importance neglected by a number of studies into eighteenth-century coffeehouses over the last ten to fifteen years.

241 Peter Borsay, The Eighteenth Century Town, 11.
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244 Peter Borsay, The Eighteenth Century Town, 11-12. Borsay claimed that the growth of the service sector and a ‘consumer based economy’ offered ‘major towns, like York and Chester, an opportunity for recovery and prosperity following a period of economic stagnation.'
Coffeehouses versus Inns

Coffeehouses first appeared in Oxford in 1650 and in London in 1652\(^{245}\), by which time the inn and alehouse were embedded in British society and culture. Was the introduction of the coffeehouse just a fad or did it provide a credible threat to existing establishments?

Coffeehouse literature has suggested that in some places, London in particular, the coffeehouse played a valuable role in providing a meeting place for the upper and middling sorts to meet and discuss business, offering services such as access to the press and providing a place for mail to be delivered. Lawrence E. Klein, Keith Suter, Brian Cowan, Markman Ellis and Bonnie Calhoun, all agree that coffeehouses were places where all people could meet to conduct business and discuss a variety of topics\(^{246}\); the same could be said for the inn, as the notices below show:

Society of the Free and Accepted Masons
Held at the Golden Lion in Leeds under the constitution of the Grand Lodge of England. Lewis Bastide, Master. Annual meeting for 27\(^{th}\) instant postponed to Thursday 29\(^{th}\) – all brethren and members earnestly desired to meet the master at the above said place at 10.00 before noon to attend and consult on divers business. Dinner will be on the table at 2.00 exactly\(^{247}\).

and

John Port Latin – Annual meeting of Gentlemen educated at St John’s College, Cambridge will be held for the present year at Mr Wood’s The King’s Arms in Leeds on 6 May. Dinner will be upon the table at half past one o’clock\(^{248}\).

In his study, *Social Life of Coffee; The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*, Brian Cowan traces the introduction of coffee into England and the growth of coffeehouses from the seventeenth century to 1720, maintaining that by this time ‘the coffeehouse and coffee consumption .... were firmly entrenched within British Society’\(^{249}\). Cowan also claimed


\(^{247}\) The Leeds Intelligencer, Tuesday, December 20\(^{th}\), 1774. Held at Thoresby Society.

\(^{248}\) The Leeds Intelligencer, Number 1261, Tuesday, May 26, 1778. In *Introductory Account of the Leeds Intelligencer 1754-1866*, 43.

that although towns like York, Birmingham and Newcastle did have a small number of coffeehouses, they were much more prevalent in London. In the City of London alone, there were eighty-two coffeehouses in 1663\textsuperscript{250}. By the end of the seventeenth century, there were estimated to be ‘several hundred’ in the London Metropolitan area. By 1734, the London Directories identified ‘551 official London coffeehouses’, not taking into account a significant number of ‘unlicensed coffeehouses’\textsuperscript{251}. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the coffeehouses in London were providing a variety of social and business services, distributing news and information and catering for a broad spectrum of ‘political, professional and social groups’\textsuperscript{252}.

Lawrence E. Klein and Cowan agreed that, although both coffeehouses and inns acted as hosts for business and social interaction, it was notions of sobriety which set the coffeehouse apart\textsuperscript{253}. Klein suggested that coffeehouses were seen as more politically problematic than inns, because alcohol was perceived as ‘mellowing and passifying’ where as coffee meant sobriety and clearness of mind\textsuperscript{254}. He differentiated the coffeehouses from the inns, alehouses and taverns, by claiming that although they all provided ‘food, drink and sociability’, sociability was the dominant characteristic of the coffeehouse\textsuperscript{255}. He also claimed that although initially it was a ‘novelty’, the coffeehouse developed into a crucial element of urban life for the middling sorts\textsuperscript{256}. In 2005, Keith Suter claimed the patronising of coffee shops by some of the top names of the Industrial Revolution, for example, Joseph Priestley and James Watt, meant that coffee shops had been a factor in the development of England as a ‘superpower’. Suter’s study suggested that, just by being a venue for discussion and exploration of ideas and sobriety coffeehouses were an important factor in the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century\textsuperscript{257}.

In 1962 sociologist, Jürgen Habermas, published his work on the ‘bourgeois public sphere’, which he claimed was created in the eighteenth century as members of the elite and middling sorts came together in coffeehouses to debate issues regarding trade, state affairs and politics. He stated that it was this ‘public sphere’ which transformed the political environment of towns\textsuperscript{258}. In 2012, Bonnie Calhoun used Habermas’s work as the
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\textsuperscript{258} Jürgen Habermas, \textit{The Structural Formation of the Public Sphere}. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 58; Craig Calhoun, \textit{Habermas and the Public Sphere}. (London; MIT Press, 1991), 12.
basis for her comparative study of London coffeehouses and Parisian salons in which she failed to acknowledge the existence of inns. Calhoun claimed that the coffeehouses ‘were the most important public sphere institutions in London’ and despite mentioning other institutions such as theatres and Masonic lodges, the inn or alehouse is totally disregarded. In effect, both Habermas and Calhoun ignored the inns, possibly the most common national ‘public sphere institution’ which had been in existence for centuries before the emergence of the coffeehouse. Calhoun goes as far as to say that despite there being other areas of the public sphere, ‘in Britain, coffeehouses made the largest impact’ . This may have been the case in London, where there were large numbers, however, the relative scarcity of coffeehouses in the rest of the country, when compared to the numbers of inns and taverns, casts doubt on Calhoun’s claims.

The emphasis on coffeehouses, ignoring the inns, alehouses and taverns, (which had been the centre of village and town life since the Middle Ages), failed to recognise the centuries’ old traditions of local inns acting as venues for local corporations, merchants, business men and magistrates and critically underestimated their significance in English culture. This culture is highlighted in Paul Jennings’ book *The Local: A History of the English Pub*, in which he described the English pub, as a distinct product of English society which is used very differently when compared to a ‘French Cafe or American saloon’.

In order to compare the roles of coffeehouses and inns in the public spheres of Leeds and York, searches of local directories and newspapers were carried out. Both Cowan and Phil Withington provided evidence of coffeehouses in York during the seventeenth century. Cowan stating that there were three coffeehouses in York in 1660 and by the late eighteenth century ‘probably no more than thirty’ , whilst Withington, quotes court papers, which identify ‘the coffee house in Minster Yard’ . However, a systematic search of *The York Courant*, failed to provide evidence of coffeehouses in the city.

The earliest local press reference to a coffeehouse in Leeds was an advertisement in *The Leeds Mercury* in 1749, for a meeting at ‘the house of Mrs Dendeny, the Coffee House,’

---
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Leeds’. The meeting was to apply for a turnpike act for the Leeds to Tadcaster road; however, this was the only reference to the coffee shop in the seven-year period, 1743 to 1750, covered by the search. By comparison, the same search identified eighteen meetings, sales or auctions that took place at inns (see tables 17 and 18). Examination of The Leeds Intelligencer in 1790 and The Leeds Mercury in 1809 failed to identify any coffeehouses in Leeds. Despite many references to sales, auctions and bankruptcy meetings being held at inns across Yorkshire, there are only references to two coffeehouses, one in Dewsbury and one in London. The scarcity of notices regarding coffeehouses may suggest that they organised their own advertising of both their existence and the events that took place there.

A search of local directories was to prove just as frustrating. In 1817, Baines’ Directory of Leeds listed a ‘Coffee Room’ in Briggate, stating that all London and other newspapers were available. However, this was not open to everyone. The ‘Gentry and principal inhabitants’ of the town could subscribe for one guinea but any new visitors had to be proposed by an existing subscriber. This indicates that the coffeehouses were not as open as some would make us believe and that polite society may not have been quite as inclusive as has been suggested. This ‘coffee room’ appears to have operated as a private club, much in the way the original coffeehouses in Oxford did in the seventeenth century. The Leeds directories for 1822 and 1829 list no coffeehouses in the town, in comparison to more than 200 inns, taverns and public houses. The 1834 and 1837 directories show only one coffeehouse listed under Inns and Hotels. It was a similar story in York. Directories prior to 1810 list no coffeehouses, whilst the directories for 1818 listed three in comparison to 180 inns, taverns and public houses. The 1829 directory listed two coffeehouses with three appearing in the 1840 directory listed under Taverns and Public Houses.

In his history of the local pub, Paul Jennings suggests that although some coffeehouses adopted many of the functions of inns, including selling alcohol, by the late eighteenth century the ‘the distinctive nature’ of the coffeehouse had been assimilated by inns; some
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Inns provided coffee rooms, as in the Old Oak in Kendal in 1743\textsuperscript{274}. Although it has not been possible to confirm if this was the case in Leeds and York, the daybook of York innkeeper, John James Anderson shows that in 1839, he was selling tea and coffee along with a range of alcoholic beverages\textsuperscript{275}. What is clear from the evidence from directories and newspapers is that inns were heavily involved with many different types of trade and business.

The consensus of opinion in the studies identified in this chapter seems to be that the coffeehouse culture of the early eighteenth century had begun to wane by the 1780s and that by the 1830’s, many had disappeared or were incorporated with other businesses. Evidence from the newspapers and directories support that view, with low numbers of coffeehouses in the directories for the 1820s and 1830s. The directories of 1848 list ‘coffeehouses with eating houses’, of which there were thirty two for Leeds and eleven for York\textsuperscript{276}.

The lack of real evidence of the numbers of coffeehouses in Leeds and York in the eighteenth century, means it is not possible to get a definitive answer as to the importance of the coffee house to the cultural life in the towns. However, the significant number of inns and their open access to all, suggests that in Leeds and York, inns, not coffeehouses were more important establishments for business and trade. As leading businessmen of the town became increasingly philanthropic, setting up clubs and friendly societies to deal with the problems of society, the boundary between state and society became indistinct and the political environment in nineteenth-century towns changed\textsuperscript{277}. Research into the local press reveals the use of inns and not coffeehouses, as venues for societal integration, rational debate and for clubs and societies. Inns seem to have played a major part in the ‘transformation of the public sphere’ in Leeds and York, rather than coffeehouses.

The Inn as a Venue for Business and Local Administration

In his book, \textit{English Society in the 18th Century}, Roy Porter claimed the growing service industry including inns, ‘coaching-houses’ and shops, not only provided employment opportunities, but also venues where business could be conducted and where increased personal wealth could be spent\textsuperscript{278}. Rosemary Sweet supported the notion of inns as venues for business in \textit{The English Town 1680-1840}. She claimed the inn ‘performed an
enormous range of functions’ and that ‘initially almost all activities were based upon an
inn’279, including legal, financial and business matters.

This was certainly true for Leeds. In 1700 there were ‘no formal meeting places or
associations for business men and no commercial information services’ 280. As a centre of
community life, an inn provided a suitable venue for merchants, meetings of Corporations,
Magistrates, Turnpike Trusts, auctions, corporation dinners 281 as well as for more relaxed
gatherings. The structure of each inn meant that they often had several rooms available,
which could be reserved for those purposes. For example, the following advertisement for
the Griffin Inn appeared in the Leeds Mercury in January 1735:

To be Lett. The GRIFFIN INN, in Leeds Being a very good House, to which is
added a large Room, wains-cotted, with several other Dining Rooms, with fore
shops, Vaults, Cellars, Warehouses and good Stabling for fifty Horses; the best
Conveniences about Town, for setting Coaches, Carriages &c. pitching or loading
of Packs; whoever is desirous to take the Premises may apply to James Hartley in
Leeds282

By announcing the addition of ‘a large room’ and a number of ‘Dining Rooms’ it intimates
there is sufficient space to accommodate large numbers of people for meetings and
dinners. This was a valuable asset, both for the innkeeper when promoting his business
and for the wider community.

Evidence of the inns being used as venues for a variety of meetings and functions as
proposed by Everitt, Sweet and Clark283 is found in local newspapers, The Leeds Mercury
and The Leeds Intelligencer:

4000 volumes of which included the library of Rev Mr Murgatroyd of Leeds,
lately deceased and several other valuable collections by Joseph Ogle, Bookseller.
On Thursday next will be published a catalogue of Books to be sold by auction at
the House of Mr Wightman, the George and Dragon in Briggate Saturday next 28th
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October at Half past six in the evening and will continue every evening (Sunday excepted) till all are sold.

Also

Auction at the house of Mrs Cooke – Innholder in Leeds at 3 in the afternoon an entire yard situated in Swinegate.

And

Auction at the Talbot in Leeds (House of Mr William Wood) Tuesday, 15 November 1774 between 4 and 6 in the afternoon Close or parcel of ground situate near Claypit House, in Leeds aforesaid, Containing one acre; with a good, new substantial and well built stone wind mill.

Unlike Leeds, York had well-established venues for business. As an ancient corporation city, the corporation owned its own property, so it had no need to use inns as venues. The Merchant Adventurer’s Hall, built in the fourteenth century and the Guildhall, built in the fifteenth century were long established meeting places. The abolition of the Council in the North in the late seventeenth century, meant that King’s Manor became redundant. Part of the building was converted into an assembly room, providing accommodation for entertainments during the assizes. In 1732, the Mansion House, built as a residence for the Lord Mayor, also provided a place for guests to be entertained and for members of the York Council to carry out their duties.

As has already been seen above, eighteenth-century newspapers provide evidence of the many of the functions provided by inns. The growth of the provincial press in the eighteenth century was inextricably linked with the burgeoning middle class and the development of urban culture. London newspapers were distributed nationally but the relatively early appearance of their own newspapers, The Leeds Mercury (first published 1718) and The York Courant (first published 1719), show the economic and cultural importance of the towns. In the early years, these papers carried little or no local news, advertisements or mentions of inns or other local meeting places.
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A search of *The Leeds Mercury* between January 1743 and December 1750\(^{290}\) revealed a variety of sales, auctions and meetings taking place at inns in Leeds, predominantly the Old King’s Arms. Table 17 shows that fifty percent of the meetings and sales identified took place at the Old King’s Arms, with a further thirty-six percent at other inns and only fourteen percent at alternative venues, namely the music hall and a house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Old King’s Arms</th>
<th>Talbot Inn</th>
<th>Other Inns</th>
<th>Other Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike Roads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates &amp; Effects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing Lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock fighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17** Inns as venues for meetings and sales taken from notices in *The Leeds Mercury* January 1743 to December 1750

A subsequent search of the *York Courant* for the year January to December 1799, revealed a similar story with notices for auctions and meetings taking place in inns all over Yorkshire\(^{291}\). See tables 17 and 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Auctions</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike Trustees</td>
<td>Enclosure Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knaresborough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18** Inns used for meetings and sales taken from the notices in *The York Courant*, January to December 1799.

The number of meetings and sales at the Old King’s Arms, shown in Table 17, reflected its reputation as the most prestigious inn in Leeds. Regularly appearing in the eighteenth-century press, it was where magistrates sat the town corporation attended grand dinners


\(^{291}\) *The York Courant*, January 1790 – December 1790, microfiche.
and the Turnpike Trusts held meetings\textsuperscript{292}. Its status is confirmed in a story which appeared in \textit{The Leeds Intelligencer} of September 1768, when it reported that the inn, at short notice, had supplied fifty horses and refreshments for the King of Denmark and his substantial retinue. Met by the Mayor and Alderman of the town, the King and his entourage also viewed the Cloth Hall, providing an excellent opportunity to promote Leeds as an important business and social centre\textsuperscript{293}. The inn was clearly an important asset to the town, the ability to supply such a large number of horses and feed large numbers of people indicated a significant, well-organised business, which had the support and the confidence of the Corporation. This provides evidence not only of a substantial business, but also of the ways in which the Corporation were able to use the King’s Arms to impress important visitors and promote the local economy.

Although the Corporation spent substantial amounts of money on dinners at the inn, spending a total of ninety-eight pounds on seventeen dinners at the King’s Arms in 1762\textsuperscript{-3}, newspapers show it also used the inns for subscription meetings. The corporation had limited formal power and lacked economic resources during the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{295}. Public subscription was used to fund building projects, vital to sustaining Leeds status as the regional centre for the West Riding cloth industry\textsuperscript{296}. The notices and reports published in the press show that in 1772, a meeting was held at the Old King’s Arms, to open a new subscription for improvements to the Aire and Calder Navigation, raising £32,000 within the first two hours\textsuperscript{297}. As a result, substantial improvements were made, extending the waterway to Selby, improving trade links, not just for Leeds, but for the West Riding manufacturing districts, placing additional commercial pressures on York\textsuperscript{298}. In 1774, following concerns about the cloth markets in Leeds and competition from other towns like Wakefield, meetings were held at the Old King’s Arms and the White Horse Inn to discuss the provision of a second White Cloth Hall. In October 1776 it was announced
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‘everything was finally and amicably settled at a meeting of merchants and clothiers at the Old King’s Arms’. By hosting these meetings, innkeepers supported local trades.

The shortage of purpose-built formal meeting places in Leeds, meant that inns were important venues for traders and manufacturers to meet throughout the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth century. As a result, the inns developed important trade links between ‘specialist factors’, who used the inns on a regular basis, disseminating commercial information, and ‘opening up new channels of trade’. Directories and notices in the contemporary local press show how inns provided important business accommodation and services for a large number of trades, both agricultural and industrial. Baines’ Directory of Leeds, in 1817, listed approximately one thousand county manufacturers who attended the cloth halls and gave the name of the inn which they frequented.

Despite the provision of new marketing and commercial facilities in Leeds between 1820 and 1860, the directories of the 1820s and 1840s indicate merchants continued to use the inns as venues for business. The 1826 Leeds Directory, provides a substantial list of merchants and producers from across Yorkshire and the inns they attended on a regular basis, all of which were in Briggate or the yards off Briggate. James Close, a butter factor from Reeth in North Yorkshire, William Wright, a seedsmen from Lofthouse, and Richard Oastler, the prominent factory reformer and land agent from Huddersfield, all carried out business at the Bull and Mouth Inn. James Sellers, a cardmaker from Halifax used the Saddle Inn, whilst The Golden Lion was used by Alder & Hansell, corn factors from Wakefield, and John Emmett & Son, paper manufacturers from Halifax. The Ship Inn was used by Andrew James, coal agent from East Ardsley and William Hardwick a corn dealer from Otley. The Williams Directory of 1844, lists more than fifty inns which were used by county cloth manufacturers, including the Bull & Mouth, Old George, Saddle, Cock and Bottle and Griffin. The large number of merchants, producers and agents trading in an extensive range of commodities from so many inns, indicate the important role played by inns in the urban economy of Leeds.

Politics

As venues of meetings, inns played a role in local and national politics. In 1775, the Leeds Mercury announced the corporation had petitioned George III to end the war with America.
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by ‘mild and lenient measures’. The petition was drawn up at a meeting, consisting of the town’s elite and ‘principal inhabitants’ of the ‘town and neighbourhood’, that took place at the Old King’s Arms\textsuperscript{305}. America was a major market forworsted cloths and the petition was in response to concerns about the effect of the war on trade. Worsted cloths accounted for half of the West Riding cloth industry\textsuperscript{306}. 

Inns also played an important part in parliamentary politics. As was shown in chapter one, York was the ‘largest constituency’ and had the ‘largest electorate in the country’, with seven contested elections between 1701 and 1741. Inns were vital to county elections. They provided election candidates and agents with rooms to use as committee rooms, and accommodation and refreshments for voters and non-voters\textsuperscript{307}.

The large number of elections in York would have proved lucrative for the innkeepers, as election committees met at the inns to organise the campaign. In 1784, the election committees stayed at the York Tavern and Bluitt’s Inn. It was a similar story in Leeds. During the West Riding Election of 1820, the Whig candidate, Lord Milton, son of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Earl Fitzwilliam of Wentworth Woodhouse near Rotherham, was based at the Bull & Mouth and the Tory candidate the Hon. James Archibald Stuart Wortley of Wortley Hall, Sheffield, at The Hotel\textsuperscript{308}.

A key task of election committees was to secure accommodation for those travelling to the polls. Failure to do so could result in losing the election. In York, in 1784, with ‘two thirds of the public houses and stables’ of York secured by the Tory committee\textsuperscript{309}, the Whig candidates were heading for a heavy defeat and withdrew from the poll the night before the election\textsuperscript{310}. The entertaining of the electorate could be crucial to the outcome of elections. Voters withheld their votes if they thought they had not received enough ‘treats of food and ale’\textsuperscript{311}. The scale of these treats is seen in the Parliamentary election that took place in York in 1774, when the three candidates paraded to the Guildhall for the Poll, before returning with the county members and Freeholders to the George Inn on
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Coney Street for a dinner. The following day ‘hospitality was dispensed at Bluitt’s Inn, followed by a public ball at the Assembly rooms for 200 people\textsuperscript{312}.

Inns were used for substantial political dinners into the nineteenth century. The accounts of Nathaniel Smith, innkeeper at the Spotted Cow in York, reveal two substantial election dinners, one on March 8th 1833 and one on March 4th 1834. It is possible to get an idea of their scale when the cost of these dinners per head is compared to a normal celebratory supper. In January 1832, a supper for fifteen was held to celebrate the birthday of Wentworth-Fitzwilliam, the 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl Fitzwilliam, at a cost of 2/6 per head. Both the election dinners cost 10\textpounds; a head and were provided for twenty-three people in 1833 and eighteen people in 1834\textsuperscript{313}. It is clear they were substantial affairs.

By hosting election committees and ‘treating’ the voters, innkeepers were actively involved in the politics of the time and well aware of ‘their pivotal role in the process’\textsuperscript{314}. At the centre of local campaigns, innkeepers could use their local knowledge and the level of service they provided, to influence not only individual voters, but also the outcome of the election.

The Inn and its Place in Polite Society and Urban Leisure

From the late seventeenth century, Britain saw a move towards a more polite and civil society, which continued to develop throughout the eighteenth and into the nineteenth centuries. Sweet claimed that changing ideas of status and behaviour influenced all aspects of life, with social association in the form of clubs and societies a significant element of the cultural life of the middling sorts\textsuperscript{315}. That view was supported by Peter Clark who claimed that, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, a variety of clubs and associations were intrinsic elements of the ‘social life of the educated classes’\textsuperscript{316}. Significant numbers of the urban middling sorts participated in voluntary societies in response to a perceived failure by the State to respond to the social problems caused by rapid urbanization and population growth\textsuperscript{317}. Predominantly held in drinking establishments, innkeepers were involved in establishing, accommodating and financing a

\textsuperscript{312} George Benson, \textit{An Account of the City and County of the City of York: From the Reformation to the Year 1925}. (Wakefield: S.R Publishers Limited, 1968), 87.


\textsuperscript{315} Rosemary Sweet, \textit{The English Town}, 185-186.


\textsuperscript{317} Peter Clark, \textit{British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800}, 95.
range of societies\textsuperscript{318} with an increased number of voluntary societies responsible for delivering charitable relief, medical care and charity schools\textsuperscript{319}. That evidence indicates the ways in which the public sphere promoted philanthropic activities.

The increase in social interaction led to a need for changing attitudes to behaviour, to enable an easy sociability which became increasingly important during the eighteenth century. In a period of increased personal wealth and commercialisation, contemporary commentaries on politeness, manners and civility played an important role in promoting the aspirational nature of society at the time\textsuperscript{320}. It is argued here, that innkeepers played a key role in promoting these changes.

Not everyone welcomed the move towards increased sociability. In his pamphlet published in 1662, John Crossel denounced stage coaches as causing ‘serious injury on society’, despite there being only six in the whole of England. Crossel claimed that the ‘convenience’ of coaches, compared to travel on horseback, not only encouraged gentlemen to travel to London more frequently, but that they also brought their wives who would have normally stayed at home. He complained that, following their visit, having bought new clothes and experiencing the entertainments, they adopted a ‘love of pleasure’ and were discontented with their ordinary everyday life\textsuperscript{321}.

Notions of respectability and politeness emerged in response to concerns regarding the rapid growth in ‘provincial urban society, the rise in commercialization and political changes\textsuperscript{322}. They were a means to promote behaviour and a culture conducive to civilizing society at a time when urbanisation had fragmented ‘traditional social bonds’\textsuperscript{323}. So what was meant by ‘politeness’ and how did it affect innkeepers of the period. Definitions of the meaning of ‘politeness’ within an eighteenth century context, have varied significantly over the years.

Rosemary Sweet claimed ‘politeness’ was not just about being polite or conforming to ideals of ‘common courtesy’, it encompassed ‘an entire social code and expectations of behaviour’. Relaxed sophistication, sociability and ‘good taste’ were all intrinsically linked
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to ideas of politeness\textsuperscript{324}. Alternatively, Philip Carter, in his book ‘\textit{Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660 – 1800}’, draws principally on eighteenth-century discourses in the form of directories, books, essays and periodicals, to illustrate the inconsistencies associated with defining ‘politeness’\textsuperscript{325}. Considering all these, Carter highlights the fundamental ‘emphasis on good character’ in contemporary publications promoting politeness and refinement. He also identified ‘three of the essential principles’ on which contemporary commentators based their definitions\textsuperscript{326}. There were changes to the definitions of politeness throughout the century, and despite a shift in their order of importance, the principles of ‘decorum’ and ‘accomplishment’ were important throughout the period. However, the most prevalent was what Carter described as an easy ‘display of generosity and accommodation to one’s companions’\textsuperscript{327}.

Before the availability of purpose built venues, inns were often used as venues for social and cultural events, promoting ideals of polite society. At a time of high migration, inns, provided meeting places, affording newcomers the chance to meet residents and enabling their adoption into urban society. According to Peter Clark, clubs and societies, often held in inns:

\begin{quote}
provided a way for respectable and artisan migrants to meet together and gain a foothold in urban society\textsuperscript{328}.
\end{quote}

Borsay claimed that by ‘developing an informal web of association, a sense of coherence and community evolved despite times of great change and population increase’\textsuperscript{329}. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, both Leeds and York were regional centres where traders, merchants, drovers, farmers, middlemen and lawyers gathered.

Provincial and county towns became important social centres for the gentry and the burgeoning middle classes as trade and wealth increased\textsuperscript{330}. York was well established as the social and cultural centre for the north of England. In Leeds, increased economic success led to the development of social activities and the town rapidly becoming an
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important social centre. According to Wilson, visitors to Leeds could experience a ‘constant round of cockfighting .... horseracing .... theatre going, dancing and card assemblies’. Already well established in providing refreshments, accommodation and stabling for large numbers of visitors attending the markets; it was only ‘natural’ that inns adapted to take advantage of the growing demand for ‘polite leisure’. The notices that appear in the local press show that in Leeds, the inns were acting for a particular kind of meeting and dinner:

The Circulating Library
Monday next 4 September Annual General Meeting of all subscribers to the circulating library in the town, is to be hold at Mr Myers, the New Inn at 3.00 in the afternoon. At this meeting, a new committee and president shall be chosen and the annual payment of 5 shillings to be made.

Tickets for a benefit concert for the General Infirmary, Leeds oratorios in Trinity Church (organ to be erected for the purpose) on Thursday, October 12 and Friday October 13. Tickets 4s and 2s each from Mr Myers - new Inn, Mrs Cooke - Old King’s Arms, Mr Esk – The Golden Lyon, Mr Wood the Talbot and Mr Northhouse – The White Horse Inn

Brotherley Society, Leeds begun January, 1 1776 at the House of Mr Samuel Appleyard, the Rose and Crown

The notices show the distinct middle class nature of the dinners and meetings taking place in Leeds Inns. The cost of membership for the circulating library and tickets for the benefit concerts would put them out of reach of ordinary people, but by promoting these forms of leisure, they were promoting polite ideals. The ‘Brotherley’ Society was a benefit society which provided a type of health insurance for its members. The cost was one shilling entrance fee and ten pence every month and after eighteen months membership, members were entitled to:

When afflicted with sickness etc. as to keep his house, to have 6 shillings a week; 4 shillings if he can walk out, though unable to work; and 2 shillings a week when through Old Age or infirmities, he cannot follow his trade and be allowed to do
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what he can for his further support. Every member to receive 40 shillings on the
death of his wife and 7 pounds to be paid to the Heirs, etc of every member at his
decease.\textsuperscript{335}

These notices show that, through acting as venues for meetings for a variety of
associations and clubs, the inns in Leeds were very much a part of the public sphere as
discussed earlier in this chapter. Through their sponsorship of all forms of leisure,
inkeepers promoted their facilities to the growing elite\textsuperscript{336} and underpinned the growth of
the service sector. An element of reciprocity meant the rise of the inn, (the coaching inn in
particular), encouraged economic growth. As the service sector expanded in response, so
inns increased in size and the services they offered expanded\textsuperscript{337}.

According to Sweet and Borsay, Assemblies were important events in the social calendar
of eighteenth-century urban society, providing a variety of entertainments and activities.
Held regularly in towns during the winter and throughout the summer season in spa
towns, assemblies attracted families from across the country.\textsuperscript{338} Before the construction
of purpose built assembly rooms, inns often accommodated assemblies and balls, adding
large ballrooms on to the inn, so the landlord could take full advantage of the economic
potential assemblies offered\textsuperscript{339}. Innkeepers regularly leased new assembly rooms and
provided musicians, refreshments and other amenities\textsuperscript{340}. My search of the press failed to
reveal evidence of innkeepers involved with providing assemblies in Leeds and York,
however, Looney claimed the Rose and Crown Inn had ‘hosted the Leeds New
Assembly in 1784\textsuperscript{341}. This, despite the early provision of facilities at the Cloth Halls in
Leeds from 1711, the first assembly rooms in Kirkgate in the 1720s and the opening of the
new Assembly Rooms in 1777\textsuperscript{342}. In York, prior to the construction of the Assembly
rooms in 1730, assemblies were regularly held at the King’s Manor.\textsuperscript{343}
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Horseracing

As well as assemblies, music and theatre, sporting activities played a significant part in the development of eighteenth-century urban social life and polite society. Horseracing, cockfighting, hunting, and cricket were all popular past times by the middle of the century. There is limited evidence of inns directly supporting racing, hunting and other sports, but their accommodation was key to the development of leisure facilities.

Although horseracing and hunting were often seen as more rural pursuits, the stabling and refreshment facilities of the urban inn meant that towns like York, Leeds and Liverpool were able to support their own hunts and horseracing and by 1770, 90% of horseracing was based in market towns. Hunting was very popular in Leeds with the original Leeds Hunt starting in 1740. It became so popular, that in 1790, it was meeting three times a week. A notice in the local press shows that in 1771, there was a move to start a second hunt, a meeting being held at the Golden Lion Inn for those who wished to ‘encourage’ the start of a new subscription hunt.

In Leeds, anecdotal evidence in local history books indicate that horseracing was popular much earlier than hunting and provided links with one particular inn, the Talbot, on Briggate in Leeds, where, by 1709, Thomas Thornton had started the Leeds Races and Cockings. Victorian local historian, William Wheater claimed that the Talbot Inn was the favoured inn of the gentry and the merchant elite. First identified as an inn in 1680, it had strong sporting links throughout its history as the centre for cocking and race meetings. Although press between 1719 and 1750 has no mention of the inns link with horseracing, notices which appeared in The Leeds Intelligencer in 1758 and 1759, provide evidence of the involvement of John Cowling, innkeeper of the Bowling Green Inn at Chapel-Town, north of Leeds, with the ‘Leedes Races’. Held on Chapel-Town Moor, the races were held over three days in June and were one of the most important dates on the town’s social calendar. They state:

All Horses, &c. that run for the said Plates to be shewn and measured, on Saturday the 10th (2nd) of June, at Mr. John Cowling’s on Chapel-Town Moor, betwixt the Hours of two and seven in the Afternoon....... the Horses, &c. to stand at such Houses as have subscribed Half a Guinea towards the said Races, and no
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more than three Horses at one House, ‘till each House have had three, except Mr. John Cowling, who is at liberty to take five (four).  

These notices also provide evidence of how innkeepers supported the races, with inns providing stabling for all the horses and innkeepers sponsoring the races through subscription. Registration took place on the Sunday and the races ran the following Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, with ‘Ordinaries every Day and Assemblies every Night as well as cockfighting. Throughout the period of the races, the Course Clerk and officials stayed at the Talbot inn, where entries were registered and handicaps set. The ‘race and cocking’ events encouraged large numbers of people into the town; there was a ‘carnival’ atmosphere as the town filled with strangers, many of whom got very drunk.

Through their sponsorship of the races, and provision of stabling and accommodation, Leeds innkeepers supported, not only the races and the local economy, but also adopted the role of ‘social and cultural entrepreneurs’. Profiting from the large numbers attending the events and thus promoting their own businesses, innkeepers were part of the move towards the commercialisation of leisure.

Leisure was vital to York’s economy. Borsay claimed that visitors attending the assemblies and horseracing maintained York’s status as a high status resort. This would not have been possible without the ancillary services provided by the inns, providing accommodation and stabling at a time when few had townhouses in the city. Prior to the beginning of the eighteenth century, the assizes had been the most important draw to York for the local gentry and were the foundation of sociability. The town’s social life developed in response to the arrival of large numbers of wealthy, aristocratic visitors and local gentry gathering for the assizes. In 1709, horseracing began, with race meetings lasting three or four days. Becoming ever more popular, at one race meeting, in 1714, there were an estimated 156 coaches, whilst in 1722, the seventy three subscribers ‘included eight Lords and five knights’. By the 1730s, York race meetings had surpassed the assizes as the ‘premier event of the social calendar’, prompting the construction of a
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new course\textsuperscript{355}. The involvement of the directors of the Assembly Rooms in the calls for the new course, suggests an important link between assemblies and horse racing. It appears that innkeepers in York, were not as involved in the organisation of races and assemblies as suggested by Clark and Houston\textsuperscript{356}.

A systematic search of the press using the seventeenth and eighteenth century Burney Collection Newspapers and British Newspapers 1600-1950 databases for the period 1700 to 1760, found no links between the races and the inns or assembly rooms. However, evidence of announcements and results of the York Races were found in a wide range of newspapers in London including the \textit{London Journal}, \textit{the General Evening Post} and the \textit{Weekly Miscellany}. In 1754, the \textit{Public Advertiser} reported that a number of members of the aristocracy and gentry had paid the subscription for a ‘Grand Stand’ at Knavesmire\textsuperscript{357}. A similar search of \textit{The York Courant} newspaper for the years 1729 to 1730\textsuperscript{358}, failed to reveal any references linking racing with the inns in York, despite there being numbers of notices regarding runners and winners of the races. However, there was evidence that inns were more involved at the races taking place at Knaresborough, Sunderland, Newcastle and Doncaster. In Newcastle in April 1730, the registering and weighing-in, not only took place at the inn of Widow Hills, she was also sponsoring prizes and advertising cockfights for the period of the races.\textsuperscript{359}

In York, horseracing continued throughout the nineteenth century but by the 1860s it was seriously threatened by the development of the Doncaster Races\textsuperscript{360}. The importance of horseracing to York's economy and in maintaining its status, is evident in the corporation’s continued support through paying subscriptions of £2000. Although the inns were not directly involved with the organisation of assemblies and horseracing, the services they offered were vital. Providing hospitality and stabling over the several days these events took place, the inns promoted the high status social life of the town and more importantly supported the local economy.

This chapter shows that by acting as hosts to a variety of events, innkeepers were at the centre of the economic and social life of Leeds and York. By acting as venues for a variety of auctions, sales and as meeting places for traders, corporations and political
business, they supported the commercial and political life of towns. Their provision of hospitality encouraged visitors to stay in the towns, and promoted not only notions of politeness, but also the development of urban social life. Innkeepers and their businesses therefore, played a major role in the urban economies of Leeds and York.
Chapter Four: The Innkeeping Fraternity?

The Angel at Stilton, in the day of the notable Miss Worthington (the famous eighteenth-century innkeeper who first introduced Stilton cheese to the world), accommodated more than 300 horses for coaching and posting.\(^\text{361}\)

One could be forgiven if, after an initial reading of the above quote from Everitt, the reader came away with the view that Miss Worthington’s expertise lay in the introduction of a new cheese to the world and not that she was running a substantial innkeeping business with stables for ‘more than 300 horses’. This chapter examines the role women played in the urban economy through their involvement in the innkeeping industry. Alan Everitt’s 1973 article begins ‘What kind of men were the Innholders who organised these highly diverse activities?’ He thus suggests that the innkeeper was inherently male\(^\text{362}\). Likewise in Peter Clark’s, *The English Alehouse A Social History 1200 – 1830*, there is little mention of women in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries\(^\text{363}\), despite local directories providing clear evidence of the involvement of women in the licensing trade.

Everitt briefly mentions Mary Lion, the widow of Charles Lyon who continued to run the Red Lion Inn at Northampton, from 1704 to 1725, and the widow of Sloswick Carr who carried on the business ‘for a number of years’\(^\text{364}\). However, he makes these statements but then does not put them in context, failing to link them with the numbers and gender of innkeepers in Northampton. His failure to acknowledge the role of women, is symptomatic of his background in the traditional masculine bias of urban history. Originally published in 1973 in his book *Perspectives in Urban History*, Everitt’s essay was reprinted without any revisions in *Landscape and Community in England* in 1985. There are brief mentions of women within that book, but the index shows only two small references to women, ‘women farmers’ and ‘women’s influence in religious movements’. In a book supposedly about Community in England, a large section of the ‘community’ is missing. One of the initial aims of this study was to identify local women innkeepers of Leeds and York through a systematic analysis of directories, wills and fire insurance records; and to examine their role in the local economy.

The work of Hannah Barker, Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall has placed women in the heart of the history of innkeeping and clearly demonstrates that the role of women as
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innkeepers was not as uncommon as previously suggested. Their role in the day-to-day life of the inn placed women in the centre of the local commercial and social networks. The provision of accommodation, food and drink was seen as an extension of a woman’s domestic role of caring for other people and managing the home. Barker suggests that this explains why ‘Victuallers and Innkeepers’ were identified as ‘female employments’ with 338 women identified in these ‘employments’ across Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield in 1828\textsuperscript{365}.

Focusing on the lower middling sorts, Barker highlighted the role increasing numbers of women played in the urban economy. Davidoff and Hall’s studies on the ‘middle class’ claimed women gradually retreated from the public sphere. However, the diversity of the urban middling sort and its ‘subtle gradations of status’\textsuperscript{366}, meant that many women may have been overlooked in their studies. Barker’s study showed that although women from the lower middling strata of society tended to participate in industries related to ‘women’s work’, food and drink, shop keeping and dealing, they were also involved in other types of business\textsuperscript{367}. Barker maintained that although there was a substantial increase in the types of women's occupations and the number of women within them, ‘feminine sectors’ of employment remained predominant between the years 1773 and 1828\textsuperscript{368}.

The local directories were used not only to identify individuals and to establish the ratio of men to women innkeepers, but also to identify the trades in which women were involved. However, a systematic analysis of the early directories revealed a number of problems. Late eighteenth-century Leeds and York directories are unreliable for identifying innkeepers. The York Directory for 1784 lists no inns, whilst the Leeds Directory\textsuperscript{369} for the same year, lists only one, although we have seen the newspapers reporting several inn businesses. A particular problem when trying to identify women within directories, is that often, only initials are given, instead of a first name. A similar problem occurs when trying to identify the marital status of women in trade, for although some may be identified as widows, many are listed by name only.

In order to see what trades women were listed as undertaking, the 1800 Binns and Brown Directory of Leeds and the York Directory for 1809-11, were examined. In Leeds, of the eighty-four women listed, seventeen percent were in non-traditional female employments,
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with twelve percent employed as dealers and seven percent involved in teaching. The single biggest group were innkeepers, at nineteen percent, closely followed by milliners on eighteen percent. In York, the employments were more evenly distributed, as can be seen in table 20.

The full range of female employments can be seen in Tables 19 and 20 indicating the types of trade women were involved in in Leeds and York. Although, the table for Leeds shows a number of widows involved in a variety of trades not normally classed as feminine trades, (for example blacksmith and wheelwright), evidence supports Barker’s view, that despite an increase in the number of women’s trades, the ‘feminine sector’ remained the principal employments.

The full range of female employments can be seen in Tables 19 and 20 indicating the types of trade women were involved in in Leeds and York. Although, the table for Leeds shows a number of widows involved in a variety of trades not normally classed as feminine trades, (for example blacksmith and wheelwright), evidence supports Barker’s view, that despite an increase in the number of women’s trades, the ‘feminine sector’ remained the principal employments.

### Binns & Brown Directory of Leeds 1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Number and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>2 (1w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipemake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Mistress</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>16 (10w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Dyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot &amp; Shoemaker</td>
<td>2 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>1 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>2 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Draper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuffmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>2 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua Maker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Dealer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Mender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinplate Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectioner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliner</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer</td>
<td>10 (4w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastry Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>1 (w)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19 Trades and the number of women (widows) listed as employed**

Table 19 shows that although a number of widows were employed in non-traditional trades, two thirds of widows were identified as innkeepers. In the directory for York, the

### York Directory 1809-1811

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal Merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen Draper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliner &amp; Dressmaker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperstrainer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocer &amp; Tea Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber &amp; Glazier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher &amp; Hosier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdasher &amp; Milliner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy Manufacturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatter &amp; Hosier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine &amp; Spirit Dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20 Female Trades in York Directory 1809-11**
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women are identified as Mrs or with their first name or initials. None are identified as widows, although the non-feminine nature of the employments, for example, coal merchant, plumber and glazier, and saddler, suggest the figures may include widows. The figures again support Barker’s view regarding the prominence of ‘female’ work.

The directories of Leeds and York identify a number of women as innkeepers during the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, providing an interesting snapshot of the principal inns run by women. Following the death of C. Topham in 1788, his wife ran the business for several years and was listed as the innkeeper of the Talbot Inn in the directory of 1797373. The directory lists one hundred and one inns, taverns and alehouses in Leeds, ten of which are identified as being run by women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YORK374</th>
<th>Number of establishments</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of identified women innkeepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1798 Inns</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809 Principal Inns</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816 Inns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818 Inns</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828/9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849 Inns &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 Gender breakdown of innkeepers identified in York Directories

Table 21 shows that in York, although there was a thirty-five percent increase in the number of inns in the period 1816 to 1849, there was an increase of 147% in the number of women identified as running inns and hotels. The figures for Leeds show a consistent percentage of women identified as innkeepers (see table 22).

The York directory of 1809375, lists one of the seven principal inns, The York Tavern, as run by Ann Coupland. In 1816, the fourteen listed inns, have still only one woman innkeeper, Elizabeth Batty376. However, by 1818, of sixteen inns, five are being run by women, whilst fifteen of the listed one hundred and sixty eight taverns and public houses are being run by women377. In 1849, six of the eighteen listed inns and hotels were still
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being run by women\textsuperscript{378} (see table 21). These figures support the views of Barker, Davidoff, and Hall, that it was not uncommon for women to be innkeepers or victuallers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEEDS\textsuperscript{379}</th>
<th>Number of establishments</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of identified women innkeepers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800 Inns</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822 Hotels &amp; Inns</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829 Inns &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 Inns &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837 Inns &amp; Hotels</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 Gender breakdown of innkeepers identified in Leeds Directories

The role of women in innkeeping should be no surprise. Women had been involved in brewing and running alehouses back to at least the twelfth century. According to Peter Clark, allowing for regional and annual fluctuations, the preponderance of brewers were women, often 'wives and daughters of villagers'\textsuperscript{380}. A view supported by Judith Bennett, who claimed that brewing was 'dominated by women'\textsuperscript{381}. Prior to the 1300s, it was assumed anyone involved with brewing was female, commonly known as an alewife. It was their responsibility to provide ale at a time when water was not always a healthy alternative. Women across the social divide were identified as brewers of ale. The poor used it to provide a small income in order to survive, whilst the wives of wealthy men 'brewed for domestic needs' and sold the surplus to the local community.

Men replaced women as brewers with the move from ale to beer brewing. Judith M. Bennett shows it was the introduction of beer from mainland Europe in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, which led to the fall in the number of women identified as brewers. Beer brewing on the continent was seen as a 'highly skilled male profession'; women were not privy to the skills and knowledge of beer brewing and were prevented from joining the brewers' gilds\textsuperscript{382}. During the eighteenth century, beer became big business and large numbers of women were gradually excluded from the brewing industry.

The work of Bernard Capp and Deborah Simonton, suggest it is highly probable, that as well as brewing, women had been running inns and alehouses since the Middle Ages. They both maintain the running of an inn was often a joint family enterprise with wives and
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daughters often playing key roles within the business. As alehouses expanded during the eighteenth century, they adopted many of the services provided by inns and became more respectable. Haydon suggests an increase in the number of female alehouse proprietors signified increased respectability. However, he also states that ‘many women ran houses that were licensed in their husband’s name’ so it is unclear how he deduces that there was an increase in the numbers of women involved in the trade. This is an important point because it could be that, although many of the principal inns of this study were listed under the husband’s name, it may have been the wife who carried out the day-to-day running of the inn. The perception that the role of women was to support the man of the house, has led to the active role played by women often being overlooked.

In his essay “Gender and the Culture of the English alehouse in Late Stuart England”, Bernard Capp examines contemporary attitudes to women in the alehouses and inns, both as service providers and consumers. Capp considers the contemporary popular representation of women visiting and running alehouses and inns as immoral and dishonest, arguing that although the behaviour of some women was consistent with contemporary views, many running and visiting these places were respectable women. Evidence of this can be seen in the examples of the Talbot Inn and the Old Kings Arms, on Briggate in Leeds. The Talbot Inn had been the private dwelling of the Simpson family for many years. Following the death of the last male heir in 1670, the house was converted to the Talbot Inn and was being run by Elizabeth Simpson in 1680. The subsequent success of the Talbot Inn, suggests it was perfectly acceptable for Elizabeth to convert her home into an inn, a natural extension of managing the household economy from the home to the inn. This not only provided accommodation, food and drink for the wider community, but also provided an income and financial security for herself and her family.

In fact, at some point in their history, the majority of the principal coaching inns in Leeds were run by widows or single women, as were many of the smaller inns and alehouses. Following the death of her husband in 1764, Mary Cooke successfully ran the Old King’s Arms at Leeds, until her own death in 1777. A major coaching inn, it was the most prestigious in Leeds. On her death, The Leeds Mercury announced:
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Friday night died Mrs Cooke who for many years with great reputation kept the Old Kings Arms Inn. The New King’s Arms in Leeds, also had a long history of being run by women. Built in 1692, it was one of the oldest and most successful inns. Tom Bradley claimed that, within a forty four year period between 1789 and 1834, the inn had been run by three widows and one single woman. Originally written in 1889, Bradley’s book carried no references, but research confirms many of his details. According to Bradley, in 1785 Widow Cowling and her son took control of the inn, which they renovated, and renamed Cowling’s Hotel and Tavern. On her death in 1789, her son in law, Richard Crossland took over until his death in 1798, when his widow, Sarah, continued with the business. Circa 1800, John Greaves became landlord and changed the name to Crossland’s and Greaves’ Hotel, before it finally became known as the Hotel or Hotel Inn. Following Greaves’ death a few years later, his widow continued with the business, including running several coaches until 1824. In 1834, following the death of the innkeeper William Crossland, (which Bradley claimed was suicide), the inn and its stables and coaching business were divided into two separate businesses, Miss Ayres taking control of the inn, whilst Matthew Outhwaite acquired the coaching business.

The 1790, 1793 and 1797 Leeds Directories corroborated Bradley’s claims and confirmed Richard Crossland as the innkeeper. Subsequent directories identified Sarah Greaves as the innkeeper in 1822, whilst William Crossland was shown as the innkeeper from 1829 to 1834. The directory for 1837 named Sarah Eyre as the innkeeper, with the census returns of 1841 indicating she was still there, four years later.

The name Sarah appeared a number of times in the information gleaned from Bradley and the directories. In order to clarify if these were the same person or a number of women all involved with the inn, it was necessary to carry out a search for links between the people mentioned by Bradley. This was important because it could illustrate a number of views put forward regarding women innkeepers. If they were different women, then it could support Hannah Barker’s work on the large number of women involved in the innkeeping industry. However if they were the same person, it not only illustrates Barker’s view about

---
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389 The Universal British Directory, 1790; The Universal British Directory, 1793; The Leeds Directory 1797.
390 Baines’ Yorkshire Directory 1822 Volume 1, West Riding.
391 Pigot’s Directory, 1829; Pigot’s Directory, 1834
392 Pigot’s Directory, 1837
widows carrying on the business after the death of their husbands; it could also indicate the dynastic model of innkeeping suggested by Everitt in 1985.\(^{393}\)

After confirming names and dates using the directories it was possible to use the Ancestry.com website to search for births, deaths and marriages. A search carried out for a marriage of Richard Crossland with a spouse name of Sarah Cowling, (assuming she was the daughter of Widow Cowling), resulted in an entry for Crossland but the name of spouse was given as Sarah Smith.\(^{394}\) On examination of the scanned image of the parish register for the 15 October 1786, a witness for the marriage was identified as John Cowling; Sarah was possibly Cowling’s stepdaughter. Following the search for a marriage for John Cowling using the spouse’s surname of Smith, the marriage of Cowling and Hannah Smith was found for 18 September 1770, identifying Sarah’s mother.\(^{395}\)

Using online access to parish records, Hannah Cowling was confirmed as the ‘Widow Cowling’, her husband died in 1781, leaving Hannah to run the business until her death in 1789.\(^{396}\) The results of a search of the local press for evidence of John and Hannah’s experience as innkeepers revealed an interesting background. The first result for 1759, linked Cowling with the ‘Leedes Races’\(^{397}\) and in 1761, a meeting of the trustees of the Leeds to Harrogate Turnpike trust took place ‘at the house of Mr John Cowling, innholder in Potter-new-ton’\(^{398}\). Today Chapel Allerton, Chapel Town and Potternewton are inextricably linked. Clear evidence of the link between Cowling, Smith and Chapel Allerton was found in a marriage announcement:

---

\(^{393}\) Alan Everitt, “The English Urban Inn”, 129.


Mr. John Cowling, Maltster of the Bowling-Green-House at Chapel-Town, and Mrs Smith, housekeeper to Jeremiah Dixon, of Gledhow, Esq. 399

The final confirmation of the link between Cowling and the inn on Briggate comes within a notice placed by John Cowling on April 11, 1775, in which he announced:

has taken that Large and Commodious HOUSE, call’d
The NEW-INN, in Briggate, Leeds 400

In the burial record for 2 April 1789, Hannah is listed as Mrs Cowling, a 45 year old Widow who died of the gout and who lived at the Hotel, Briggate. It is clear therefore that Hannah is Widow Cowling who not only appears in Bradley’s book, but is also mentioned in the local press as the innholder of the New Inn on Briggate which she renamed, Cowling’s Hotel. To verify that Sarah Crossland was Sarah Greaves, parish records were researched in order to confirm Richard’s death. Buried on the 18 February 1798, Crossland was identified as a thirty-seven year old man, living at the Hotel, Briggate, who died of ‘decline’ 401. My research had indicated that John Greaves became landlord of the Hotel c.1800. A search for the marriage of John Greaves and Sarah Crossland c.1800 revealed they had married on 4 April 1799 402, confirming that Sarah Crossland and Sarah Greaves were one and the same. Further research of parish records uncovered the death of Greaves in May 1811, aged forty-seven he died of decline. Sarah died thirteen years later in July 1824, aged fifty eight 403. Within a period of twelve years, Sarah had lost two husbands at relatively young ages to ‘decline’. This research suggests that Sarah may have been involved in working in the inn from being a child and well capable of running the inn.

---

401 Burial record of the church of St John the Evangelist, held in the West Yorkshire Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, 1512-1812 accessed through Ancestry.com
Bradley's claim that Sarah and Richard's son William Crossland took control of the inn following Sarah's death, had already been corroborated by the directories. In order to explore the possibility of finding out more about the business, Bradley's claims about William's apparent suicide, were investigated. Confirming his death in 1835, aged forty-two, the burial record showed he was buried in the grounds of St John's church, his burial in consecrated ground casts doubt on suggestions of his suicide. Searching the local press for any information regarding his death, the following notice was found:

TO BE DISPOSE OF, very shortly, either by Private Contract of by Public Auction, of which further Notice will be given, the whole of the VALUABLE COACHING AND POSTING CONCERN, HACKNEY COACHES, POST CHAISES &c belonging to the Mr WM. CROSSLAND, of the Hotel, Leeds 'The Business of the Hotel will be continued as usual. Leeds, 28th May 1835

Further research uncovered a report 'Coroner's Inquest at Leeds' in both The York Herald and Advertiser and the Hull Packet. The detail in this report suggests that people in York and Hull may well have known William Crossland and the Hotel in Leeds. After being missing for ten days, Crossland's body was found in the river Aire on Thursday May 21, a couple of miles from the centre of town. An inquest held the following day heard evidence from the headwaiter of the Hotel who claimed that Crossland had refused to answer questions regarding the business. The Jury retired only for a few minutes and returned the following verdict:

That the deceased, Mr Wm Crossland, was found drowned in the river Aire, how or in what manner he came there is to the Jurors, unknown.

This article has highlighted some useful details about the inn and the family. The Crossland family are obviously well respected in the town, with the author of the article stating 'a respectable family has been thrown into the most poignant distress'. We also get some hint of the business. Named as the proprietor, the family obviously owned the Hotel, a 'large commercial house' freehold, not just as tenants. In the report published in
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The Hull Packet, it is claimed, that following his disappearance, a reward of £10 was offered for the ‘recovery of Mr Crossland’s person’\(^\text{408}\). This equates to a current day value of nearly £500, a substantial amount for 1835, and indicative of both the success of the business and of Crossland’s importance.

The will of John Greaves’ for 19 November 1811\(^\text{409}\) confirmed a family link between him and Sarah Eyres whom Bradley claimed took over the inn when Crossland died in 1835. The last entry on the will is a bequest of £100 to his niece Sarah Eyres, when she reaches the age of twenty-one. The Census record for 1841 indicates that Miss Sarah Eyre was the innkeeper of the Royal Hotel, Briggate\(^\text{410}\). Aged forty, she was running the business as a single woman employing at least seven female servants and a postboy. The main clientele for the inn were commercial travellers, with members of the armed forces also residing at the hotel.

A systematic examination of directories, newspapers, wills, parish records, birth, marriage and burial records and census returns, has revealed one family’s connection to two important Leeds inns from 1761 to 1841, the Bowling Green Inn at Chapel Allerton and the Royal Hotel on Briggate. The long term association of these three women over a span of sixty years is evidence that women were able to run successful commercial businesses. This supports the view of Barker, that the ease with which women took control of the family business, implies significant earlier involvement in the business\(^\text{411}\).

Research for this study proves, that as successful innkeepers of a prestigious inn, Hannah Cowling, Sarah Crossland/Greaves and Sarah Eyres were part of the town’s commercial life, at an important time of economic growth and prosperity. It also illustrates how the contribution of women to the innkeeping trade has been underestimated. Sarah Crossland/Greaves had probably worked at the inn helping her mother and stepfather, but when her mother died, the inn was officially placed in her husband’s name. Following the death of her husband, she kept the business going as a widow, before marrying her second husband, who took over the business. Following her second husband’s death, she successfully ran the inn and coaching business for thirteen years until her death in 1825.


\(^{411}\) Hannah Barker, The Business of Women, 171.
The work of Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall illustrates that widows working as innkeepers were not uncommon. In their study of Birmingham, they discovered that, in most cases, where a male innkeeper had left a will, the business was left ‘unconditionally’ to his wife; 71% of widows gained full control of the business as opposed to ‘50% of the whole sample of wills’\(^\text{412}\). Wives were often made sole executrix of wills, indicating a level of confidence in their abilities to deal with legal and financial matters. The wills of innkeepers from Leeds and York, indicate a number of ways in which estates were dealt with. Further details of the wills identified are shown in Appendix 2.

Examination of probate records have shown that more than seventy-five percent of inn businesses were left to widows of innkeepers in Leeds and York. Business and property was left to widows or to male Trustees for the benefit of widows, until their death, or until the youngest child reached the age of twenty-one. The business and property would then be passed to sons or daughters or sold and the proceeds split between the children. This suggests that although some men had faith in the ability of their wives in continuing with the business, there was still an element of patriarchy involved, with the appointment of male trustees to oversee the business.

Evidence of the appointment of male trustees can be seen in the will of Philip Clarke, a Leeds innkeeper. Appointing two executors to act as trustees, he requested they permit his wife to continue the business to provide for her and the children until the sons reach the age of twenty-one and the daughters until they marry\(^\text{413}\). On the death or second marriage of his wife, or when the youngest reached twenty-one, the cash value of the estate was to be realised and divided equally between the children. Another Leeds innkeeper, John Atkinson, bequeathed his stock in trade, brewing vessels, barrels, house and furniture, plate, linen, beds and bedding to his wife, ‘in order that she may carry on the business of innkeeper’\(^\text{414}\). The Clarke and Atkinson examples suggest the wives had considerable experience of running the inn and their husbands had confidence in their ability to run the business; endorsing Barker’s and Capp’s view that women were often greatly involved with the day to day business of the inn. Insurance records also support this view, as can be seen in table 15 which shows John and George Titford, were appointed as trustees for Widow Kilby a maltster and innholder from York, who appears to be carrying on the business following the death of her husband.

\(^\text{412}\) Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850*, 299.


Sometimes a business was left to the widow with the proviso that, if the executors believed the business was failing, they could take over or sell the business for the benefit of the wife and children. Samuel Appleyard, from Leeds, was such a case. Bequeathing the house, furniture, stock in trade and vessels to his widow ‘during her life or as long as she should continue his widow’; he left instructions for the trustees to take possession of everything and sell it if she remarried or ‘should be losing by carrying on the business.’ The male executors were able to step in and take control of the business if they deemed fit.

As was the case with Sarah, Widow Cowling’s daughter and Richard Crossland, a married daughter’s husband, would often take control of the business. Even though a married daughter may inherit property, her husband would be responsible for the business. This is evident in the 1755 will of John Rivis, a yeoman innkeeper, in which he bequeaths his substantial estate of over two hundred and forty pounds to his daughter, Mary, whom is the executrix; To his wife he leaves ‘the sum of twelve pounds for her life’. However the ‘Deed & Articles’ for his wife’s inheritance was agreed with his son in law, Walter Baldock. This shows that, although the daughter was the beneficiary and executor, her husband assumed control of the estate. The will of Hannah Cockcroft, the wife of successful Leeds innkeeper Thomas Cockcroft, avoided this by leaving the estate to the daughters and granddaughter of Hannah, stating it is for their ‘sole and absolute use’. This was a means to ensure the female members of the family remained in control of their own fortunes.

It was not unusual for widows to inherit substantial estates, even in cases where the husband died intestate. Under ecclesiastical law, widows were afforded legal rights and entitlements even if her husband died intestate. The National Archive Records provide examples of widows of innkeepers, farmers, woollen merchants, master mariners, husbandman and butchers administering substantial estates of between three hundred

---

416 Borthwick Institute for Archives: ‘Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of John Rivis, Innholder & Yeoman, North Grimston, 1755. Microfilm Reel 1253.
418 Hannah Barker, *The Business of Women*, 106. ‘a widow was legally entitled to administer her husband’s estate and was allowed to enjoy one third of her husband’s real property during the remainder of her life. In practice, this meant that widows could assume the running of a family firm at least until, and often after, any sons came of age’; R. Morris, *Men, Women and Property in England, 1780-1870*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 87.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy Holder</th>
<th>Property insured</th>
<th>Value of insurance on main property (£)</th>
<th>Household goods, utensils and stock (£)</th>
<th>Total Value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>570098</td>
<td>31/5/1790</td>
<td>Rose Rushworth Innholder &amp; Mortgager and Thomas Struther Esq, Mortgagee</td>
<td>2 houses under one roof, brewhouse and stables adjoining the Pack Horse Inn, Briggate</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 houses in inn yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 houses in St James Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 tenements in Vicar Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602429</td>
<td>2/7/1792</td>
<td>John &amp; George Titford Gentlemen in trust</td>
<td>House &amp; malthouse &amp; chamber in Tanner row in tenure of Widow Kilby, maltster.</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House, wash house and 2 stables in Hosier Lane, in tenure of Mawson, innholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House only in Thursday Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House only in Peter Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 houses in Micklegate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603239</td>
<td>19/7/1792</td>
<td>Elizabeth Coulton Widow</td>
<td>The White Horse Inn in tenure of Elizabeth Boscoa, Innholder. House only, inc 5 stables &amp; chamber 2 tenements and stable 2 tenements</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607103</td>
<td>26/10/1792</td>
<td>Tabitha Cawood, Innholder, Mortgager and William Blanchard, Mortgagee</td>
<td>House, stables, dining room, wash house and chamber above all part of the Sandhill Inn, 3 stables &amp; brewhouse in yard all in tenure of Tabitha Cawood House in Collingate</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 Women Innkeepers in the Sun Insurance Office Records, Extract from table in Appendix 1

419 London Metropolitan archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/369/570098, 31 May, 1790
420 London Metropolitan archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/602429, 2 July, 1792
421 London Metropolitan archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/603239, 19 July, 1792
422 London Metropolitan archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/391/607103, 26 October, 1792
and three thousand pounds. In 1811, Mary Pulleyn was listed as the administratix of her husband's estate of three thousand five hundred pounds.\(^{423}\)

Women innkeepers were able to get mortgages to finance the inns they were running. This suggests they must have had prior experience of running an inn. The mortgagees must have had faith in the women’s ability to run the businesses, before loaning the money on what appears to be substantial properties. Evidence of women innkeepers as mortgagors or as tenants of substantial property is found in the Sun Insurance records, shown in table 23. Rose Rushworth from Leeds and Tabitha Cawood from York, both had mortgages to enable them to finance their inns and property. Whilst Elizabeth Boscoa, innholder tenant of Widow Elizabeth Coulton, was also running a significant sized business with the inn and five stables insured for £890. These three examples suggest that these women were of good reputation and had previous experience in order for them to get mortgages or rent significant businesses.

Women were not only involved as innkeepers, but contributed in a number of ways in the day to day workings of an inn, which not only provided employment, but opportunities for trade. The daybooks of the York innkeepers show the ways in which women and young girls were involved in the daily life of an inn. They were employed in a number of ways. For example, as cook or servants, or in other work contracted out on a weekly or occasional basis such as charwomen, washer women or even as babysitters for the innkeepers’ children. In Thomas Belt’s day book for 1833, the wages for a number of girls are given but no indication of their role, Mary Jane Shepherd’s wages for the year were six pounds and six shillings, whilst the wage of ‘Joanna’ was five pounds. The 1839-40 day book for John James Anderson shows the wages he pays on a regular basis for four females plus a washerwoman and cook.\(^{424}\)

Census records show there were a significant number of women employed in the principal inns of Leeds and York. Table 24 provides a gender breakdown of servants employed at the inns of the two cities, taken from the returns for 1841, 1851 and 1861. The full table giving a breakdown of the job descriptions can be seen in Tables 14, 15 and 16.

The information for 1841 is only basic identifying the family, servants and visitors and it is difficult to identify the principal inns in Leeds on the returns, I have therefore, omitted the


figures for the 1841 census returns from my calculations, due to their unreliability. However, the returns for 1851 and 1861 give much more information and it has been easier to identify them for these periods. In the 1861, census there is a definite change in classification from inn and innkeeper to hotel and hotel keeper, reflecting the changing role of the inn as described in chapter one. Table 24 indicates the percentage of female servants employed in York remained roughly the same over the three census periods, however, the number of male servants dropped by thirty-five percent. The details for Leeds reflect the growth of Leeds at this time, with the number of female servants increasing by fifty percent from twenty-two in 1851 to thirty three in 1861. Unlike York the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Horse Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull &amp; Mouth Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Lion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old George Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Inn, Briggate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Leeds</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swan Inn</td>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Inn</td>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Inn, Castlegate</td>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed inn, Pavement</td>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Horse Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill Inn</td>
<td>M 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>W 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Hotel</td>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>M 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Rooms, Railway Station</td>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Station Hotel, Railway Stn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for York</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Inn</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Leeds &amp; York</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24  Employment Data from Census Returns425
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number of male servants also increased significantly at a rate of fifty-four and half percent between 1851 and 1861. However, the ratio of women to men servants in both Leeds and York remained roughly about 2:1.

The total figure for Leeds and York show the number of men employed by inns remained about the same over the thirty year period of these returns, however, the number of female servants employed, rose by twenty-three percent from fifty-three in 1851, to sixty five in 1861. The returns also show that forty percent of the ten innkeepers identified on the 1861 census returns were female. These figures suggest that the inn or hotel was a much more feminised place than Everitt would have us believe. The figures indicate that in 1851, the inns in Leeds were employing thirty percent fewer women and twenty percent fewer men than in York, however, by 1861 Leeds had slightly surpassed York426. This reflects the relative stagnation of York and the continued growth of Leeds as an industrial town. These figures reflect the findings of Leonard Schwarz in his study of servants in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries427. Schwarz showed that after 1780, the percentage of the male population employed as servants declined ‘consistently’ whilst the female percentage continued to rise until it peaked in 1871428.

The daybooks show, that on occasions, innkeepers employed young girls as nannies or babysitters. The employment of young girls is evident in an article in The York Herald of 12 July 1851, in which Ellen Jeffrey is identified as the landlady of the Saracen’s Head Inn. Her husband had been the landlord since 1840 but she took over the running of the business on his death. The report claims that in 1851, she ran the inn and looked after her two children aged 8 and 10 with the help of a young servant called Anne Pearson429.

The vulnerability of some of these girls is clear when considering a report which appeared in The York Herald of 29 June 1844, in which the death of twelve year old Elizabeth Warrington is reported. Employed by innkeeper Richard English, as a nanny for his children, Elizabeth had been badly beaten by the innkeeper’s wife for being out late. 426
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429 Peter Coxon, Landlords & Rogues in and around York’s Old Inns, 77.
When she was again out late a couple of days later she drowned herself rather than be flogged again⁴³⁰.

Women involved in a variety of trades are identified in the innkeepers’ account books, providing evidence of inns carrying out trade with women on a daily basis; for example, Mary Simpson, a Wine and Spirit dealer and Mrs Robinson a poultry supplier.⁴³¹ This indicates, as Barker argues, that women were not automatically marginalised because they were women, there were many opportunities available in business. Indeed the changing urban environment offered women, married, unmarried or widowed, opportunities to participate in a town’s commercial development. According to Simonton, many women were involved in commercial partnerships, whether they be with husbands, sons, or other women⁴³². Barker’s work suggests that wives of innkeepers provided an invaluable contribution to the household economy. They ‘helped to ensure social standing and credit worthiness’⁴³³ a clear indication of a husband and wife partnership. However the label of ‘women’s work’ suggests an element of derision, the work of the wife being less important than that of the man, the ‘head of the household’. The categorisation of trades such as innkeeping, as ‘women’s work’, fails to acknowledge the commercial aptitude of the many women involved in the industry and undermines their contribution to the urban economy and commercial developments in general.

My research has placed innkeepers of the principal inns of Leeds and York in the centre of the cultural life of the towns. The success of the inns reflects the innkeepers ability to promote themselves and their inns in response to the ever changing expectations of polite society and an urban clientele. In Family Fortunes, Davidoff and Hall claimed that middle class women were gradually removed from the work environment during the nineteenth century. To some extent this was the case in Leeds, as wealthy merchants and manufacturers built larger houses on the outskirts of town to escape pollution and overcrowding. Previously, warehouses and workplaces were attached to the home within the centre and women were heavily involved in the business. As the home and business premises became separated, so were many women and business. However, this study shows that there were significant numbers of women in a variety of trades, but predominantly in innkeeping and shop keeping trades, who ran successful businesses and continued to support town centre economies. This study shows without a doubt that women were heavily involved with innkeeping businesses in Leeds and York. Often

---

⁴³² Deborah Simonton, “Claiming their Place in the Corporate Community”, 102.
substantial businesses, they provided valuable services to customers and they employed and managed several members of staff who were increasingly female. Everitt’s use of the term ‘innkeeping fraternity’ echoes the male chauvinistic attitude of historians of the 1970’s. The evidence of this study shows that, far from being a fraternal environment, inns increasingly became a feminised space, where women provided employment and supported the local economy.
Conclusion

This dissertation argues that innkeepers and their business were crucial to the urban economies of Leeds and York. As well as hospitality, inns provided a range of services, encouraging visitors of all rank to the towns to spend time and money; and acted as venues for a range of meetings, dinners and auctions before purpose built premises were available.

York, despite losing its status as capital of the north, remained an important ecclesiastical centre and assizes town. In the eighteenth century, it was a high status service and entertainment centre for the aristocracy and gentry, and market centre for its agricultural hinterland. Its well-established infrastructure of inns and entertainment facilities meant that, despite periods of stagnation, York retained its status as a high-class visitor centre. In the early eighteenth century, a shift towards an appreciation of ancient history, ruins and medieval buildings, led to the promotion of York as an ancient city, reinforcing its reputation as visitor centre. The assemblies, music concerts, horseracing were very popular with visitors and vital to the York economy. Although inns were not central to the provision of entertainments, they supported and enabled them, through provision of accommodation, hospitality and stabling.

In Leeds, the industrial and textile trades which had developed in the seventeenth century continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The inns supported economic growth in the town, by providing (1) hospitality and accommodation for those attending the markets, (2) a meeting place for merchants and manufacturers and (3) hosting a number of specialist factors on a regular basis. The inns in Leeds were at the centre of commercial life in the town.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, both Leeds and York experienced significant demographic growth, due (in differing degrees) to the introduction of the railways, which resulted in increased numbers of visitors and work opportunities. The railway was important to the York economy by strengthening York's position as a communications centre. The census records show, that following the introduction of the railway, the type of person staying at the inns changed significantly. In 1841, those of independent means were the main visitors to York, however, by 1851, the highest number of visitors were commercial travellers; the improved transport links drawing in those wanting to take advantage of supplying the luxury trades in the city.
In Leeds, despite the introduction of the railway in 1835, the coaching and carrying trades remained important and reinforced Leeds’ as a major transport centre. Census records show the majority of visitors to the town were involved with commerce or trade. The number of commercial travellers and merchants increased substantially between 1841 and 1861, reflecting the continued importance of trade and manufacture in the town’s economic growth. The inns in Leeds and York continued to support the local economy well into the nineteenth century, adapting to the changing needs of their customers.

Throughout all the changes that took place in the two cities, the inn was a constant but changing presence. Well established by the end of the seventeenth century, they continued to increase and develop into the nineteenth century and although principal inns were few in number, this was offset by their considerable size. Providing accommodation, food, drink, stabling and a range of services for visitors, they were central to a growing service sector at the centre of urban changes in Leeds and York. In York, innkeepers were providing substantial amounts of food and drink, tailored to high class tastes, including out of season pears and peaches, lobster, steak as well as brandy, port and wine. Whilst the inns of both towns employed large numbers of staff to service guests and their horses, providing opportunities for people migrating to the towns.

Inns supported the commercial and economic life of Leeds and York in a number of ways by developing credit and trade networks. Hospitality was often part of a larger enterprise as innkeepers diversified into other areas of business, the most common being agriculture and the carrying trade. Those involved in agriculture provided distinct services for farmers and drovers attending the markets, providing grazing and sheds for livestock. The stabling and warehouses available at inns, meant that they were well placed to be involved within the carrying trade; the Sun Fire Office showing that these were often substantial businesses. Inns also acted as distribution centres, providing a place for local and national carriers to meet and do business, whilst specialist factors would attend specific inns on a regular basis; evidence of which can be seen in contemporary directories. Innkeepers also encouraged the growth of small businesses and craft workshops by renting out properties in their yards, as a result, these inns became business centres. In Leeds it was the letting of workshops that led to the development of a large number of new industries.

In chapter three, the use of inns and coffeehouse as venues for business and social interaction were examined. In areas where there were no purpose built venues, inns were often used for hosting a variety of meetings, auctions and sales. Historians Everitt, Borsay and Sweet have all claimed that nearly all business and social activities were hosted at the inn, whilst more recent coffeehouse literature claims coffeehouses were important places for the wealthy to meet and discuss business. A systematic search of
local directories and newspapers, highlighted a significant number of meetings, auctions and sales taking place at inns, with little evidence of coffeehouses in the two towns. In Leeds, the corporation, magistrates and turnpike trustees sat or had dinners at the Old King’s Arms on a regular basis, whilst other inns in the town hosted meetings of the Masons, the Brotherley Society and the Circulation Library as well as auctions and sales and sold tickets for benefit concerts. In York, although there is evidence of auctions at inns, its long history and traditional guild system meant that it had well established business venues. This dissertation shows, that although there may have been large numbers of coffeehouses in London, there were relatively few in Leeds and York, and while the dearth of evidence regarding coffeehouses makes it difficult to arrive at a definitive conclusion regarding their position versus inns, it is clear that inns were regularly engaged as places for meetings, business and trade.

Exploring the importance of the reputation and respectability of the innkeeper to an inn’s success, this study shows the innkeeper not only had to be seen to be honest and trustworthy, he/she had to be able to deal with a diverse clientele. Innkeepers used their links with the armed forces and their previous experience of working as servants for the gentry and the town’s elite, as evidence of their respectability. By highlighting their connection to the army and militias, innkeepers declared their inn as a politically safe place, free of radicals. By adopting ever changing notions of politeness and sociability, an innkeeper not only promoted his business and the ideals of civil society, but encouraged emulation and supported the growth of the middling sorts within local society. Borsay and Sweet both argued that inns acted as venues for urban leisure, providing music, assemblies and sports such as horseracing and cockfighting. This study shows, that whilst there is evidence of inns being used in providing music and supporting horseracing, they were not central to the provision of assemblies and horseracing in Leeds and York. The importance of the ancillary services provided by inns should not be underestimated, the success of all aspects of urban culture depended on the hospitality, stabling and services provided by inns.

Having previously identified a number of women innkeepers, this study aimed to assess the relevance of Everitt’s description of an innkeeping ‘fraternity’ to the experience of Leeds and York, discovering that the inn environment was a much more feminised space. Davidoff, Hall and Barker all argued that it was women innkeepers were not uncommon and the evidence from directories and probate and insurance records show that was definitely the case in Leeds and York, my research showing women regularly appeared as innkeepers in both towns. A search of directories revealed that of all those listed as widows in Leeds, the majority were innkeepers with probate records proving that a significant number of women in both towns continued with the business, even if their
husbands died intestate. This study also found that substantial numbers of female servants were employed by the inns, carrying out a variety of housework duties, and that innkeepers were trading with women, whether it be for food or drink, or for services, by way of example, doing washing, or childcare. It is the contention of this study that women had a much greater involvement in the local urban economies than had previously been suggested. Female innkeepers were often running considerable sized businesses and along with women servants and traders, they were all contributing and supporting the local economy, playing their own part in urban development.

This study has shown, that innkeepers and their businesses were at the centre of the economic life of Leeds and York. They supported the local economy by providing a range of services for visitors who took advantage of the development of entertainment facilities. They supported the commercial life of the towns by providing hospitality for those who visited the markets, and by acting as a place for traders, merchant and manufacturers to meet. The credit and trade networks they developed enabled them to expand their businesses and employ large numbers of servants. As part of the developing service sector, the services they offered and their promotion of politeness and civility, encouraged the growth of urban society. Innkeepers were therefore at the centre of the urban renaissance, as their hospitality encouraged visitors to the town and supported the growth of towns as shopping centres.

Most of the information in this study regarding the day-to-day life of innkeepers has come from their account books. The use of these account books has provided an interesting insight into their businesses, however, the scale of this study has meant that it has only been possible to give a sense of the information held within them. There is scope for much greater in-depth study of the books to get a bigger picture, not only of the day-to-day life of these innkeepers, but also the process by which they spent time in debtor’s prison.

As a local study of inns and innkeepers, this work provides an interesting comparison when read alongside the work of Everitt on Northampton and Chartres' work on London Inns. It appears that inns and innkeepers across the country were operating in very similar ways. All three studies show that innkeepers were often running substantial businesses, encouraging local business development by renting out workshops and properties in their yards and providing a range of services for visitors and the local communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy Holder</th>
<th>Property insured</th>
<th>Value of insurance on main property (£)</th>
<th>Household goods, utensils and stock &amp; goods insured for (£)</th>
<th>Stock &amp; goods held in trust in warehouse or yard (£)</th>
<th>Total Value (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>561018</td>
<td>23/9/1789</td>
<td>John Hick Innholder</td>
<td>The King’s Arms Also stables and sheds at Squire Pasture farm</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561513</td>
<td>23/9/1789</td>
<td>Timothy Rhodes Merchant</td>
<td>Dwelling house</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561757</td>
<td>12/10/1789</td>
<td>William Howson Innholder</td>
<td>The White Swan Inn, Market Cross, Leeds</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561758</td>
<td>12/10/1789</td>
<td>Samuel Glover Tobacconist</td>
<td>House, shop &amp; cellar under one roof called the New King’s Arms in the tenure of Richard Crossland. Kitchen, stables &amp; offices in yard Building on north side of yard 3 stables &amp; warehouse All in tenure of Richard Crossland</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

434 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561018, 23 September, 1789
435 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561513, 23 September, 1789
436 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561757, 12 October, 1789;
437 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/364/561758, 12 October, 1789;
438 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/369/570096, 31 May, 1790
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>570098439</td>
<td>31/5/1790</td>
<td>Rose Rushworth Innholder &amp; Mortgagor and Thomas Strother Esq. Mortgagee</td>
<td>2 houses under one roof, brewhouse and stables adjoining the Pack Horse Inn, Briggate 2 houses in inn yard 2 houses in St James Street 2 tenements in Vicar Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582168441</td>
<td>11/4/1791</td>
<td>John Hick Innholder</td>
<td>Household goods in dwelling house, kitchen and offices adj to King's Arms. Also stables and sheds at Squire Pasture farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592549442</td>
<td>22/11/1791</td>
<td>John Hick &amp; Co of Leeds Innholder of King's Arms Inn</td>
<td>Post Wagon Warehouses, New Street, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592552443</td>
<td>22/11/1791</td>
<td>George Turner Fruit Merchant</td>
<td>3 houses adjoining – opposite the market cross, Leeds House, Kitchen, brewhouse, stable &amp; offices – the Brown Cow Inn in tenure of Thomas Black Innholder 6 tenements in the said inn yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601330444</td>
<td>11/6/1792</td>
<td>Joseph Dearnly, innholder of Ship Inn, Mortgagor and Thomas Charlesworth, woollen draper and Mortgagee</td>
<td>House on north side of yard in tenure of Dearley House on south side of yard Stables &amp; office 4 Cottages in Yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

439 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/369/570098, 31 May, 1790
440 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/582167, 11 April, 1791
441 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/582168, 11 April, 1791
442 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/376/592549, 22 November, 1791
443 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/381/592552, 22 November 1791
444 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/388/601330, 11 June, 1792
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601331445</td>
<td>11/6/1792</td>
<td>John Sawyer, Leeds Watchmaker, hardwareman, mortgagor and Joseph Newsam, Tobacconist &amp; mortgagee</td>
<td>House and shop in Ship Inn yard</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602168446</td>
<td>2/7/1792</td>
<td>Edward Markland Park Lane, Merchant</td>
<td>Dressing, Press and Workshops adjacent in Park Lane</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602429447</td>
<td>2/7/1792</td>
<td>John &amp; George Titford Gentlemen in trust</td>
<td>House &amp; malthouse &amp; chamber in Tanner row in tenure of Widow Kilby, malthster.</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House in Castlegate in tenure of Cartwright and Innholder &amp; 25 stables adjoining.</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House, wash house and 2 stables in Hosier Lane, in tenure of Mawson, innholder</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House only in Thursday Market</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House only in Peter Lane</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 houses in Micklegate</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603239448</td>
<td>19/7/1792</td>
<td>Elizabeth Coulton Widow</td>
<td>The White Horse Inn in tenure of Elizabeth Boscoa, Innholder. House only, inc 5 stables &amp; chamber 2 tenements and stable 2 tenements</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606862449</td>
<td>24/10/1792</td>
<td>Ard Walker Wine &amp; Brandy Merchant Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607103450</td>
<td>26/10/1792</td>
<td>Tabitha Cawood, Innholder, Mortgager and William Blanchard, Mortgagee</td>
<td>House, stables, dining room, wash house and chamber above all part of the Sandhill Inn, 3 stables &amp; brewhouse in yard all in tenure of Tabitha Cawood House in Collingate</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

445 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/388/601331, 11 June, 1792
446 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/602168, 2 July, 1792
447 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/602429, 2 July, 1792
448 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/387/603239, 19 July, 1792
449 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/391/606862, 24 October, 1792
450 London Metropolitan Archives Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/391/607103, 26 October, 1792
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Party 1</th>
<th>Party 2</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>607104451</td>
<td>26/10/1792</td>
<td>Roger Glover &amp; John Furnish, York Coach makers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utensils &amp; stock in stable, coach house &amp; granary House hold goods in new dwelling house opposite</td>
<td>300 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615067452</td>
<td>18/5/1793</td>
<td>Robert Myers Innholder &amp; Mortgagor and James Rogerson innholder &amp; Mortgagee</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 cottages adjoining inn at Pudsey</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615713453</td>
<td>15/6/1793</td>
<td>John Newsham Mortgagor, Druggist and Seaman and Robert Coghlan Esq. Mortgagee</td>
<td></td>
<td>House, large warehouse, laboratory, starch house &amp; offices all in tenure of Newsham. also 2 houses &amp; shops, 2 houses &amp; office, 1 house &amp; stable, 2 stables, 2 tenements all in yard</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

451 London Metropolitan Archives  Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/391/607104, 26 October, 1792
452 London Metropolitan Archives  Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/395/615067, 18 May, 1793
453 London Metropolitan Archives  Sun Insurance Office MS 11936/395/615713, 15 June, 1793
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>GIVEN NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EXECUTORS</th>
<th>LEGATEES</th>
<th>Value of Estate if given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Innholder</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife - Elizabeth</td>
<td>Nephew – Silver watch, clothing, bedstead, bed and bedding. Wife – remainder of personal estate and effects</td>
<td>£29:10:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivis</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Innholder &amp; yeoman</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>North Grimston</td>
<td>Daughter – Mary</td>
<td>Daughter – all personal estate. Wife - £12 annually for life (deed and articles made between Rivis &amp; Mary’s husband, Walter Baldock)</td>
<td>£243:0:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consett</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Victualler</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife – Mary</td>
<td>Wife – on her death leasehold premises to son, John. 2 further sons £20 each, 2 daughters £40 each and 3rd daughter £50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave(s)</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife - Margaret</td>
<td>Wife – Dwelling house in Huby, personal estate and effects to wife – on her death to be shared between 2 younger sons and daughter - share and share alike. Sister – house in Crosthwaite, Cumberland – following her death to pass to eldest son.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratt</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Innholder</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Brotherton</td>
<td>Daughters Mary, Elizabeth, Jane and Grace</td>
<td>Daughter – Ann – lands, tenements, hereditaments and promises Other 4 daughters – Personal estate share and share alike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Richard Mackley &amp; William Camping – both Gentlemen of York</td>
<td>The Starr Inn – House, stables, out houses and all furniture to Mackley and Camping to hold in trust – Wife to ‘hold, use and occupy’ house, furniture and premises and receive profits of the inn until her death. Eldest daughter - £100, Eldest Son – watch. On wife’s death, everything to be sold and divided between other 5 children after debts discharged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Innkeeper Wills accessed through The National Archives Website: Discovery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>GIVEN NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EXECUTORS</th>
<th>LEGATEES</th>
<th>VALUE OF ESTATE IF GIVEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appleyard</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>James Bulman – Gentleman and John Walker – Bookkeeper</td>
<td>Home and Business to wife as long as remains a widow – if she re-marries trustees to take immediate possession &amp; sell – money to be shared between all children.</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stead</td>
<td>Theophilus</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Philemon Land – Wine merchant and William Westerman – Merchant</td>
<td>Land and Westerman to hold in trust for the benefit of his wife whilst a widow. If she re-marries all property, goods and stock to be sold and money shared equally between son and daughter.</td>
<td>£2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wesson</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Jeremiah Sowden, son</td>
<td>Daughter, son and granddaughter</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Joseph Atkinson, brother – farmer George Layer, uncle – joiner</td>
<td>All goods, stock in trade, furniture etc to be held in trust for his wife to have full use and continue the business as innkeeper.</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greaves</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Vintner &amp; Innkeeper the Hotel (formerly New King’s Arms)</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>James Boynton Allison Richard Kemplay Thomas Moor</td>
<td>Executors to hold in trust – wife to have full access to everything for her lifetime for the maintenance of their 5 children and his wife’s 3</td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jubb(^{459})</th>
<th>Thomas</th>
<th>Innkeeper</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>Leeds</th>
<th>Wife – Sarah</th>
<th>children from previous marriage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clark(^{460})</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>William Christopher Burke</td>
<td>All goods, stock in trade, furniture etc to be held in trust for his wife to have full use and continue the business as innkeeper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cockcroft(^{461})</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>James Waring – Cooper Stevey Wardman</td>
<td>Wife, Hannah – household goods, furniture, utensils and the business – public house called the White Hart. Railway shares for a number of companies. 2 houses on Wellington St, 3 houses on Grove St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cockroft(^{462})</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Innkeeper &amp; widow of Thomas Cockroft</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Sarah Ann Ellis Emma Richardson Daughters</td>
<td>Daughters and granddaughter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Underwood(^{463})</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>John Kilby Esq. And Emanuel Stables - Linendraper</td>
<td>All personal estate and effects to wife</td>
<td>£1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Horsley(^{464})</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>George Ellis – Wine merchant and</td>
<td>Held in trust for his wife to continue the business</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME</th>
<th>GIVEN NAME</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EXECUTORS</th>
<th>LEGATEES</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Duckworth</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Wife – Mary</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dearnley</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Wife - Hannah</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wilkinson</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife – Margaret</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Stocks</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife - Dinah</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hessay</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Daughter – Elizabeth</td>
<td>Daughter Elizabeth Batty – wife of William Batty, InnKpr</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Coupland</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife - Ann</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pulleyu</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>Wife – Mary</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>£3500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Primary Sources

Davenport, Henry. *The publican's lawyer:* being a plain and easy explanation of all the laws now in force concerning innkeepers, victuallers, and publicans of every class: including the laws relating to the licensing of publicans, and pointing out the methods of redress when licenses are unfairly withheld from them by Justices, from partiality, malice, or political motives. The Acts of Parliament relating to the billeting of soldiers; together with that which passed the 19th of May, 1795, for the relief of publicans; and directions for proceeding against parish officers for partiality in billeting soldiers; also the Act for establishing benefit clubs and societies at public houses; the laws concerning gaming, &c. down to 1797. By Henry Davenport, Esq. of the Inner Temple. London, [1795]. Eighteenth Century Collections Online. Gale. University of York. Accessed 10 Jan 2013. [http://find.galegroup.com/ecco/retrieve.do?inPS=true&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=uniyork&tabId=T001&bookId=1614100600&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSet=ECCOArticles&showLOI=&docId=CB3326428646&docLevel=FASCIMILE&workId=CB126428645&relevancePageBatch=CB126428645&retrieveFormat=MULTIPAGE_DOCUMENT&callistoContentSet=ECLL&docPage=article&hilite=y]

Archives

Borthwick Institute for Archives.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Thomas Crosby, Innholder, York, 1743. Microfilm Reel 1252.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Joseph Gill, Innholder, York, 1754. Microfilm Reel 1253

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of John Rivis, Innholder & Yeoman, North Grimston, 1755. Microfilm Reel 1253.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Robert Hepinstall, Innholder, Monkgate, York, 1760. Microfilm Reel 1253

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Robert Consett, Victualler, 1766. Microfilm Reel 1254.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of John Grave(s), Innkeeper, York, 1774. Microfilm Reel 1255.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of George Eratt, Innholder, Brotherton, 1775. Microfilm Reel 1255.

Borthwick Institute for Archives: Wills proved through Dean and Chapter Peculiar Court: Will of Hardy Flower, Innkeeper, York, 1776. Microfilm Reel 1255.
City of York Council/Explore Libraries and Archives Mutual


1809-1828 John Harrison
1822-1827 Thomas Belt
1826-1828 Frances Kilby
1830-1836 Nathaniel Smith
1831-1833 William Mangles
1837-1840 James Wilson
1839-1840 John James Anderson

London Metropolitan Archives

Sun Insurance Office, 1710-1863, London Metropolitan Archives, ref. MS11936-7

MS 11936/364/561018, 23 September, 1789, John Hick, Innholder, Leeds
MS 11936/364/561513, 23 September, 1789, Timothy Rhodes, Merchant, Leeds
MS 11936/364/561757, 12 October, 1789, William Howson, Innholder, Leeds
MS 11936/364/561758, 12 October, 1789, Samuel Glover, Tobacconist, Leeds
MS 11936/369/570096, 31 May, 1790, Rev James Milner, Leeds
MS 11936/369/570098, 31 May, 1790, Rose Rushworth, Innholder, Leeds
MS 11936/376/582167, 11 April, 1791, Richard Mosley Atkinson Esq, Pontefract
MS 11936/376/582168, 11 April, 1791, John Hick, Innholder, Leeds
MS 11936/381/592549, 22 November, 1791, John Hock & Co. of Leeds
MS 11936/381/592552, 22 November 1791, George Turner, Fruit Merchant
MS 11936/388/601330, 11 June, 1792, Joseph Dearnley, Innholder, Leeds
MS 11936/388/601331, 11 June, 1792, John Sawyer, Watchmaker, Leeds
MS 11936/387/602168, 2 July, 1792, Edward Markland, Merchant, Leeds
MS 11936/387/602429, 2 July, 1792, John & George Titford, Gentlemen, York
MS 11936/387/603239, 19 July, 1792, Elizabeth Coulton, Widow, York
MS 11936/391/606862, 24 October, 1792, Ard Walker Wine & Brandy Merchant, Leeds
Sheffield City Council Archives


Birth, Death and Marriage Records


Census Records


Public Record Office Reference – H0107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece No.</th>
<th>Book No.</th>
<th>Folio No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Name and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Charles M. Wilks, Innkeeper, Boar Lane, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 27 January 2014. (White Horse Inn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frances Lee, Innkeeper, Briggate, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 27 January 2014. (Golden Lion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jane Thompson, Innkeeper, Bay Horse Yard, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 27 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sarah Eyre, Innkeeper, Royal Hotel, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 23 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Christopher Harker, Innkeeper, Coppergate, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>William Lockwood, Innkeeper, All Saints Pavement, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Abraham Braithwaite, Innkeeper, Coney Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014. (Black Swan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jane Hall, Innkeeper, Coney Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>William Crummack, Innkeeper, Blossom Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Holiday, Innkeeper, Castlegate, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessed 30 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece No.</th>
<th>Folio No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Name and Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2321</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Charles Wilks, Innkeeper, Boar Lane, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2353</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Daniel Addison, Castlegate, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2353</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thomas Winn, Hotel Keeper, (George Inn), 10 Coney Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2354</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Martha Crummack, Innkeeper, Wind Mill Inn, Blossom Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2353</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Christopher Harker, Innkeeper, St Helen’s Square, York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece No.</th>
<th>Folio No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Name and Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3396</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Clark, Hotel Proprietor, Golden Lion Yard, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3372</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jane Crossley, Hotel Keeper, Albion Hotel, Briggate, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3396</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Joseph Giddy, Hotel Keeper, White Horse Inn, Boar Lane, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3371</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>George Dyson, Hotel Proprietor, Old George, Briggate, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3547</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>John Holiday, Hotel Keeper and Farmer, Railway Station Royal Hotel, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3545</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sarah Ann Senior, Hotel Keeper, George Hotel, Coney Street, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3545</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Christopher Harker, Hotel Keeper, York Hotel, St Helen’s Square, York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Directories

### Leeds Directories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Directory Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Bailey’s Northern Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>The Universal British Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>The Universal British Directory: Yorkshire Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>The Leeds Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Binns &amp; Brown Directory of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Baines' Directory for the Town of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>The Commercial Directory 1818-1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Baines' Directory and Gazeteer Vol. 1, West Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Baines' History, Directory and Gazeteer, of the County of York: Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Baines' Directory for the Borough of Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Pigot’s Directory 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Pigot’s Directory 1834, Yorkshire Sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>White’s 1837 Gazetteer, History and Directory of the West Riding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Williams Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Slater’s Royal National Commercial Directory Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>White’s Directory of the Boroughs of Leeds and Bradford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>White’s Directory of Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, Halifax, Wakefield, Dewsbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### York Directories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Directory Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Universal British Directory Vol. IV: York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809-11</td>
<td>Holden’s Triennial Directory: York Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816-17</td>
<td>Pigot’s General Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Pigot’s General Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818-20</td>
<td>Pigot’s Commercial Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Baines’ History, Directory and Gazeteer, of the County of York: York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-9</td>
<td>Pigot’s Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>White’s Directory of York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Slater’s Royal National Commercial Directory Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Slater’s Royal National Commercial Directory Yorkshire &amp; Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>White’s East and North Riding Directory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newspapers


*The Leeds Intelligencer*, (Leeds, England), Tuesday, April 14th, 1761; page 3; Issue 364.


The Leeds Mercury (Leeds, England), Saturday, May 30, 1835; page 1; Issue 117
Accessed 8 February 2014

February 2014

The York Herald, and General Advertiser (York, England) Saturday, 23 May 1835;
Issue 3271. Accessed 8 February 2014

Thoresby Society

MS Box VII No. 27 (1955)
Extracts relating to coaches to and from Leeds taken from the Leeds Intelligencer
and Leeds Mercury, c 1734-5 to 1780. Copied from TS Publications and
presented by G. E. Kirk

MS Box VII No. 29 (1955)
Beckwith, J.D. “The Coaching Era in Leeds,” Being the Substance of a lecture
delivered to the Thoresby Society - 8th January 1955 by John D Beckwith. Leeds,
8th January 1955.

Newspapers held at Thoresby Society

Leeds Intelligencer, Tuesday, November 1, 1774

Leeds Intelligencer, Tuesday, December 20, 1774

Probate Records

Prerogative Court of Canterbury and related Probate Jurisdictions: Will Registers.

The National Archives – Prerogative Court of Canterbury. 1384-1858. Reference
PROB 11

The National Archives Website: Discovery: PROB 11/2167/241 Will of Thomas Jubb,
(accessed 28 October 2014)

The National Archives Website: Discovery: PROB 11/2237/182. Will of Philip Clark,
(accessed 28 October 2014)


The National Archives - Boards of Stamps, Taxes, Excise, Stamps and Taxes, and Inland Revenue. 1796-1803. Reference: IR26


Secondary Sources


http://commons.colgate.edu/car/vol3/iss1/7/?utm_source=commons.colgate.edu%2Fcar%2Fvol3%2Fiss1%2F7&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages


