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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Coketown," Dickens reminds us, was a town of red brick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes had allowed it... It was a town of machinery and tall chimneys, out of which interminable serpents of smoke trailed themselves forever and ever, and never got uncoiled. It had a black canal in it and a river that ran purple with ill-smelling dye, and vast piles of building full of windows where there was a rattling and a trembling all day long, and where the piston of the steam-engine worked monotonously up and down like the head of an elephant in a state of melancholy madness.1

A stranger travelling to Leeds in Yorkshire's West Riding in the early 1850s would surely believe that he had found Dickens' "Coketown".

Travelling from the South on the Leeds and Bradford rail line a stranger would enter Leeds through the working class townships of Hunslet and Holbeck. He would see on the north, as he entered Holbeck, the Meadow Lane Pottery and the Jack Lane Primitive Methodist Chapel. If his eyesight was good, and the smoke was not too heavy, the traveler could see beyond the Pottery, four malt kilns, two iron foundries, and a brewery. At this point, most

probably he would be struck by the row upon row of begrimed, red brick, back-to-back houses with chimneys belching black coal smoke. Continuing in a northwesterly direction the traveler would spot some open fields on his left and perhaps might wonder why, a few feet away, the builders of Leeds had packed so many houses together so tightly. Looking to his right the visitor could not help but notice Marshall's Flax Mill, famous in Leeds and the West Riding. Heading in a more northerly direction, the train passenger would then spot Hol beck, one of the many small and filthy becks, or tributaries, leading into the River Aire. In 1871 one of these becks was cleaned and it yielded the carcases of seven cats, eleven rats, seventeen dogs and six pigs.2

Turning sharply to the North East, the tracks took the traveler slowly past, and then over, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. After running parallel to the River Aire for only a short while, the tracks crossed the River and came to rest in the Wellington Street Station on the River's north bank.

Upon disembarking from his train, if the visitor glanced to the West down the River Aire, he would undoubtedly be struck by the sheer number of mills in sight along the river bank. From East to West heading into Leeds' West Ward a string of mills appeared, starting with the Air Dale

---

Saw Mill, and continuing with the Britannia Cloth Mill, Victoria Cloth Mill, Wellington Bridge Dye House, Wellington Cloth Mill, Airedale Cloth Mill, Perseverance Cloth Dressing Mill and the Print Works. All the mills were situated to take full advantage of the river water in powering the mills' numerous steam engines. If the traveler gazed beyond the Print Works, he could see four dye houses and the large Joppa Tannery on the horizon.

The visitor wishing to explore the city north of the river might be lulled into thinking it would be an easy day's walk, as the entire township of Leeds contained only 2,672 acres. He would soon discover that Leeds was a very up hill and down dale city. Sloping, not so gradually, upward from the River, the Woodhouse Moor, less than a mile away, sits over 230 feet above the Aire. In the process of that climb the traveler to Leeds would perhaps see the substantial Mill Hill Unitarian chapel in Park Row, or he might walk the ancient street of Briggate, where the shopkeepers congregated and where he would undoubtedly see Dyson's Clock and the hatter shop of Henry John Jarvis. He might be intrigued by the numerous courts and yards which filled in every nook and cranny behind Briggate as the city grew and expanded: Commercial Court, White Cross Yard, Kenyon's Court, Fleece Yard, and Heaton's Yard, to name just a few. As Leeds was justly famous for its woollen industry, any traveler would certainly want to visit the Cloth
Hall in an area of the city known as The Calls. Just past the Cloth Hall was the imposing St. Peter's Church.

If the traveler chose to continue walking to the east he would find himself in the primarily working class wards of Leeds known as the East and North East wards. These two wards were dominated by the working classes, and by the substandard housing of Leeds known as back-to-backs. There was a certain monotony of housing in these areas, which consisted of coal blackened, red brick rows of "one ups, one downs". These "one up, one down" working class, back-to-back cottages often had rooms of only five yards square, and about four yards high, with one room on the ground level and one above.4 Sometimes there might also be a cellar dwelling.

Our traveler might also find walking a little difficult in hilly Leeds because only 86 streets out of 586 were paved.5 It was common in Leeds to put down ashes to form a pavement, however, in dry weather this caused an irritating dust and on wet days spongy black puddles appeared. Although the nineteenth century traveler was probably somewhat accustomed to unsanitary conditions,


5Ibid., p. 994.
surely even he would have noticed the incredible stench in certain areas of the city. The noxious odor was caused, in part, by overflowing and inadequate privies. It was a common habit to empty chamber pots into the street, as, even when privies were provided, there was no sewerage system in which to flush the contents. All the matter had to be dug out and carted away.6 Conditions had not improved much by 1871 when 293 houses in Wellington Yard, a notorious epidemic area, were torn down. There was a midden twenty-one feet long, five feet ten inches wide and six feet deep. One night, so the story goes, a drunken man fell in and suffocated.7

In an attempt to get away from this less than desirable section of town, the traveler could turn to the west and head back to the center. As he passed through the Quarry Hill area, a continuation of the poorer working class districts, he might notice St. Peter's Wesleyan Methodist Chapel or the Lady Lane Wesleyan Chapel, situated in the middle of this working class warren. Hurrying on towards central Leeds he would arrive at the Town Hall on Park Lane; next door he would undoubtedly notice the finely appointed Oxford Place Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, with seats for 2,000 worshippers. In hopes of finding a little nicer neighborhood, the traveler, if he continued West, would discover


7 Nuttgens, p. 38.
the fashionable Park Square, Park Place and Hanover Square area; an area reserved for the wealthier, upper middle-class population of Leeds. It consisted of lovely terraced houses, with substantial gardens, and separate small estates surrounded by gardens. Despite the upper middle class appearance, the neighbourhood was located less than half a mile from the River Aire, whose banks were dotted with the belching factory chimneys. In one last effort to rid himself of factory smoke the traveler could walk up Woodhouse Lane, past Blenheim Terrace and Springfield Lodge, to the height of the Woodhouse Moor and look down upon the city. All visitors agreed that Leeds was a smokey town, but if the traveller were observing the city on a Sunday, rather than a weekday, he might be able to "see from hill to hill". Even on a Sunday he might find his view less than desirable because Leeds experienced sunlight only twenty percent of daylight hours, and central Leeds only sixteen percent, compared to thirty percent for all of England and Wales.  

Our traveler's perambulation and view of Leeds would probably convince the visitor of one thing. The city was dominated by the factory chimney and not by the spires of


its churches and chapels. One could raise the same questions for Leeds as Dickens did for Coketown's eighteen denominations.

Who belonged to the eighteen denominations? Because, whoever did, the labouring people did not. It was very strange to walk through the streets on a Sunday morning and note how few of them the barbarous jangling of bells that was driving the sick and nervous mad called away from their own quarter, from their own close rooms, from the corners of their own streets, where they lounged listlessly, gazing at all the church and chapel-going, as at a thing with which they had no manner of concern.10

This feature of city life, which Leeds held in common with other large towns of the nineteenth century, was in sharp contrast to the dominance of the parish church, and sometimes the dissenting chapel, of sixteenth and seventeenth century villagers.11

I

In 1851, Leeds Borough had a population of 172,270, with the township comprising 101,343 of the total. Yet the township comprised only 2,672 acres out of the total Borough acreage of 21,450.12 The remainder of the Borough was made up of the working class out-townships of Holbeck

10Dickens, p. 32.


and Hunslet; the pastoral townships of Farnley, Chapel Allerton and Potternewton; Beeston, most noted for coal mining; Headingley-cum-Burley, advantageously located to the north and above Leeds township; the townships of Wortley and Bramley, textile centers, with Bramley especially strong as a handloom weaving center; and finally, Armley (along with Wortley) an increasingly important center for engineering and railways. For the entire Borough population there were only 137 churches and chapels, with seats, generally referred to as settings, to accommodate merely 76,488, or 44 percent of the worshippers. These few settings would appear to have been more than adequate to accommodate Leeds Church of England (hereinafter referred to as church members) and nonconformist (hereinafter referred to as chapel members) worshippers as only 39,392 people worshipped at the most popularly attended morning services.\(^\text{13}\)

As a city dominated by nonworshippers, Leeds was little different from most of the industrialized cities of Great Britain. Kenneth Inglis examined this trend, using the figures from Census Sunday, March 30, 1851, published in the 1851 Census of Religious Worship. Inglis developed an index of attendance which is based upon the

---

total attendance at all places of worship within an area expressed as a percentage of the population in that area. He showed that all places of worship in England and Wales experienced an attendance index of 61; but in rural and small towns, the index rose to 71.4 and in larger towns of 10,000 or more, it dropped to 49.7. Even this figure is misleading, however, as most of the largest towns were well below that average. Leeds revealed an index of attendance of 47.4, which, although poor when compared to small towns and rural areas, was considerably better than many of the larger towns such as Preston at 25.5 or Manchester at 34.7.14

Leeds was a city which exhibited not only relatively good attendance at religious worship among larger towns, but it was also a city dominated by Nonconformity. This fact prompted the new Vicar of Leeds in 1837, Walter Farquhar Hook, to write that the city's "de facto established religion is Methodism."15 Inglis' figures relating to the ratio of Nonconformist chapel attendance to Church of England attendance in the large towns reveal even more the dominance of Leeds' nonconformity. Of each 100 worship-


pers, Leeds experienced 59.4 percent Nonconformist attendance, whereas Preston showed 43.8 percent and Manchester 42.3 percent. The figures for Methodist attendance certainly corroborate Hook’s observation, however, as 42.9 percent of the Nonconformist attendance in Leeds was Methodist.

Nonconformity is often grouped under the titles Old Dissent and New Dissent. Dissent from the established Church of England began in the sixteenth century when the Independents came into being. The seventeenth century spawned the Baptists, Presbyterians, the Unitarians, and Society of Friends. These religions, became known as Old Dissent, when in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Wesleyan Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodists, the Southcottians, the Swedenborgians, the United Brethren, and the Mormons, were formed. The Dissenting religions under study in this thesis are the Independents, the Baptists, the Unitarians, Society of Friends, the Wesleyan Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodists and the Mormons.

The Independents traditionally traced their origins back to Robert Browne’s gathered congregation in Norwich,

16 Inglis, "Patterns of Religious Worship in 1851," pp. 82-83. Both Manchester and Preston had relatively high Roman Catholic attendance, which kept the figures for both the Church of England and the nonconformists low.

17 Ibid., p. 85.
in 1581.18 Browne was the first to spell out the Independent's basic principles which center around church polity. A Christian church must be a congregation of true believers and in order to achieve that ideal all authority must be vested in the congregation, and none given absolutely to its leadership. Although the titles Independents and Congregationalists are often used synonymously, there is a different meaning conveyed by each term. Independency denotes the idea of total freedom of the body from outside control; whereas the term congregationalism suggests that every church member participates in its administration.19

Both of these ideals are practiced by the Independent congregations.

The strength of Independency was in a group of counties stretching eastward from Devon to Essex and Suffolk. The West Riding was only moderately affected by Independency, and the 1851 Religious Census figures show that the large manufacturing cities were much more affected by Methodism than Independency. Leeds revealed only eleven Independent chapels out of a total of 101 Nonconformist chapels.

The Baptists, with thirteen chapels in Leeds Borough in 1851, showed their greatest strength in the West Riding

19 1851 Census of Great Britain Report and Tables on Religious Worship, p. 11.
of Yorkshire, in the counties which stretched from the East Midlands to the East Anglian coast; i.e., Leicestershire, Rutland, Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire, Suffolk and Essex.

The Baptists traced their origins to John Smyth, who, in 1609, reinstituted the doctrine of adult baptism by immersion, according to the doctrine of the New Testament. It was felt by Smyth, who was strongly influenced by the continental European anabaptist teachings of the 1500s, that baptism by immersion was the basis for the fellowship of a gathered church. Smyth's followers became known as General Baptists, because they held that salvation was for all men. The Particular Baptists, on the other hand, sprang into existence in 1633 in London under Henry Jacob, who asserted that only a particular part of mankind was predestined for salvation. Nine of the thirteen Baptist chapels in Leeds were Particular. In church polity there was hardly any difference between the Baptists and the Independents.

John Biddle, a tractarian of the 1650s is generally credited as the father of English Unitarianism. Their

---

20 Gay, p. 121.

ecclesiastical organization was essentially congregational in nature, with each individual body ruling itself in a manner similar to the Independents and the Baptists. Their doctrine was radically different from the other two Old Dissenting religions. They apparently accepted the miracles of the New Testament, but they rejected the divinity of Christ. In addition, they could not accept man's inherent sinfulness and, therefore, did not admit that an atonement was necessary.22

The total numbers of Unitarians were small, however, and what strength they had rested in the West Riding, Lancashire and Cheshire.23 Leeds had only three Unitarian chapels in 1851, which represented only 1240 sittings.

The Seekers, later called the "Religious Society of Friends", originated out of the great religious upheaval of the mid-seventeenth century. George Fox was the founder of this important Nonconformist religion, which perhaps embodied the most extreme protest against ceremonial religion. Their worship was without any set liturgy or appointed minister, and was based on the Inner Light. This Inner Light rested on the foundation that the Divine nature


23Gay, p. 182, 317.
of Christ worked directly on man's soul and provided the means to perform good works. Visibly its effect was shown through an improved moral character. In church polity, although there was no appointed minister, there were certain officers, such as elders who were responsible for meetings, and overseers who were responsible for the temporal welfare of their members.24

The Society of Friends, isolated behind a wall of peculiarities, were a declining religion. In 1851 in England there were 371 congregations, with settings for 91,599 persons. If Leeds was typical, however, the number of settings far exceeded the number of attendants. There was only one meeting house in Leeds, with settings for 1100, and attendance at morning worship of only 363. Despite the small membership evidenced in Leeds, the Friends were the strongest numerically in Yorkshire and other areas of the north, such as Lancashire and Westmorland. The southwest, also showed membership pockets in London, Bristol and Norwich.25

New Dissent was dominated by Methodism and, particularly, the Original Wesleyan Methodist Connexion. Its origins can be traced to John Wesley, an ordained Anglican minister, whose conversion experience in 1738 led him to

travel the country preaching the gospel of "scriptural holiness". Although there was nothing in Wesley's teachings that were contrary to the doctrine of the Established Church, his methods went against the ministerial grain. Wesley's habit of ignoring the parish system and preaching to all the masses was at odds with established practice. Although Wesley never had any intention of leaving the Church of England, the final break with the Established Church was made by his followers, after his death in 1791.26

The growth of Methodism seemed to be dependent upon the weakness of the Church of England, in a given geographical area. It was in these areas that John Wesley, a faithful Anglican minister, saw the greatest need, and to which he and his itinerant preachers traveled. Consequently, the newly expanding industrial cities were the natural breeding ground for Methodism. Leeds was no exception to this practice. In 1851 there were twenty-six Wesleyan Methodist chapels, and a total of sixty Methodist chapels.

There were radical Wesleyan Methodists who, shortly after Wesley's death, felt that the break from the Established Church was taking too long, and was not going far enough. It was almost inevitable that a schism would

appear, and in 1797 Leeds was in fact the scene of a major schism, known as the Kilhamites, after the Rev. Alexander Kilham, who founded the Methodist New Connexion. In all respects, except the added power given to the laity, the Methodist New Connexion was no different from the Original Connexion. Its strength lay primarily in the North, in the West Riding, Durham, and Northumberland, and in the Midlands in Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, and Herefordshire. Leeds in 1851 had seven Methodist New Connexion chapels, with sittings for over 2700 people.27

A more important schism in the Wesleyan Methodist Church occurred in 1810 when Hugh Bourne and William Clowes felt that they were unduly restricted in their camp meeting evangelizing. They consequently formed their own group, the Primitive Methodists, and it was by far the largest Methodist schism. By 1851 there were almost 3000 places of worship in England, and in Leeds there were thirteen chapels, second only to the Wesleyans among Dissenting chapels. Their strength was in the Potteries, Durham, Northumberland, the West Riding, and Lincoln.

In all aspects of doctrine and worship the Primitive Methodists were Methodist, but their preaching methods set them apart from other Wesleyans. They were primarily street

revivalists, who apparently attracted a lower social level than the Original Connexion.28

The last or the New Dissenting chapels under discussion was not one of the prominent Dissenting Protestant chapels in England, but an American denomination which was imported to England in 1837. The Church of Jesus Christ or Latter-day Saints (hereinafter referred to as the Mormons) was organized in New York on April 6, 1830, by Joseph Smith, the founder of the religion. In 1837 the first Mormon missionaries entered England through the port of Liverpool. These missionaries, and subsequent prominent members of the Church, such as Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff, and Parley P. Pratt, who came to England as missionaries in 1840, were relatively successful in finding and baptizing converts. Horace Mann attributed Mormon success among the working classes to their Millenarian doctrines, and to the attractiveness of a church based upon continuing revelation and subsequent infallibility.29

By 1851 there were over 220 Mormon places of worship in England, with almost 31,000 sittings. And it is estimat-


ed by Mann that over 20,000 Mormons had already immigrated to America. 30 In Leeds Borough there was only one meeting place, with sittings for 240 attendants. The numerical strength of Mormonism centered in Lancashire, Cheshire, the West Riding of Yorkshire, Hampshire and Gloucestershire. The announcement of polygamy in the Millennial Star of 1 January 1853, diminished the Mormon proselyting success in England. 31

II

This thesis examines the Nonconformist chapel goers of the Borough of Leeds to determine their social composition. Membership from the Old Dissenting chapels of the Independents, Baptists, Unitarians, and the Society of Friends, along with the New Dissenting chapels of the Wesleyan Methodists, the Methodist New Connexion, the Primitive Methodists, and the Mormons are all utilized. The West Riding maintained a heavily Nonconformist tradition, a pattern consistent with other large industrial cities such as Bradford, Oldham, and Sheffield, and it was for this reason that the city of Leeds was selected for this study. It is not only the most prominent city in the West

31 Chadwick, I: 439.
Riding, but it is also representative of the chief manufacturing cities of England in the early Victorian era. In 1851 it was the fifth largest city in the nation with a Borough population of 172,270. Although a leading woollen manufacturing town, Leeds also had a burgeoning engineering industry. Like many cities in the Industrial Revolution it experienced rapid population growth, differentiated residential patterns, and a predominantly working class occupational structure.

This study questions whether the social categories Owen Chadwick used in his important work *The Victorian Church* are appropriate for a Victorian city such as Leeds. Were the Wesleyan Methodists primarily from the lower middle class and artisans? Were the Unitarian congregations more educated? Is it true that Congregational or Independent chapels were predominantly houses of worship for the upper middle class, with few labourers? Were Baptist chapels attended by a distinctly artisan and lower class clientele? Were the the Quakers not a religion of the poor? And lastly were the Mormon converts almost all of the poor?32

The problem actually goes deeper than the social categories assigned by Chadwick. Although the social and economic status of the chapel goers is one important aspect of this study, an added dimension revolves around the family structure. Were there differences among the chapel goers

32Chadwick, 1:424, 437.
relating to size of families, the presence of an extended family, a noticeable trend in mobility and persistence in an area? If so, what do these differences suggest?

Although the answers to these questions may reveal the social composition of the Leeds nonconformists, they will not completely answer the question why these individuals were attracted to a particular Nonconformist religion. Because few journals and diaries exist which might reveal religious motivation, one way to answer this question is to study the organizational structure of the various denominations. Did certain chapels provide more opportunities for personal involvement than others? If so, did the occupational patterns of a particular denomination show a correlation between greater church involvement and lower occupational status? In other words, could an individual who had less say in his occupational world be more attracted to a religion which allowed him more say? Or can the personal commitment exhibited by some members be measured in some way other than through the traditional literary sources, which are scarce for these groups? As Spufford has suggested

If a relatively poor man were prepared to give time, energy, and above all money to . . . his particular brand or faith, his convictions must have been both deep and genuine. 33

Although these questions are not necessarily new,

33Spufford, p. 344.
the answers to them have primarily been explored only on the national level. There have been only two major studies of English cities conducted to date. E. R. Wickham in *Church and People in an Industrial City* examined the religious history of Sheffield from the English Civil War to the turn of the nineteenth century. Hugh McLeod presents a sociological study of religious trends in Bethnal Green, London in his work entitled *Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City*. The latter focuses on the period from 1880 to 1914, because McLeod believes that the nineteenth century provided the essential features of our modern situation. Both of these studies present valid evidence which supports much of Chadwick's statements about social structure. However, it can be argued that London is not necessarily representative of the kingdom, and certainly differed markedly from industrial cities of the north. Sheffield, however, was one of the "chief industrial cities" and, therefore, the results of Wickham's study could be interpreted as representative for other major industrial cities of the early Victorian era. The focus of both of these works, however, is primarily on literary evidence and neither provides the type of large statistical samples which

could amplify and either corroborate or disprove Chadwick's social structure contentions.

In this study a statistical population of 2385 people was gathered by listing all the entries from the 1830-1837 birth and baptismal registers for twenty-three nonconformist chapels in Leeds. The Leeds Branch Mormon membership lists of the 1840s and early 1850s provided the people from the twenty-fourth chapel. All readable names listed on the Mormon membership lists were included. The original population of 2385 people were not grouped by families, but were simply an alphabetical list of individuals. As soon as these individuals were checked against the 1851 Census or Population they became families. The population now available for further study was reduced to 483 male heads of households, along with their families by two factors: 1) many of the individuals were revealed as a member of a family; and 2) many of the individuals were not found on the census. The 1851 Census of Population was also used to determine occupation, birthplace, the presence of servants or lodgers, and nuclear or extended family structure. In addition the male head of household was checked against the 1843, 1845, 1847, 1849, 1851 and 1853 commercial directories for Leeds; and each family residence was located on the 1851 Ordnance Survey five foot plans for Leeds Township and the out-townships of Holbeck and Huns-
A statistical approach will reveal denominational social structure patterns which have only partially been viewed through literary sources. For example, will further study of larger numbers reveal that the working classes were primarily detached from religious worship? In terms of religious worship, then, did Leeds resemble Coketown? Or, were there specific denominations which attracted the working classes more readily than others, as Horace Mann, the compiler of the 1851 Census of Religious Worship suggested? Mann determined that it was New Dissent in general which was more attractive to the working classes,

35 The most serious delimitation of this study is the small number of families found, which represented a relatively small proportion of the membership of each denomination. Using the male head of household only, and comparing against each denomination's attendance at their most popularly attended meeting on Census Sunday, March 30, 1851, the following percentages are revealed: Unitarians, 4 percent, Independents, 2.7 percent, Baptists, 3.7 percent, Friends 6 percent, Wesleyan Methodists, 2 percent, Methodist New Connexion 1.3 percent, Primitive Methodist 2 percent, Mormons 16.5 percent. These figures in reality are higher, if the family were compared against attendance and not just the male head of household. The numbers were limited by the sources and the decision, for the sake of comparability, to use only male heads of households found on the 1851 Census of Population. Although it is suspected that the tendencies revealed in this study would not be significantly different the confidence level would be greatly improved if more families could have been found. Additional sources such as more journals, voter registration and voting patterns, community involvement, and the Church of England membership, need to be examined to add both the personal voice and valuable material on social composition. Lastly this same type of study needs to be extended to other industrial cities to examine similarities and differences.
and Methodism, and Mormonism, in particular, which showed strength among working class worshippers.36

To answer these questions the occupational, residential, and family and household characteristics, of each of eight Nonconformist denominations identified earlier will be tested to determine the associational ties common to each denomination. Although the study utilizes groups rather than individuals as its focus, it is hoped that the individual will not be lost in the process, for it was the individual, not the group, who provided the sacrifices and personal commitment to a set of beliefs which were labeled Methodist, Baptist, Independent, Quaker, Unitarian or Mormon.

CHAPTER II

THE CHAPEL GOERS OF LEEDS: OCCUPATIONAL PATTERNS

In Coketown, according to Dickens, the labouring population did not belong to the city's eighteen denominations, but Robert Spurr, a shoemaker of Bramley, one of the out-townships in Leeds, did belong to a chapel. He states, one of my shop mates and my self began to go to the Baptist Chapel. I thought it very strange when i saw men and women go down into the water, and the Minister in the water Baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and holy Ghost. But i heard them preach the word of truth--and reading for my self in the book, i found it to be true--so i went along with them, hoping to be in heaven with them.\footnote{R. J. Owen, ed., "The Autobiography of Robert Spurr," \textit{Baptist Quarterly}, xxvi (1976), p. 284.}

Although probably more religious than the inhabitants of Coketown, and most of Leeds, Spurr presented the classic example of the occupational uncertainties of the working classes. When his first wife died and left him with a tiny son, Joshua, he wrote,

I then went off with a very heavy heart to seek work. I worked 3 months at Gildersome, making mens' boots 2s. per pair. After that, i came to work for Brother John again for some short time. But i wished again to try my weel of fortune else where, so i went at Leeds, up at bank, and lived with Brother David but i slept at another place. I had not been there long before my master removed

to meanwood and all the shopmen went with them—5 in number... My master was very poor and liked his drop of ale, and he had very little money and little work, so when I had been there 18 months I had to leave 50s. of my wages in his hands and work at Rodley.2

After joining the Bramley Zion Baptist Church in 1832, Spurr met his second wife, Mary, and continued with the hardships of his life: of their eight children, four died in infancy.

Spurr, like all labouring class men, worked with his hands. No matter what the wages or the skill, a man's social status was determined by the type of work he performed. An ill-paid school teacher or lowly clerk would always consider himself the social superior of a more highly-paid skilled artisan, simply because that artisan used his hands to perform his work. Additional hallmarks of the labouring man were the insecurity of the job, and the wide divergence of skill and pay within the working classes. A skilled artisan could earn 35-40 shillings a week, whereas a labourer might only earn 10 shillings a week on an uncertain basis. Yet both men were part of the labouring population of England.3

The middle classes also showed a wide range of pay and skill, but more importantly, physical labour was not

---

2Ibid., pp. 283-84.

performed by this class. The upper end of the middle class scale was represented by men who could mingle easily with the gentry. The upper middle class, in fact, formed a city oligarchy. Edward Baines, who was an Independent, a Liberal M.P. from Leeds, and the proprietor of the Leeds Mercury represented the professional category: as did Richard Constantine Hay, an Independent and member of the Royal College of Surgeons. Newman Cash, a Quaker and prominent woollen merchant was typical of the powerful merchants of Leeds. On the other hand, the lower middle classes were closer to the labouring classes in pay and were mostly noted for the "taint of trade" or the performance of a paid service. They were the £10 householders who might include a shopkeeper, coal merchant, innkeeper, commercial traveler, school teacher and clerk. The Wesleyan Methodist, John Anderson (a tea dealer and grocer on 20 Park Lane), the Quaker, William Broadhead (who maintained a Coffee House on Meadow Lane Road), or the Independent, Thomas Buckton (who was a grocer and druggist in Wortley), were all men who fit easily the lower middle-class mold.

Although £300 a year was often mentioned as a minimum for middle class living, teachers and clerks earned as little as £60 a year, which was much less than a skilled artisan. Nevertheless, these people were considered middle class because of their educational attainments, and because there was no taint of manual labour associated
with their jobs. These qualities provided the middle classes with the social status that Robert Spurr could not and did not enjoy.4

Born in 1801, Robert Spurr grew up during the rise of the great manufacturing cities of England, at the height of the Industrial Revolution. Although born in Ossett, near Wakefield, he spent most of his adult life in Leeds. He therefore was a part of that city's tremendous growth from 53,276 in 1801 to 172,270 in 1851, from the sixth largest to the fifth largest city in the nation, with only London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham larger.

Although the 1851 Census of Occupations clearly shows that agriculture was still the largest industry, of the nonagricultural industries, textiles, dominated the nation. They prevailed, not only in numbers (around 1.1 million workers, not including hosiery and lace), but also as a pace-setter for industrial organization. It was in textiles that the great technological innovations occurred, and it was in textiles that the factory system was developed. This new system required the development of skills in industrial and economic organizations. The textile industry, along with the railroads, also spawned the neophyte mechanical engineering industry. Although only about a quarter of the working population in 1851 was engaged in

4Ibid., pp. 103-4.
manufacturing and mining, these labourers were the motive force behind Britain's ascendancy as the "Workshop of the World." 5

I

Robert Spurr's Leeds in 1851 was very much a part of the emerging urban structure of British society. For the first time slightly more than half the population in England was urban, and Leeds, a leading woollen town, was the fifth largest city in the country. In White's 1853 Leeds Directory, for example, there were listed twenty-eight flax and tow spinners; forty-six iron and brass founders; fifty-one machine makers; 127 merchants, which included stuff merchants, and woollen cloth merchants; and eighty-eight woollen cloth manufacturers. 6 However, using the 1851 Census of Occupations, the strength of the textile industry in Leeds becomes clearer. Of 83,889 men and women over age twenty, 28,889 (34 percent) were occupied in the textile industry, by far the largest percentage in any occupation. (See Appendix A for a detailed occupational profile)

But what of Robert Spurr and his son, George, and

5Ibid., pp. 10-11.

such young men whose coarse red hands told you they did something with their hands for their living? Was Spurr a typical Baptist in Leeds? What is the occupational profile for each of the denominations, and which denominations were apparently the most attractive to the labouring population? By viewing the six columns on Table 1.B (i.e., Artisan, Factory/Supervisory, Factory/Skilled, Factory/Unskilled, Labourer, and Farming) as one group, a good picture of the labouring population of each denomination emerges. All of the sects, except the Friends, displayed over 55 percent labouring population. The high percentage in the artisan category of the working class population may, in part, be accounted for by the number of people still engaged in the domestic system of the woollen and other textile production. This was true especially among the Baptists in Bramley, who were dependent on handloom weaving for their livelihood. Despite this apparent skewing toward the artisan occupational category, it does not alter the total picture of the working classes as demonstrated in Table 1.B. If these people, engaged in the domestic system, changed occupations, it is more likely the change would occur within other working class trades rather than middle class professions.

The smaller percentage of the working class members found among the Friends, the Unitarians, and the Independents, is intriguing, when one considers how large the Leeds
TABLE 1.A

OCCUPATIONS OF MALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, 1851,
IN LEEDS ARRANGED BY DENOMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLERKS/</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>BOOKKEEPERS</th>
<th>MANUFACTURERS</th>
<th>SALESMAN</th>
<th>SHOPKEEPER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATIONS</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENOMINATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) UNITARIANS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) BAPTISTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) FRIENDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) WESLEYAN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODISTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) METHODIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) PRIMITIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) MORMON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cumulative Middle Class = 132/477 = 27.67%)

TABLE 1.B
OCCUPATIONS OF MALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, 1851
IN LEEDS ARRANGED BY DENOMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARTISAN</th>
<th>FACTORY/</th>
<th>FACTORY/</th>
<th>FACTORY/</th>
<th>LABOURER</th>
<th>FARMING</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR NO. %</td>
<td>SKILLED NO. %</td>
<td>UNSKILLED NO. %</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>1.A &amp; 1.B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>9 45.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 5.0%</td>
<td>1 5.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>29 31.9%</td>
<td>1 1.1%</td>
<td>7 7.7%</td>
<td>12 13.2%</td>
<td>6 6.6%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>31 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>39 51.3%</td>
<td>1 1.3%</td>
<td>4 5.3%</td>
<td>5 6.6%</td>
<td>10 13.2%</td>
<td>6 7.9%</td>
<td>76 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>7 31.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>1 4.5%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>73 39.9%</td>
<td>8 4.4%</td>
<td>12 6.6%</td>
<td>16 8.7%</td>
<td>19 10.4%</td>
<td>4 2.2%</td>
<td>183 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>11 52.4%</td>
<td>1 4.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>4 19.0%</td>
<td>1 4.8%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>10 32.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>7 22.6%</td>
<td>7 22.6%</td>
<td>3 9.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>16 48.5%</td>
<td>1 3.0%</td>
<td>4 12.1%</td>
<td>2 6.1%</td>
<td>7 21.2%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>12 2.5%</td>
<td>27 5.7%</td>
<td>47 9.9%</td>
<td>52 10.9%</td>
<td>13 2.7%</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Cumulative Working Class = 345/477 = 72.33%)

* ONE CHELSEA PENSIONER, ONE NOT OCCUPIED;  ** ONE NOT OCCUPIED
*** TWO PARISH RELIEF, ONE NOT OCCUPIED

SOURCE: Great Britain, 1851 Census Enumerator's Schedules. Townships of Leeds and Great Britain. 1851 Census of Enumerator's Schedules Borough of Leeds
working class population was. Leeds has variously been described as three-quarters or four-fifths working class during this period. These were the men who generally faced insecurities in their working world, insecurities brought on by the casual labour of a road paver or the low wages of a stone gatherer. They also worked long hours to earn these uncertain and fluctuating wages; the average work week was 60 hours. (See Appendix B for a list of the occupations placed in the eleven categories, and Appendix C for a partial list of occupations and wages for Leeds and other industrial cities.)

The measurement of factory labour within the labouring population will reveal which of the denomination-al memberships were the most heavily involved in the Leeds factory movement. By combining the categories of factory/skilled, factory/unskilled, and factory/supervisory, the top four denominations are the Methodist New Connexion, 23.8 percent; Primitive Methodists, 22.6 percent; the Independents, 21.5 percent; and the Mormons, 21.1 percent. The Wesleyan Methodists come in with a close fifth place, at 19.4 percent; the Baptists show 13 percent; the Unitarians considerably less with 5 percent; and the Friends were not

---

represented in this category. It was expected that those denominations having the highest percentage of working class membership would also have the largest number of men working in the mills. This proved to be true, except for the Baptists. Perhaps their relatively low showing among the factory element in Leeds stems, in part, from the fact that almost 69 percent of the member sample was drawn from Bramley, a town dominated by the handloom, not the power loom.

II

In the nineteenth century class distinction even permeated the time of day that religious worship took place. Evening services, for example, tended to attract a higher proportion of working class worshippers than morning services.\(^8\) To help determine which Nonconformist denominations attracted more working or middle class members, the total number of sittings versus the number of worshippers were compared for each denomination, for both the morning and evening services. This comparison is presented as a percentage of attendance for each meeting (See Table 2). It is readily apparent that attendance was generally poor, with one exception -- the Mormons.

Horace Mann, the compiler of the 1851 Religious

---

\(^8\)1851 Census of Great Britain Report and Tables on Religious Worship, p. clvii.
Census, held the view that the membership of the nonconformist denominations showed a decidedly lower social status than the Church of England, as revealed through attendance at morning and evening service. This observation does not appear to be totally true in Leeds. If it was correct, none of the Dissenting denominations would disclose a percentage of attendance higher in the morning service than the evening service. In reality all except the Primitive Methodists and the Mormons revealed a stronger preference for morning worship over evening worship. This suggests that either Mann was incorrect, or only partially correct, in his observation, or that the percentages of working classes and middle classes are not as definitive as they appear on Table 2. Probably the more accurate answer lies in a combination of both.

III

Although the denominational comparison of morning and evening worshippers does not shed any conclusive light on the attractiveness of particular dissenting groups to the working classes, the city directories proved more insightful. City directories are a valuable source in identifying social status within the community. An entry in the city directory was based upon written solicitation of all Borough households. Response to these mailed questionnaires was provided by the head of household who gave occupational
TABLE 2
PERCENTAGES OF MIDDLE AND WORKING CLASSES
BY DENOMINATION WITH ATTENDANCE AND SITTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATIONS</th>
<th>% OF WORKING CLASS</th>
<th>% OF MIDDLE CLASS</th>
<th>% OF APPROPRIATED SITTINGS</th>
<th>% OF ATTENDANCE MORNING</th>
<th>% OF ATTENDANCE EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODISTS</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMONS</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is undoubtedly an overlap in attendance for many of the worshippers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>LISTED</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GENTLEMAN/MR</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORNON</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** The 1843, 1845, 1847, 1849, 1851, and 1853 City Directories for the Township and Borough of Leeds. For a more complete citation refer to the Bibliography.
information, business and home address, and, possibly, social status. It was more likely that an educated businessman or a family with a social status to maintain, would find the directory most beneficial. A quarryman, would undoubtedly see little need to have his name and occupation listed, whereas a grocer or woollen merchant might find the city directory a significant source for advertising his business or trade.

The information revealed by the city directories was rather consistent with the occupational profile (provided on Table 1.A and 1.B), as well as the tentative class breakdown based upon that occupational profile (See Table 3). As was expected, the Unitarians, Independents, and the Friends, exhibited a very high percentage of city directory listings. Surprising, however, was the relatively high percentage of entries for the Wesleyan Methodists, the Methodist New Connexion, and the Mormons. This suggests that a higher proportion of the working classes was represented in the directory than expected, that there were some definitional problems with the occupational profile and its subsequent translation into class structure, or that there was a striving for a higher social status among members of the predominantly working class denominations. If this latter observation were true, it would be expected that the Mormons with 91 percent working class membership and
one-third of its members listed in the city directories, might reveal city directory occupational entries in working class occupational categories, other than the artisan category. In reality, however, eight of the eleven men listed exhibited occupations in either the artisan or shopkeeper categories, with one professional, and another a manufacturer. Only one individual could be classified as a labourer, with the occupation of railway porter. The Methodist New Connexion also showed seven of ten men listed in the city directories as artisans or shopkeepers: a profile markedly similar to the Mormons. The distribution was apparently due, in part, to the sample size.

The higher social statuses, represented by the rank of gentleman, were more common among the Unitarians and the Friends than any other denominations. The Independents exhibited a smaller percentage of gentlemen than expected, with 5.4 percent.

IV

Horace Mann repeatedly lamented the paucity of labouring class worshippers at churches and chapels, but particular Nonconformist denominations enjoyed much greater success than others in reaching the labouring population who were involved in religious worship. The Mormons, the Primitive Methodists, the Baptists and the Methodist New Connexion experienced considerable success within this
apparently religiously apathetic group. Contemporaries attempted to explain why the labouring classes did not normally attend religious worship, as well as why particular classes might be more attracted to one religion than another.

One of the most common impediments to the attendance of a poorer man at religious worship was the practice of pew rents. Horace Mann, the compiler of the *1851 Census of Religious Worship*, contended that the practice of pew rents served to exacerbate the already difficult problem in England of class distinctions.

Working men, it is contended, cannot enter our religious structures without having pressed upon their notice some memento of inferiority. The existence of pews and the position of the free seats are, it is said, alone sufficient to deter them from our churches; and religion has thus come to be regarded as a purely middle-class propriety or luxury.9

Edward Miall, a contemporary critic of the Established Church and the influential editor of the journal the *Nonconformist*, also had strong views upon this same subject:

Here in Great Britain, we carry our class distinctions into the house of God, whether the edifice be a splendid monument of art, or whether it be nothing superior to a barn. The poor man is made to feel that he is a poor man, the rich is reminded that he is rich, in the great majority of our chapels. The square pew, carpeted, perhaps, and curtained, the graduated scale of other pews, the free sittings, if there are any, keep up the

---

separation between class and class. Edward Miall's journal invited working men, in 1848, to write letters on "The Working Classes and Religious Institutions". The majority of the respondents denounced the social distinctions which permeated from the secular world into the religious world. They especially commented on "the almost total want of sympathy manifested by the ministers of religion of every denomination with the privations, wants, and wastes of the working classes." Pew rents versus free sittings was a contemporary issue that divided worshippers along class lines. It would seem obvious that those chapels which had the highest percentage of free sittings would also show the highest percentage of the working classes as worshippers. At first glance this hypothesis would appear logical and consistent. The Mormons' 240 seats, at their South Market place of worship, were free, and the Mormons demonstrated the highest labouring population, 91.2 percent. The clarity of this observation becomes a little muddied, however, when one considers the Society of Friends, whose Meeting House on Water Lane was only about 500 feet away from that of the Mormons. The Friends had the lowest percent of labouring


population, 36.3, but all of their 1100 seats were free (See Table 2). The free seats, in the Friends' plain chapels, were provided because doctrine dictated it. According to George Fox, if all people were to receive salvation by grace, without money or price then both tithes and appropriated sittings were at odds with God's doctrine.12 The plainness of their meeting houses can also be explained on theological grounds. Perhaps one of Fox's most quoted tenets of faith was that "God ... did not dwell in temples made with hands."13 Indeed he expanded on this idea to indicate

the Church was ... made up of living stones, living members, a spiritual household which Christ was the head of, but he was not the head of an old house made up of lime, stones, and wood.14

Although contemporaries were undoubtedly correct that class distinctions carried into the houses of worship, a clear picture does not emerge from the denominations.

Not knowing specifically how each of the Nonconformist chapels was physically organized creates an additional problem in the interpretation of free versus appropriated sittings and its impact on the poor man. Perhaps some of the chapels were laid out in the way that Miall described,

13Ibid., p. 8.
14Ibid., p. 24.
but certainly some were not. The Mormons, at this time, worshipped in a rented facility at the South Market Complex, a building which was not designed for chapel use and which presented, therefore, no hierarchical seating distinctions. Approximately three years prior to the Census, the Mormons were meeting in John Barnes' working class cottage on Shannon Row. The Friends, for theological reasons entertained no seating distinctions either. However, it is difficult to know whether any of the other denominations were so organized.

Charles Elliott's study, "The Social and Economic History of the Principal Protestant Denominations in Leeds, 1760-1844," examined the approach of the Church of England, the Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists and the Unitarians, to the problems of economic reorganization during the early period of the Industrial Revolution. He answered the question posed above by analyzing briefly the impact of pew rents on the different denominations. He concluded that differences in pew rents existed between the denominations.\(^{15}\) However, the prevailing opinion was that the poor abandoned the Established Church for Dissent because the nonconformist attitude towards the poor was less offensive.

Wesleyanism originally was very sensitive to the needs of its poorer members and, although free seats were not always available, cheap seats were obtainable. In the Old Chapel, for example, eight pence gave access to a pew for six months, and this same pew rent existed in the out-townships. Apparently, all but the most destitute preferred paying something to nothing when the chapel had partially appropriated sittings. This cheap seat practice did not prevail, however, when the giant chapels were built. At the Oxford Place Chapel, there was no seat under 2s. 6d. per six months, whereas most of the seats were at least 6s. 6d.

Among the Baptists and the Independents, Elliott claimed that there were "good grounds" for assuming that the Nonconformist Chapels sittings were cheaper than the Anglican, but at the larger, prestigious chapels, such as Queen St., East Parade and South Parade, the differences were negligible. A member of the South Parade Baptist church in fact even went so far as to express "her respect for the Pastor and people", but was unable to attend the chapel because of her poverty.\textsuperscript{16}

The Pew Register for the Mill Hill Unitarian Chapel also suggests that the poor were not regular renters. The Register includes twenty wool merchants, three gentle-

\textsuperscript{16}Deacons Minute Book, 1844, Quoted in Elliott, p. 147.
men, three accountants, three solicitors, three commission agents, one Consul (American), one bookseller, two engineers, and many others with a similar social status. Although Elliott admits that there may be some distortion of the social composition in his study, because he used barely half of the list, it appears that the price of Unitarianism was high.17

Elliott's observations lend credibility to the arguments that pew rentals did indeed carry class distinctions into the chapels as well and the churches. The anomaly between the middle-class nature of Unitarianism with its 44 percent appropriated sittings, and the working-class Baptists with 71 percent seat appropriation, cannot readily be explained alone by the socially divisive practice of pew rents. Other factors within the organizations must be considered.

V

An intriguing denominational polity centered around the concept of lay participation. To what degree were men permitted to contribute time, money, and energy to their chapel? Were there differences between the chapels in the extent of lay-ministry? If differences in lay-ministry participation existed were they related to the suggestion in

17Ibid., pp. 103-253.
Chapter I that the lower the occupational status, the more likely it was that an individual would be attracted to those chapels which permitted him the greatest participation? The answers to these questions have potential for supporting or refuting the statement of the Secretary of the London Diocesan Church Building Society made before a House of Lords Select Committee in 1857 in which he said that in a chapel community a shopkeeper or an artisan might be "looked upon as somebody, whether in the capacity of deacon, visitor, tract distributor or as the holder of some office."18

The poor, according to Horace Mann, harbored unfortunate suspicions regarding the indifference and even hostility of the ministers. Engels asserted that the cry of "He's a parson" was enough to drive a clergyman from the speaker's platform of a public meeting.19 Mann contended that the use of lay-agency might have helped to allay these fears, because the message of Christianity would be discussed by individuals in the same socio-economic circumstances. He pointed to the success of Wesley and Whitfield, and to the Mormons' considerable success among the labouring


population to show that the masses were not totally inacces-
sible to religious feelings. Which of the denominations
then permitted the greatest participation?

The Society of Friends and the Mormons had the
greatest degree of lay participation, although their
membership were on the opposite ends of the social scale:
the Friends were 63.7 percent middle class and the Mormons
were 9 percent. Both of these organizations, however, had
lay ministries. The difference in social composition
between the two denominations may be accounted for in part
by the introverted habits of the Friends compared with the
extroverted programs of the Mormons. The Friends, for
example, excommunicated members on the basis of marriage
outside the fold, and they avoided evangelical missionary
activities. Without the infusion of new blood, the Friends
exhibited patterns of upward social drift as its members
practiced their self improvement principles. This account-
ed, in part, for the higher socio-economic status of its
membership. The Mormons, on the other hand, were totally
committed to the lay missionary ideal, which brought a
continual flow of new members. Of course the Mormons, as a
new sect, introduced in England in 1837, had not been in
existence long enough to experience any upward social
drift.

201851 Census of Great Britain Report and Tables on
Religious Worship, p. clx, clxii.
The life blood of the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion was the class leader. Each week these Christian laymen would meet with a class of about twelve students to hear statements of their spiritual attainments and to give counsel. The further use of lay or "local" preachers, who followed secular callings and preached on the Sabbath at appointed places, gave an added dimension to the Wesleyan movement. These lay preachers were not permitted to accept payment for their services. The practice of love feasts, where all could participate in an outpouring of religious sentiment, provided another avenue generally denied the members of the Established Church.

The Primitive Methodists, by far the largest of the splinter groups of the Wesleyan Methodists, were organized in 1811. While in doctrine the "Ranters" were Wesleyan, in practice they were closer to the Mormons in their proselyting techniques. They conducted not only camp meetings, but street meetings, and were what Chadwick called "simple street revivalists of the open air." They carried the practice of church participation further than the Wesleyans, and this may account for their strong appeal to the working classes.


22. Chadwick, p. 386.
The Methodist New Connexion was founded in 1797 in Leeds over the question of the right of the laity to participate in the secular and the spiritual government of the denomination. The doctrine of the denomination had not strayed from its Wesleyan origins, but the degree of participation was challenged and extended beyond the Wesleyan Connexion.23

The participatory nature of the Mormon laity went far beyond that suggested by the Secretary of the London Diocesan Society. First of all, the male members of the denomination were ordained to hold various offices within a priesthood organization: offices such as deacon, teacher, priest, elder or high priest. Each of these offices called forth certain responsibilities. In addition, men such as John Barnes, a shoemaker; William Shires, a wool dyer; James Emsley, a tobacco pipe maker; were given responsibility as heads of their local organization, called branches. They made appointments, such as missionary assignments, speakers for meetings, individuals to head various aspects of the organization. They also had responsibility as disciplinarians and watchdogs of their flock. These men, who held secular jobs, as well as extensive ecclesiastical positions within the organization, were often expected to attend to heavy evangelical missionary activities. The

Mormon membership showed commitment to their cause by relatively heavy financial contributions.24

The influence of the minister, as opposed to the laity, was much greater in such Nonconformist denominations as the Independents, the Baptists, and the Unitarians. The Baptist ministers, it was lamented, were generally poorly educated and poorer than the Independent ministers, who represented primarily the diversity of the middle classes. The Unitarians were expected to be wealthy and carry on the aristocratic heritage of Presbyterianism. Being a Unitarian minister carried with it the presumption of gentility.25 As noted in the Christian Reformer in 1840,

It is expected that the minister shall have the education, manners, habits and appearance of a gentleman; that he shall do honour to the pulpit he is invited to fill by the efforts of mind he may call into exercise, that he shall be fit society for the best educated and most refined of the members of his congregation and of their wives and daughters and that he shall reflect credit upon their selection of him by the ability he may display at public meetings of their body.26

Both denominations, however, permitted a limited lay participation as trustees or, perhaps teachers.

24 Council Minutes of the Leeds Branch, Leeds Conference 1859-1875, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Historical Department, Salt Lake City, Utah; Charles Miller, "Missionary Diaries and other Writings of Charles D. Miller," typescript, Brigham Young University Library, Provo, Utah.

25 Elliott, pp. 413-420.

26 Christian Reformer, 1840, p. 471, Quoted in Elliott, p. 417.
The argument for a higher percentage of middle class membership in these two denominations stems from the more educated status of the ministry, which tended to attract to it a more educated congregation. Perhaps this reveals a different type of lay participation than that evidenced in Methodism and Mormonism. Amongst the Independents it was argued that the poor could not come to chapel when the sermons were aimed above their heads.

When young R. W. Dale (1855) attacked the theology of original depravity in the chapel of Carr's Lane, Birmingham, he used language which in no way brought the difficulty down to easy understanding; and if the same sermons had been preached in an Anglican or Roman Catholic or a Methodist place of worship, we can imagine a contemplative doze afflicting pew or bench. Yet at Carr's Lane, we are told, excitement deepened into alarm, and alarm rose to the height of a panic. The congregation was like one great Bible class; there was a Bible open in almost every hand. Wave upon wave of emotion rolled through the congregation as the preacher developed his theme. This is a sign both of education and of that lay responsibility which is the raison d'être of a Congregational polity.27

The Sunday School movement was also strong in Leeds and provided opportunities for lay participation among the dissenting denominations. W. B. Stephens notes that there were thirty-six Church schools in Leeds Borough in 1851, with a student body of 7,000. In fact Leeds, with a tradition of Dissent, had a higher proportion of its population at church schools in 1851 than Bristol, Bradford, and...
Hull, Newcastle, London, Liverpool, Manchester, or Birmingham. In Leeds township, according to the 1851 Census of Education, Sunday schools were operated by the Independents (six), Baptists (five), Society of Friends (one), Unitarians (one), Wesleyan Methodists (eleven), Methodist New Connexion (three), and Primitive Methodists (one).

A final question must be asked regarding the analysis of the different occupational and social structures of the Nonconformist Denominations. To what degree did the different denominations provide a social orientation for their membership, or in what sense were the chapels social communities for their members? Hugh McLeod contends that the diaries speak often about sermons, music, and awe-inspiring cathedrals, but never about community. He adds,

For the poor, churches were sources of money, for the middle class they were social centres; but for the upper class they were places of worship first and last. Their community already existed in the form of the branch of Society to which they belonged; moreover life in Society permitted local ties only in the form of patronage.


If McLeod is referring to churches such as the Church of England he is perhaps correct. But the evidence here suggests that among the working classes, as well as the middle classes, there was considerable community cohesion. Charles Elliott sees, at least in the Baptists, an extremely strong case for community. He believes that the "formal and formidable token of membership" in the form of baptism by immersion as a converted adult welds Baptists into a cohesive community causing particular social classes to pale in comparison.31

VI

There was a strong sense of community extant in most of the Nonconformist denominations. An 1813 observer of Methodism angrily pointed out that Methodists considered themselves to be a chosen and separate people. They went so far as to call themselves "the elect", or "the people of God", whereas the rest of the people were "the people of the world". He further observed that everything they had must be exclusive, from their chapels, to their schools, their own magazine, their own Bible, and even their own mad-houses.32

The same spiritual and community exclusiveness could have been leveled at the Mormons, who from their

31Elliott, p. 500.

inception have referred to themselves as "a peculiar people", and who also possessed their own scriptures, The Book of Mormon, and their own magazine in England, The Millennial Star. It is hard to imagine a greater sense of commitment to community and to the organization, than that exhibited by the working class men of the Mormon Church. In addition, the membership of this chapel also came together in social functions, especially tea parties, which were well attended.33

The belief in baptism by immersion, of the Baptists and the Mormons, did seem to provide an added sense of community. The form and importance of baptism was the first thing Robert Spurr noticed about the Baptists. The Mormons took this tangible baptismal covenant further, however, by implementing it repetitiously as a continuing ideal of commitment. Repeatedly the early Mormons submitted to rebaptism into the Kingdom of God. Their membership records reveal this, as do the diaries and the Council Minutes already referred to. Surely the concept of being baptized into the Kingdom of God and recommitting oneself to that community was a rather "formidable token", as Elliott suggested.

The willingness to sacrifice time and even dignity

to the cause of ones' community was equally reflected in the missionary activities of the Primitive Methodists and the Mormons. Owen Chadwick eloquently tells the story of Thomas Russell, a young Primitive, who attempted to evangelise Wantage in Berkshire:

Thomas Russell, evangelised Wantage, and was bruised with stones, his clothes torn in rags, his body coated in slime and mud and stinking eggs. He washed the clothes in a canal and went to Farringdon, washed his clothes in a pond and went to Shrivenham, washed his clothes in a brook and preached a fourth sermon, this time encountering nothing but a stone which cut his lip. That day he walked thirty-five miles, preached four sermons, was three times stinking with eggs and filth.34

The dedication of Mormon missionaries can be illustrated through Charles Miller whose journal provided a constant and daily record of travel, preaching, counsel with members, and the continual commitment of the members of this community to house and feed him.35 William Clayton of Manchester in his diaries also revealed how he gave himself wholly to the work as he traveled without "purse or scrip", and how committed the members of the Mormon Church were, who, although not necessarily well off, fed and housed him to the best of their abilities.36

34 Chadwick, p. 389.
35 Miller, "Missionary Diaries and Other Writings".
The Methodists, Baptists, and Mormons had similar feelings about their communities, and they were strongly committed to their beliefs and ideals. Perhaps Robert Spurr stated it well for all of these groups: "I went along with them, hoping to be in heaven with them."37 The evidence suggests that these people, who had received very little from their worldly circumstances, had finally found a home—a place to belong.

The Friends, Independents, and Unitarians, social structure was on a somewhat different level than those denominations discussed above. Was there then the same sense of commitment to a community? There was certainly a closeness between the Friends which extended into their extensive businesses. Joseph Kitching and William Marshall, both share brokers and members of the Society of Friends, had offices next door to each other at 1 and 2 Change Court, Leeds. George Mason and William Dyson, were better examples, sharing partnership in the milling business of Dyson and Mason, prosperous corn millers and flour dealers of Wellington Street. This closeness stemmed mostly from the sea of "peculiarities" which walled the Friends off from the rest of the world. They believed in simplicity of religion above all else, and this constrained them against tithe for the Established Church, paid ministers, and all fixed

37Spurr, p. 284.
ceremonies. They refused to call the names of the days of the week or months of the year by their familiar names because they were given in honour of false gods, so that Sunday became First Day and July was Seventh Month.\textsuperscript{38} Mann indicated that the Friends came to realize gradually that salvation lay only in what their lives typified.\textsuperscript{39} These beliefs, along with their practice of excommunicating members who married outside their community, suggest strongly that the Friends existed as a socially cohesive community.

The Independents, on the other hand, experienced less separateness than the Friends exhibited. However, their belief that a Christian church consisted of a congregation of true believers, set them apart as a community. Not only must this community of true believers openly profess its faith, but it also must change its "disposition and demeanor". The membership existed in a democratic society, where decisions of acceptance and rejection of new members resided with each member of the community, and not solely with its officers.\textsuperscript{40} This type of chapel polity extended a sense of control over its community.

\textsuperscript{38} Chadwick, p. 421.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{1851 Census of Great Britain Report and Tables on Religious Worship}, p. lxiii.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. li.
that did not exist within the Established Church. Perhaps there was less need for a strongly cohesive social organization among the Independents because at least part of the Independents enjoyed social standing in the community.

The Unitarians also enjoyed more social status than the Mormons, Methodists, or Baptists, and had less need to form themselves into a socially cohesive community. Certainly some of them enjoyed a measure of social acceptance, based upon their middle-class status. But equally certain, their somewhat "arid" religious doctrines did not lend themselves to emotionalism and commitment, but rather to intellectual argument. In fact, Chadwick contends that the Unitarians were more prone to admit "they did not know". It would not appear to be a religion to attract a "congregation of true believers", or a "peculiar" and "elect" people. It would seem more likely to attract people who were seeking discussion rather than definitive doctrine, but who willingly "gathered" into a relatively cohesive body to do so.

Despite the differences between the Dissenting Denominations as to the socio-economic status of their memberships, it is evident that within the chapel community there was cohesion. All aspects of a member's life were involved in his commitment to his membership, whether it

41 Chadwick, p. 396, 391.
had to do with dress or behavior. Alan Gilbert stated this idea best when he declared

Baptism in infancy made a man an Anglican, but becoming a Methodist, a Congregationalist, or a Baptist, involved thorough integration into a 'gathered' church.42

Although the social structure categories Owen Chadwick assigned to the various Nonconformist denominations appear to be accurate, there is some blurring within the denominations. For example, the Independents were the houses of worship for the upper middle classes in many instances, but it is not true that there were only a few working class members within the denomination in Leeds.

Nor does there seem to be a direct correlation between greater church involvement and lower occupational status. The Mormons with a completely lay ministry exhibited the highest working class population. The Friends, with the highest middle class membership, also conducted their meetings under a lay ministry.

The hypothesis that the Old Dissent, represented by the Independents, Unitarians, Baptists and the Friends showed similar social composition patterns is only partially true. In all cases the Baptists, with a very low middle class representation, skewed the cohesiveness of this group of denominations. The Baptists fit more closely with New Dissent than with Old Dissent. Of course, within Leeds,

42Gilbert, p. 87.
there was a unique occupational pattern among the Baptists as a large part of its membership was taken from the Bramley Zion Baptist Church, many of whose members were downtrodden handloom weavers.
CHAPTER III

THE CHAPEL GOERS OF LEEDS: RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS

The most important social effect of urbanization was segregation by class.¹ As labourers were lured to the large cities by the hope of economic betterment, the city's population mushroomed and the residential patterns became more differentiated. A working class labourer, the Robert Spurrs of the large towns, was tied closely to both work and home, because his hours of work were long, public transport was limited, and casual labour was frequent.² In addition, those who were better educated and wealthier removed themselves from the disagreeableness of the inner city. Unlike the labourer, the well-to-do tradesman or industrialist did not have to live near his work and it was this fact which exacerbated the isolation of class to class.³ Perkin, paints a picture of town functions localized into concentric


rings which, although carried to the extreme, presents an accurate picture of the social segregation:

shops and offices in the centre, factories and poorest working-class homes hard by, artisans' and poor clerks' houses somewhat further out, middle-class homes in the inner suburbs, merchants', industrialists' and higher professional men's villas in the outer ring, or when the railways came, in detached satellite suburbs strung along the railway lines.4

I

Leeds was no exception to this general pattern, although opinions differ as to the extent of the differentiation. J. F. C. Harrison sees the working classes living in well defined areas of Leeds township, in the North, North East, and Kirkgate wards, in the township of Leeds, along with the out-townships of Holbeck and Hunslet. The middle classes were more pleasantly located in the Mill Hill, West, and North West wards. He sees this social segregation far advanced during the early Victorian era, with the differences of dress, and speech further accentuated by physical isolation.5 David Ward agrees with Harrison that residential segregation was a commonplace of mid-nineteenth century Leeds, but he sees the segregation as more weakly differentiated. He arrives at this conclusion after studying the

---

4Perkin, p. 118.
extent of the middle-class evident in what contemporaries and other historians have traditionally designated working-class only areas.6

The most important contemporary account of social segregation was that of Robert Baker, a Leeds physician, surgeon to the Poor Law Commission, and later factory inspector. In 1833 Baker prepared an initial report of Leeds cholera cases for the Leeds Board of Health. This report contained a map which portrayed, perhaps for the first time, a concept of social geography.7 Later he elaborated on this theme in his Leeds local report which became a part of Owen Chadwick's monumental work, Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population. Baker concluded that the greatest instance of cholera was in the working-class areas of the eastern portions of the city, whereas the West and the Northwest were relatively immune.8

Baker also devised an intriguing scheme to determine the number of working class population in each of the wards in the township of Leeds. He arrived at his totals based upon a census ratio of 4 1/2 people to a house which he then


combined with the number of houses under £10 annual rent. The housing valuation was conducted in the town between 1838 and 1839. Although this was thirteen years earlier than the period in question, the increase in population was no doubt distributed in similar proportions.\(^9\) The last column of Table 4 below was added to provide, at a glance, the proportion of working class in a ward. Baker also provided information on population density by ward and township (See Table 5) which serves to show distinct differences between the townships.

Derek Fraser provides the information found on Table 6, which tends to corroborate the idea of a spatially differentiated population within the township of Leeds and some of its out-townships. There are minor differences noted among Fraser, Baker and Harrison's categorizations (i.e., Kirkgate appears to have a higher socio-economic base under Fraser and Baker's categories than it does under Harrison). Harrison places Kirkgate as a working-class neighbourhood, which disagrees with Fraser and Baker's assumption. The discrepancy may center around the use of rents as the main criteria for determining working class status. Probably the rents in Kirkgate were substantially affected by its location at the heart of the city where many businesses were found. Business property often elevates

\(^9\)Ibid., p. 993.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARDS</th>
<th>POPULATION OF THE WARD</th>
<th>DWELLINGS UNDER 8½ ANNUAL RENT</th>
<th>POPULATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES AT 4½ TO A HOUSE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF THE WORKING CLASS AT 4½ TO A HOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>12,506</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST</td>
<td>15,269</td>
<td>3,422</td>
<td>15,399</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>14,271</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>5,638</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKSGATE</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILL HILL</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>15,483</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH WEST</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>82,120</td>
<td>13,603</td>
<td>61,212</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
POPLATION DENSITY FOR THE
BOROUGH OF LEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUT-TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>AREA IN ACRES</th>
<th>INHABITED HOUSES</th>
<th>POPUL. 1851</th>
<th>1851 POPUL. TO A HOUSE PER ACRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farnley</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Newton</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Town</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeston</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>6,105</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armley</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortley</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>7,896</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbeck</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>14,152</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEEDS PROPER**

| NORTH-WEST WARD | 538 | 2,693 | 12,270 | 4.5 | 22.8 |
| EAST WARD       | 657 | 3,781 | 17,421 | 4.6 | 26.5 |
| WEST WARD       | 560 | 4,231 | 20,176 | 5.0 | 36.0 |
| NORTH-EAST WARD | 541 | 4,564 | 21,301 | 4.6 | 38.0 |
| MILL HILL WARD  | 127 | 969   | 5,414  | 5.5 | 42.7 |
| SOUTH WARD      | 123 | 1,363 | 6,677  | 4.9 | 54.2 |
| KIRKSGATE WARD  | 31  | 632   | 3,337  | 5.3 | 107.6 |
| NORTH WARD      | 92  | 2,828 | 14,454 | 5.1 | 157.1 |

**LEEDS PROPER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2,672</th>
<th>21,061</th>
<th>101,050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OUT-TOWNSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17,121</th>
<th>15,059</th>
<th>70,680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MILITARY**

| 19,790 | 36,120 | 171,730 |

| 293 |

### TABLE 6
**ECONOMIC STATUS OF LEEDS WARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEEDS TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>RENTS</th>
<th>% Of Houses Over 10 Pounds p.a.</th>
<th>% of Houses Under 5 Pounds p.a.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEEDS BOROUGH</th>
<th>AVERAGE PER CAPITA</th>
<th>Poor Rate Payable 1840 Shilling</th>
<th>Rate Value 1841 Pounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkgate</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headingley</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremley</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunslet</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbeck</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEEDS BOROUGH** Average per capita rateable value in pounds 1841

| Mill Hill | 11.94 | North West | 2.78 |
| Kirkgate | 7.52  | North      | 2.24 |
| Headingley | 6.27 | Hunslet    | 2.23 |
| South    | 3.82  | Holbeck    | 2.11 |
| West     | 3.67  | East       | 1.83 |
| Bramley  | 2.82  | North East | 1.40 |

rents. Although there is reason to agree with Harrison that Kirkgate was more of a working class area than the rents would suggest, Chapter IV corroborates Fraser and Baker's assumptions. This conclusion was reached after reviewing the type of housing found on the 1850 Ordnance Survey five foot plans for the Leeds, Holbeck and Hunslet townships.

Another means of determining contrasting standards of living between the eight wards of Leeds township is to look at the differences in mortality rates among the wards. The consequences of living in certain wards becomes obvious as Baker's figures and analysis of the death rates are reviewed. Area No. 1, which includes the North and North East Wards revealed a death rate of 43.5/1000; Area No. 2, which contains the East, South, and Kirkgate Wards, had a death rate of 33.3/1000; and area No. 3, the predominantly middle class wards of Mill Hill, West and North West, showed a death rate of 27.8/1000. The death rate of 43.5/1000 was approximately twice the national average (21.6/1000 in 1841).


II

It was determined in Chapter II that there were both economic differences and social status variances among the denominations. The Independents, Friends and Unitarians, revealed patterns of a higher economic base and more middle-class social status than the other denominations. Whereas the Baptists, Wesleyan Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodists, and the Mormons disclosed, in varying degrees, a more working-class economic base and little or no social status. It is assumed that this same pattern will persist when the residential arrangement of the denominations are examined.

Table 7 displays the number of heads of households for a particular denomination who were living in one of the eight wards of the township of Leeds or one of the ten out-townships of the borough of Leeds. Although the numbers and their corresponding percentages are interesting, they are not significant until like wards and townships are grouped together. For example, the Leeds township wards of Mill Hill, West and North West, were generally considered to be the enclave of the middle-classes. Based upon the occupational study in Chapter II, it was expected that the Unitarians, Independents, and the Friends would have the highest percentage of their members living in these three wards. This expectation proved to be true with 35 percent of the Unitarians, 38.7 percent of the Independents, and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>UNITARIAN</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>BAPTIST FRIENDS</th>
<th>WESLEYAN</th>
<th>METHODIST</th>
<th>METHODIST NEW</th>
<th>PRIMITIVE</th>
<th>MORMON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILL HILL</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK GATE</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH EAST</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEADINGLEY</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL ALLERTON</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTTERNEWTON</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMLEY</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARLEY</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTLEY</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEESTON</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAMLEY</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLBECK</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNSLET</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBERS</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(196)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40.9 percent of the Friends.

It was also expected that the Mormons and the Primitive Methodists would have the smallest percentages of their families living in these wards. This expectation also proved to be true, with only 8.8 percent of the Mormons, and 9.7 percent of the Primitive Methodists residing in these three wards. If one adds three of the wealthier out-townships of Headingley, Chapel Allerton, and Potternewton, the picture emerges more clearly. The middle-class composition of the Unitarians, Independents, and the Friends, is further strengthened, with 45 percent, 45.2 percent, and 59.2 percent, respectively, living in these areas. The essentially working class nature of the Primitive Methodists and the Mormons is also reemphasised with 13 percent and 11.7 percent member residents in these relatively middle-class or even wealthy areas.

If the denominational membership from the traditionally working-class areas of the East and North East wards, along with the townships of Holbeck and Hunslet are combined, the percentage of members for the Mormons, Independents, and Friends are as expected. The Mormons show 70.5 percent of their membership living in these areas, whereas the Independents had only 15.2 percent and the Friends, 22.7 percent. The low percentage for the essentially working class Primitive Methodists is surprising until one recognizes that 61.3 percent of the membership
drawn for this study resided in the working class out-townships of Armley and Wortley. The Baptists show a similar pattern with almost 69 percent of the membership living in the out-township of Bramley, a depressed township, heavily dependent on handloom weaving. As expected from the occupational analysis, the Unitarians show an equal proportion of their membership residing in middle-class and working-class areas.

These denominational statistics represent a general and crude touchstone for the measurement of social status by residence. A more refined measurement is an examination of the type of housing found by ward and township within the Leeds Borough.

III

An advertisement in the Leeds Mercury in 1799 described the estate known as Springfield House. This villa was located about 200 feet away from another estate very similar in size, called Springfield Lodge, owned by Newman Cash, a prominent woollen merchant and member of the Society of Friends. The description of the villa to be sold at auction illustrates the wealthy end of the Dissenting membership.

A newly erected Mansion-House with every requisite Outbuilding, and also an excellent Garden with a Wall Four Yards high, in which there is a large Basin well supplied with fine Water, and which Garden, and an Orchard adjoining, are stocked with the choicest Fruit Trees together with two
pleasant Dwelling-Houses, and a large well-built Warehouse Twenty-seven Yards by Twelve properly divided, for Dressing, Packing-Shops etc. . . . The Estate commands a most extensive and delightful View over the Town and the adjoining Country. The House consists on the Ground Floor of a Dining Room (26 ft. by 28) - Drawing Room (22 ft by 18) - and Kitchen fitted up with Stoves (24 ft by 18) (and all 12 1/2 ft high) together with a Store Room (18 ft by 12), Back Kitchen, Pantry, and Brewhouse . . . There are Nine spacious and airy Lodging-Rooms with commodious Dressing-Rooms, and Water conveyed into a Closet for the use of the Rooms; and the House is well supplied with hard and fast Water. The Estate has Right of Common upon Woodhouse Moor, and is very valuable for building upon.12

Although this description was written 50 years before the time under study, there is little question from a perusal of the large scale Ordnance Survey maps of 1850 that Springfield House and Springfield Lodge were still lovely areas within Leeds. But this description of opulence is in sharp contrast to the more common depiction of the working man's cottages found in contemporary writings. The working man's cottage was the traditional "one up, one down", with one room on the ground floor and one above: a room only about five yards square, and about four yards high.

Robert Baker once again provides the most poignant description of one of these poorman's cottages. Thomas Rooley and his wife, both about 66 years old, lived in such

a cottage. He was formerly a soap boiler, but was not working because of ill health. Thomas, his wife, and their unemployed son, survived on his wife's wages and parish relief, which amounted to about 2s 6d. a week. The family had lived in their cottage for about a year, and both Thomas and his wife had very poor health. The yard had not been dry since he and his wife moved in. Although the landlord made a sumphole, at great depth, in one corner, it is full to capacity of deposit. The stench is often so bad, and especially after rain, that he and his wife cannot bear it. The fire-place of his house has a small place under it for ashes, but he has been forced to remove the grate and put down an oven-plate to cover it with, in consequence of the stench coming under the house and making its way up the grate. Last week, in consequence of much rain, he would have been up to the knees in wet but for bailing the water out and throwing it over the wall. He worked five hours at it. Last winter, when the thaw was, he had water in the house for some days. The necessary above drains into this water through the partition wall, and adds to its offensiveness. Then there are suds and dirty water also which are forced to be added to it, for there is no drain nor means of throwing them elsewhere.\(^{13}\)

These two extremes of prosperity versus poverty in living conditions are also represented in the housing categories used in Table 8. The back-to-back cottage was the most common in Leeds for the working classes. These were the "one up, one downs" with no ventilation, because the cottage was surrounded on three sides by other cottages

### TABLE 8

**DENOMINATION BY TYPE OF HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATIONS</th>
<th>BACK-TO-BACK (1)</th>
<th>TERRACED NO GARDENS (2)</th>
<th>TERRACED WITH GARDENS (3)</th>
<th>SEPARATE DWELLING SURROUNDED BY GARDENS (4)</th>
<th>ESTATE (5)</th>
<th>UNDEFINED (6)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>24.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.99%</td>
<td>41.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>28.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL %</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.96%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Great Britain. Ordnance Survey of Leeds (5 feet to a mile, 25 sheets) Southampton, 1850.
and shared walls. The first such cottages were constructed as early as the 1750s, as the old yards and courts of Briggate, Kirkgate, and the Headrow were lined with these five yard cottages. The only difference between these early back-to-backs was their irregular and haphazard appearance compared to the newer variety of the 1800s which were always built, symmetrically and monotonously, in straight lines.14

The next type of housing was the terraced house, which was simply a row house. The terraced house with gardens generally appeared on the maps with a front yard, sometimes small, but often long and narrow. The yard served to insulate the house and its inhabitants from the street. John Peele Clapham, the Treasurer of the County Court, an Independent, lived on Hanover Street in the West Ward, where his terraced home displayed a substantial front garden. By 1853, Clapham was listed in the city directories as a gentleman and he had removed to Hanover Square, a short distance away, which was a more opulent abode. Thomas Young, a Mormon and an Inland Revenue Officer, lived with his wife, Harriett, and five children on Byron Street, North Ward. This terraced home with gardens, was not as grand as John Peele's, because the garden was in the back of the house, and contained what appears to be a privy.

Joseph Kitching, a Friend and well-to-do sharebroker, lived in a relatively opulent home on St. Mark's Place, Woodhouse, in the North West Ward. The home was a separate dwelling surrounded by gardens, but not up to the estate category represented by Newman Cash at Springfield Lodge, or Edward Baines' estate at Hanover Square.

Many of the houses had to be described as "Undefined" on Table 8. This was necessitated by the lack of street numbers on the 1850 Ordnance Survey five-foot maps. In some cases because the street was comprised of back-to-backs and terraced housing it was impossible to tell which one represented a particular address.

Table 8 demonstrates the incidence of types of housing by denomination. It is evident immediately that the number of families represented by each dissenting denomination is considerably less than the original sample. This diminution occurs because the Ordnance Survey maps used covered only the townships of Leeds, Holbeck and Hunslet. Also the numbers are diminished because it was not possible to find every address on the 25 indexed sheets.

The first thing that is apparent is the high percentage of back-to-backs among all the denominations, except the Friends. This is not surprising because a large part of Leeds was built with this type of housing. The middle class pattern persists for the Friends and the
Independents as one looks at the percentage of back-to-backs. But there is no question again that the Friends were the most affluent of the Nonconformist denominations. What is surprising, however, is that the Mormons, the most pronounced working-class group, had only 52.94 percent living in back-to-back housing.

An examination of the percentage of the residences actually found for each of the Dissenting denominations, provides an interesting aside to the type of housing in which they lived. For example, of the Mormons only 32 of the 34 from the original sample lived outside of Leeds, Holbeck or Hunslet, and yet it was only possible to find 17 of the addresses, approximately 53 percent. The remaining denominations showed a much higher rate of success, which suggests that perhaps the Mormons lived on rather obscure streets, courts or yards in some of the poorer sections of town. The Baptists and the Primitive Methodists were found at a rate of 66.66 percent; the Wesleyan Methodists at 70.73 percent; the Unitarians and the Friends at 76.4 percent; the Independents at 80.95 percent; and the Methodist New Connexion at 84.6 percent. If it is true that the opportunity for locating these families on the maps was based, in part, on how obscure the street or court was, then it is surprising that the Methodist New Connexion had such a high incidence of return, when they enjoyed a middle class membership of only around 20 percent.
Table 9 amplifies further the idea of the differences which existed between the wards of Leeds and the townships of Holbeck and Hunslet concerning socio-economic status. Mill Hill stood out as a wealthier and more advantageous neighbourhood, but the West and North West wards also show similar patterns. There is no question, as one looks at the most prevalent type of housing between the Leeds wards of the North, and North East, plus the out-townships of Holbeck and Hunslet, that back-to-backs were the predominant housing. This fact fits well with the extent of the working classes resident in these areas noted on Table 4.

Another way of noting differences between streets and type of housing, is to examine those streets which were frequently condemned by contemporary critics, and which contained a heavy concentration of back-to-backs (For a list of these streets, see Appendix D). It would be expected that the Mormons and Primitive Methodists had a larger number of their families living on these kinds of streets, but surprisingly they, along with the Baptists and Unitarians, had no families living on any of these streets. The Friends had one family living on Middle Row in Camp Field; the Methodist New Connexion, also had one family living on Quarry Hill. The Independents, showed one family living at 2 Templar Street; and the Wesleyan Methodists revealed two families, one at Front Row, Camp Field, and the
## TABLE 9

**TYPE OF HOUSING BY WARD AND TOWNSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>BACK-TO-BACK NO GARDENS (1)</th>
<th>TERRACED WITH GARDENS (2)</th>
<th>TERRACED SURROUNDED BY GARDENS (3)</th>
<th>SEPARATE DWELLING ESTATE (4)</th>
<th>UNDEFINED (5)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILL HILL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK GATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLBECK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNSLET</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Great Britain. Ordnance Survey of Leeds. (5 feet to a mile, 25 sheets)
Southampton, 1850.
other at 1 Quarry Hill. Perhaps because the sample was small, the results contradict the earlier observations regarding occupational and residential patterns.

One additional measure of residential differences among the denominations is based upon an examination of those streets composed wholly or partly of back-to-backs built between 1781 and 1815. In addition, the number of cholera cases identified by Baker and the incidence of cellar dwellings on these streets is also examined (See Appendix D for a complete listing of the streets).

The Unitarians reveal 15.4 percent, or two of its thirteen families, living in these circumstances. One family lived at Hope Street, where cellar dwellings existed and two cases of cholera had been reported. The other family lived at High Streets, where seven cases of cholera were reported, but no cellar dwellings existed.

The Independents showed a slightly lower percentage, 11.8 percent, of its fifty-one families living in these circumstances. One family lived at Kendall Street, where no cholera cases and no cellar dwellings existed. Another family lived on Hope Street, where cellar dwellings and two cases of cholera were reported. Two families lived on Templar Street, where no cellar dwellings or cholera cases were found. Zion Street was the home of another family where four cholera cases were found, but no cellar dwellings. And finally one family lived on Charles Street where
seventeen cases of cholera were reported, but where no cellar dwellings existed.

Of the ten Baptist families, none lived on these streets. The Friends, however, did have one family, James Kershaw, a watchman, who lived on Middle Row, Camp Field, where ten cases of cholera were reported, but which contained no cellar dwellings. This family represented 7.7 percent of the thirteen families whose addresses were found.

The Wesleyan Methodists showed 5.8 percent of the eighty-seven families lived on these types of streets. One of the families lived on the same Charles Street, identified above for the Independents. Another family lived on Reuben Street, which contained cellar dwellings and reported two cases of cholera. Front Row in Camp Field, was the same section as James Kershaw lived in noted above. Chatham Street, which reported no cholera, but contained cellar dwellings, claimed another Wesleyan Methodist family. Walker's Place where neither cellar dwellings or cholera cases were reported housed the last of the families.

The Methodist New Connexion, revealed 15.4 percent of its eleven families living on these streets. One family lived on Zion Street, which contained no cellar dwellings, but which revealed four cases of cholera. The other family lived on the infamous Charles Street, which revealed seventeen cases of cholera.
The Primitive Methodists record only one of the six families living on one of these streets, for 16.6 percent of the sample. Chatham Street was the home of Richard Humble, a joiner, and a Primitive Methodist.

The Mormons, surprisingly, revealed only one family of seventeen living on one of these streets. Little Line Street, the home of Thomas Green, a mariner, had no cholera cases and no cellar dwellings, suggesting that it was not the worst of these types of streets.

Because of their heavy working class composition, it was expected that a little higher incidence of Mormons, Primitive Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Wesleyan Methodist, and Baptists would be dwelling on these particular streets. It was somewhat surprising to see the percentages of Unitarians and Independents living on these streets. However, it is possible that this type of micro-cosmic study and analysis can be pushed too far. It must always be born in mind that the area under examination was not large. Leeds township contained 2,672 acres, Hunslet 1,100 acres and Holbeck only 760 acres. And, although men such as Newman Cash and Edward Baines could somewhat insulate themselves in their homes in the West Ward at Springfield Lodge and Hanover Square the vast majority of the population lived in back-to-backs or terraced housing. Over everything in the city hung that great pall of smoke. Smoke generated by the factories, the dye-houses, the
workshops and the domestic chimneys. In addition, the lack of street pavements, privies, and poor drainage, were experienced by almost everyone in the city. Although many of Baker's observations are based on data ten years prior to the time period under study, there is good reason to believe that his observations and informed analysis held true. In fact, B. J. Barber, an historian, recently observed that a municipal Local Act passed in 1842, which provided wide powers to the city council to improve public health conditions, in actuality did almost nothing. Barber further notes,

There is no reason to suppose that the motives of the speculative builders and the consequences of their activities were any different in these decades from those of an earlier generation castigated by Robert Baker in the 1840's. Indeed, an informed observer in 1866 claimed that the regulations in the 1842 Act could be easily sidestepped by the "cottage speculator".

IV

Based upon residential patterns, it has again been demonstrated that the congregations of the Unitarians, the

15 Nuttgens, p. 38.
17 Hole, p. 29.
Independents, and the Friends, were much more likely to be composed of middle class worshippers than the other nonconformist denominations. In addition the Mormons, the Primitive Methodists, and the Baptists, exhibited working class residential patterns as expected from their heavily labouring class occupational profiles. These patterns at the macrocosmic level of the Borough are complementary with the occupational profiles. However, at the microcosmic level when the types of houses and the actual addresses of the member families are reviewed, the picture is much more muddied. Although it is fairly easy to say that the Mill Hill, West and North West Wards were composed of more middle class than any other ward, and that the East and North East Wards, along with the townships of Holbeck and Hunslet are primarily working class, these become generalizations. One is soon forced into agreement with David Ward that "exclusively middle-class areas were extremely small and these districts housed only a minority of that class."\(^{18}\) Indeed even on a given street there were differences in houses and social composition. The rest of the city was undoubtedly dominated by the working classes. But what is impossible to ascertain from the maps under review in this study was the stratification of the working-class majority

\[^{18}\text{Ward, p. 142.}\]
from contemporary testimonies as to whether these distinctions were also reflected in the patterns and levels of residential differentiation.\textsuperscript{19}

The occupational and residential patterns of the Dissenting denominations complemented each other regarding the economic and social status levels of their adherents. To determine further if there are additional distinctions among the denominations member families and their households, these patterns will next be examined.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

THE CHAPEL GOERS OF LEEDS: FAMILY AND HOUSEHOLD PATTERNS

If a snapshot of the family was perhaps the best image of Victorian society, no one represented the domestic scene better than the regal persons of Victoria and Albert. When the nation viewed the monarchy they saw not so much the aristocratic order, but a "bourgeois family". Family journals abounded. At mid-century middle class families could gather around the fireplace and read such magazines as *The Home Circle, The Home Companion, The Home Friend, Home Thoughts, The Home Magazine, Family Economist, Family Record, Family Friend, Family Treasure, Family Prize Magazine and Household Miscellany,* and the *Family Mirror.*

Anthony Wohl contends that the Victorian family was almost a creed. In fact, its doctrine was that the stable family distinguished England from less moral societies. He adds that the Victorians felt the home

was the foundation and the family the cornerstone of their civilization and that within the family were first learned the moral, religious,

---


2 *The Victorian Family: Structure and Stress,* p. 9
ethical and social precepts of good citizenship.  

Many of these statements, especially the magazine readings, were based upon the middle-class family rather than the working class family.

The private home with its heavily curtained windows and its cosy, comfortable atmosphere, was the bastion of the middle class family. In this hierarchical institution the husband and father was the head. His authority extended over his wife and children, but also over the servants. As the wife and children rarely ventured out to work, they were dependent upon his income only, which provided a good basis for his authoritarian family control.

The middle class family became imbued with a certain holiness during this time. Although the image was idealized, family prayers every evening and attendance at church or chapel were commonplaces of the middle class family. Charles Kingsley, an Anglican minister and Christain Socialist, believed that family relationships were given to mankind to help him understand "the meaning of a Father in Heaven". Men must be fathers themselves to understand this and they "must have wives to love, and love them" to understand "how Christ loved the Church".  

---

3 Ibid., p. 10.

Victorian commentary about working-class families was primarily negative, unlike the idealized visions of middle class family life. The role of the father appeared to be demeaned; children were required at a young age to help support the family; and mothers employed outside the home all pointed to the destruction of a stable family. It was charged that the factory system broke up the family.\(^5\)

Engels dramatized this situation in a letter from a labouring man, Robert Pounder, Baron's Buildings, Woodhouse, Moorside, Leeds, to Richard Oastler. According to Pounder, a working man on a walk came to St. Helens, Lancashire, and looked up an old friend.

He found him in a miserable, damp cellar, scarcely furnished; and when my poor friend went in, there sat poor Jack near the fire, and what did he, think you? Why he sat and mended his wife's stockings with the bodkin; and as soon as he saw his old friend at the doorpost, he tried to hide them. But Joe, that is my friend's name, had seen it, and said: 'Jack, what the devil art thou doing? Where is the missus? Why, is that thy work?' and poor Jack was ashamed, and said: 'No, I know this is not my work, but my poor missus is in the factory; she has to leave by half-past five and works till eight at night, and then she is so knocked up that she cannot do aught when she gets home, so I have to do everything for her what I can, for I have no work, nor had any for more nor three years, ...' There is work enough for women folks and children hereabouts, but none for men.\(^6\)

Contemporary fiction also reflected the dangers to

\(^5\)Harrison, *The Early Victorians*, pp. 73-74.

\(^6\)Engels, p. 173.
family life that the factory brought. Elizabeth Gaskell's main character Mary Barton, in the novel of the same name, talks about this problem.

'Father does not like girls to work in factories,' said Mary. 'No, I know he doesn't; and reason good. They oughtn't to go at after they're married, that I'm very clear about. I could reckon up' (counting with her fingers) 'ay, nine men I know, as has been driven to th' public-house by having wives as worked in factories; good folk, too, as thought there was no harm in putting their little ones out at nurse, and letting their house go all dirty, and their fires all out; and that was a place as was tempting for a husband to stay in, was it? He soon finds out gin-shops, where all is clean and bright, and where the fire blazes cheerily, and gives a man a welcome as it were.7 .. . I say it's Prince Albert as ought to be asked how he'd like his missis to be from home when he comes in, tired and worn, and wanting some one to cheer him; and may be, her to come in by-and-by, just as tired and down in th' mouth;'7

In this chapter the differences between the Nonconformist denominations will be studied in regard to the family and household. Because there has been no research found which reviews the family in relationship to denominations, this chapter will focus on the socio-economic differences based upon middle and working class concepts as described above. The family size, its household makeup, whether the family was nuclear or extended, and whether there were servants or lodgers present, the extent of wives employed, the ages and extent of male children as scholars

in these families, and finally family mobility will be examined.

The size of the family is a critical issue from an economic sense. If the family is viewed as an economic unit as well as a social unit, then factors which affect the economic viability of the family can also affect that family's birthrate. The nineteenth century is generally considered to be a period of high fertility in England because many parent's viewed children as contributor's to the family's economic wellbeing more than they viewed them as an expense. This factor made larger families, but as soon as the family fortunes rose and children were no longer viewed as a direct or necessary contributor to the family income, the size of families decreased. 

This assumed pattern described the basic differences between the working class family, which would be larger, and the middle-class family, which would be slightly smaller. Peter Stearns, for example, claims that by the mid-century or earlier the average middle-class family size began to drop steadily. The same was not true for the working

---

Table 10 outlines the number of children by denominations. Because of the manner in which the sample populations were gathered, all of the results for the denominations are not comparable. The families for the Unitarians through the Primitive Methodists on this table were gathered by extracting baptisms or membership records for the years 1830-1837. This means that the life cycle for each of these families is similar. However, the Mormon sample was gathered by extracting information on families from membership records for the period of the late 1840s and early 1850s. Because the Mormons were a first generation church, the sample population is younger than the other denominations, and the families are in a different life cycle than the other nonconformist denominations' families. This difference is readily reflected in the mean number of children noted for the Mormon families compared with the other dissenter's families. It was necessary, therefore, to exclude the Mormons from a comparative review of family size.

If there is any validity to the idea that middle class families were slightly smaller than working class families, then it would be expected that the Friends, the

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>NO. OF FAMILIES</th>
<th>NO. OF CHILDREN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>% OF FAMILIES WITH FIVE OR MORE CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIAN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>37.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>27.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>36.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>38.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>48.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>23.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unitarians, and the Independents should reflect the smallest family size, because they showed the highest proportion of middle class in their ranks. This expectation did not prove to be completely accurate, however, because the Unitarians exhibited the smallest family size and the Friends had larger families than the Methodist New Connexion families. Even the Independents had slightly smaller families than the Wesleyan Methodists. The Baptists and the Primitive Methodist families did prove to have the largest average family size of the denominations, which matched the hypothesis proposed above. They also revealed the highest percentage of families with five or more children.

Several factors accounted for the larger than expected family sizes of the more predominantly middle class dissenting religions. The decrease in family sizes had not begun to occur until after mid-century. The fact that this sample was taken during the 1830s would reflect this lack of change. The Friends had a middle class structure of more than 50 percent, but all of the other denominations, including the Unitarians and the Independents, were still more predominately working class than middle class, although the differences were not great.

There is also the problem of how the data on family size were gathered in this study. The process of family reconstitution was not utilized; rather, the family data were taken from the 1851 Census. This means that
there were undoubtedly children not found on the census who were members of the family. This cross-sectional approach is less accurate than family reconstitution, but, is still indicative and useful, and was the only approach possible for this study because of the records. There is a possibility among the Unitarians, Independents, and Friends that sons were away at boarding school during the time that the 1851 Census was taken in March, which means that these families were larger than shown on table 10.

II

An additional economic consideration within a family was the presence of kin. Was the family nuclear or was it extended? Michael Anderson, in his study of family structure in Preston in 1851, has shown successfully that dependence on relatives was an economic necessity for many families. In fact, contrary to popular contemporary opinions, the extended family was a more likely entity in mid-Victorian England than in pre-industrial England. Anderson's studies in Preston revealed that 23 percent of the families contained kin, whereas Peter Laslett's pre-industrial studies exhibit only 10 percent extended families.10

The presence of kin in a family may not be as clearly a middle-class versus a working-class breakdown as might be expected. If a calculative dependence on kin was necessary for survival, then "country cousins" seeking work in the "big city" would be just as likely to contact their middle-class relatives as they would their working-class relatives. In fact, it would seem more likely that the middle-class relatives would be able to help in finding work more readily than the labouring class. It is not surprising then that the Unitarians and the Friends showed a high percentage of extended families. More surprising is that the Independents revealed a small percentage of extended families, the lowest of any of the denominations. Of course it must always be born in mind that sample size dramatically affects these percentages. The small number of Unitarian and Friends' families found on the 1851 census is a factor in the higher percentage of extended families (See Table 11).

IV

Of concern among contemporary critics of industrialization and its debilitating affects upon the family was the perceived increase in mothers' employment. Engels and Elizabeth Gaskell recite the deleterious effects of working mothers on husbands. In addition, the contemporary observer was equally concerned over the children of such families.
### TABLE 11

**EXTENDED FAMILY BY DENOMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>NUCLEAR FAMILY</th>
<th></th>
<th>EXTENDED FAMILY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIAN</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTIST</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIEND</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Godfrey's Cordial", a pacifier laced with laudanum, was commonly used to keep young children quiet. Indeed a chemist in Nottingham told the Children's Employment Commission that there were chemists who sold as much as a gallon of laudanum a week. Mary Colton, a 20 year old lace runner, was not unlike many of the poorer families in Nottingham. She gave birth to an illegitimate child in November 1839. When the child was only a week old she began giving it half a teaspoonful of Godfrey's twice a day. She gave it Godfrey's to keep it quiet, so that she might be able to continue her work on her lace piece uninterrupted.11

Women as workers were not harmonious with the Victorian philosophy of deification of the home. Women were to marry and have children and certainly were not supposed to work after they married.12 Yet Litchfield's study of working women in Stockport shows a surprising number of mothers working, and many of these mothers had small children at home. He notes, "In fact more than half the mothers with children at home aged under one year were


listed as working in the census."13

Michael Anderson's seminal work on Preston is still the measure against which other studies of this type can be compared. He showed that in Preston 26 percent of all wives were working, and of the wives working 52 percent were employed in factory work. However, he claims that the effects of this work on husbands and children were much less than might originally be imagined because much of the work was performed at home. Also many of the working wives had few or no children at home. He discovered that 20 percent of the working mothers had children under 10 years of age. The majority of mothers worked in order to help their families survive.14

Leeds township revealed a pattern of 36 percent of all females aged 20 or over working. The records do not indicate what percentage of married women were working, but the figure Anderson arrives at for Preston (26 percent) is probably also close for Leeds. Table 12, which shows the "Wives Employed by Denomination", reveals an interesting trend for Leeds nonconformist families. They were not heavy contributors to the numbers of working women in Leeds, with

13Litchfield, p. 191.

TABLE 12

WIVES EMPLOYED BY
DENOMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>% NOT EMPLOYED</th>
<th>% EMPLOYED</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODISTS</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBERS</td>
<td>(398)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(442)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

only 10 percent overall employment. Only the Methodist New Connexion at 22.2 percent, and the Primitive Methodist at 17.2 percent, are even close to the Preston sample. If economic necessity drove wives to seek employment, there would have been smaller percentages of wives employed among the Unitarians, Friends and the Independents. But it is only in the case of the Unitarians that this assumption held up. The percentage of married women employed was higher for the Independents than it was for either the Wesleyan Methodists or the Mormons.

To test further the theory of economic necessity among working wives, a comparison of the various jobs held by the women was made with the occupations of their husbands. Among the Baptists, all the women except one were cloth burlers. Their husbands' jobs ranged from delver to farmer's man, none considered high paying. All of the Methodist New Connexion wives were woollen cloth burlers, and all of their husbands was involved in the cloth industry as weavers, sorters, dressers. The only exception to this observation is one of the two employed wives of the Friends. Employed as a French corset weaver, Mary Galloway employed four men and three women. Her husband, Thomas, a master painter, was also an employer of seven men and two boys. This hardly appears to be a case of economic necessity. Perhaps some nineteenth century women worked for enjoyment rather than economic necessity.
There is also strong evidence to support Anderson's observation that many of the women worked at home. Occupations such as milliner and dressmaker, stay maker, corset maker, sack maker, and laundress, were all occupations which could be performed at home. In addition, many of the women worked with their husbands. Elizabeth Barnes, a Mormon and a bootbinder, worked for her shoemaker husband, John. Hannah Marsden, a Unitarian, and her husband, Joseph, ran a shop. Of the Wesleyan Methodists members, Mary Hicks was an assistant bookseller for her husband, John, who was a publisher and bookseller. James and Catherine Hutchinson were canvas weavers.

The horror stories of the heavy drugging of young children through the use of "Godfrey's Cordial" suggests that many of the working wives had young children to raise. Anderson's work in Preston reveals that of all working wives with children only 20 percent had children under 10. This figure proved to be much higher among the Leeds dissenting denominations working wives, although the Unitarians and Mormons had no wives working with children 10 or under. From the highest percentage to the lowest percentage, all of the rest of the denominations showed much higher ratios than those for Preston: the Primitive Methodists, 80.0 percent; the Methodist New Connexion, 75.0

---

15Ibid., p. 185.
percent; the Independents, 72.7 percent; the Baptists, 57.1 percent, the Friends 50.0 percent; and the Wesleyan Methodists, 27.3 percent. These figures, along with the percentage of working wives, do not clear the blurry lines between the denominations. They suggest that the middle class versus working class labels assigned in Chapter II are not definitive and that the generalizations attached to certain denominations being of the poor and others being primarily of the middle class are just that--generalizations. Of course it must also be born in mind that there were differences in type of employment among the women, such as a shopkeeper or a factory piece worker. This fact sheds a different light on the statistics.

V

The presence of lodgers or servants indicated a particular class structure in a family. Michael Anderson's study describes the presence of 23 percent lodgers in the Preston of 1851. However, the number of lodgers among the Dissenting Leeds denominations are not so informative, other than to indicate that the presence of lodgers was less common in Leeds than in Preston (See Table 13). However, it would be premature to make such an assumption, because no pattern emerged among the Nonconformist denominations. It might be expected that the Friends, Unitarians, and Independents would have the smallest number of lodgers; and that
## TABLE 13

**LODGERs BY DENOMINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATIONS</th>
<th>% WITH ONE LODGER</th>
<th>% WITH TWO LODGERS</th>
<th>% WITH THREE LODGERS</th>
<th>% WITH FOUR LODGERS</th>
<th>% NO LODGER</th>
<th>% TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIAN</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTIST</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIEND</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODIST</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COLUMN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Great Britain, 1851 Census Enumerator’s Schedules. Townships of Lees and Great Britain. 1851 Census Enumerator’s Schedules Borough of Leeds.
the Mormons, Primitive Methodists, Baptists, Methodist New Connexion and Wesleyan Methodists would have the largest numbers. In fact, the Friends and Primitive Methodists had the highest percentage of families with lodgers, and the Unitarians, Independents, Baptists, Methodist New Connexion and Mormons were all within two percentage points of each other. The only pattern which emerges is that of the low percentage of 93.4 of the dissenting families having no lodgers. A study of the percentage of lodgers in Leeds Borough needs to be conducted to determine if the nonconformist pattern is consistent with Leeds.

The presence of servants among the Nonconformist families, however, was more revealing, (See Table 14). This fact fits well into the patterns already established from the occupational and residential analyses of the previous chapters. It was anticipated that the Mormons, Baptists and Primitive Methodists had the smallest percentage of servants; the Unitarians, Independents, and Friends had the highest percentages; and the Wesleyan Methodists and Methodist New Connexion fell in the middle. This assumption was based upon the middle class versus working class composition of the denominations, as well as their residential patterns. Unlike the lodgers, the servants fell conveniently into place as anticipated. The overall percentage of servants among the families was 13.6 percent, which is slightly higher than the figure for Preston of 10
TABLE 14

SERVANTS BY DENOMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATIONS</th>
<th>% WITH ONE SERVANT</th>
<th>% WITH TWO SERVANTS</th>
<th>% WITH THREE SERVANTS</th>
<th>% WITH FOUR SERVANTS</th>
<th>% WITH SIX SERVANTS</th>
<th>% WITH NO SERVANTS</th>
<th>% WITH ROW TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIAN</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTIST</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIEND</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNEXION</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COLUMN</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(417)</td>
<td>(463)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent.16

The Friends exhibited a middle class appearance with 68.2 percent of their families having one or more servants. This figure is quite close to the middle class percentage of 63.7 percent settled upon from the occupational analysis. The presence of 25 percent of the Unitarian families with servants, is 20 percent lower than the occupational middle class analysis showed. Not every middle class family had servants. The 23.7 percent of Independent families with servants also reveals a middle class structure greater than the average of 13.6 percent.

Table 15 displays an analysis of the servants by townships and wards within the Borough of Leeds. The economic strength of these various geographic areas is congruent with the data from Chapter III which revealed the economic and residential desirability of the Mill Hill, West and North West wards and Headingley township.

VI

A family is an economic as well as a social institution. Sons were important financial contributors in a working class family and often went out to work long before the so-called educational period of three to fifteen years

16Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNSHIPS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH SERVANTS</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES</th>
<th>% OF FAMILIES WITH SERVANTS</th>
<th>% OF SERVANTS PER TOWNSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILL HILL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRK GATE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEAST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEADINGLEY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPEL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLERTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTTERNEWTON</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMLEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARNLEY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTLEY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEESTON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAMLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLBECK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNSLLET</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was complete. Therefore, the educational patterns of the sons of dissenting religions in Leeds is another link in understanding the socio-economic status of the dissenters and the emphasis given educational attainment.

Michael Anderson noted the ages of boys in Manchester/Salford and Preston, in 1851, who were employed. Given the industrial nature of both these cities to Leeds, the percentages of boys in Leeds employed would clearly be similar (See Table 16). It would be expected that boys from the years 5 through 10 would be listed on the Leeds 1851 Census as scholars, but at about age 11 a greater tendency to assume employment began. Anderson discovered, that on the average, 57 percent of the boys in Preston were employed during the ages of 11 through 14. By comparison over 70 percent of the 11 through 14 year old sons of Dissenters in Leeds were employed, or undescribed on the census. The percentage of 28.1 scholars ages 11-14, for all the denominations, is considerably lower than the national average, 36.1%. The percentages for several of the denominations were close, or above the national over. Over 41 percent of the Independent scholars were in between the years of 11

17 Harrison, The Early Victorians, p. 136.


19 1851 Census of Education, between pp. 132-133.
TABLE 16
FAMILIES WITH MALE SCHOLARS BY DENOMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>1 MO.- 5 YRS.</th>
<th>6-10 YEARS</th>
<th>11-14 YEARS</th>
<th>15-19 YEARS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>31.03%</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESLEYAN METHODISTS</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
<td>32.08%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE METHODIST</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN AVERAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.67%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>(21)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(76)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(45)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(11)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(153)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Great Britain, 1851 Census Enumerator’s Schedules. Townships of Leeds and Great Britain. 1851 Census Enumerator’s Schedules Borough of Leeds.
through 14; 100 percent of the Unitarian sons; 30 percent of the Friends; and almost 30 percent of the Wesleyan Methodist sons; and over 33 percent of the Mormons' sons were scholars during these years.

It is in the years of 15 through 19 that a considerable financial commitment to education was made. Any family who had sons of these ages still attending school meant that either there was sufficient money in the family to permit this activity or that all the members of the family were sacrificing so that this one son could continue to pursue his education. It is difficult to tell which circumstance might be holding sway for each of the families, but in any event, the Independents, Primitive Methodists, Friends, Methodist New Connexion, Baptists and Wesleyan Methodists all had one or more families with sons continuing their education at either 15 years of age or older (See Table 16 for percentages). This is consistent with Anderson's figures of 93 percent of the Preston boys working at age 15.²⁰

VII

In his short autobiography, Robert Spurr, a Baptist convert, cited several instances of migrations to find better employment. Some of these moves were within the

²⁰Ibid.
Borough of Leeds, but others took him short distances away to Gildersome or Meanwood.21 Because the type of study conducted here, in which the major source was the 1851 Census for the Borough of Leeds, it was impossible to find the many places a family could have resided. Using city directories over a ten year period to find the heads of households revealed little in the way of migration patterns. Too few of the male heads of households were listed in these directories, and often only the place of business was listed. Yet it is revealing to study the migration patterns of the various families because this type of study tells something about economic necessity among the families. One or two of the denominations might reveal patterns of heavy migration.

Leeds township was sustained by in-migration before 1851. But in 1851, the pattern had changed and Leeds Borough had 74.9 percent of its population born in the Borough and only 25.1 percent in-migration. In-migration was low for the Borough when compared with Bradford, for example, which had 55 percent and Preston 53 percent of migrant population.22

Two theories about migration are of special interest to this study. Ravenstein's theory states that economic

21Spurr, pp. 283-84.
motivation is the primary cause of migration. He observed that "most people migrate short distances and few people migrate long distances." In Stouffer's theory of intervening opportunities, he mathematically tested Ravenstein's short distance migration observation. Stouffer attributed the short distance migration to the fact that many opportunities would have to be passed over in order to go a long distance. Other theories return to Ravenstein's economic determinism. Michael Anderson's study of Preston follows Ravenstein's short distance theory with 70 percent of its migrants having traveled 30 miles or less.

In studying the migration patterns of Leeds Dissenting families, the male head of household's birthplace was used. Because the sample population was gathered primarily from Leeds Borough baptismal records of 1830-1837, the use of the families' children as part of the migration patterns would skew the sample towards a heavier in-Leeds Borough birthplace.

Table 17 exhibits the results of this birthplace study. Although all of the Dissenting religions show a lower Borough birthrate than the 74.9 percent noted above the Unitarians are close to this figure. Only the Mormons

---

24 Ibid., p. 59.
TABLE 17

FATHER'S BIRTHPLACE BY DENOMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENOMINATION</th>
<th>BOROUGH OF LEEDS</th>
<th>REST OF YORKSHIRE</th>
<th>CONTIGUOUS YORKSHIRE</th>
<th>TO WEST OF YORKSHIRE</th>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>SCOTLAND</th>
<th>IRELAND</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITARIANS</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENTS</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPTISTS</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODISTS</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODIST</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CONNEXION</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMITIVE</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORMON</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS       | 52.4%            | 38.1%             | 2.1%                 | 5.3%                 | 0.8%    | 0.4%     | 0.4%    | 100.0%|

and the Friends show a significantly lower Borough birth-rate, with 36.4 percent and 24.2 percent, respectively. Ravenstein's short distance migration theory holds up well among all the denominations, except the Mormons. The percentage of in-migrants from outside of Yorkshire or the three counties of Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and Lancashire, which are contiguous to the West Riding of Yorkshire, are miniscule. The Mormon evidence reveals that 30.2 percent of the fathers were born outside of these areas relatively close to Leeds; The Friends 13.6 percent; the Independents, 10.9 percent; the Wesleyan Methodists, 5.9 percent; and the Baptists show a negligible 1.3 percent. The motivation for these moves is difficult to ascertain. The Friends' closed society, with marriages outside their religion creating excommunication, and their close business partnerships with other Friends, may have created some unique migration needs. This could be the beginning of an explanation for a total of 63.6 percent Friends in-migration to the Borough of Leeds. Perhaps a small portion of the labouring elements of the dissenting religions provided an economic motivation for these migration patterns. It could not be determined if these men migrated to Leeds on their own, or if they came as children with their parents.

The Mormon migrant population in Leeds of 75.7 percent, however, presents a picture different from other dissenters. With this group too, there is more
evidence that the majority of Mormon men actually migrated on their own and not as children with their families. This evidence is suggested through the Mormon membership records where dates and places of adult baptism were a standard part of the record.

Alan Gilbert's observations about anomie, which he describes as a social disorganization brought about by the breakdown of long established social and cultural systems applies to the Mormon group. According to Gilbert, anomie is

a loss of *solidarity* produced by the collapse of old social structures, and a loss of *consensus* as norms and values previously taken for granted are challenged or overthrown and social insecurity in a period of rapid social change and dislocation. . . . The obverse of anomie is a heightened demand for new associational and communal foci to replace those which have been lost.26

The problem with this theory is that Gilbert believes that the success of Evangelical Nonconformist recruiting was affected by it only in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a success shown by the occupational lists of the various dissenting denominations. He bases the timing of his theory on the fact that by the Victorian era the change from the agrarian to the industrial system was complete. According to Gilbert, this change explains the declining Nonconformist numbers of the 1840s and

---

26 Gilbert, p. 89.
1850s.27

In general, Gilbert is correct in his observation that the majority of people had already adjusted to the social dislocation created by rapid industrialization. However, the Mormon population in Leeds fits anachronistically into this concept. Being from the working class, they were more subject to the buffetings of social and economic change. Of the Nonconformist adherents, Mormons were one of the most heavily involved in the factory movement. Their heavy mobility pattern suggests that they were in the earlier patterns of adjustment to the Industrial Revolution, when more people experienced anomie. Certainly the Mormons were migrating into the city well after the height of its in-migration. Perhaps the Mormons were the most vulnerable to the blandishments of a new religion because of their social status and social dislocation. Emilio Willems, the eminent Brazilian sociologist has studied this phenomenon in Brazil, where he examined the appeal of Protestantism over the establishment Catholic Church. He states:

The establishment status of Brazilian Catholicism, he has argued, is a serious handicap to the maintenance of the Catholic religion within certain social groups. Conversion to Protestantism 'constitutes one of the many ways in which hostility and rebellion against a decaying social structure may be expressed. . . . The Catholic Church is often perceived by the masses as a

27 Ibid., pp. 89, 145-6.
symbol of the traditional order or as an ally of its supreme exponent the landed aristocracy... The further removed the ideology and structure of a particular denomination are from those of the traditional society the stronger the appeal it holds for the common people.28

A first generation church expanding rapidly with adult converts made the Mormon congregation different than the other nonconformist denominations whose members came from existing congregations, not converts. Four of the eight Nonconformist religions had been in existence, in some form or other since the Stuart Restoration. The Wesleyan Methodists and Methodist New Connexion bore strong liturgical resemblances to the Church of England, which attracted people out of the Establishment religion who did not wish to stray too far from the familiar. The Mormons were the only group that fit into the patterns described by Gilbert and Willems.

Although the differences between the denominations as to family size, the employment of wives and the education of sons, and the presence of lodgers in the household were slight, the presence of servants and the mobility patterns (especially of the Mormons) did tend to show social differences among the different dissenting groups.

CHAPTER V

THE CHAPEL GOERS OF LEEDS: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Nonconformist chapel goers of Leeds were examined in this study to determine their social composition. In the beginning questions were raised regarding differences of socio-economic status among the denominations and the ability of the chapels to attract particular classes or groups of people. These questions were answered through an examination of occupational, residential and family characteristics, where social composition could be studied against the backdrop of Leeds, a leading manufacturing center. Leeds, the fifth largest city in the nation, also provided an appropriate setting for a study of nonconformity because it, along with the West Riding, enjoyed a tradition of Dissent.\footnote{Harrison, The Early Victorians, 1832-1851, pp. 126-30.} The city also experienced relatively high attendance at religious worship when compared with its sister woolen city, Bradford, or Manchester, Oldham and Preston. The attendance at religious worship of all large towns (10,000 or more) caused alarm among contemporaries,
when compared with small towns and rural areas.\textsuperscript{2}

Because nonconformity was strong in Leeds and religious worship was relatively high it was felt that the membership of the Leeds' Nonconformist denominations would fit the patterns accepted among contemporaries and scholars. For example, the Friends proved to be a predominantly middle class, indeed an upper middle class group. The Unitarians showed strong features of a more educated and middle class membership, as did the Independents. Their middle class composition was less than expected, however (45% and 40% respectively). Certainly the Mormons and the Primitive Methodists faiths tended to attract labouring people rather than the middle classes. Although the Baptists were part of Old Dissent, none of the upward social drift experienced by the Friends, Unitarians or Independents affected the Baptists in Leeds. This situation may be unique to Leeds where a high number of the Baptists used in this study were gathered from the out-township of Bramley where handloom weaving was strong. The Baptist population exhibited 34 percent of the Baptist men engaged in the domestic system. The lower level in society revealed by the Baptists of Leeds, however, is not inconsistent with the national view.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{2}1851 Census of Great Britain Report and Tables on Religious Worship, p. clviii; Miall, p. 211.

\textsuperscript{3}Chadwick, I: 424, 437.
The Wesleyan Methodists provided its membership a familiar feeling on Sabbath day worship, because its liturgy was doctrinally rooted in the Established Church. Perhaps for this reason, and also because it was a second generation church, it displayed a higher than expected percentage of middle-class worshippers (29) than the other New Dissent denominations. This appeared to place the Wesleyans squarely between the more middle class Old Dissent chapels of the Unitarians, Independents and the Friends and the New Dissent worshippers of the Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodists, and the Mormons as well as the Baptists of Old Dissent.

The occupational analysis, city directory listings, residential patterns, and the presence of servants clearly placed the social composition of the Nonconformist denominations as expected. The results of the investigation of the type of housing, number of children in a family, the presence of an extended family, percentage of wives employed, and the presence of lodgers in a family proved inconclusive as clear patterns favoring a middle or working class composition. The results in these areas do shed additional light, however, on the social composition of each denomination.

Throughout, this study has primarily examined the heterogenous characteristics of the dissenting denominations, yet there are also characteristics of homogeneity.
Gilbert, in fact, strongly suggests that particular denominations did not serve "distinctive social constituencies" and that, although social nuances between denominations could be significant in certain localities, it was the social homogeneity that was most significant. Leeds dissenters revealed differences among the denominations, but the surprising feature was the high percentage of working classes among all of the dissenting groups, except the Friends. Out of one hundred men, seventy were working class and thirty middle class. Out of one hundred residences, eighty were back-to-back or terraced houses with no gardens. A clear pattern emerged demonstrating working class membership in the Nonconformist denominations in Leeds rather than middle class. This result flies in the face of contemporary observations, as well as later attempts at historical investigation.

The prevailing opinion among contemporaries and historians was that English Nonconformity was a middle class phenomenon and that it neglected the working classes. Horace Mann talked of the middle classes augmenting rather than diminishing their religious devotion; but he further reflected that the labouring classes showed the greatest laxity in religious worship, and proposed the idea that

---

4Gilbert, pp. 61-2.
secularism was the dominant devotion of this group. Hugh McLeod sees non-church goers as most prevalent around the bottom end of the social hierarchy, and Nonconformists around the middle. In the 1850s an Englishman offhandedly referred to the "upper and middle classes (those whom we term church-goers)". Gilbert comments that above the middle classes English society was virtually impervious to Protestant religious deviance; and at the bottom of the social scale, among the lowest income groups and those without employment, there was another, much larger segment of the population grossly under-represented in Evangelical Nonconformist communities.

Horace Mann and Edward Miall concluded that there was a gross under-representation among the lower classes at religious worship. Their crowded and often debilitating living conditions appeared to preclude the contemplative atmosphere necessary for true religious worship.

The scenes and associates from which the poor, however well disposed, can never, apparently, escape; the vice and filth which riot in their crowded dwellings, and from which they cannot fly to any less degraded homes; what awfully effective teaching, it is said, do these supply in opposition to the few infrequent lessons which the

---


7. A. Layman, Why are Our Churches Closed, 1858, p. 23, Quoted in Inglis, Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England, p. 322.

8. Gilbert, p. 66.
Christian minister or missionary, after much exertion, may impart! . . . Perhaps no slight degree of that religious character by which the English middle classes are distinguished is the consequence of their peculiar isolation in distinct and separate houses--thus acquiring almost of necessity, from frequent opportunities of solitude, those habits of reflection which cannot be exercised to the entire exclusion of religious sentiments; but, certainly, however, this may be, no doubt can be admitted that a great obstruction to the progress of religion with the working class would be removed of that condition which forbids all solitude and all reflection were alleviated.9

Miall echoes this same concern for the difficulty of maintaining spirituality in the homes of the poor.

The spiritual man must be, in some measure, at least, contemplative, and contemplation asks privacy--but with the class to which we refer there is scarcely a possibility of retirement.10

Yet out of the mass of formal nonworshippers prevalent among the Leeds' working classes, there were Primitive Methodists who were willing to submit to public humiliation, including stone and egg throwing, to preach their brand of the gospel to the uncommitted. There also existed a small group of Mormons who felt strongly enough about their religion to walk well over a mile to chapel on Sunday, after working six days during the week. Certainly there was a significant number of Dissenters, who found the time and energy for contemplation and involvement in their


10Miall, pp. 350-1.
particular denomination. In fact, the most surprising element of all is that it was more likely for the poorest dissenters, living in predominantly back-to-back or unadorned terraced housing, to join the denominations that required the most time, energy and commitment.

When Robert Spurr joined the Baptists he stated:

I believe that creed to be according to the new testament and generally agreed with their doctrines such as original sin, regeneration by grace, Baptizam and the Lord Suppor, free justification and adoption, the final perseverance of real believers, the eternal happiness of the righteous and so on.\textsuperscript{11}

The spelling and grammar reflected a relatively uneducated man; yet, Spurr's reasons for joining the Baptists were not shallow and reflected considerable contemplation. James Bywater, who joined the Mormon faith, almost immediately recognized what to him were truths when he heard the "necessity of baptism, the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost; also the signs following the true believer, the necessity of continual revelation."\textsuperscript{12}

The principles that led Robert Spurr and James Bywater to join their particular Nonconformist sects were profound, not shallow. They reflected a desire for religious truths, more than a desire for social contacts.

\textsuperscript{11}Spurr, p. 284.

Perhaps there was more cause for the working classes to belong to a church for religious rather than social reasons. The middle classes had more cause to need social contacts and to find these in the socially acceptable religions. As the family fortunes rose, the socially unacceptable religions such as the Primitive Methodists or the Mormons, would be unlikely to attract the middle classes who were seeking respectability.13

Contemporaries reflected on some of the expected features of middle class religious observance at the national scene. Charles Booth found that not every middle class Englishman who went to church or chapel was enthusiastic about his religion. In fact he found many worshippers' faces exhibited "blank indifference" to the proceedings. As Inglis suggests, "perhaps custom rather than inclination brought many people to church."14 A Congregational minister observed in 1867 that many of the middle classes were in church or chapel out of habit and "regard for appearances, than from real respect for Christ's ordinance of social worship and real desire for Christian edification."15

13 McLeod, "Class, Community and Region," p. 29.


But the working classes who attended religious worship presented a more intriguing picture. These people seemed to be true seekers, the name originally given to the Society of Friends, and a term used by Malcolm Thorp to describe the early Mormon converts of Britain.16 As Hugh McLeod observes,

Working-class religious converts were mainly drawn from those with ideas, in search of meanings, systems, explanations, or from those in revolt against the way of life of their neighbours. In either case, questions both of personal morality and of the nature of the social and cosmic order were likely to bulk larger in their conception of religion than the contemplation of bliss to come.17

While this is true, it has been amply demonstrated that the working-class Nonconformist worshippers in Leeds were the majority, and that converts to the dissenting religions were more likely to be drawn to Methodism, Mormonism, and the Baptists, than they were to Unitarianism, Independency, or the Friends.

17McLeod, Class and Religion in the Late Victorian City, p. 283.
## APPENDIX A

### OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE OF LEEDS IN 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Agriculture</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib Animals</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Mines and quarries</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Bricks, glass and pottery</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Chemicals and oils</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Engineering</td>
<td>7,415</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Precious metals</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Textiles</td>
<td>28,889</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Skins and leather</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Dress</td>
<td>9,184</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Food, drink, tobacco and lodging</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Woodworking</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII Paper, books and printing</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV Building</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV Gas, water, electricity and sanitary</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI Transport</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII Commerce</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII Government (local and national)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX Defense</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX Professional</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI Domestic and other service</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XXII Others occupied 5,128 6.1

Total 83,889 100.00

NUMBERS OCCUPIED IN VARIOUS BRANCHES OF TEXTILE PRODUCTION IN LEEDS (CENSUS REPORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textile Branches</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COTTON</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOL AND WORSTED (Total)</td>
<td>17,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen cloth manufacture</td>
<td>14,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsted stuff manufacture</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket manufacture</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitters, fullers and undefined dealers</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILK</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAX AND HEMP</td>
<td>8,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed or undefined materials</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleachers, printing and dying</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealers</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX B

#### OCCUPATIONAL CODES

**Professional**

- Architect
- Banker
- Consul, United States
- Highway Surveyor
- Inland Revenue Officer
- Listing Maker
- Magistrate, Borough of Leeds
- Minister
- Police Officer
- Proprietor of the Leeds Mercury
- Publisher
- School Assistant
- School Master/Mistress
- Solicitor
- Surgeon
- Teacher
- Treasurer of County Court

**Clerks/Bookkeepers**

- Banker's Clerk
- Bookkeeper
- Cashier
- Clerk
- Post Office Clerk
- Railway Clerk
- Secretary
- Solicitor's Clerk
- Warehouse Clerk

**Salesman**

- Clothier
- Commercial Traveler
- Commission Agent
- Corn factor
- Fire Brick Agent
- Leather Merchant
- Linen Yarn Merchant
- Paper, Rage, Waste merchant
- Sharebroker
- Stone Merchant
- Woollen Merchant
- Woolen Merchant Foreman
- Woolstapler

**Shopkeeper**

- Barber
- Bookseller
- Butcher
- Chemist
- Coffee House/Temperance House Keeper
- Druggist
- Fellmonger
- Fish Dealer
- Flock Dealer
- Flour Dealer
- Fruiterer
- Green Grocer
- Grocer
- Hairdresser
- Innkeeper
- Ironmonger
- Linen Draper
- Pawnbroker
- Proprietor of Houses
- Provision Dealer
- Shop Boy
- Stationer
- Tea Dealer
- Tobacconist
- Undertaker
- Warehouseman
- Woollen Draper
Artisan

Plumber  
Potter  
Printer, Compositor  
Rope and Sail Maker  
Saddler  
Sawyer  
Shoemaker  
Shuttle Maker  
Smith  
Spindel Maker  
Stay Weaver, Handloom  
Stone Mason  
Stuff Dyer  
Tailor  
Tanner  
Tin Plate Worker  
Tobacco Pipe Maker  
Tomb Stone Engraver  
Upholsterer  
Wagoneer  
Wheelwright  
Whitesmith  
Wood Turner  
Woolcomber  
Woollen Cloth Printer  
Woollen Cloth Miller  
Woollen Cloth Weaver  
Woollen Hand Loom Weaver  
Woollen Hand Spinner  
Woollen Spinner  
Yarn Spinner  

Manufacturer  

Bolt & Screw  
Brush  
Canvas  
Chemist  
Cloth  
Fire Brick  
Hair Setting & Curled Hair Manufacturer  
Malster  
Stay Maker  
Woollen  

Mill/Supervisory  

Coal Master  
Cloth Foreman  
Cloth Mill Overlooker  

Artisan  

Blacksmith  
Blue Slater  
Book Sewer  
Bookbinder  
Boot & Shoemaker  
Brazier  
Brushmaker  
Builder  
Cabinet Maker  
Canvas Weaver  
Carpenter  
Carpet Dyer  
Carpet Weaver  
Carver & Gilder  
Chandler  
Clock & Watch Maker  
Cloth Maker  
Cloth Spinner  
Cloth Weaver  
Coachbuilder  
Cooper  
Cordwainer  
Corn Miller  
Cotton Weaver  
Currier  
Dyer  
Engraver & Printer  
Flax Spinner  
Gray Slate Riveer  
Gun Maker  
Handloom Weaver  
Hatter  
Hatter  
Jenny Maker  
Joiner  
Leather Dresser  
Linen Weaver  
Lithographer  
Marble Mason  
Mason  
Millwright  
Needle Maker  
Oil Miller  
Painter  
Paper Hanger  
Pattern Settler  
Pin Cutter/Grinder/Maker  
Pipe Dresser  
Pipe Maker  
Plasterer  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cloth Overlooker</th>
<th>Cloth Press Setter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flax Mill Overlooker</td>
<td>Flax Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax Overlooker, Power Loom</td>
<td>Flax Mill Fluter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman Woolen Merchant</td>
<td>Grinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Loom Overlooker</td>
<td>Mule Cloth Piecer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Foreman</td>
<td>Silk Warp Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Factory Overlooker</td>
<td>Slubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuff Tenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wool Sorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Cloth Burler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Cloth Dresser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Cloth Scourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Cloth Tenterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Mill Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Piecer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Mule Piecer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Scribbler &amp; Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Slubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollen Sorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mill/Skilled</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilermaker</td>
<td>Farm Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmaker</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist, Analectical</td>
<td>Groom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Maker</td>
<td>Horseman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer Fitter</td>
<td><strong>Labourer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Brick Maker</td>
<td>Band Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackle &amp; Gill Maker</td>
<td>Belt Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Driller Mechanic</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Founder</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Foundry, Metal Weigher</td>
<td>Cart Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Moulder</td>
<td>Coal Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Planner Mechanic</td>
<td>Coal Miner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Turner</td>
<td>Chapel Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive Engine Tester</td>
<td>Delver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Maker</td>
<td>Engine Tenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Mechanic</td>
<td>Errand Boy/Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>Factory Boy/Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic Turner</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule Spinner</td>
<td>Handle Setter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed &amp; Heald Maker</td>
<td>Iron Bundler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack Maker</td>
<td>Iron Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Keeper Cloth</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Cloth Finisher</td>
<td>Labourer, Iron Foundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Mule Spinner</td>
<td>Labourer on Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Power Loom Weaver</td>
<td>Lamplighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mill/Unskilled</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carder Feeder</td>
<td>Milkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carder Fuller/Filler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Drawer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Dresser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Mill Warper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miner
Porter
Pottery Labourer
Quarryman
Railway Porter
Screwer
Shoe Lash Maker
Stone Getter
Stoker at Gas House
Street Paver
Stuff Presser
Thread Reeler
Warehouse Worker
Watchman
Water Carrier
Waterpipe Dresser
APPENDIX C

SELECTED WAGE INFORMATION FOR LEEDS

Leeds and Neighbourhood, average rates for years 1855, 1856, and 1857.

**Linen and Flax Manufacturers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flax Spinning &amp; Weaving</th>
<th>Fine Flax Yarn Spinning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>5 s 0</td>
<td>6 s 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>3 s 6</td>
<td>4 s 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>1 s 6</td>
<td>3 s 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Labourers and operatives**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>2 s 9</td>
<td>2 s 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>2 s 6</td>
<td>2 s 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>1 s 0</td>
<td>1 s 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>0 s 11*</td>
<td>0 s 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0 s 10*</td>
<td>0 s 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Wages of children of 13 to 18 years; under 13 years of age 7d.

**Engineering and Foundry Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam engine building, millwright work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and boilermaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>5s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>4s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>2s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers or Operatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Iron foundry and machine tool making**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled persons</td>
<td>4s to 5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers or Operatives</td>
<td>2s 4d to 2s 8d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Earthenware and Porcelain Manufacture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skilled persons</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>3s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>2s 1d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labourers or Operatives</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>2d 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glass Manufacture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glass bottle manufacture</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>1855 - 6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>1857 - 4s 9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>1855 - 5s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1857 - 4s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1855 - 4s 9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1857 - 3s 7d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labourers or Operatives</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leather Tanning and Dressing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labourers or operatives</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>4s 1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>3s 2d to 3s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>2s 8d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paper Manufacture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brown and grey paper manufacture</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labourers or Operatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>4s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third class</td>
<td>2s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1s 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>1s 2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous Trades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hackle Pin Manufacture, Also Hackle, Gills and All kinds of Steel combs used in Fibrous Working Machinery:*</th>
<th>Wages per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>5s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second class</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers or Operatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First class</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tobacco Manufacture**

**Skilled persons**
- First class: 5s
- Second class: 4s
- Third class: 8d to 1s 8d

**Labourers or operatives**
- Boys: 6d to 9d
- Girls: 6d to 9d
- Women: 1s 2d

*Six manufacturers "The grinders of gill and hackle pins are mostly employed on piece-work, but earn on an average 5s 6d per day. Those who average 4s per day are hackle and comb workers."

**Eleven establishments in Leeds, six of them first-class, trading over whole kingdom.

### Average rates of wages paid in Leeds and Neighbourhood during the year 1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oil Refining</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil miller, men</td>
<td>29s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil miller, boys</td>
<td>10s to 13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enginemen</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwrights</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>18s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tobacco cutting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stovers</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine men</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinners of twist tobacco</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickers, apprentices</td>
<td>5s to 12s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers in Metal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>22s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitesmiths</td>
<td>26s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Rates of wages paid in Leeds and Neighbourhood in the year 1858.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woollen Manufacture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wool sorters, men</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool scourers, driers, etc., men</td>
<td>2s 8d to 3s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slubbers, men</td>
<td>5s 10d to 6s 8d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mule spinners, men 4s 8d
Weavers, handloom, men 2s 6d
Overlookers and tuners 3s 6d to 4s 8d
Millers 3s to 3s 4d
   Overlookers 5s to 6s 8d
Dyers 2s 8d to 3s
   Foreman 5s to 10s
Warpers, women 2s
Weavers, powerloom, women 1s 8d to 2s
Knotters 1s 3d
Burlers 10d to 1s
Servers or filler, for one machine 10d
girls or boys
Billy piecers, boys and girls 8d
Billy piecers, half time, boys & girls 4d

Woollen Cloth Dressing

Dressers, men 3s 4d to 3s 8d
Drawers, men 5s 2s to 6s 8d
Tenters, men 4s 4d to 5s
Press setters 5s 10d to 6s 8d
Engineman 4s
Dressers, young men 2s to 2s 8d
Dressers, boys 8d to 1s 6d
Dressed cloth burlers, women 1s to 1s 2d

Cloth Merchant's Warehouses

Warehouseman 3s 4d to 4s 4d

Average rates of wages in Leeds and Neighbourhood during the year 1860.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Rates of Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flax and Tow Spinning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlookers</td>
<td>22s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and warehouseman</td>
<td>18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and warehouseman boys</td>
<td>6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labourers</td>
<td>15s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labourers boys</td>
<td>5s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinners and twisters, female</td>
<td>6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarn and thread reelers, females</td>
<td>7s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacklers, line and town preparers, boys</td>
<td>4s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacklers, line and town preparers, women</td>
<td>6s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-time hands, in reeling,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
spinning, twisting, etc., boys and girls 2s.

Linen Manufacture

Weavers, female 9s.
Winders, warpers, etc., female 8s.

Iron and Steel Manufacture

Rollers, piece-work 12s
Hammerman, piece-work 9s
Furnaceman, piece-work 9s
Heaters, piece-work 7s
Refiners, piece-work 7s
Puddlers, piece-work 6s 6d

Machine Tool Making*

Fitters and turner 24s to 28s
Moulders 26s to 30s
Pattern makers 22s to 28s
Labourers, unskilled workmen 16s to 18s

*60 hours/week. A great deal of overtime work is performed in large establishments, some men occasionally working 100 hours per week for which they are paid accordingly.

Metal Wares and Brass Work

Braziers 30s
Coppersmiths 30s
Tin-plate workers 24s
Brass moulders 30s
Brass finishers 35s

Leather Manufacture*

Tanners 20s
Leather dressers 23s
Fellmongers 21s

*This is a very important branch of trade in Leeds and a leather fair is held quarterly.

Boot and Shoe Manufacture

Machine hands, female 8s to 15s
Machine fitters, feamel 7s to 15s
General workmen 16s to 20s
### Seed Crushing and Oil Refining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil millers</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enginemen</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwrights</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>18s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rates of wages paid in Manchester and Neighbourhoods during the year 1839, 1849, and 1859

### Shoemakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boot closers</td>
<td>1839 - 26s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1849 - 26s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1859 - 32s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot makers</td>
<td>1839 - 22s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1849 - 23s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1859 - 25s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rates of wages paid in Manchester and Neighbourhood during the year 1859

### Printing and Bookbinding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper compositors/weekly paper</td>
<td>31s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper compositors/daily paper</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositor, general</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressman</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookbinders</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithographers</td>
<td>26s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engravers to copper-plate printers</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hat Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hatters, Silk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body makers</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Finishers</td>
<td>25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippers off</td>
<td>35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatters, Felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body makers</td>
<td>22s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofers</td>
<td>32s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockers</td>
<td>35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyers</td>
<td>30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishers</td>
<td>28s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown sewers, women and girls</td>
<td>9s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimmers</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cabinet Making and Upholstery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet and chair makers</td>
<td>28s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carvers 30s
Polishers 20s
Upholsterers 30s
Upholsterers, women 10s

**Coach and Carriage Building**

- Body makers 35s
- Carriage makers 30s
- Springmakers 38s
- Smiths 35s
- Vice-men 22s
- Wheelers 30s
- Strikers 14s
- Body painters 32s
- Carriage painters 28s
- Labourers 16s 6d
- Trimmers 32s

**Building Trades**

- Bricklayers 33s
- Bricklayers, Labourers 21s
- Stone-masons 30s
- Stone-masons, Labourers 18s
- Slaters 26s
- Slaters, Labourers, 18s
- Plumbers 28s
- Plasterers 28s
- Painters 28s
- Joiners 28s
- Paperhangers 30s

Average rates of wages paid in Leeds and Neighbourhood during the year 1877

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages per hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers</td>
<td>8 1/2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House carpenters</td>
<td>8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterers</td>
<td>8 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaters</td>
<td>8 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>7 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaziers</td>
<td>7 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>7 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasfitters</td>
<td>7 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellhangers</td>
<td>7 1/2 d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paperhangers 7d
Labourers, generally 6d

Source: Returns of Wages published between 1830 and 1886
### APPENDIX D

**STREETS FREQUENTLY MENTIONED BY CRITICS AS CONTAINING BACK-TO-BACK HOUSES AND POOR SANITARY CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Court</td>
<td>4 back-to-backs on either side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Field</td>
<td>3 rows of back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalier Street</td>
<td>all back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson's Yard</td>
<td>8 back-to-backs, entered through a tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Lisbon Street</td>
<td>some back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufton's Yard</td>
<td>12 back-to-backs, 6 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenezer Street</td>
<td>38 back-to-backs, 11 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulden's Buildings</td>
<td>24 back-to-backs in interior court; adjoining graveyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Street</td>
<td>33 back-to-backs, 11 through; adjoining markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howarth Court</td>
<td>14 back-to-backs, entered through tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td>31 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Street</td>
<td>41 back-to-backs, 9 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah's Ark</td>
<td>10 back-to-backs in totally enclosed court but one of the few developments south of the river that came to the attention of reformers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Street</td>
<td>53 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Street</td>
<td>40 back-to-backs, 3 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paley's Galleries</td>
<td>back-to-backs of several stories, unique in Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip's Yard</td>
<td>11 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry Hill</td>
<td>26 back-to-backs, many through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Court</td>
<td>7 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Street</td>
<td>29 back-to-backs, 2 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>23 back-to-backs, 4 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes Yard</td>
<td>14 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templar Street</td>
<td>49 back-to-backs, 36 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Street</td>
<td>53 back-to-backs, 3 through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker's Yard</td>
<td>18 back-to-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Place</td>
<td>12 back-to-backs (at least)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Yard</td>
<td>38 back-to-backs and 15 single cottages (at least)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FIRST GENERATION: THE 43 STREETS MADE UP WHOLLY OR PARTLY OF BACK-TO-BACKS BUILT BETWEEN 1781 AND 1815

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bow Street (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Bow Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bridge Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Burmantofts Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Field (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Row, Middle Row, Back Row</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cankerwell Lane (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalier Street (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Street (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Chatham Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke Street (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ebenezer Street (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellerby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellerby Lane (27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Ellerby Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*George's Street (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back George's Street (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulden Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Goulden's Bldgs (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Harper Street (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back High Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hope Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Street (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall's Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Row (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East King Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leighton Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Line Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Lane (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nelson Street (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Park Street (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Row (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Nile Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Off Street (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Queen Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randerson's Yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Road (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anne's Lane (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*St. James' Street (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steander Row (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sykes Yard (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templar Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Street (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Row (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker's Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker's Row</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*York Street (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back York Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Street (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Zion Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion Square</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Little London - Reuben Street (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers in brackets after each name are the cholera cases in 1832 (Robert Baker, Report of the Leeds Board of Health [1833], 21-7. The 372 cases in these 43 streets made up 28 percent of the total (1,448) for the in-township.

The list consists of streets, etc, that (a) appear on Netlam and Giles' plan of 1815 and also (b) have back-to-backs indicated on the large-scale (five-foot = one mile) OS plan of 1850. It also includes Reuben Street, Little London, which lay within the in-township but just beyond the bounds of the 1815 plan; Great Woodhouse hamlet, also part of the in-township, lay beyond the area of the 1815 plan but Thorpe's plan of 1821 shows no streets laid out beyond the courts and folds except possibly Pickard Street (which was back-to-back).

Streets marked by asterisks* also had cellar dwellings.


THE SECOND GENERATION: 360 OTHER STREETS WITH BACK-TO-BACKS, BUILT 1815-1850
(Back-to-back houses on OS 'Five-foot' plan of Leeds, 1850)

Sheet 1
Smith's Bldgs
Clarkson's Row
Pleasant Green
Pleasant Court
King's Row
King's Court
Graveley Tce
Graveley Row

Sheet 2
Moseley St
Albert St
Chancellor St
Rhodes Sq
Buslingthorpe Row
Scott Hall St

Sheet 3
Hobson's Bldgs
Close St
Mark St
Spenceley St
St Mark's St
Cross Mark St
Asquith St
Cemetery St
Cross Cemetery St
Scotts Tce
Holborn Tce
Charing Cross St
Huddersfield St
Bateson St
Toulson Row
Sheet 4
Lapish St
Pickard St
Pickard Green
Horrock St
Tolson St
Daisy St
Hobson St
Walsh Row
Oaklands Row
Oaklands St
Beckett St
Alfred Tce
Camp St
Meanwood St
Reuben St
Back Reuben St
Primrose St
Sheepscar Bldgs
Victoria Place
Barrack St
Buslingthorpe St
Buslingthorpe Lane
Buslingthorpe Tce
Chapletown Rd
Wild's Court
Roundhay Rd
Wingham St
Wingham Place
Wingham Tce
White St
Roundhay St
Queen's Tce
Sheepscar Row
Sheepscar Green
Sheepscar Vale
Chapeltown St

Sheet 6
Fenton St
Sunny Bank Tce
Toulson Place
Cankerwell Lane
St James' St
Portland Crescent
Back Portland
Crescent

Sheet 7
Carr St
Elmwood Vale
Elmwood St
Cobourg St
Queen's Pl
Barclay St
Whitelock St
Stamford St
Darley St
Lilac Tce
Concord St
Imperial St
Myrtle St
Busfield St
Vandyke St
Byron St
Cannon St
Mason St
Cloth St

Sheet 8
Winnflower Place
Lincolnfield Tce
Lincolnfield Row
Lincolnfield Place
Lincoln St
Hay Mount Place
Hay Mount Bldgs
New Cleveland St
Cherry St
Cherry Row
Pilot St
Rushworth St
Haigh St
Cambridge St
Grey St
Lion St
Tiger St
Violet St
Low Close Bldgs
Providence Bldgs
St Luke's Tce
Upper Cherry St
Green St
Pollard St
Lilac Tce
Concord St
Accommodation Place
Accommodation Tce
Harrison's Bldgs
Farrar St
Boston St
Selby St
Whitehall St
Anglesea St
Beckett St

Sheet 9

Hollis St
Grattan St
Florist St
England St
Dover St
Corporation St
Baker St
Angel St
North Hall St
North Hall Tce
Pimlico St
Burley Road
Caroline Place
Park Lane
Newcastle St
Durham St
Darlington St
Wortley St
Wellington Tce
Abbey St
Denton St
Thackray St

Sheet 10

Harcourt Place
Marlborough St
Chatham St
Hanover St
Back Hanover St
Howard St
New Park St
Back Park St
Park Court
Fountain St
Caroline St
Parliament St
Government St
Somers St
Bedford Place
Chorley Lane
Leighton Lane
Oxford St
Bentick St

Portland St
Portland Crescent
West St
Henrey St
Charley St
Forest St
Mercy St
Wellington St
Well St
Back Well St
Skinner St
Grove St
Lisbon St
School St
Eldon St
Cropper Gate
Wellington Place
Calder St
Airedale Pl
Westminster Pl
Cross Lisbon St
Castle St
Saville St
Little Queen St

Sheet 11

Russell Pl
Merrion St
Belgrave St
Back Nile St
Nile St
Copenhagen St
Hope St
Templar St
Lower Templar St
Cross Templar St
Bridge St
Livery St
Malt St
Templar's Court
Moscow St
Noble St
Sun St
Star St
Gower St
Brewery St
Bell St
Poland St
Saint St
Time St
Pendulum St
Tulip St
Pink St
Rose St
Little Bridge St
Lydia St
Nelson St
Union St
Ebenezer St
George's St
Back George's St
East Lane
Harper St
Sykes' Yard
Sykes St
Goulden's Bldgs
Goulden's Square
Dyers St
Somerset St
Upper Somerset St
Little Somerset St
Cross Somerset St
Duke St
Quarry Hill
St Anns Lane
Charles St
Clarkson's Yd
St Mary's Row
Church St
Little Line St
Billett St
Cross Billett St
Shear St
High St
Back High St
Upper Corn Hill
Little Albion St
York St
Brick St
Off St
Brussels St
Lee's Square

Orange St
Mason's Bldgs
Stone St
Plane St
Stainburn Sq
Vienna St
Vienna Court
Cross Vienna St
Purdy St
Giles St
Chapel St
Carver St
Cross Ebenzer St
Helen Court
York Court
Crispin St
Cato St
Railway St
Grantham St
Madras St
East Field St
Clay St
Glue St
Cross Shannon St
Steel St
Flint St
Forester's Arms Court
Cleveland St
Plaid Row
Cable Row
Shannon Row
Vincent St
Rodney St
Sloe St
Hatfield St
Shaw St
Elm St
Oak St
Upper Accommodation Rd
Keeton St
Sugden St
Blackburn's Cresc
Cottage St
Woodman St
Bath St
Beckett St
East Beckett St
East Grove St
Rock St
Burmantofts

Sheet 12

Linsley Row
Union Row
Boynton St
Hound St
Fox St
Cross High St
Prospect Row
Lemon St
Upper Burmantofts St
Cross Burmantofts St
Barker's Row
Barker's Bldgs
Waterloo St
Pea St
Anchor St
Bean St
Acorn St
Upper Acorn St
Mulberry St
Wheat St
Bread St
Apple St
Windsor St
Edgar St
Plato St
Railway Tce
Accommodation Row
Pleasant Row

Sheet 14

Front Row (Camp Field)
Middle Row
Back Row
Stone Row

Sheet 15

Pool Row
Pitt Row
Short Row
Williams Court
Walker's Row
Walker's Yard
Steander Row
New Lane
New Lane Place
Hinchliffe's Court
Land's Court
Kendall St
Kendall Row
Waterloo St

Sheet 16

Foundry St
Milk St
Brook St
Lower Cross St

Upper Cross St
Upper Cross Yd
Spring St
Spring Yard
Giles' Bldgs
Ball's Bldgs
Lumb St
Brighton Yard
Brighton Court
Wheeler St
Mill St
Worsted St
Spinner St
Richmond Rd
East Field St
Clay St
Edmund St
Catherine St
Providence St
Cross St
Little Providence St
Dolphin St
Little Dolphin St
Short Dolphin St
Cross Dolphin St
Dufton St
Wrigglesworth St
Copper St
Brass St
Brown's Bldgs
Upper Wrigglesworth St
New Row
Flax St
Kendall's Bldgs
Back Ellerby Rd
East King St
East Queen St
Zion St
Back Zion St
Zion Square
Cavalier St
Upton's Court
Willis St
Morpeth St
Upper Cavalier St
High Markland St
Fawcett St
Cookson St
Sussex Court
Sussex St
Surrey St
Leicester St
Kent St
Elam St
Sheffield St
Bachelor's St
Bachelor's Bldgs
Lower Bachelor St
Ellerby Lane
Walker's Place
Carnation St
Dahlia St

Sheet 19

John St
Orfeur St
Barstow St
Douglas St
Banner St

Sheet 20

Bridgefield Bldgs

Note: No back-to-backs on Sheets 5, 13, 17, 18. Sheets 21-25 cover land outside in-township.

APPENDIX E

MALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY DENOMINATION

Unitarians

Blackett, Lancelot Fitzgerald, Linen yarn merchant
Dunderdale, David, woollen cloth merchant
Jennings, Benjamin, cloth merchant
Lilley, Joseph, shoemaker
Lupton, Darnton, woollen cloth merchant
Mallinson, Benjamin, woollen cloth finisher
Marsden, Joseph, shopkeeper
Musgrave, Albert, dyer
Musgrave, William, dyer
Oxley, Henry, private banker
Ramsden, Thomas, boot maker
Rhodes, Joseph, stuff dyer
Stears, Thomas, joiner
Sutcliffe, John, journeyman carpet weaver
Varley, Thomas, bricklayer
Walker, Thomas, malster
Wardle, Thomas, share broker
Wellbeloved, Charles, Secretary of the Leeds Manure Co.
Williams, Benjamin, innkeeper
Wood, James, wood turner, master employing 1 man

Independents

Armstrong, Robert Leslie, Independent minister
Atkinson, James, Commission agent
Atkinson, William A., carpet dyer
Baines, Edward, Proprietor and editor of the Leeds Mercury
   and master printer employing 41 men and boys
Bean, William, engineer fitter
Bennet, James, labourer upon the road
Bennet, William, dyer
Bingley, John, bookkeeper timber merchant
Blackburn, William Henry Parker, dyer emp 6 men
Booth, Nathaniel, stationer
Buckton, Thomas, druggist
Catley, Robert, stone mason
Cawood, Thomas, clerk post office
Clapham, John Peele, treasurer of County Court
Crossfield, Joseph, clothier 'spinner
Davis, John Clement, handle setter
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Davy, Albert, consul United States
Dealthy, John, spreader flax mill
Dickinson, James, road labourer
Dixon, James, woolstapler
Eddison, Samuel, woollen cloth weaver
Fawcett, James Dawson, woollen spinner
Fletcher, Thomas, cornmiller
Gardam, William, fish dealer
Guthrie, Ebenezer, machine maker
Haigh, George Washington, cloth presser
Hammond, Thomas, dyer
Hampshire, Thomas, shoemaker master emp 20 men
Hardcastle, John, mechanic
Hartley, Christopher, press setter cloth
Hay, Richard Constantine, member Royal College Surgeons, London, practicing apothecary
Hezzlewood, Abraham, hand woollen cloth weaver
Hullah, Robert, brickmaker, employing 5 men
Inman, John, labourer at quarry
Jackson, James, woolsorter and shopkeeper
Janson, Joshua, joiner master employing 1 man
Janson, Thomas, band maker
Kilbinton, William Hoad, clerk machine maker
King, William, cloth dresser journeyman
Kirk, John, rag, paper, waste merchant
Knight, James Young, wholesale and retail stationer
Lambert, Joseph, cloth dresser
Longstaff, Richard, engineer
Mahon, Thomas, chelsea pensioner
Marshall, Benjamin, carrier
Maude, William, clothier
Morton, Jonathan, cloth dresser
Moxon, William, warehouseman
Naylor, Jacob, proprietor of houses
Naylor, John, cloth weaver
Newton, Isaac, mason master employing 6 men
North, David, cloth weaver
Ormsby, Joseph, cloth dresser
Palmer, William, tobacconist
Pape, George, highway surveyor
Parker, Joseph, cloth weaver
Penniston, Thomas, cabinet maker
Pickles, John, cloth millner
Platt, Joseph, cloth maker
Priestly, William, cloth dresser
Rawson, George, solicitor
Richardson, Samuel, woollen cloth weaver
Rider, David, commission cloth merchant
Roebuck, George, woollen merchant and linen draper
Rogers, Robert, innkeeper
Rogers, Thomas, woollen cloth printer
Shackleton, Roger, corn miller, employing 3 men and 2 boys
Smith, Edward, tailor, undertaker, woollen draper
Smith, John, banker
Smith, John Wales, woollen draper and tailor
Smith, Joseph, millwright
Standish, John, plumber and glazier
Sykes, Samuel, dyer
Teale, Jacob, clothier
Temple, Henry, woollen mule spinner
Thornton, William, schoolmaster
Tillotson, George, hackle and gill maker
Tomlinson, William, cordonner
Townend, William, whitesmith journeyman
Turner, Joseph, cloth dresser
Turner, Thomas, cloth finisher
Walker, John, cashier in woollen cloth warehouse
Walker, John, cloth dresser
Walker, John, coal master, firm of 4
Walker, Robert, cloth manufacturer
Webster, Jonathan, woollen cloth manufacturer
Webster, Joseph, canvas weaver
Wheatley, John, schoolmaster
Whitaker, John, woollen cloth manufacturer
Whitehead, John, woollen cloth merchant
Wilkinson, John, felted cloth merchant employing 27 men and 2 women
Winteringham, George, blue dyer
Wood, Thomas, no occupation

Baptists

Armitage, David, cloth spinner
Barnes, Abraham, woollen slubber
Blakley, John, cloth handloom weaver
Booth, William, cart driver
Bradshaw, George, cloth manufacturer employing 2 men
Bragg, John, farm labourer
Brown, John, farm labourer
Chadwick, Joseph, stone mason employing 7 men
Chadwick, William, quarryman
Clegg, Benjamin, cordonner master employing 4 men
Cliff, Joseph, magistrate Borough of Leeds, fire brick manufacturer employing 161 men
Clough, John, butcher
Cordingley, Joseph, cloth handloom weaver
Craven, Edwin, lamplighter
Craven, Thomas, cloth weaver
Craven, William, farmer's man
Dean, John, grocer/draper
Dewhirst, John, delver
Drake, Joseph, woollen handloom weaver
Ellis, John, shoemaker
Ellis, Joseph, farmer's man
Farrar, William, cloth weaver
Fawcett, Benjamin, farmer/corn dealer
Fawcett, Thomas, woollen power loom weaver
Fearnside, Henry, carver and gilder
Fletcher, Richard, labourer
Gaunt, John Edward, woollen hand loom weaver
Gaunt, Nathaniel, woollen hand loom weaver
Gill, John, millwright employing 1 man
Guy, Joseph, woollen hand loom weaver
Hardacre, Joshua, labourer
Hardwick, Thomas, joiner
Heaps, William, plumber
Hessling, Edward, farmer's man
Hewitt, Benjamin, stone mason
Hill, John, reed and heald maker
Hinchcliff, William, gray slate riveer
Hobson, James, cloth weaver
Holdsworth, John, warehouseman
Holgate, Joseph, woollen cloth fuller
Hollings, Thomas, porter
Hudson, William, grocer
Hyde, James, woollen cloth weaver
Kitson, John, cloth weaver
Mancy, John, joiner
Marsden, John, millwright man
Marsden, Joseph, cloth weaver
Marsden, Samuel, handloom weaver
Middlebrook, Joseph, woollen cloth weaver
Morris, George, quarryman
Naylor, John, cloth weaver
Naylor, Richard, quarryman
Nichols, John, butcher
Pickles, George, innkeeper
Pickles, John, joiner and builder
Pratt, Thomas, woollen cloth manufacturer employing 4 men
Proctor, Thomas, mason
Purdon, John, cloth dresser
Robinson, Charles, mule spinner
Smailes, John, mechanic
Smith, Joseph, woollen cloth manufacturer
Spence, William, woollen handloom weaver
Spurr, Robert, shoemaker
Tailford, Nathan, tomb stone engraver
Tate, Joseph, woollen spinner
Thompson, John, carpenter
Turner, John, cloth maker
Walker, James, wool carder
Walker, James, butcher and grocer
Waterhouse, John, power loom overlooker
Webster, Samuel James, slubber
Wentworth, Joseph, woollen handloom weaver
Wheatley, Jonathan, woollen spinner
Wilson, John, stone mason
Wilson, Nathan, clothier
Wood, John, woollen cloth miller

Society of Friends

Broadhead, William, cloth drawer and coffee house keeper
Cash, Newman, cloth stuff merchant
Dyson, William, corn miller master employing 6 men
Edison, Edwin, solicitor
Galloway, Thomas, painter master employing 7 men and 2 boys
Gardner, Richard, linen draper employing 4 men
Hall, William, carpenter master employing 6 men and 4 lab.
Haworth, William, coach builder master employing 16 men and
18 apprentices
Jowitt, John, retired woolstapler
Kershaw, James, watchman
Kitching, Joseph, sharebroker
Linsley, Joseph, mustard, cocoa and chicory manufacturer
employing 26 workers
Marshall, William, sharebroker
Mason, George, corn miller
Naylor, John, flour dealer
Thistlewaite, Anthony, flour dealer
Thorne, James, tea dealer and grocer
Walker, Thomas, cloth manufacturer
Walker, Thomas, flax spinner
Walton, Benjamin, saddler
Watson, Nathaniel, oil miller journeyman
West, William, professor, analectical chemist

Wesleyan Methodists

Addy, George, cloth dresser
Anderson, John, grocer
Anderson, John, cloth dresser
Appleyard, George, cloth weaver
Armitage, Samuel, cart driver
Armitage, William, woollen spinner
Atack, David, coal miner
Austerberry, Michael, police officer
Bagot, Thomas, coal leader, master employing 2 servants
Batty, Joshua, woollen hand loom weaver
Bell, Michael, tailor
Bellhouse, William, chandler, master employing 2 men
Best, William, cloth weaver, parish relief
Blackburn, William, sawyer
Booth, Abraham, cloth overlooker
Booth, Thomas, cloth weaver
Booth, William, stone mason
Boothman, David, builder employing 37 men
Broadley, Joseph, labourer, chelsea pensioner
Broadley, Joseph, labourer, chelsea pensioner
Brogden, Joseph, miner
Brook, Joshua, commission agent
Brown, John, journeyman whitesmith
Brown, Samuel, engraver and printer journeyman
Buckley, John, clothier
Bulmer (s), Michael, mason
Burgoyne, James, provision dealer
Burrows, John, letter sorter
Butterfield, John, tailor, shopkeeper, and letter carrier
Calverly, James, coal miner
Calvert, Thomas, shoemaker and Hotel Temperance
Carr, Charles, rope and sailmaker
Clarkson, Thomas, cloth drawer
Claufton, William, machine maker
Clayton, John, millwright and farmer of 6 acres
Clough, John, woollen hand spinner
Coates, Robert, linen weaver
Cooke, Thomas, printer compositor
Cooper, George, butcher
Cornforth, Joshua, hair dresser
Davidson, Nathan, chemist
Davison, Benjamin, cloth fuller
Davison, James, shoemaker
Dean, Robert, stay maker, master employing 5 women and 1 apprentice
Deane, John, mechanic
Denison, William, shopkeeper, huckster
Denton, Samuel, handloom weaver
Dews, Enoch, time keeper cloth
Dixon, Nathan, woollen factory overlooker
Dove, Christopher, retired leather merchant
Driver, Richard Clapham, schoolmaster
Duck, James, tanner and brazier
Dunderdale, Job, iron driller mechanic
Eddison, George, canvas weaver
Ellis, John, linen draper
Farrar, John, metal weigher at iron foundry
Fawcett, Matthew, spinner
Fearnley, John, woollen manufacturer employing 30 men
Fearsides, William, cloth hand loom weaver
Fernie, David, mechanic
Firth, Abraham, woollen spinner
Firth, John, clothier
Firth, Thomas, woollen manufacturer and cotton dealer
Fletcher, Thomas, clock and watch maker
Fowler, Thomas, street paver
Gill, Christopher, milk man
Goodall, Richard, farm labourer
Gott, William, clothier
Gough, Peter, boot and shoemaker
Greenwood, Michael, iron moulder
Grimshaw, David, railway clerk
Haley, John, bundler of iron
Haley, Joseph, cloth manufacturer employing 143 women, 46 men and 22 boys
Hardacre, Joseph, labourer at stone quarry
Harrison, Jonathan, cartman
Hemsley, George, cloth spinner
Hicks, John, bookseller, periodical publisher and binder
Higgins, Thomas, mechanic
Hind, William, dyer of black cloth
Hodgson, John, coal leader (?)
Holgate, John, cloth mill overlooker
Horsefield, Nathan, commercial tea traveller
Horsman, Thomas, corn miller, master employing 6 men
Hudson, John, bricklayer
Hudson, Thomas, shopkeeper
Humble, Richard, joiner
Hutchinson, James, canvas weaver
Illingworth, David, dyer
Isles, Thomas, cloth dresser
Jackson, Thomas, tailor
Johnson, Benjamin, staymaker employing 3 women
Kenworthy, Robert, flock dealer
Kitson, John, cloth weaver
Knight, William, woollen mule spinner
Langstaff, John, cloth handloom weaver
Lawson, James, woolstapler
Lawson, William, tailor
Leach, John, woollen spinner
Lear, Thomas, blacksmith
Lister, John, hair setting and curled hair manufacturer employing 2 men and 4 boys
Lister, Thomas, bricklayer
Lockwood, Charles, deliver
Lockwood, Thomas, cloth weaver
Lofthouse, Leonard, milk dealer
Longbottom, Joseph, fire brick manager
Masterman, Thomas, gardener
Mathews, Joseph, woollen cloth weaver
May, John, joiner
Mortimer, James, cloth weaver
Musgrave, John, woollen cloth manufacturer employing 2 men
Newell, Thomas, cordwainer
Nicholson, William, joiner and builder employing 15 men and 3 apprentices
Noble, Luke, warehouseman
Norfolk, Abraham, farm labourer
Norton, Jonathan, plumber and glazier
Othick, William, woollen cloth dresser
Padgett, George, cabinet maker
Parker, Edmund, smith master employing 3 men and 1 boy
Pearson, Joseph, fire brick agent
Perkin, Stanhope, woollen cloth scourer
Pool, Benjamin, warehouseman flax
Pool, Luke, bolt and screw manufacturer employing 40 hands
Proctor, David, flax machine maker
Pullan, Robert, woollen spinner
Radcliffe, Charles, Wesleyan minister, Bramley
Reinhardt, Johann Christian, chemist and druggist master
Rhodes, John, handloom stay weaver
Rhodes, Robert, post office clerk
Richardson, George, cloth weaver
Robinson, Jonathan, woollen cloth dresser
Robinson, Joseph, woollen cloth weaver
Rogerson, Abraham, coal miner
Rothery, William, canvas manufacturer employing 6 men and 2 women
Schofield, George, cloth dresser
Schofield, Richard, clothier
Scott, Joseph, tailor and provision dealer
Sedgwick, John, cabinet maker and upholsterer employing 1 apprentice
Senior, John, clothier
Settle, James, woollen cloth weaver
Settle, John, listing maker
Sharpe, James, gun maker
Simpson, James, cloth drawer
Simpson, John, farmer 38 acres
Simpson, Richard, butcher
Slater, William, engine tender
Smith, John, commission agent
Smith, John, stuff dyer
Stead, Robert, woollen handloom weaver
Steele, James, salesman (shoemaker)
Stephenson, Samuel, shoemaker
Stokell, Robert, wheelwright
Sugden, Samuel, slubber
Sykes, Benjamin, cloth weaver
Sykes, William, cloth dresser
Taylor, Joseph, joiner, cabinet maker and paperhanger
Teal, William, blacksmith
Thackray, Joseph, foreman wool merchant
Thompson, Joseph, shoemaker
Thompson, Mark, iron founder
Thompson, Thomas, policeman
Thornton, Robert, coal miner
Todd, Joseph, overlooker cloth factory
Todd, Samuel, woollen handloom weaver
Townsley, John, chapel keeper and joiner
Tracey, Joshua, tailor
Valentine, James, currier
Varley, James, woollen handloom eaver
Veveris, Patrick, tanner foreman
Wade, Abraham, cloth weaver
Wade, Thomas, clothier
Wadkin, Joseph, overlooker at flax mill
Wainwright, Charles, joiner
Wainwright, Ralph, working chemist
Waite, Thomas, groom
Waite, William, cloth dresser
Walker, James, handloom weaver
Walker, Samuel, malster master employing 16 men
Walton, George, woollen cloth dresser
Wealding, James, cloth dresser
Whitaker, John, cloth weaver
Whitaker, William, smith
Whittles, Joseph, stuff slubber
Wilks, Thomas, shoemaker
Wilson, Jasper, bricklayer
Wood, George, woollen cloth dresser
Wood, James, cloth warehouseman
Wood, James, no occupation

Methodist New Connexion

Annal, Robert, shoemaker master
Briggs, John, woollen spinner
Fowler, James, woollen cloth weaver
Hargreaves, John, tin plate worker
Hartley, Jonas, journeyman cooper
Holt, Samuel, cloth weaver
Hopwood, David, bricklayer's labourer
Mortimer, James, woollen spinner
Rawson, George, cordwainer, chelsea pensioner
Rider, Jacob, dyer and shopkeeper
Roberts, George, cloth dresser
Roberts, John, woolsorter
Sunderland, Joseph, pawnbroker
Tiffany, Christopher, brush manufacturer employing 7 men and 3 boys
Wainman, Benjamin, grocer
Wainman, John, woollen weaver
Wilkinson, Robert, cloth dresser
Wilson, John, tobacco pipe maker
Woffindin, Richard, overlooker in flax mill
Wood, John, cloth dresser
Wright, Robert, boot and shoemaker employing 2 men

Primitive Methodists

Armitage, William, cloth dresser
Briggs, William, at brickyard
Carlton, David, joiner
Eddison, Jeremiah, clothier
Fawcett, John, farmer 5 acres
Flather, John, woollen cloth weaver  
Goodson, Jonn, clothier  
Grayson, John, handloom weaver  
Haywood, John, cloth dresser  
Heaton, John, cloth fuller  
Hollingsworth, John, coal miner  
Hollingsworth, Thomas, coal miner  
Hudson, Isaac, agricultural labourer  
Hunter, Thomas, woollen cloth dresser  
Hutton, James, handloom weaver  
Kendall, Thomas, woollen cloth dresser  
Land, William, rope maker  
Mansfield, Jonn, agricultural labourer  
Myers, Thomas, farm labourer  
Morton, William, cotton weaver, chelsea pensioner  
Peat, John, woollen cloth dresser  
Popplewell, George, woollen yarn spinner  
Riley, Joseph, coal tender  
Ruecroft, George, labourer  
Stead, John, hand cloth weaver  
Stead, John, clerk machine works  
Summersgill, Joseph, linen weaver  
Thrippleton, Jonn, woollen cloth maker  
Wade, John, labourer stoneyard  
Webster, Miles, labourer  
Whitely, Jonn, cloth dresser  

Mormons  
Ashman, John, plasterer  
Bagshaw, Edward, grinder  
Barnes, John, boot and shoemaker  
Barrass, George, water carrier carrying Holbeck spa water, late cloth weaver  
Brook, John, locomotive engine tester  
Campbell, Bryce, carpenter  
Eddison, William, brickmaker  
Emsley, William, pipe maker  
Fairburn, Edward, boot and shoemaker (visitor at John Barnes)  
Field, Joseph, needle maker  
Fishburn, Francis, tobacco pipe maker  
Green, Thomas, mariner  
Hellewell, Robert, grinder  
Hill, George Thomas, pork butcher  
Holland, Joseph, tailor master employer and manufacturer  
Hutchinson, George, handloom weaver  
Jaques, William, blacksmith  
Jarvis, Henry John, hatter  
Kedington, William, seaweed dresser  
Lambert, Thomas, leather dresser  
Newton, Samuel, bricklayer
Nuns, Robert, tailor
Pullan, Thomas, wood sawyer
Reeve, Robert Warne, manufacturing chemist
Riall, Richard, stoker at gas house
Richardson, John George, shoemaker (visitor at John Barnes)
Scarborough, John, railway porter (husband of a member)
Scatcherd, Samuel, boiler maker (husband of a member)
Shires, William, wool dyer
Tempest, Joseph, bricklayer labourer
Terry, Henry, woolcomber
Woodworth, John, boilermaker
Young, Thomas, inland revenue officer
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ABSTRACT

This thesis examined the Nonconformist denominational membership in the Borough of Leeds during the early Victorian era to determine the social composition of its members. The chapel goers of Old Dissent, represented by the Unitarians, Baptists, Independents, and the Society of Friends, and New Dissent, represented by the Wesleyan Methodists, Methodist New Connexion, Primitive Methodists and the Mormons were the basis for this study. The results of the occupational, residential, family, and migration analysis revealed a surprisingly high percentage of working classes (72) represented among the Dissenters. This fact flies in the face of contemporary observation and historical investigation, which placed English Nonconformity as a middle class phenomenon. There were also significant differences among the denominations. The Friends displayed an upper middle class orientation, the Unitarians and Independents, were more educated, with slightly less than half their membership middle class, and the remaining denominations proved to be more attractive to the working classes.
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