CHAPTER 4

PUBLICANS AND SOCIAL COHESION

The key issue explored in this chapter is the social importance of the publican. In the introduction and first three chapters of this thesis an argument has been developed that the Victorian pub was an important agency of social cohesion within urban communities experiencing rapid growth. A corollary of this thesis is that the landlord or landlady – the licence holder – could and often did serve a significant function within the community of people that regarded themselves as 'regulars' at his or her public house. The particular emphasis in this chapter is to discuss the length of time that publicans remained the licence holders at their public houses. It is presumed that the longer the length of that licence holding, the more significant is likely to have been the role of the publican as an agent of social cohesion.

The term 'regular' was first coined in the fourteenth century to describe a person who was subject to a religious rule.[1] There are perhaps parallels to be drawn with the way the term came to be used in later centuries to describe those who drank regularly in the same pub – their 'local'. These latter-day 'regulars', too, were bound by ties of obligation and familiarity, drawn by their neighbourhood links to share time with friends and acquaintances in an activity – drinking – that had its own rituals and – through the inebriating effects of the alcohol – its own transcendent qualities. There are grounds for

finding parallels between the role of the church and that of the pub for individuals and social groups.[2]

To pursue the analogy of the pub as a church, it seems plausible to suggest that within working-class communities lacking any alternative religious experience the publican may have taken on some of the functions of the priest. There would have been within the working classes a social and personal need to find meaning and security in a world that was changing so rapidly, although such a dynamic is difficult to analyse within the disciplines of historical research. The population of England had nearly doubled from 8.6 million to 16.5 million between 1801 and 1851, with industrialisation and urbanisation transforming the social landscape and leading sometime in the early years of the nineteenth century to the identification by contemporaries of the 'working classes'. [3] Most of these working classes avoided institutional religion.

The Census of Religious Worship (1851) indicated that around 40 per cent of the population had not attended any place of religious worship on Sunday 30 March in 1851. It was a figure far higher than contemporaries had expected. [4] The figure for non-attendance within the working classes alone would have been higher still. Within Norwich, 53.9 per cent had not attended, compared with the national and Norfolk figures for non-attendance of 41.9 per cent and 34.7 per cent, respectively.[5] The curate in charge of the parish of St. Edmund in Norwich noted in the Census that:

'this parish consists principally of working people engaged in the different branches of Norwich manufacture very few of which can be prevailed upon to attend any place of Public Worship' [384]. [6]

Such frankness is singular, but the observation would have held good in many of the thirty-five parishes within Norwich.

In general, the conclusion holds that religious practice in the large towns ran at much lower levels than in other smaller communities. In the sixty-five large towns, including London, identified by the Census Report, aggregate attendances for all denominations were about two-thirds of those for the rest of England and Wales.[7] Nationally, Norwich was ranked in the top half of this table for non-attendance: twenty-fourth out of the sixty-five large towns. Significantly, as Ede and Virgoe themselves noted, Ipswich and Cambridge, the nearest major towns to Norwich, each have populations half the size of Norwich and come towards the bottom of the table: fifty-eighth and sixty-first respectively.[8] An examination of Table 4.1, however, indicates the danger of over-generalising and concluding simply that the larger the town (and therefore the higher the number of the working classes within it), the lower the percentage of those attending church. There are numerous exceptions to this conclusion, suggesting the importance of local and regional factors. Nevertheless, a link between size of population and non-attendance may be drawn, albeit hedged with caveats. It is significant that only six of the forty-one towns below Norwich in the table for non-attendance have larger populations.[9]

Moreover, urban centres that had experienced a significant increase in population were likely to have difficulties in providing ecclesiastical accommodation for all its population. Norwich might pride itself on its numerous places of worship – eighty-one are recorded in the 1851 Census – but once the Census was published in January 1854 a local newspaper calculated that whereas in Norfolk sittings in churches and chapels across all denominations were available for 70 per cent of the population, in Norwich only 42 per cent (around 29,000) of its population of 68,706 was provided for.[10] The urban working classes may have preferred to make meaning in their lives through time spent in the drinking place rather than the church or chapel but it is important not to overlook the social

geography of church and pub: there were more than enough pubs and too few churches and chapels to accommodate the working classes.

The development of social relations at a particular pub, as ‘regulars’ made a drinking place their own ‘local’, would have been a pattern repeated across the network of public houses and beerhouses within any urban community and is likely to have played a key part in the development of working-class communities in Norwich. A general need, common to all those who consumed alcohol (barring the few solitary drinkers), would be for a sense of belonging and attachment. A publican who remained the licence holder in a public house for a long period would be likely to be serving an important social function within his or her own community. This would seem to be true not only of the publican but also of his or her family. Pubs were places where people went not only to drink but also sometimes to eat food that had to be cooked, and to be entertained as well as to entertain themselves. The family pub could play its part in all three activities in a way that the single publican could not.

Regrettably, any examination of the role of the publican is constrained by the dearth of extended direct primary source material such as private journals or newspaper obituaries.[11] However, as is evident in Chapter 3 above, Walter Wicks provided significant evidence for the importance of the drinking place as a social institution and some specific detail for the social importance of the publican. His accounts of the pugilist landlords who were also linked with local politics, such as “Cock” Blyth, “Licker” Pratt and “Dick” Nickalls, offer a rare glimpse of this particular type of working class leader.[12] And most significantly for this research, quantitative data for the length of licence holding has survived. Initially, I analysed the ‘Registers of Victuallers Licences for the City of Norwich’ that cover the later

Victorian period.[13] In Bradford, the records of licensing sessions earlier than the twentieth century were not available, apart from a few fragmentary survivals.[14] The survival of the Norwich registers has meant that for the first time such a study is possible. Moreover, another important source later came to light: 'The Schedule of Agreement for the hire of Bullards' Public Houses' which covered the period from 1843 to 1867.[15] This discovery allowed the analysis to be extended back into the earlier Victorian period and served both to confirm the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the registers and to develop new insights.

In order to make a more effective comparison of the figures from the registers, I decided to divide the licence holding publicans into three groups, according to whether they were long-term licence holders (a term that was defined as seven years or longer); medium-term licence holders (a term that was defined as less than seven years and more than two years); or short-term licence holders (defined as two years or less). [16] In total, there were 2902 holders of annual licences recorded in the first Register, 1867-93. Of these, the number of long-term licence holders was 804 (27.7 per cent). Therefore, over a quarter of the publicans of Norwich had served what may justifiably be termed a long-term period behind the bar. Eighty-eight of these 804 were female (10.9 per cent), most becoming the publican after the death of their husband, the previous licence holder.[17] The number of medium-term licence holders was 872 (30.0 per cent). Therefore, over a half of the publicans of Norwich had served behind the same bar for more than two years. Ninety-five of these 872 were female (10.9 per cent again, a consistent figure).

Nevertheless, the number of short-term licence holders was 1226 (42.2 per cent). Approaching a half of the publicans of Norwich had served for two years or less. One

hundred and thirty-two of these 1226 were female (10.8 per cent, again a notably consistent percentage). An initial reaction to such statistics is to be struck by the high number of short-term licence holders and raises the question: how far may such figures call into question the argument that publicans were agents of social cohesion? If there are so many publicans serving for two years or less, then the picture is suggestive perhaps of overall instability.

It is clearly essential to address this issue of the high number of short-term publicans. Some insight into the reasons underlying the fluidity of licence holding in some pubs at particular times is provided in the source material itself. Not only do the registers record the names of the annual licence holder at each public house but also they include the names of the holders of any temporary licence at each public house. Individuals could obtain a temporary form of licence through securing a transfer from the previous holder at one of several transfer sessions that were held during the year. The temporary licence was then converted into the annual certificate in the August general annual licensing session. However, not all the holders of the transfers did proceed to the stage of securing the full annual licence; there might, indeed, be as many as three or four transfers to different individuals during the year before the eventual issuing of the annual certificate.[18] Both the reasons for these transfers and the reasons why individuals did not necessarily proceed to become the annual licence holder are often not apparent but a number of explanations are possible and some of these would also serve to help explain the phenomenon of short-term licence holding.

Is there a policy of vetting being operated by the brewery in some instances, in effect a system of probation? Do some of these new landlords fail to make the grade with the

customers on the other side of the bar? Did some of them fail to produce sufficient capital, as required by the brewery to match the valuation of the property? How many proved incompetent? Or did some find the competition was too much and they could not make ends meet in a low barrelage pub? Does an offer of more attractive employment provide the explanation? Sometimes the explanation is clear enough since death may intervene and this has been recorded - publicans did have a higher than average mortality.[19] Or the register entry may detail the perils of falling foul of the law.[20]

Brewery or customer disapproval of the publican, financial problems, alternative employment opportunities, death, or the hand of the law provide a range of explanations for both temporary transfers and short-term licence holding. Certainly, those who ‘couldn’t fit in’ or ‘didn’t care for the trade’, to use a brewery official’s phrases [21], would not remain behind the bar. In order for a publican to act as an agent for stability, he or she needed to be accepted by both the customers and the brewery if the pub was ‘tied’. They also needed to be healthy, and sufficiently content with the trade not to seek ‘to improve his position’, again to use the brewery official’s phrase.[22] It is perhaps unsurprising that many publicans did not satisfy all these criteria – not least because there were aspects of urban life in Norwich, as elsewhere, that were in themselves de-stabilising.

Death, or illness, through disease and epidemic, remained an ever-present threat for the Norwich working class.[23] Very significantly, the industrial foundations of working-class life in Norwich had been shaken by the decline in the traditional textile manufacturing industries. By 1876, the two Royal Commissioners, investigating electoral corruption, reported that these staple industries had been:

‘… replaced by wholesale shoemaking and clothing trades, in which labour is very low-priced’.

They found that large sections of the poor population of the city – with estimates varying between 2,000 and 7,000 men – constituted:

'… a floating or migratory section, which wandered from ward to ward … and tenement to tenement'.[24]

The 1871 Census had recorded a Norwich population of 80,386 so these estimates are a significant part of the adult male population. Such an official picture of the city's economic instability suggests a milieu in which some of those who aspired to rise from this floating section of the population would have tried their hand at running a pub. Some might have succeeded; others would have failed. In the context of such fluidity in the labour market, a measure of temporary and short-term licence holding becomes less surprising.

Moreover, my analysis of the statistics for those pubs that had a large number of short-term publicans indicates that the picture of instability was not all that it seemed. I decided to take the figure of six or more short-term publicans between 1867 and 1893 as indicative of an unstable pub and found a total of forty-three such public houses.[25] Fifteen of these pubs only had no long-term tenants.[26] All of the remaining twenty-eight pubs had at least one long-term publican, and five of them had two long-term publicans.[27] This way of analysing the statistics produces a different emphasis from the initial observation that there was a high percentage (42.2 per cent) of short-term publicans. Out of a total of 530, there were forty-three (8.1 per cent) public houses that experienced a significant measure of instability as a result of short-term licence holding and only fifteen (2.8 per cent) of these experienced nothing but the short-term publican. Within these forty-three pubs, 334 (28.3 per cent) of the 1200 short-term publicans are concentrated and produce an average of 7.8 short-term publicans per pub.[28] Over a quarter of the short-term publicans are to be found in less than a tenth of the pubs.

The exceptional nature of this instability is made even clearer when the figures for all Norwich are considered. The total of 530 Norwich pubs and the total of 1200 short-term publicans produce an average of 2.3 short-term publicans per pub. However, when the forty-three 'unstable' pubs and their 334 short-term publicans are deducted from these totals, the resulting figures – 487 pubs with 866 short-term publicans – produce an average of 1.8, a further decline of 0.5. It seems reasonable to conclude that the phenomenon of publican instability was concentrated in only a small number of Norwich pubs.

Does it then follow that these relatively few 'unstable' public houses are located in particular areas of Norwich? Are there specific 'trouble-spots' in the city where the pubs are evidently not yet acting as agencies of social cohesion and where the drinking places and the associated drunken behaviour were actually contributing to the social disorder? How far may the statistics for convictions against the licences of publicans support this idea of pockets of social difficulty that were resistant at least for a time to the general trend towards social cohesion? At first sight, it might seem so. Taking the fifteen pubs in Table 4.2, there appears to be a significant concentration in what can be termed the 'western frontier' area of Norwich that some contemporaries were referring to as 'the new city'. [29] Forty per cent of these pubs were outside the city walls – three pubs were in Heigham, two in Lakenham and one in St. Stephen outside the walls.

However, appearances can be deceptive. There had been a very large increase in the population of Heigham and a large increase in Lakenham between 1851 and 1881. By 1881, 30,409 (34.6 per cent) of the 87,842 population of Norwich were recorded as resident in these two areas. Predictably, there had been a related increase of fifty-five drinking places in these two suburbs within the same period.[30] Given these population and

public house densities, there is less significance than might at first seem in 40 per cent of these ‘unstable’ pubs being outside the city walls since over 35 per cent of the population of Norwich were living in the area made up of Heigham, Lakenham and St. Stephen outside the walls. Given the size of both the population and the number of public houses in the ‘new city’, there does not after all seem to be a significantly large number of ‘unstable’ and ‘difficult’ pubs outside the walls.

Within the walls of Norwich, too, a similar conclusion holds. The nine pubs from Table 4.2 that are in the old city are spread across a range of different parishes.[31] Furthermore, taking the twenty-eight pubs in Table 4.3, a pattern emerges similar to that in Table 4.2. Around a third of these twenty-eight pubs are in the west, outside the city walls. Eight pubs are in Heigham and one – the ‘Coach and Horses’ – in St. Stephen outside the walls. This concentration, however, is again not exceptional given the population and public house density. The remaining nineteen pubs are also spread across a range of different parishes within the city walls.[32] It seems reasonable to conclude that there were no markedly obvious areas of publican instability either within or outside the city walls of Norwich. The ‘unstable’ and ‘difficult’ pub was the exception to the general case that the drinking place in Norwich provided regular contact with a publican who had held the licence long enough to have become a well-known local figure and therefore a key character in the process of social cohesion.

My analysis also suggests that a significant number of those public houses that have been categorised as ‘unstable’ and ‘difficult’ on the basis of their number of short-term licensees may be viewed differently from another perspective. One might expect drunkenness to be more of a problem in such drinking places and also their number of convictions against the

licence to be higher than elsewhere. However, this would appear to be the case for around only half of the fifteen most ‘difficult’ pubs and when one takes into account all forty-three pubs with six or more short-term licence holders between 1867 and 1893, less than half of this larger group. Within the group of fifteen, seven pubs have no convictions against the licence during these twenty-six years; the other eight, however, share thirteen convictions (5.7 per cent of the 227 convictions against the licence in Norwich between 1867 and 1901). The figures for the larger group of forty-three pubs provide a similar pattern, albeit more emphatically. Within this larger group, over a half – twenty-five pubs (58 per cent) - of the forty-three have no convictions; the other eighteen (42 per cent) share twenty-seven convictions (11.9 per cent of the total of 227 convictions). [33] This data indicates that the presence of at least one long-term licence holder in these ‘unstable’ and ‘difficult’ public houses did make it less likely that they would face convictions against the licence. It also suggests that within this exceptional group of forty-three pubs, there is a significant variant in ‘instability and ‘difficulty’ with only a hard-core of less than twenty drinking places having faced police charges.

If, as seems to be the case, the great majority of publicans and drinking places were helping bring communities closer together, this was clearly in the interests of the group who owned the majority of the pubs of Norwich – the city’s four main breweries: Steward and Patteson, Bullard, Youngs, and Morgan. As business enterprises, it was in their financial interest to try to ensure that their property did not suffer from a high turnover of

licence holders or from a reputation for being a disorderly house that allowed drunkenness. Tenants who served long periods in one pub and who did not fall foul of the police were likely to produce more profit for the brewery. There is therefore a direct connection between the role of the publicans and the public houses in helping the development of more stable communities and the financial interest of the breweries. Breweries, too, can be seen as agents of social cohesion.[34]

Nevertheless, an analysis of the brewery ownership of the forty-three 'unstable and 'difficult' pubs, and in particular of the hard-core of eighteen that had faced police charges suggests that there were wide variations between the four main breweries of Norwich in terms of avoiding publican instability and police charges. Morgan – the firm with the least public houses [35] – was likely to have had an unenviable reputation for owning pubs with a high turnover of publicans. Eighteen of the seventy-nine pubs they owned in 1893 – nearly a quarter – were among the forty-three most 'unstable' pubs in Norwich. None of the other three breweries approach this number; all have a figure of less than 10 per cent for 'difficult' pubs in their ownership. There are, however, variations between these remaining three. In the case of Youngs, nine (9.2 per cent) of the ninety-eight pubs they owned in 1893 were among the forty-three 'difficult pubs, whereas Steward and Patteson have relatively fewer – nine (6.5 per cent) of their 138 pubs are in this group. But most striking of all, none of the 118 public houses owned by Bullard in 1893 appear as 'unstable'. [36]

Is the success of Bullard in avoiding publican turnover due to better management skills? Did they have a better selection process with more effective interviews? How far were they

able to attract the best candidates because of their own reputation as the Norwich brewery that was expanding most rapidly, yet with firm foundations based on an established pattern of long-serving publicans? Bullard had increased its ownership of pubs by 63.6 per cent in the twenty-six years from 1867 to 1893 – from seventy-five to 118.[37] Prior to 1867, it is clear from the surviving papers that longevity in licence holding was already an established feature of Bullard as an institution.[38] Reputations tend to stick; inertia becomes a factor of significance. It seems likely that the name of Bullard would have been associated with 'good' pubs; the name of Morgan – in addition to its connection with sportsmen and pugilists in particular - would have been coupled with those pubs that were 'difficult'. [39] Fifteen of the twenty-seven police convictions against licences – over a half – are linked to pubs bearing the name of Morgan.[40] Was there, perhaps, a connection between the high rate of convictions and the association with the sport of fighting? Did the Morgan pub name attract the more aggressive drinkers and those landlords less able to deal effectively with the local police force or their own customers?

My argument so far in this chapter has been that publican instability was a phenomenon limited to only a small number of Norwich pubs and that these few drinking places were not concentrated in particular 'difficult' areas. Furthermore, less than a half of these few 'unstable' pubs ever faced police charges against the licence between 1867 and 1893; high turnover figures for licence holders did not necessarily mean such pubs became associated with the kind of drunkenness and disorder that led to police charges. The great majority of publicans were acting as agents of social cohesion, and so too were the breweries. Considering the four main breweries of Norwich, Bullard stands out as an exemplar of how good business management in the pursuit of profit could lead to publican stability and therefore contribute to social cohesion; only one brewery – Morgan – seems to have been

less successful in meeting this criteria of business effectiveness. The analysis that follows shows that even this limited degree of publican instability was subject to significant improvements in stability in the last couple of decades of the Victorian period.

It is a remarkable fact that a considerable number of the forty-three pubs with a high turnover of publicans between 1867 and 1893 experienced a period of publican stability at the end of the Victorian era. This shift to greater stability began in some cases in the late 1880s and was generally evident in the 1890s. The evidence for this development comes from the Second Register of Victuallers Licences that runs from 1894 to 1925. My analysis of this document indicated that some of those publicans in these forty-three pubs categorised as short-term or medium-term in the analysis of the first Register continued as the resident publican and should be re-categorised as long-term publicans. Most of the other publicans in these forty-three pubs, who are first recorded in the second Register, hold the licence for seven years or more, and so beyond 1901 and into the Edwardian period.[41]

Taking the fifteen pubs in Table 4.2, the data from the second Register indicates that eleven (73.3 per cent) of these fifteen drinking places began to experience publican stability through having a long-term licence holder during this late-Victorian and, in some cases, early-Edwardian period. In two of these eleven pubs there were two periods of long-term licence holding. Taking the twenty-eight pubs in Table 4.3, the data from the second Register indicates that there were twenty-two drinking places (78.6 per cent) that had a long-term licence holder during this same period. In one of these twenty-two pubs there were two periods of long-term publican licence holding.[42] A remarkable shift towards

greater stability is evident in thirty-three – over three-quarters – of this group of forty-three most 'difficult' pubs in Norwich during the late-Victorian and early-Edwardian period. Explaining such an improvement in stability of licence holding on such a scale is not straightforward and needs to take into account both developments in Norwich and national trends.[43] It does seem, however, to support the proposition that publicans may be expected to serve long periods as licensees in those optimum social and market conditions that all parties had an interest in achieving. Brewers, publicans, police and urban elite, the drinkers too: all had something to gain from orderly drinking places run by known characters. In Norwich, by the end of the Victorian period, even the putative 'difficult' pubs had 'settled down'; over time, it seems, nearly all pubs will tend to have publicans who serve long-term periods as licence holders, as one would expect if they indeed do have a social function as agencies of social cohesion and stability.

The case for the publican's social influence becomes even more compelling when the data is interrogated with a focus on those long-term publicans who held the licence for seven years or more at any of the 530 houses that were licensed continuously during the twenty-seven years of the first Register (1867-1893). Each of these public houses had none, one, two, or a maximum of three such long-term licence holders during such a period. In fact, there were twelve public houses that had the maximum of three such long-term licensees, 201 public houses that had two long-term licensees during this period, and 284 houses where there was one long-term licensee. A small number of these 284 publicans remained licence holders throughout this period of over a quarter-century and it is these individual cases of longevity in the licensed trade that will now be examined. Before doing so, however, it is worth noting that these figures leave only thirty-three public houses (6.2 per cent) of the total of 530 without at least one period of stable, long-term stewardship by a

publican between 1867 and 1893. Furthermore, if the evidence from the second Register is also considered only eight public houses (1.5 per cent) of these 530 houses are left without the experience of long-term licence holding between 1867 and 1901.[44]

I further reasoned that my argument would be strengthened still more if there were publicans who presided behind the same bar not only for seven years or more but also for a generation or beyond. Having adopted this new criterion of thirty years or more for longevity in licence holding, I found that fifty-six public houses (10.6 per cent) of the total of 530 that were licensed continuously during the period of the first Register (1867-1893) were associated with a publican who had held the licence for a generation or more, beyond 1893 and in many cases extending into the first decades of the twentieth century.[45] Moreover, it was also clear from the Registers that there were some publican families, the members sharing the same surname, whose combined licence holding also spanned a generation or more at the same pub.[46] Discounting the fifteen pubs that had already appeared in Table 4.7, there were still another sixteen public houses associated with extreme longevity in family licence holding to add to the fifty-six pubs linked to individual publicans resident for thirty years or more. For seventy-two drinking places – over one in ten pubs in Norwich – to have had the same licensee or same family as licensees for a generation or more does indeed seem powerful evidence for the case.

The effects of such stabilising influences would have been felt across all Norwich. These seventy-two public houses were spread across the parishes of Norwich.[47] Twenty-seven parishes (62.8 per cent) of the total number of forty-three have at least one such public house within their boundaries, acting as a cohesive force within the currents of urban social

mobility. There is a fairly even distribution between those parishes north of the river (with twenty-three such pubs), those parishes in the centre (with twenty), and those in the west (with nineteen). In this western area, thirteen of these nineteen public houses are located outside the city walls, eight in Heigham, three in Lakenham, and a couple in St. Stephen outside the city walls. This one might expect given the high density of population and the correspondingly large number of pubs in the areas comprising the 'new city'. Nevertheless, it is still significant that an area that had had experienced such rapid expansion and social mobility should have as many publicans serving for a generation or more.

The brewers of Norwich, too, shared in the benefits of such remarkable longevity in licence holding, the division of such pubs between the main four breweries being approximately proportionate to their share of the total number of public houses.[48] In this respect, Morgan does not emerge in the poor light it did with respect to 'unstable' and 'difficult' pubs within its stock.[49] Steward and Patteson leads with eighteen, closely followed by Bullard with sixteen such pubs, and Youngs with eleven and Morgan with seven complete the list. Together these four breweries account for nearly three-quarters of the ownership of such ultra-stable public houses. However, it is noteworthy that free houses still account for nearly a quarter of the total. There was a strong independent retail sector in the Norwich drink industry that played a significant part, too, in the development of communities.

The question that remains to be discussed concerns the point in the Victorian period when these patterns of longevity and stability become apparent. The Registers themselves can only shed light on the later decades of the reign. From their evidence it is clear that in each of the first three decades covered by the Registers a significant number of public houses

begin their association with an individual publican or publican family. Thirty public houses (41.7 per cent) of the total of seventy-two were first linked with a publican or publican family in the 1860s or before. Sixteen public houses (22.2 per cent) began their link in the 1870s, and twenty-two public houses (30.6 per cent) in the 1880s. It is only with the decade of the 1890s that the figure drops dramatically to four public houses (5.5 per cent) and this must be due largely to the traumatic effects of World War One.[50]

However, the pattern before the 1860s is unclear and in this context the survival of so many of the records of the Bullard Anchor brewery has been particularly fortunate. An examination of one of these Bullard sources, covering the twenty-five years from 1843 to 1867, indicated that an extraordinary number of this brewery's public houses were linked with long-term licence holding.[51] By using the Bullard source with the two Registers of Victuallers Licences from 1867 to 1925, I could trace the continuous history of licence holding at Bullard public houses for around three-quarters of a century, covering nearly all the Victorian period. It was clear, as in the later period already analysed, that families as well as individuals had their identifiable patterns of longevity as licence holders and I therefore drew up separate sections for these two categories within the table.[52]

There were twenty-three families who had served for seven years of more and between them they produced a total of 664 years of licence holding, that is an average of around thirty years service for each of the twenty-two public houses with which they were connected. Fifty individuals had been long-term licence holders and between them they produced a total of 825 years of licence holding, that is an average of 17.6 years service at each of the forty-seven public houses with which they were linked. Since two public houses appear on both the lists of individuals and families, there is a total of sixty-seven

Bullard drinking places where long-term licence holding began between 1843 and 1867. With seventy-five Bullard pubs recorded in 1867, this figure represents a high proportion of the Bullard stock of public houses in Norwich. An exact calculation is not possible since some of the periods of long-term tenancy had occurred before 1867 and some after but nevertheless the extent of long-term tenancy associated with the Bullard brewery is remarkable.[53]

There seems to be no particular concentration of such long-term service in the twenty-eight parishes represented other than in Heigham and St. Stephen, with the former having a particularly high population and therefore more pubs than other parishes.[54] Instead, there seems to be general stability and longevity of service throughout the Bullard stock within Norwich. In these circumstances, an explanation for the profitability of the brewery and its capacity to expand is not hard to find. In 1845, it had thirty-one public houses; in 1867, the number had increased to seventy-five, and in 1893, it had reached 118. Stable tenancies provided regular and dependable quarterly rental payments to the brewery as well as popular and profitable pubs. Bullard were reaping the rewards of their own effective management practices throughout the Victorian period.[55]

If other breweries may not have matched this Bullard success, it would seem surprising if their public houses did not experience some measure of longevity in licence holding during the same period. It would therefore seem reasonable to conclude that a case for the existence of significant long-term licence holding in Norwich throughout much of the Victorian period can be made. Furthermore, it was clearly in the interests of all the breweries to encourage this trend and develop the management skills that Bullard, in particular, demonstrated.

The presumption underlying the argument in this chapter has been that the longer the length of licence holding, the more important becomes the role of the publican as an agent of social cohesion. This proposition seems reasonable but is likely to remain less than fully grounded for the lack of substantive qualitative data. Nevertheless, the quantitative data presented in this chapter points not only to the significance of the publican in the social landscape of the urban community but also the importance of the brewer who supplied the publican and controlled so many of the parameters of his life as employer and perhaps, in addition, magistrate, Watch committee member, and politician.

Footnotes to Chapter 4

[1] T.F. Hoad (ed.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (Oxford, 1986).
[2] Thomas Hardy in *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (1886) described the pub in Mixen Lane that served the least respectable section of Casterbridge as having a quasi-spiritual function: 'The inn called Peter's finger was the church of Mixen Lane … Waifs and strays of all sorts loitered about here. The landlady was a virtuous woman who years ago had been unjustly sent to gaol … and had worn a martyr's countenance ever since'. (Penguin Classics, p.330.)
[3] See above, p.13, note 11.
[4] Janet Ede and Norma Virgoe (eds.), *Religious Worship in Norfolk: The 1851 Census of Accommodation and Attendance at Worship* (*Norfolk Record Society*, LXII, 1998), p.15.
[5] Ede and Virgoe, *1851 Census*, pp.15, 23. The writers struck a note of caution about the low attendance figure in Norwich pointing out that 'so many of the city's dissenting chapels were omitted from the final returns' (p.15). However, they cite a total of only six such chapels, which were likely to have had relatively small congregations; since the Census in Norwich is based on eighty-one places of worship, the inclusion of these additional six would have only a marginal effect.
[6] Quoted in Ede and Virgoe, *1851 Census*, p.15. The writers, nevertheless, claimed: 'That it was the poorest groups in society who failed to attend Sunday worship cannot be tested. Anecdotal evidence, such as it is, does not appear to bear this out'. Only two examples, both rural, are cited in justification of this opinion.
[7] B.J.Coleman, *The Church of England in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (The Historical Association, 1980), p.26. This pamphlet, in particular Table D, is cited in Ede and Virgoe, *1851 Census*, p.23.
[8] Ede and Virgoe, *1851 Census*, p.23.
[9] See below, p.114, Table 4.1.
[10] *NN*, 14 Jan.1854, cited in Ede and Virgoe, *1851 Census*, p.36.
[11] See David W.Gutzke, *Alcohol in the British Isles from Roman Times to 1996: An Annotated Bibliography* (Westport, Connecticut and London, 1996), pp.205-208, where 'Biographies, Autobiographies and Memoirs of Publicans' are listed. None is focussed on the Victorian period.
[12] *Wicks*, pp.60-61, 104-105, 108.
[13] First Register of Victuallers Licences; Second Register of Victuallers Licences.
[14] Paul Jennings, *The Public House in Bradford, 1770-1970* (Keele, 1995), p.16.
[15] NRO, BR3/11, 'The Anchor Brewery Norwich Schedule of Agreement for hire of Public Houses, July 1866 (updated October 1867)'.
[16] My decision to define 'long-term' as seven years or longer was a little arbitrary but justified I think by the view that a discernible and lasting influence would have been made on the public house and its 'regulars' after such a length of service.
[17] This particular change of licensee within the family, on the death of the present holder, was administered through what was termed a Section 14 grant.
[18] The Alehouses Act (1828) had set up the system of the annual issue of licences at the August sessions; it also provided for the transfer sessions – no fewer than four, no more than eight – during the year. From 1903, the annual licensing sessions were held in February, not August.
[19] Mark Girouard noted that: 'In the 1890-2 period the death rate from drink among London publicans was more than nine times the average for employed males' (*Victorian Pubs* (New Haven and London, 1984), pp.16-17).

[20] The story of John William Watling at the Volunteer Stores in St. Giles is illustrative of both the consequences of breaking the law and the working of the licensing system. On October 3 1874, for whatever reason, the licence was endorsed to John William Watling from the holder of the annual certificate for the two previous years, William Blogg. On October 6, Watling was caught selling intoxicating liquor during prohibited hours on a Sunday and later fined £1 with £1 1s 6d or two months imprisonment in default of distraint of goods, a relatively heavy sentence. On October 10, Watling attended a transfer session. On November 4, he refused to admit a police constable to the licensed premises. For that offence, Watling was later fined £2 with £1 6d costs or two months in default. It is no surprise to find the licence endorsed to another licensee on July 8, formally transferred to him on August 11 and later that month confirmed with the issue of the annual certificate. This 'new' licensee was, however, the former tenant: William Blogg (First Register of Victuallers Licences).
[21] See pencilled annotations to folios 3 and 9 in NRO, BR1/157, 'Steward & Patteson Register of public houses giving licensees, annual sales and profits, 1894-1947'.
[22] See pencilled annotations to folio 21.
[23] See below, Chapter 5 *passim* and, in particular, NHC, L362.1, *Norwich Medical Officer of Health Reports*, 1874-1901.
[24] 'Royal Commissioners Report on alleged electoral corruption', *Norwich Mercury Supplement*, March 25 1876.
[25] As in the case of note 16, above, my decision to take the figure of six as an indicator of 'instability' was 'a little arbitrary' but again justifiable. The experience of six or more short-term publicans in a twenty-six year period would certainly not have helped social cohesion.
[26] See below, p.120, Table 4.2.
[27] See below, p.121, Table 4.3.
[28] The figure for this calculation is taken as 1200 since the focus is on those 530 pubs that were continuously licensed between 1867 and 1893. Twenty-six of the 1226 short-term publicans were licence holders in pubs that first appear in the Registers between 1868 and 1892.
[29] One public house outside the city walls, in Crooks Place, Lakenham, was called the 'New City'.
[30] See above, p.47, and pp.48-49, Figs. 2.1 and 2.2.
[31] Two are in St. George Colegate and one in St. James – all north of the river; two are in the west of the city in St. Lawrence and St. Giles; two are in the south in St. Julian and St. John Sepulchre; and two in the centre, one in St. Andrew and one in St. John Timberhill.
[32] One is in St. George Colegate, one in St. Paul and two in St. Augustine – all north of the river; three are in St. Giles and three in St. Stephen in the west; two are in the south-east in Thorpe outside the walls; the rest are in the central area with two in St. John Timberhill, one in St. Gregory, three in St. Michael at Thorn, and one in St. Andrew.
[33] See above, pp.120-121, Tables 4.2 and 4.3, and below, p.125, Table 4.4.
[34] See below, Chapter 7 *passim*.
[35] See below, p.127, Table 4.5.
[36] See above, pp.120-121, p.125: Tables 4.2 and 4.3 and 4.4.
[37] See above, p.127, Table 4.5.
[38] See below, pp.139-144.
[39] See above, pp.77-78, 80, and p.107, note 30 for connections between Morgan and pugilism.
[40] See above, pp.120-121, Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

[41] For the purpose of this analysis, the length of licence holding for each publican who appears in the second Register between 1894 and 1901 has been calculated up to the point the name of the licence holder changes. Therefore a publican who became the licence holder in 1901 and continues to hold the licence up to and including the entry for 1907 will be classified as a long-term publican.
[42] See above, pp.120-121, Tables 4.2 and 4.3, column 8.
[43] For previous developments of this strand in the argument, see above, pp.11-12, 25-27, 82, 84-85.
[44] See below, p.132, Table 4.6.
[45] See below, pp.133-134, Table 4.7.
[46] See below, p.135, Table 4.8.
[47] See below, p.136, Table 4.9.
[48] See below, p.138, Table 4.10.
[49] See above, p.126.
[50] See above, pp.133-135, Tables 4.7 and 4.8.
[51] NRO, BR3/11, 'The Anchor Brewery Norwich: Schedule of agreements with public house tenants, 1843-1867'.
[52] See below, pp.140-143, Table 4.11.
[53] See above, pp.140-143, Table 4.11.
[54] See below, p.145, Fig. 4.1.
[55] See below, pp.249-259.