# ‘The Champion Club of the Midland Counties’: a social study of the Nottingham Chess Club, 1829 – c.1904

Rob Ensor

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the Masters Degree in Sport History and Culture, De Montfort University, September 2016

**Acknowledgements**

For their assistance and patience, thank you to the staff at the various libraries and archives I have trawled while researching this dissertation, in particular Bromley House Library, Nottingham; Nottingham University Manuscripts and Special Collections; and Nottinghamshire Archives.

Thank you also to Dr Adrian Harvey and Dr Tim Harding for the generous provision of their time and research notes and papers, without which this work would be far less illuminating.

To my supervisor, Dr Neil Carter, thanks for your advice throughout the research and writing process, including on several ideas cut through lack of time and/or space!

Finally, thank you to friends and family – to my mother for her assistance with my research, and her suggestions for avenues of investigation; to my wonderful wife, Jeevi, for her almost limitless patience and support; and to Hazel Glasse for the encouragement and referencing help!

Contents

## Chapter 1: Introduction

With a documented history stretching back around 1500 years chess is a game ripe for historical study, yet it has been virtually unexplored by historians of sport and leisure. Even the exceptions to this have largely concerned themselves with notable individuals, usually those who played the game professionally or derived a large part of their income from the game through other means, such as journalism, exhibitions or teaching.[1] Within these examples there has been little focus on amateur chess and the people who played it, with only Harding producing any significant work in this area.[2] However, chess is, from a historical viewpoint, little different to other sports that have been extensively studied by sports historians in that while details may vary, there are common themes running through their histories. In particular themes of class; individual and group identity; cultural differences; and professionalism are equally applicable to chess as to, for example, soccer.

The comparatively limited academic attention the history of chess has heretofore received inevitably means there are myriad possibilities for further research. One aspect that has thus far escaped notice is that of the baseline organisational unit of many sports, the club. While there exist descriptive histories of various clubs on occasions such as centennial celebrations, a

[1] One such monograph is T. Harding, *Joseph Henry Blackburne: a chess biography,* Jefferson, NC, 2015, while Adrian Harvey has written articles such as A. Harvey, 'Howard Staunton*', Kaissiber*, 17, 2001, 55–60.

[2] For example, T. Harding, *Correspondence Chess in Britain and Ireland, 1824–1987,* Jefferson, NC, 2010. Harvey has authored a few articles related to amateur chess, significantly A. Harvey, 'Social participation in the game of chess: a recreation for everyone', *Caissa* 1 (1), April 2016, 18–27.

social profile of the type produced by historians of other sports, such as soccer and golf, would be unique to the historical study of chess.[3]

This work, therefore, takes as its focal point the Nottingham Chess Club (NCC), one of the first enduring chess clubs to be formed in Britain, with the aim of investigating and assessing the societal position of the club in Nottingham. The key considerations will be, firstly, who were the members and, in particular, the officials of the NCC and what socio-economic positions did they occupy in Nottingham? Once these fundamental issues have been addressed there will be a base to investigate broader questions including the relationship between the members and civic and commercial power and influence within the city, and how the NCC fits with modern theories of Victorian leisure, such as rationality and respectability.

Prior to undertaking the above analysis, however, a brief outline of the world of chess during the lifetime of the NCC will be given to offer a historical context for this work; a summary of the club's three-quarter century existence will be provided for the same purpose.

As alluded to above, perhaps due to their myriad potential foci sports clubs have long been a topic of study for historians, with political, cultural and social identities frequent themes. Soccer and golf clubs are among the most common subjects of the type of social studies similar to this paper, often emphasising what Holt and Mason referred to as 'quiet harbours of casual

[3] D. Kennedy, 'Class, ethnicity and civic governance: a social profile of football club directors on Merseyside in the late-nineteenth century', *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 22 (5), September 2005, 840–866, and R. Holt, 'Golf and the English Suburb: class and gender in a London club, c.1890-c.1960', *The Sports Historian,* 18 (1), May 1998, 76–89.

exertion and sociability'.[4] However, for all that there exist high quality works of this nature on sports clubs, including by such eminent names as Holt and Vamplew, MacLean observed these 'tend to focus on the elite, the commercial and the resilient'.[5] He prefers to accentuate the coincidence between sports and other forms of clubs, leading to the conclusion that the study of sports clubs is both important and necessary as 'they are an essential element of civil society'.[6] Consequently, the links between the NCC and Nottingham society take on a wider socio-historical context.

Sports clubs' social functions and their establishment as part of civil society thus implies that their study should include reference to other, similar, 'essential elements', in particular other types of club. In the geographical and historical context relevant to this paper by far the most common such institution was the gentleman's social club, although Clark advisedly notes that clubs and societies were 'hardly unique to the period', citing examples from ancient Greece to Renaissance Florence.[7] These clubs flourished in post-Restoration England, becoming 'a constituent part of the eighteenth-century concept of "sociability"'.[8] Ultimately they diversified from their heavily politicised origins into the voluntary welfare, scientific and cultural bodies – such as Friendly and Literary and Philosophical societies – and sporting

[4] R. Holt and T. Mason, *Sport in Britain, 1945–2000*, Oxford, 2000, 38.
[5] R. Holt, 'Golf and the English Suburb'; W. Vamplew, 'Sharing Space: inclusion, exclusion and accommodation at the British golf club before 1914', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* 34 (3), August 2010, 359–375. The quote is from M. MacLean, 'A Gap but not an Absence: clubs and sports historiography', *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 30 (14), 2013, 1688.
[6] MacLean, 'A gap but not an absence', 1692.
[7] P. Clark, *British clubs and societies 1580-1800: the origins of an associational world,* Oxford, 2000, 13.
[8] S. Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: ritual and authority and the English industrial city*, Manchester, 2007, 85.

institutions that contributed to the 'extensive social and cultural opportunities' available to the middle class male of the mid-Victorian period.[9]

By the nineteenth century the middle classes, typically the urban-based elites of this social stratum, dominated these voluntary societies. The cultural and scientific organisations in particular were designed for the provision of 'an arena…for middle class men',[10] while the broader collection of institutions offered a platform from which the middle classes could 'improve[e], discipline[e] and [reform]' the working classes.[11] Though neither Gunn nor Morris explicitly refer to it, this is the core of the Victorian movement for rational recreation, the idea that leisure pursuits of any type should have the primary aim of improving 'self and society'.[12] Bailey saw this as a means of 'forg[ing] more effective behavioural constraints' for the working classes, while Cunningham referred to it as a method of 'subtle and insidious' social control.[13] Both historians are in agreement that rational recreation was not solely, nor even originally, a concept that included physical sports. However, from the 1840s, supported by theories such as Kingsley's muscular Christianity and the type of manliness, 'shorn of any suggestion of boorishness or animalism', found in Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays,* this had started to change.[14]

As an intellectual rather than physical recreation chess clearly has a significant claim to be considered rational in this context, and indeed the two

[9] Gunn, *Public Culture,* 89; R. Morris, 'Voluntary societies and British urban elites, 1780–1850: an analysis', *The Historical Journal,* 26 (1), March 1983, 95–118.
[10] Gunn, *Public Culture,* 84.
[11] Gunn, *Public Culture,* 27; Morris, 'Voluntary societies', 96.
[12] H. Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, c.1780-c.1880,* London, 1980, 90.
[13] P. Bailey, *Leisure and class in Victorian England: rational recreation and the contest for control, 1830-1885*, London, 1987, 177; Cunningham, *Leisure,* 91.
[14] Bailey, *Leisure and class*, 83 – 5; Cunningham, *Leisure,* 116–17.

have often been linked.[15] Harding notes that it is a game of 'pure skill' that was 'not well suited to gambling', while Harvey claims that 'chess can almost be seen as embodying' the ideals of rational recreation.[16] Sharples takes issue with this view, however, claiming that to describe chess as rational is 'contentious' and that it 'seemingly connoted the absence of sound, disorder and notoriety', though he is more concerned with the respectability – Huggins' 'sharp line of social division'[17] – of chess and its protagonists as opposed to its rationality. Most damningly he argues that applying 'the image of a quiet, respectable, rational game uncritically and uniformly…across the entire Victorian period would be misleading.'[18] These claims and counter-claims as to the rationality and respectability of chess as a leisure pursuit will be examined in this paper in light of the activities of the NCC and its members.

[15] Such as T. Harding, *Eminent Victorian Chess Players: ten biographies,* Jefferson, NC, 2012; A. Harvey, '"You may say what you like to the professional and dismiss them when you want": the rise and fall of professional chess players in Victorian Britain', *Sport in History,* 30 (3), September 2010, 402–21; and J. Sharples '"I am a Chess-player"': Respectability in Literary and Urban Space, 1840–1851, *Sport in History*, 35 (2), May 2015, 296-321.

[16] T. Harding, 'Kings and Queens at Home: a short history of the chess column in nineteenth-century English periodicals', *Victorian Periodicals Review,* Winter 2009, 42 (4), 359; T. Harding, 'Policeman on the Case: early chess in Lancashire and the *Preston Guardian* chess column 1879–83' in R. Spalding and A. Brown (eds) *Entertainment, Leisure and Identities,* Newcastle, 2007, 50; Harvey, '"You may say what you like…"', 403.

[17] M. Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures? Leisure, respectability and the male middle classes in Victorian England', *Journal of Social History,* Spring 2000, 33 (3), 585.

[18] Sharples, 'I am a Chess-player', 297–8.

## Chapter 2: The Nottingham Chess Club and the world of Victorian chess

### 2.1 The founding of the Nottingham Chess Club: the historical context

The immediate environment in which the Nottingham Chess Club was formed was one of potential. The economy of the town of Nottingham was already largely based on textiles but would shortly be transformed by the boom in its lace industry, while the penny post and the dramatic extension of the British railway network were imminent. Both of these innovations would also have a significant impact on chess, respectively reducing the cost of games played by correspondence and enabling easier inter-city travel for matches between clubs. The game of chess already had a history approaching one and a half millennia by this time, yet itself would see great change during the nineteenth century. During its lifetime the NCC witnessed the first international chess tournament, the first 'official' world champion,[19] and the general acceptance of rules and practices that continue to this day.[20]

At the time of the Nottingham Chess Club's formation there existed a variety of clubs and societies for the middle classes of Nottingham to pursue membership of, and thus it must be assumed that it was designed purely, or at least primarily, to allow an environment for its members to gather to play and study chess. The first institutions that could be recognised as organised chess clubs were found in London, with the first being that held at Parsloe's coffee shop from 1774. The London Chess Club was formed in 1807, and, while

[19] Wilhelm Steinitz became the first 'official' world champion after defeating Johannes Zukertort in a match in 1886. Prior to this, individuals such as Howard Staunton and Paul Morphy had been acknowledged as the world's best but not officially crowned.

[20] Among other things, in 1829 rules concerning stalemate varied widely, with all three results (a draw and a win for white or black) having currency somewhere. Also, the rule that white had the first move was not official until the late-nineteenth century: previously players would take either colour and agree on who would take the first move.

various attempts were made to establish clubs in provincial towns and cities, including Liverpool, Manchester, and Hereford, over the next two decades, these generally only lasted a handful of years.[21] Therefore, although it was not the first such club to be formed in Britain outside of London, by 1833 the NCC was claimed by a local newspaper to be the sole 'regularly organized' club outside of London and Edinburgh;[22] by its fiftieth anniversary, nine years after the dissolution of the original London Chess Club, it laid claim to being 'the only one which has existed for such a long period'.[23]

As outlined above, this paper will seek to investigate and examine the NCC through its members – more specifically, it will attempt to determine the societal position of the club from the social status of individual members, and the interaction of the club itself with wider society. The focus here will be on the officers of the club, in particular its presidents and secretaries, but also those who served other functions such as committee members and treasurers, as these are the individuals with the greatest influence on the club. To identify members a variety of sources have proved useful: the key primary sources are surviving documents from the NCC itself, while contemporary newspapers and periodicals have provided further detail as to which members held positions within the club. Further to this, trade directories from the period in question have been utilised to determine individuals' occupations and, where possible, addresses, as these can be useful proxies for such social indicators as wealth and class. Census and probate records have also been

[21] T. Harding, 'Which are the oldest chess clubs?', *The Kibitzer,* September 2011; Harvey, 'Social participation in the game of chess'.
[22] *Nottingham Review,* December 13 1833, 3.
[23] *Nottinghamshire Guardian,* October 3 1879, 5. This is seemingly true of English chess clubs, though the Edinburgh Chess Club was (and still is) extant.

mined to ascertain details of employment and wealth as proxies for social status.

Several of these sources have also been used to establish public positions held by members of the NCC. Contemporary local newspapers in particular proved excellent sources for this, while trade directories have similarly provided copious detail. Furthermore, poll books, with their reviews of the election process, offer information on those in positions of local power and influence in addition to indicating those members who qualified to vote. A variety of secondary sources concerning the history of Nottingham have also offered biographical details on NCC members, including histories of Nottinghamshire cricket, and of the Nottingham Chamber of Commerce.

## 2.2 The Nottingham Chess Club: a brief history

There is no evidence of any chess club existing in the town of Nottingham prior to the establishment of the institution that is the subject of this work. The NCC itself was founded in October 1829: the precise date given by the club itself was October 16th of that year, though a contemporary newspaper report implies the correct date was in fact October 26th.[24] The ultimate fate of the club is unknown: its activities were reported on during the 1902-03 season, but from 1904 it was no longer being listed in any Nottingham commercial directories.

In its first two decades the NCC engaged in a number of correspondence matches with clubs from other towns, usually organised through challenges issued in *Bell's Life in London* (BLL), the chess column of which was written by George Walker throughout its 38 year run from 1835. Walker appeared to have been a personal friend of Samuel Newham, one of the founding members of the club, dedicating his 1833 book *A new treatise on chess* to him, in which he hyperbolically referred to the Nottingham club as one of 'the leading chess clubs in this country', level with London and Edinburgh; he was elected an honorary member of the NCC in that year.[25] The club was not without success in its matches; indeed, on the occasion of the club's 50th anniversary a local newspaper was able to recount that it had 'never suffered

[24] Records of Nottingham Chess Club 1842–1900, University of Nottingham Manuscripts and Special Collections, MS 675; *Nottingham Review* October 30 1829, 3. The newspaper report states that the first meeting of the club was the Monday of the week the newspaper was printed, which would have been October 26.

[25] G. Walker, *A new treatise on chess,* London, 1833, 6 – this claim may have had some truth, in that Nottingham were one of the few chess clubs in existence at the time in Britain; *Nottingham Review,* December 13 1833, 3.

defeat by any club in the United Kingdom'.[26] From the 1870s onwards it also conducted matches 'over the board', regularly visiting Derby and Leicester, with occasional matches against clubs from towns such as Hull, Manchester and Birmingham.

By the 1890s, despite its reputation and though its position as Nottingham's pre-eminent chess club was still apparently recognised, it was occasionally noted in the local press that its activity was sporadic, with conspicuous public exploits masking often poor attendances at the regular club nights.[27] Though the club was evidently still active in the 1902/3 season – the *Nottinghamshire Guardian* (NG) reported on its match with the Leicester club in December 1902 – it is conspicuous by its absence from Nottingham's commercial directories from 1904 onwards despite a previously almost unbroken presence.

[26] *NG,* October 3 1879, 5. This claim would last almost exactly one further year, when a Nottingham team visited the Leicester Chess Club only to be defeated 7.5–5.5. Having suffered one defeat the NCC appeared to gain a taste for it, losing matches to the Manchester Athenaeum and Birmingham St George's clubs 17–8 and 11–4 respectively in the same season.
[27] For example, *NG,* April 15 1893, 7 and November 25 1899, 7.

## 2.3 The Nottingham Chess Club: officials and members

Currently four founding members have been discovered, though the true number is almost certainly somewhat greater. By 1835 there were at least twenty members and in 1837, 22.[28] In the first year for which the accounts and subscription lists of the club are available, 1842, there were 32 members; by 1844, however, just 21 remained, and by 1846 only 16 members are listed as having paid subscriptions.[29] These numbers may not be exact, unfortunately, as individuals known from other sources to be members are not always included every year. Furthermore some members were somewhat erratic in their subscriptions, paying for several years at a time, making exact counting difficult. Indeed, precise counts of the membership are rare, although there are two extant member lists, from 1858 and approximately 1888. The former indicates there were 40 members (including one honorary member) in that year, while the latter comprises 41 names, though the arrangement of the list indicates that new members were added to it as they joined; the original list appears to have contained 29 members.[30] The subscription lists in the club account book show that this range (20 – 40) is likely to be an accurate gauge for annual membership numbers throughout the NCC's existence, with the exception of an apparent heyday for the club in the early 1870s when membership reached 52. The low membership numbers may have been, at least in part, due to the subscription fee of half a guinea per year, plus an entrance fee of £1 in the first year. Though this was anywhere from two to five times the weekly wage of a textile worker, this did not stop the NR describing

[28] *Nottingham Review,* October 23 1835, 3, and October 20 1837, 3.
[29] Records of Nottingham Chess Club, MS675.
[30] Records of Nottingham Chess Club, MS675; Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club (established 16 Oct 1829), Nottinghamshire Archives, DD/703/1.

it as 'so small, as to be almost nominal'.[31] The boom in membership numbers during the early 1870s was not unlikely to have been at least partly linked to the decision to abolish the entrance fee from 1865 onwards, although on applying a prospective member still needed to be proposed and seconded at a subsequent general meeting of the club.[32] It is not clear if this was the sole test of entry: new members are described as having been elected, though the nature of election is not made explicit.[33]

In total it has been possible to identify 235 individual members in the approximately 75 years prior to the club's presumed dissolution. Due to the nature of one of the sources – a club account book containing details of paid subscriptions between 1842 and 1900 – this number may well to be not far off the total number of members the club ever had. However, many of these members are known merely by a surname, and for several more either only a first initial has been found, or the full name is so common as to preclude further identification – for example, a John Walker joined the club in 1885 but in White's Directory of 1885-6 there are eight John Walkers listed. Ultimately, reliable information on social characteristics has been found for 168 NCC members, nearly 75%.

Clearly the social characteristics of the membership as a whole are of interest to this work. However, it is the officers of the club who are of particular interest as the individuals who fulfilled these roles would have been either elected to their positions or, at the least, subject to nomination and seconding prior to taking up such a post. Three individuals in particular had considerable

[31] *Nottingham Review,* December 13 1833, 3.
[32] *NG,* October 20 1865, 5.
[33] Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club, DD/703/1.

influence over the club in its first 50 years, and this paper will now look at these men in some detail.

The club's first president was Thomas Wakefield, 'the town's leading Whig politician', and known locally as 'King Wakefield', who had considerable power and influence in Nottingham.[34] He had made his fortune in the hosiery industry before becoming a senior councilman in 1817, and was later elected mayor in 1835 and 1842. His political influence was such that he was able to have his business partner, Thomas North, elected mayor of Nottingham in 1844.[35] Prior to this, he routinely chaired public meetings during, for example, election campaigns, and was fundamental in the creation of the first Nottingham Chamber of Commerce in 1835, of which he was the first chairman and one of the first directors. He appears to have been widely respected in the town, giving a 'conciliatory speech' to a crowd of 20,000 townspeople unhappy with Parliament's rejection of the Second Reform Bill in 1831.[36] An indication of his wealth can be gathered from his declining 'the customary allowance of 300 guineas per year' awarded to the mayor during both his years in office.[37] It would be tempting, therefore, to depict him as a figurehead for the NCC, raising the profile of a burgeoning club, but this would appear to be incorrect as his subscription to the club continued after he relinquished the presidency up until he suffered financial difficulties and, ultimately, bankruptcy in the mid- to late-1840s.

[34] R. Church, *Economic and Social Change in a Midland Town: Victorian Nottingham 1815–1900,* Abingdon, 2006, 217; R. Walton, *The History of the Nottingham Chamber of Commerce 1860–1960,* Nottingham, 1962, 16.
[35] A. Griffin, 'Thomas North: mining entrepreneur extraordinary', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society,* 1972, 56 (1), 54.
[36] W. White, *History, gazetteer, and directory of Nottinghamshire,* Sheffield, 1832, 110.
[37] Walton, *Nottingham Chamber of Commerce,* 20.

The second president of the NCC, and its first secretary, was Samuel Newham, who was at various times both a solicitor, a wine and spirit merchant, and, later in life, a borough magistrate.[38] He was a wealthy man, owning property in the Park area of Nottingham – previously part of the estate of the Dukes of Newcastle, and perhaps the most affluent area of the town – in London and in villages around Nottingham. He was the strongest player in the club for many years, more than once being referred to as one of the strongest players outside of London,[39] and he played in the first ever international tournament during the Great Exhibition of 1851. Due to his administrative acumen – he held the position of secretary of the Nottingham Subscription Library, itself an elite institution, in addition to that of the NCC – combined with his chess strength, it is likely that it was he who was the driving force behind the foundation of the club and its growth over the succeeding decades.

The final influential man in the first half century of the NCC was Sigismund Hamel, a German merchant. Hamel settled in England after arriving from America in 1854, though he had often visited Britain in the decade previously: his first year as a subscriber to the NCC was in 1849. His brother Leopold was also a member of the NCC, while his chess-playing relatives Ludwig and Julius settled in Scotland and Manchester respectively. He was initially a lace merchant, setting up in business with William Wright, a Nottingham resident,

[38] Newham gives his occupation as retired solicitor in the 1851 census: UK Census 1851. Nottingham, Nottinghamshire, *HO107/2133/621;* he is listed as a wine and spirit merchant in, for example, S. Glover, *The History and Directory of the town and county of the town of Nottingham,* Nottingham, 1844, 176 and Lascelles and Hagar, *Lascelles and Hagar's Commercial Directory of the town and county of the town of Nottingham,* Nottingham, 1848, 54.

[39] For example, in Anonymous, 'Chess-clubs of Great Britain' in *Le Palamède,* 1842, 313, and a pseudonymous letter in the chess column of *BLL,* August 27 1837.

before diversifying into lace manufacturing in the late 1870s.[40] His years as president coincided with a revivifying of the club's desire to contest matches with other clubs: prior to matches being arranged with the Glasgow and Ipswich clubs in 1873 and 1874, the club are not recorded as having played any matches for almost two decades.[41]

Wakefield held the presidency for approximately the first decade of the NCC's existence before Newham and Hamel occupied the office for around the next fifty years between them. These three men, therefore, were the greatest influence on Nottingham establishing itself as a nationally respected chess club. Following Hamel's retirement from the presidency a rule was instituted to limit the incumbent's term to two years; subsequently at least a further seven men were elected president of the NCC, although as there are a handful of years where it has not been possible to determine who held the office the true number may be slightly higher.[42]

The position of president was largely a ceremonial – and, perhaps, promotional – one; most of the official business of the club was conducted by the honorary secretary – honorary as the position was not paid. Newham's tenure in this post presumably lasted until he was elected president around 1840, and indeed for much of the club's first forty years the precise dates that individuals held this office are hard to pin down. Though a further sixteen men have been identified as assuming the role of secretary, the true number may

[40] W. White, *History, gazetteer, and directory of the county of Nottinghamshire,* Nottingham, 1864; *Kelly's Directory of Nottinghamshire,* Nottingham, 1881.
[41] The former matches are noted in Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club, DD/703/1, and the latter in Records of Nottingham Chess Club, MS675. In his monograph on correspondence chess, Harding records no other matches played by the NCC in this period: Harding, *Correspondence Chess,* 355–9.
[42] For a chronological list of officers of the NCC, see appendices 1a–f.

be greater due to the relatively large number of years in which no secretary could be identified.

Another position that may well have been predominantly ceremonial was that of vice-president. It is unknown when this office was created – there may have been such a role from the formation of the club – but the first clearly identified vice-president was Thomas Hind, in 1851.[43] By 1877 the club appointed two vice-presidents each year. As with the role of secretary it is likely that not all of the NCC's vice-presidents have been identified in this research, however, subsequent to 1851, a minimum of thirteen further men were elected to the position.

There were three other official positions within the NCC during its existence, and that this paper is therefore particularly interested in: those of treasurer, committee member and match captain. Those of treasurer and match captain were, with two exceptions – Edwin Marriott and Edward Dale held the latter role for a year each in the 1890s – only held by individuals who at other times (or in at least one case simultaneously) occupied other offices of the club. Moreover, the position of match captain had little responsibility as arrangements for matches were conducted by the committee and secretary, and indeed the position appears to have defaulted to the club's best player in each year an individual has been identified as holding it.

As with that of vice-president it is unclear when the committee was first formed. It is known that there was a 'match committee', perhaps formed on an *ad hoc* basis, when the club played matches by correspondence with other

[43] *NG,* December 11 1851, 3. Newham had previously been referred to as vice-president, but only in the context of a social function. *Nottingham Review,* December 20 1839, 4.

clubs, the first of which – the committee for which comprised five individuals – was played against a club in Cambridge from April 1837.[44] There was also some sort of committee involved in arranging the 'first instance of a chess ball' in the country, held to celebrate the ninth anniversary of the NCC, which was made up of Wakefield, Newham and four others.[45] These committees, designed purely for a single purpose (the match committees would almost certainly have consisted of the club's best players), are therefore likely to have little in common with the later committees that addressed club business such as sending and responding to match invitations, organising visits from professional chess players, and the important matter of arranging the club's annual soirees! The first mention of a club committee in the NCC was in 1868, which identifies three members. Between this point and 1896, the latest reference to a committee discovered, 28 additional men are known to have served on the NCC committee. Thirteen of these 30 also held other positions within the club at other times and so of the 235 members initially discovered in this research, a total of 46 have been identified as holding office in the NCC during the club's existence; a further eight were on the perhaps impromptu committees from the 1830s.

It is hoped that by uncovering information as to the social characteristics of these men, a greater understanding of the societal position of the NCC will be obtained. Among the key pieces of information that may be available are their occupations and addresses, and it is on this area that this paper will now focus. As with the example of Samuel Newham above, who was both a solicitor and a wine and spirit merchant, it is evident that over the course of

[44] *Nottingham Review,* April 28 1837, 3.
[45] *Nottingham Review,* January 4 1839, 3.

their lives and their membership of the NCC there will be those who had more than one occupation. For the statistical purposes of this paper each member will have only the occupation with which they seem most associated during their period of membership of the NCC ascribed to them, although where it is warranted their other occupations will be noted.

Of the 54 office holders listed above, it has not been possible to determine further identifying characteristics of five of them – D and H Adams, Mr Barber, Lewis Johnson and John Watson, the last of these largely due to his common name. One further individual, Thomas Marriott, despite being the brother of Arthur and Edwin Marriott, could not be reliably further traced in part due to the numerous men with that name living in Nottingham in the latter part of the nineteenth century. As the son and brother of lace manufacturers, however, it is likely that he was the Thomas Marriott listed in Wright's 1889 commercial directory of Nottingham as a machine holder at Ilkeston.[46] Thomas Marriott's younger brother Arthur died of tuberculosis in 1884 at the age of 24; in the 1881 census he gave no occupation and nor does he appear in any commercial directories of the time. Of the remaining 48, seventeen were clearly involved in the lace industry, most either as manufacturers (that is, factory owners) or merchants, though Thomas Crisp was employed as a warehouseman at one of the leading lace manufacturers. Four more owed their livelihood to Nottingham's textile trade, either in hosiery or silk. Two further men were also likely to have been employed in textiles – Arthur Hayes was a warehouse manager, while William Mellor, brother of a lace

[46] A 'machine holder' was a person who rented one or more lace machines from a factory owner then employed his own workers to make lace. S. Mason, 'Lace' in A. Briggs-Goode and D. Dean (eds), *Lace: Here: Now*, London, 2013, 1–26.

manufacturer, was a factory manager. Thus almost half (23 of 54, 43%) of the officials of the NCC were employed, or owned businesses, in Nottingham's textile industries. Church observes that precise figures for how many people were employed in the lace industry in Nottingham are 'impossible to calculate' but estimates that in 1834 there must have been over 7500, and by 1851 a figure of 10000 – based on census returns – was 'almost certainly an underestimation'.[47] The figure for employment in textiles as a whole for 1851 amounts to over half of the working population of Nottingham.[48] That nearly half of the officials of the NCC were involved in the textile industries is therefore unsurprising, though they tended to be business owners or merchants rather than machine operatives. The majority of the remainder for whom details were found were employed in professional or white collar capacities: only three did not have such an occupation (see appendix 2b for full breakdown).

These figures correspond remarkably closely to the general occupational background of the club as a whole, indicating that election or appointment to the offices of the NCC was effected on a meritocratic basis. Of the 174 individuals for whom employment information has been discovered 80 (46%) were commercially involved in the textile industries in some way, with 60 of these being manufacturers in their own right. The remaining 20 were employed as merchants, managers or 'agents' to the manufacturing companies. The different branches of the professions were also well represented, with solicitors, teachers, accountants, bankers and medical professionals making up a further 33 (19%) of members. Furthermore, almost

[47] Church, *Economic and social change, 82–3.*
[48] Ibid, 232.

a third of the members identified worked in the commercial or white collar sectors, including four newspaper proprietors. In addition five members of the clergy subscribed to the club in its 75 years, leaving just six (4%) members who had clearly working class occupations. Thus while the NCC may have largely been run by the commercial and professional classes of Nottingham, this was anything but an inaccurate representation of its membership.

Despite the officials roughly mirroring the general socio-economic makeup of the club, there is a clear differentiation between the upper and lower middle classes in the roles they occupied within it, even once the latter started to comprise a significant proportion of the membership. Following Hamel's retirement as president in 1889, at least seven men were elected to the position. Of these four were very successful businessmen (two in lace, one in silk and one in soap), and the remaining three were a doctor, a solicitor and a reverend. There were also seven secretaries in this time, but these included two solicitor's clerks and an insurance agent as well as a dentist, accountant, draper and lace manufacturer. While clearly clerks and insurance agents would likely have the necessary skills to carry out secretarial duties, it is notable they either did not put themselves forward for, or were not elected to, the role of president. The incumbents of the vice-presidency had more in common with the former group than the latter: only one of those identified, Arthur Marriott, was not either a businessman or from the professions, and it is almost certain he was elected to the position due to his prowess and standing within the chess world.[49]

[49] *NG,* May 30 1884, 4.

A further indication of the socio-economic background of the members of the NCC can be gleaned from the value of estates left by individuals on their death. Such data are not without their problems: for example, disposal of assets by an individual prior to death can mean the probate value underestimates their true wealth. Also, one significant issue is that the date of death is often well after a member's association with the club had ended, particularly for those who died in the twentieth century, and so changes in fortune can skew the picture. An excellent example of this is Thomas Wakefield who died in 1871 with less than £100 to his name, 25 years after leaving the NCC.[50] However, with a large enough dataset there will be both positive and negative skews that can cancel each other out: the example of Wakefield is balanced by that of Job Derbyshire, a moderately successful accountant around the turn of the century who amassed a fortune of nearly £300,000 on his death, equivalent to £7 million now.[51] Furthermore, it is more likely for a person to make a will if they have significant assets to pass on, meaning one would expect a sizeable proportion of those for whom records are found to have considerable fortunes. Nonetheless, both as a whole and in the detail the data will cast further light on the socio-economic characteristics of the NCC's membership.

Out of the 168 clearly identified members of the NCC probate records have been unearthed for 83 of them, almost exactly half. Due to the dates of death varying by up to a century, the values of estates have been normalised to

[50] National Probate Calendar, 1871.
[51] National Probate Calendar, 1954.

2015 prices by multiplying by the change in the retail price index over time.[52] At these prices, the range of estate values left is from a little under £4,500 to almost £21 million, with 38 of them (46%) worth over £1 million. An arithmetic mean is largely meaningless due to a handful of particularly valuable estates, though the median value is almost £700,000, a significant sum of money, and an indication of the income level and wealth of the NCC membership. Over two thirds, 26, of those worth over £1 million on death were involved in the textile industry while five were solicitors and two accountants. Four of the remaining five accrued their wealth from sources as varied as the railways and jewellery, while one clergyman, the Reverend Henry Williams, signatory to the 1863 Cambridge University football rules, had a fortune equivalent to £2.7 million when he died.[53]

This is not to say that every NCC member whose livelihood was derived from the various textile industries of the town was so successful. Sigismund Hamel and his brother, Leopold, both died in 1897 with estates worth £100,000 and £5,000 respectively, while Sidney Smith, who had been a lace manufacturer from the 1830s to the 1850s, was worth just £25,000 by his death in 1886. Overall, however, there is a general distinction between the well-off and the less wealthy in the dataset, with professionals and textile manufacturers tending to be the former and the latter consisting of men from occupations such as printing, teaching and shop owners. A further example of the differences between the two can be seen with two men who played cricket for

[52] Calculations were performed on the website http://www.measuringworth.com/ppoweruk. While changes in the RPI are not a perfect way of measuring relative values over time, some level of comparison is possible.

[53] G. Curry and E. Dunning, *Associational Football: a study in figurational sociology,* Abingdon, 2015, 74; National Probate Calendar, 1911.

Nottinghamshire – John Dixon, a clothing manufacturer, England soccer international, amateur captain of the county team throughout the 1890s and later the 'only life member' of the cricket club's committee, left an estate valued at £3.5 million when he died in 1931, while Robert Tolley, a professional player during the 1870s, died a travelling salesman in 1901 with under £4,500 to his name.[54]

Over the course of its existence, therefore, it can be seen that the membership of the NCC was generally of a middle-class or commercial background. A significant reason for this is the entrance and subscription fees necessary to obtain membership, the former of which was measured as a multiple of the average weekly wage for the working classes, and even the lower middle classes, for much of the nineteenth century. However, the abolition of the one pound entrance fee in 1865, combined with an increase in real wages in the second half of the 1800s, meant that membership of the NCC did become more affordable in the latter half of its life. It should also be noted that from the mid-1850s some of the poorer elements of Nottingham society were being effectively evicted from the town centre: new housing resulting from the beginnings of Nottingham's enclosure was replacing the existing back-to-back slums, and that these new dwellings, thrice the size of the back-to-backs, commanded rent at a level unaffordable to large parts of the existing population.[55] This paper will now compare the socio-economic backgrounds of members from the earlier part of the NCC's existence (those

[54] F.S. Ashley-Cooper, *Nottinghamshire Cricket and Cricketers,* Nottingham, 1923, 229. Ashley-Cooper describes Dixon as 'one of the leading forwards for Notts County'. Estate values from National Probate Calendar, 1931 (Dixon) and 1901 (Tolley).

[55] J. Beckett and K. Brand, 'Enclosure, Improvement, and the Rise of "New Nottingham", 1845–67', in *Transactions of the Thoroton Society,* 98 (1), 1995, 101.

who joined prior to 1865, and would thus have paid a pound to join) to those in the later part, for whom the first year's subscription would have been half a guinea.

This is, unfortunately, not a perfect method for dividing the members into two groups, as there are instances of individuals joining shortly prior to 1865 whose period of membership lasted at least into the 1890s: one such case is that of Hugh Browne, president between 1892 and 1894, who was a continuous member from 1862.[56] There were also approximately a dozen members who subscribed to the club for a number of years both prior to and following the removal of the joining fee – Louis Liepmann is recorded as paying the subscription every year between 1842 and 1896, while George Berry was a member for 49 years until his resignation in 1887.[57] To mitigate this shortcoming, therefore, only the year an individual joined the club shall be taken into account, as opposed to the duration of their membership before and after 1865; for the earlier period, any individual known to have been a member during this time will be included in this group.

Once again, only members for whom occupational data has been unearthed are included in this analysis, giving a total of 166 members for whom their date of joining the club is known. Of these 66 joined prior to 1865 with the remainder joining in or later than the 1865 season:[58] the discrepancy in numbers despite the periods being of almost equal length is predominantly due to there being more surviving records for the latter period, although as

[56] Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, MS 675.
[57] *Nottingham Daily Express,* December 16 1879; Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, MS 675.
[58] Chess was a winter sport and the season ran from October to March or April.

previously mentioned it does appear that membership was higher for a time shortly after 1865.

Overall, of the 66 men who have been confirmed as joining the NCC prior to 1865, fully half (33) were directly involved in the lace industry, the majority solely or in partnerships as manufacturers. Five of the remaining half, including Thomas Wakefield, made their livelihood from the manufacturing of other textiles, largely hosiery. Professionals comprise twelve of the remainder (18% of the total), with five medical men and seven solicitors, while three belonged to the clergy and an identical number were newspaper proprietors. Nine of the eleven men thus far unaccounted for had their own businesses, in fields as varied as jewellery, grocery and printing. Of the other two, one was a military captain, son of a deputy-lieutenant of Nottinghamshire, who would go on to revolutionise the management of the railway industry, while the only individual outside of the textile industries who was not self-employed was the head of the Government School of Design, later the Nottingham School of Art, Frederick Fussell, an artist from London.[59]

In comparison, only 30 of the 100 members who joined the club after 1865 worked in the lace industry in some capacity, with an additional seven working in other textile industries. Unlike in the period before 1865, however, one of these was a warehouseman, a working class occupation, while the number of those who worked as agents had increased from one to three. There were also proportionally fewer men from the professions: only three solicitors joined the NCC between 1865 and 1900, although seven doctors and a dentist was

[59] T. Gourvish, 'Captain Mark Huish: a pioneer in the development of railway management', *Business History,* 12 (1), 1970; University of Glasgow History of Art and HATII, 'Frederick R Fussell', *Mapping the Practice and Profession of Sculpture in Britain and Ireland 1851–1951,* 2011.

an increase on the five medical men joining in the period 1829–65. Three accountants, a bank manager and a sharebroker made up the sixteen per cent of post-1865 members who belonged to the professions. Conversely, there were a number of members after 1865 who worked in lower middle class white collar occupations, including five clerks, four insurance agents, a cashier at the Lenton and Nottingham Co-Operative and a journalist. Finally, while there had been apparently no working class members of the NCC in the period before the entrance fee was removed, seven men with such occupations joined following its abolition. It is not immediately clear from the occupational data gained on these members which were in skilled and which were in unskilled work. Though the two men described as an engineer and upholsterer respectively were clearly skilled workers, it is difficult to discern the precise nature of the job of a warehouseman, of which there were two who belonged to the NCC.

There was, therefore, a gradual change in the social makeup of the NCC's membership over the course of the nineteenth century, with more lower middle and working class men joining towards the end of the Victorian era. It should not go unnoticed, however, that the numbers of commercial and professional men becoming members of the club changed very little – before 1865, fifty members have been found to have been either professionals or commercially involved in textiles (i.e. as manufacturers or merchants), while between that year and the end of the century 52 were from these occupational backgrounds. The fifty per cent increase in members joining in the latter period can therefore almost solely be explained by a greater number of individuals from both the working and lower middle classes, as well as the

non-commercial middle classes such as teachers (who totalled five of the new members in this period) entering the club. This is consistent with Morris's observation that prior to 1850 the working and lower middle classes were 'less likely to take part in voluntary societies' and that most such organisations 'were dominated by the elite' of the middle classes.[60] It is notable that the only point at which any of the aristocracy were associated with the club was as patrons of the international tournament held in Nottingham in 1886, a tournament organised by a committee of club members.[61]

The removal of the entrance fee in 1865 appears to have provided a catalyst for a sharp increase in membership numbers of the NCC in the years immediately following. However, the period 1860 – 1874 saw average real wages in the United Kingdom increase by nearly thirty per cent, a rate of growth unsurpassed in the nineteenth century.[62] Though it can be unwise to use national average wage data when examining an individual city, the textile industries in Nottingham were heavily unionised leading to a significant rise in real wages for the majority of people of Nottingham in this period as well.[63] Similarly, the stability of the textile industries in the town at this point, following decades of cyclical recessions dating back to at least the 1820s, meant that employment was both easier to find and more secure.[64] Thus the increase in membership seen by the NCC cannot solely be ascribed to the reduction in cost of joining, as economic conditions both in Nottingham and the country as

[60] Morris, 'Voluntary societies', 96.
[61] Records of Nottingham Chess Club, MS 675.
[62] P. Deane and W.A. Cole, *British economic growth 1688-1959: trends and structure*, Cambridge, 1962, 25.
[63] Church, *Economic and social change,* 269–77 and 293–306.
[64] Ibid, 269, 284.

a whole would have enabled more confident spending on leisure than had been possible previously.

## Chapter 3: Rationality, respectability and civic pride

### 3.1 The Nottingham Chess Club and rational recreation

The status of chess as a rational and respectable recreational activity is, as seen above, the matter of some debate. However, it was clearly to the benefit of those making money from chess – authors and journalists such as Walker and Howard Staunton, for example – to advertise the game as such. The two adjectives do not necessarily go hand in hand: it was possible for chess to be rational but not respectable and vice versa. Sharples concedes that by the mid-nineteenth century the 'dominant image' of chess was that it was 'respected and rational' but argues that this is 'misleading',[65] proceeding to deconstruct the veneer of respectability chess afforded its players. In terms of rationality, chess was associated with a wide variety of idealistic qualities: honesty, patience, morality and respectability were among those often cited in support of the game's promotion.[66] Despite this its status as a game caused some to equate chess with gambling in the form of dice or cards, leading to a limiting of its introduction in organisations such as Mechanics Institutions in the mid-nineteenth century.[67]

In terms of pre- and early-Victorian leisure, rationality was not so closely linked with the physical culture of the working and middle classes. Indeed, in the mid- to late-Georgian period, such a connection would have been considered unusual: Cunningham observed that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries 'sport…was not rational, books [and music] were.'

[65] Sharples, '"I am a chess-player"', 296–7.
[66] Harvey, 'Social participation', 22.
[67] Harding, 'Policeman on the case', 52. Notably, the Nottingham Mechanics' Institution apparently had no issues with the creation of a chess club there; this may have been because Newham's involvement as founder and first president.

Furthermore, the rational recreation movement was 'of and for the middle class', being 'deliberately exclusive' to the working classes through means of cost or social tone.[68] The Nottingham Chess Club appears to bear this out as it had both a costly subscription – the entrance fee of a pound was anywhere from two to five times the average weekly wage of workers in the hosiery and silk industries in the early 1830s[69] – and rooms in the socially exclusive Nottingham Subscription Library. By this time the idea of rational recreation was starting to be disseminated to the working classes, although in its first decade the NCC as an organisation hardly appears to have embraced this to any significant extent, its activities being limited to correspondence matches and annual dinners. In 1839, however, the club's secretary and strongest player, Newham, advertised a series of lectures he would be conducting the following year, to be held in the club's room at the library. Who attended these lectures is unclear, although the notices in the *Nottingham Review* (NR) and *Bell's Life* advised that tickets would be provided free of charge to 'any gentleman'.[70] Where else these lectures were advertised is unknown, but the audience of these publications is unlikely to have included a significant portion of the lower classes. Moreover, the terminology used may also have put off any working man (or woman) who might have seen the notices. Interestingly, as women were not publicly involved in chess until around the 1870s,[71] Newham noted several years later that there had been 'many ladies present' at these lectures, 'a very delightful circumstance'.[72] It is somewhat typical of male Victorian leisure that women may have been excluded from what

[68] Cunningham, *Leisure,* 91.
[69] Church, *Economic and Social,* 41–2. These wage levels continued until around 1850.
[70] *Nottingham Review,* December 20 1839, 4; *BLL,* January 5 1840, 4.
[71] Harvey, 'Social participation', 25.
[72] *NR,* January 28 1848, 3.

Huggins terms 'private public contexts' but embraced in the more overtly public elements.[73]

The occasion of Newham's comments on the success of his 1840 lectures was a further talk he gave in January 1848 at the Nottingham Mechanics' Institution (NMI), where the formation of a chess class had been proposed the previous year. This proposal was shortly accepted and the class was 'formally recognised by the managers' later in 1848, with Newham becoming president.[74] It is similarly unclear to whom this talk was delivered, although again there were a number of ladies in the audience. If the lecture was appropriately pitched in terms of the level of education of the audience, they would appear to have been relatively highly educated: the *Review's* report notes references to Shakespeare and Charlemagne, while Newham quoted Dryden and Percy Shelley during its course.[75] While the NCC itself may not have represented the promulgation of rational recreation, therefore, there were at least elements within it who recognised the potentiality of the game to effect the moral and behavioural improvement Bailey identified as the purpose of the movement.[76]

Even towards the end of the nineteenth century the NCC rarely explicitly involved itself in matters outside of chess, appearing somewhat isolated from the wider world. Aside from matches, both correspondence and 'over-the-board', with other clubs, the main event of the chess season was the 'annual

[73] Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures?', 593, highlights the tensions between female-ruled domesticity and the male homosociality of the public private context. This is also apparent in the *Review's* report of the 1839 chess ball which notes the attendance of the wives and daughters of a number of men: *NR,* January 4 1839, 3.
[74] J.A.H. Green (ed.), *History of the Nottingham Mechanics Institution, 1837–1887,* Nottingham, 1887, 13.
[75] *NR,* January 28 1848, 3.
[76] Bailey, *Leisure and class,* 52.

soiree', usually chaired by the Mayor of Nottingham (an arrangement presumably enabled due to the significant links between members of the NCC and local politics), though at one point even this had fallen into abeyance – it was minuted at the club's 1888 general meeting that there had been a 'discontinuance' of these and that there was now a 'general feeling as to the desirability' of reinstating the practice.[77] It is somewhat difficult, therefore, to debate the idea of the rationality of leisure using the NCC as an example. There were clearly members of the NCC who believed in the improving nature of chess, most prominently Newham and Hamel who were both simultaneously president of the NCC and the NMI club. Newham, for example, believed that 'young men could not devote themselves to a more…self-improving recreation',[78] and that an interest in chess, from 'a moral point of view' would lead to

> 'very beneficial results, inasmuch as it not only tends to improve and develope (sic) the intellect, but also offers facilities for rational recreation from the dull monotony of business and the pursuit of literary and scientific knowledge, which cannot be obtained in the tavern or similar places of resort.'[79]

Also, both he and Hamel repeatedly provided prizes for tournaments within the NMI club, providing further encouragement for its members to develop their interest in chess. The existence of the club at the NMI, however, may have led to a presumption among the members of the NCC that they need not concern themselves with the promotion of chess as a rational recreation for the working classes, as anyone from the lower orders could sate an interest in

[77] Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club, DD/703/1: the previous recorded annual dinner was in 1882.
[78] *NG,* October 3 1861, 5.
[79] *NG,* November 30 1854, 5.

the game at the NMI. Those members of the Nottingham club who were concerned with the moral welfare of the working classes could use the NMI club as a vehicle for promoting the game. Indeed, at least 44 confirmed members of the NCC also held membership of the NMI club at some point; twenty – nearly half – occupied an official role within the latter club. It is impossible to say that all of these joined both clubs due to their concern for the moral development of their fellow men: more than likely it was largely due to a desire to play chess, though in light of Bailey's claim that the middle classes saw themselves as the 'superintendents of the reformation' of working class leisure, it is significant that so many took up office at the second club. Furthermore, the social mixing that occurred in the NMI club was an example of Bailey's 'taking of recreation in common…assuag[ing] the hostilities of capital and labour, and restor[ing] a sense of community between the classes'.[80]

[80] Bailey, *Leisure and class,* 177.

## 3.2 Respectability and the Nottingham Chess Club

If rationality was not necessarily evident within the NCC, the same can be said of respectability. As noted above chess was largely considered a respectable pastime from the mid- to late-Victorian period, an image that remained unchallenged until Sharples article on the *Café de la Regence*. Since then Harvey has noted that prior to 1850 there was a 'pervasive feeling within society' that chess was not respectable, with opponents often equating it with gambling.[81] This feeling was even apparent in Nottingham with the chess club in Basford (then a small town on the outskirts of the city, now a suburb of Nottingham) refusing the offer of a room at the offices of the Local Board with the pointed comment that 'remarks as to gambling were entirely and quite uncalled for'.[82]

As Huggins and Mangan have noted, what could be classed as respectable or disrespectable behaviour differed according to temporal and physical location.[83] Thus the varied circumstances in which a Victorian Nottingham chess player may have been found must be treated differently; a club night at the NCC in the 1830s was of an almost incomparable nature to one of the club's annual dinners in the 1890s. The former were serious affairs, evidenced by the club's rule that every member must attend and play one or more games each week on penalty of a fine. It was also during these occasions that the match committees for correspondence games would have met. The social events of the club were an altogether different beast. Perhaps the greatest

[81] Harvey, 'Social participation', 19.
[82] *NG,* December 11 1863, 5. The quote is from a letter from WH Dashwood, honorary secretary of Basford Chess Club, printed in the article.
[83] M. Huggins and J.A. Mangan, 'Prologue: all mere complexities', in M. Huggins and J.A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: less virtuous Victorians at play,* Abingdon, 2004, xv.

indicator of this was given in the French chess periodical *Le Palamède* in describing the purpose to which club fines were put:

> 'The money which results from these fines is carefully preserved to be used at the annual dinner of the club, for special wines: Burgundy, Rhine, [and] Champagne.'[84]

Over the years, references to drink were not uncommon in the reports of the NCC's encroachments onto the social calendar. A typical one is from a report in the *NG* of the NCC's 22nd anniversary dinner in 1851, attendees at which 'refreshed themselves…with sherry, port [and] champagne' during the meal, subsequent to which a number of toasts reaching well into double figures were drunk 'with enthusiasm'.[85]

Not only did the NCC host its own events, its members were not unwilling to travel for such an occasion. The Yorkshire Chess Association (YCA), the first multi-club chess organisation in Britain, hosted annual meetings almost every year during the 1840s, and several Nottingham players, most frequently Newham, attended these. The first such event was at Leeds in January 1841, although no members from the NCC were present. The second, in November of the same year, was held at Wakefield, and Newham, Mr Marx and Francis Noyes made the trip. Newham even attended despite having been advised by his doctor not to play![86] The 1843 meeting at Huddersfield saw a further three NCC members attending in addition to Newham,[87] while the 1844 event was hosted by the NCC in Nottingham. Despite it being in their home town, just

[84] Anonymous, 'Chess-clubs of Great-Britain', 313–14.
[85] *NG,* December 11 1851, 3.
[86] *NR,* November 19 1841, 2.
[87] *NR,* November 17 1843, 2.

seven members of the Nottingham club were present.[88] A subsequent meeting in Caistor, Lincolnshire, in 1851, saw the visit of five Nottingham players, Newham plus four others.[89] In total, at least fifteen members of the NCC attended these various meetings, at least in part for the social aspect.

These events, both of the NCC and the YCA, though involving the playing of chess early on in proceedings, perhaps created an environment more in keeping with the 'permanent private zones' of the gentleman's club in which 'alcoholic drink and sociability were key attractions', than that of the 'quiet, respectable, rational' chess club and thus should be judged in a similar way.[90]

How important were these social events to the members of the NCC? Newspaper reports appear to show they were well attended, often with guests from nearby clubs. Occasionally professionals were invited from further afield – Isidor Gunsberg, Joseph Blackburne, Francis Lee, Josef Kling and Porterfield Rynd were among those who attended at least one of the NCC's annual events – which likely helped boost attendance among the general membership. On at least one occasion there were two such dinners in a season, indicating some significant demand, especially as the NCC did not cover the cost out of its own funds: instead each member paid for their own share. Exact costs per person are difficult to determine, though the accounts show expenditure of around £3 per year for these events; in the 1855-6 season, however, for no apparent recorded reason, the club held two dinners

[88] *NR,* July 26 1844, 6. The report states that six NCC members attended, then proceeds to give eight names, seven of whom were members at the time.
[89] *Lincoln, Rutland, and Stamford Mercury,* October 17 1851, 3.
[90] Gunn, *Public Culture,* 87; Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures?', 593; Sharples, '"I am a chess-player"', 297.

at a total cost of over ten guineas.[91] For some considerable time these events were well attended and seemingly well appreciated, and it is unclear, therefore, why the practice of holding them was temporarily discontinued in the 1880s.

It should be made clear that the existence of these dinners does not automatically indicate any level of disrespectability on the part of the NCC or its members. However, there was certainly greater opportunity for some form of disreputable behaviour: Huggins points out that where 'drink could be taken…in the club…or a cab could be found, overindulgence could be easily concealed'.[92] Drink was not the only cause or symptom of disrespectability, however, and there is evidence that several NCC members were not fully upholding of the idea of middle class respectability.

A number of members of the chess club had brushes with the law at various points during the nineteenth century, three of whom were otherwise largely respectable figures. John Pigot, mayor of Nottingham in 1840, was tried in 1856 for the felony of 'pointing a loaded pistol and attempting to draw the trigger thereof', though found not guilty.[93] Francis Noyes, a teacher and Tory councillor in the late 1830s who also played cricket for Nottinghamshire, was something of a rogue. Having been tried for assault at the Nottingham Midsummer Assizes of 1834, he later founded a social club known only as 'The Society', the members of which made a name for themselves in the town

[91] Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, MS 675.
[92] Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures?', 590.
[93] Nottingham Assizes, March 13 1856. Home Office: Criminal Registers, England and Wales, *HO27/115/86.*

for unruly and borderline illegal behaviour.[94] Noyes later emigrated to California during the Gold Rush with significant unpaid debts. In 1889 Charles Rosenberg was convicted of fraud while ten years later Hymen Rosenbaum was in court, though was acquitted of assault.[95] Edward Renals, later secretary, vice president and trustee of the NMI, was convicted in 1832 of stealing from his employer, Richard Sutton, proprietor of the *Review* and member of the NCC.[96] This was, admittedly, at the age of 18, and thus is more an example of 'life-cycle variation' than an indication of any underlying disrespectability on Renals' part.[97] Indeed, over half a century later a history of the NMI attributed 'much of its present prosperity…to [Renals'] careful and judicious discharge of his duties' as its secretary between 1842 and 1872.[98] Furthermore, away from the courtroom, it became apparent during Thomas Wakefield's bankruptcy hearings that he had been misusing money held in trust from his father's estate to prop up his failing colliery business.[99]

Finally, Huggins asserts that a variety of occupational types – what could loosely be termed the creative arts, although he includes journalists – were 'outside the pale of unimpeachable respectability' due to an assumed or real 'association with bohemian habits'.[100] With regard to the members of the NCC this would include Frederick Fussell, an artist who became head of the Nottingham Art School; James Glendinning, journalist; and James Prior Kirk,

[94] Nottingham Assizes, Midsummer 1834. Home Office: Criminal Registers, England and Wales, *HO27/48/504;* The Society's book (proceedings of a Nottingham social club): volume 1, Nottinghamshire Archives, M/358.
[95] *NG,* January 5 1889, 8 and December 9 1899, 8.
[96] Nottingham Assizes, March 12 1832. Home Office: Criminal Registers, England and Wales, *HO 17/3/116.*
[97] Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures?', 589.
[98] Green, *History of the Nottingham Mechanics Institution*, 35.
[99] Griffin, 'Thomas North', 52.
[100] Huggins, 'More sinful pleasures?', 591.

an author of moderate renown. It is possible that these men sought membership of the NCC, rather than the chess club at the NMI, to increase their own respectability and social status. Huggins argued that respectability could be conferred on an activity by the 'participation of the "right" people': similarly, respectability could be conferred on a person by association with the right people.[101] Further literary links with the chess club include Joseph Neuberg's work as secretary, translator and 'companion and guide over the battlefields of Prussia' for Thomas Carlyle, and George Hume's authorship of several compilations of chess problems,[102] although as these were not their substantive occupations they are of less interest.

Thus there were evidently examples of less respectable activity – or at least activities associated with disrespectability – even among those members of the NCC who may otherwise have appeared eminently respectable. As with any organisation, however, this is only one side of the coin. One club member, Dr Benjamin Whitelegge, was knighted in later life for his work in public health.[103] Mayor of Nottingham William Ward was also widely expected to be knighted for his work in local government, notably his pivotal role in the restoration of Nottingham Castle and its re-opening as an art gallery – he unfortunately died less than three weeks prior to the Prince of Wales formally opening the gallery and his successor as mayor, James Oldknow, was knighted instead.[104] Ward's appointment to the mayoralty was the culmination

[101] M. Huggins, 'Direct and indirect influence: J.A. Mangan and the Victorian middle classes: Major revisionist in the history of sport', *International Journal of the History of Sport,* 20 (4), 2003, 38.
[102] F. Boase, *Modern English Biography volume 2, I–Q,* London, 1965, 1111; Hume co-authored a number of A.C. White's annual *Christmas Series* books, such as *Changing Fashions*, Stroud, 1926 and *Valves and Bi-valves,* Stroud, 1930.
[103] *London Gazette,* June 19 1911, 4952.
[104] R. Mellors, *Men of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire,* Nottingham, 1924, 226.

of his political career, having started out in local government in New Basford following the removal of his business interests to there from Nottingham. He was neither the first nor the last NCC member to achieve this distinction, a further indication of the apparent respectability of the club and its members.

There was, therefore, a mix of the respectable and disrespectable among the NCC members. On the other hand, the club – and the game of chess itself – appears to have a very respectable reputation. The above-mentioned meetings of the YCA, attended by NCC members, were chaired by, variously, an earl, an MP, and the High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire, all of whom were happy to associate themselves with the game of chess and the men who played it.[105] Similarly, the attendance of various Mayors of Nottingham at the NCC's annual dinners – regardless of any social connections they may have had with NCC members – implies a significant degree of respectability. Finally, a swathe of local aristocracy were happy to promote and be associated with the Counties Chess Association Congress held in Nottingham in 1886 – the names of eleven members of the social elite, along with two MPs and two future baronets, were patrons of the Congress.[106] Sharples is somewhat critical of the idea of chess as a respectable pastime, though his focus is specifically the chess-player rather than chess itself, and indeed the environment of the *Café de la Regence,* as described by Sharples', is less

[105] The 1841 meeting in Leeds was chaired by James Milnes Gaskell, MP for Wenlock, Shropshire, *Leeds Mercury,* January 23 1841, 3; at Huddersfield in 1843 the chair was the Earl of Mexborough, *NR,* November 17 1843, 2; Charles Paget was chair of the July 1844 meeting in Nottingham, *NR,* July 26 1844, 6;

[106] Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, MS675. The full list of patrons: the Duke and Duchess of St Albans, the Duke of Portland, Earl Manvers, Lord and Lady Belper, Lord and Lady J Manners, the Marquis of Hartington, Lord Newark, Lord Galway, the Mayor of Nottingham, Bishop Bagshawe, Canon Hole, Sir Henry Bromley, Bart, Colonel Seely, H.S. Wright, MP and C.G.S. Foljambe, MP.

than respectable.[107] Nonetheless, it is clear that it must have been widely considered respectable, or dukes, earls and baronets would have turned down opportunities to be connected with it.

[107] Sharples, '"I am a chess-player"', 297–8.

## 3.3: The Nottingham Chess Club and Civic Pride

The chess club at the NMI, perhaps due to the perceived improving nature of its parent organisation, appears to have largely dominated local chess in the latter part of the nineteenth century: it was the NMI that was more active in chess in and around Nottingham, playing matches with clubs at various church institutes, as well as those from other Nottinghamshire towns and villages. Despite this there is plenty of evidence to suggest the NCC was still recognised as the pre-eminent chess club in the city. For example, an 1884 testimonial collection for Blackburne, an English chess professional, was organised by the NCC, while the Counties' Chess Association (CCA) invited the Nottingham club, rather than the Mechanics' to host its annual tournament in 1886.[108] At a joint meeting of the NCC and the NMI chess club in 1892 the chairman, in the absence of the president of the former club, was merely a committee member of the Nottingham club.[109] Even as late as 1897 it was the NCC that sent delegates to represent Nottingham at a meeting aimed at forming an association to represent Midlands chess counties.[110] During this lull in social activity it had also been somewhat damningly recorded that in the 1885/6 season:

> 'The [matches with other clubs] were all very interesting and enjoyable, but the same cannot be said with regard to the regular meetings of the club, the average attendance being small and the proceedings of a lifeless description. In point of ordinary club life the season was a failure.'[111]

[108] Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, MS675; Minute book of the NCC, DD/703/1.
[109] *NG,* July 2 1892, 7.
[110] Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club, DD/703/1.
[111] Ibid.

The summer following this season saw an event that may have shaken the NCC out of this turpitude when an international tournament was organised by the club in conjunction with the Counties Chess Association's annual event, the hosting of which had been taken on by the club the previous year.

The Nottingham Chess Club was a relatively small society in Nottingham; by the early 1860s it was not even the largest chess club in the town, with that honour going to the 'chess class' at the NMI.[112] To give some illustration as to how its maximum membership of 52 compared with other institutions in the town, the various gentlemen's and political clubs had anywhere from 70 to over 1000 members,[113] while on the founding of the Nottingham Literary and Philosophical Society in late 1864, 173 people (fifteen of whom were or would be members of the NCC) enrolled as members in approximately two months.[114] In its 29th year, the NMI had reached a membership of 1000, which was only to grow towards the end of the century.[115]

However, comparatively small though its membership may have been, a large proportion of those individuals who made up the NCC were involved in both the political administration and law enforcement of Nottingham and the running of a wide variety of voluntary institutions in the town. This chapter will examine the extent to which members of the chess club 'had a heavy

[112] The NMI club was probably bigger in 1861 when it boasted over 50 members; the following year it had over 60. *NG,* November 15 1861, 3 and October 17 1862, 3.
[113] See for example, C. Wright, *Wright's Directory of Nottingham and 12 miles around,* Nottingham, 1895, 444–5.
[114] *NG,* February 3 1865, supplement.
[115] Ibid, 3.

investment in civic pride and institutions' as Gunn claimed the middle class of the Victorian period did.[116]

The first area to address is that of power and influence in terms of political administration and law enforcement. Beckett and Brand have noted that few of Nottingham's prominent local politicians, including men such as Richard Birkin, William Felkin and Thomas Wakefield, made any attempt to broaden their influence to a national stage, apparently preferring to be big fish in a comparatively small pond.[117] One Nottingham man who did make the step to national politics was John Ellis, NCC member for a time from 1872, and Liberal Member of Parliament for the constituency of Rushcliffe in the south of Nottinghamshire from 1885 to his death in 1910. Born in Leicester, he had moved to the Nottingham area in the 1860s to manage his brother's colliery in Hucknall Torkard, a village north of Nottingham.[118] Despite the NCC not being the only chess club in the area at this time – in addition to the previously mentioned Mechanics Institute club, there were also clubs at New Basford, Newark and Retford[119] – this was the one that Ellis, who by the time his subscription to the NCC began was a successful printer and stationer, chose to join.

Prior to the municipal reforms of the 1830s Nottingham had been somewhat uncharacteristic of English towns and cities, having a largely Dissenting Whig-controlled corporation rather than the 'traditional Tory urban establishment' to

[116] Gunn, *Public Culture,* 28.
[117] J. Beckett and K. Brand, 'Municipal Reform and Parliamentary Enclosure' in J. Beckett (ed), *A Centenary History of Nottingham,* Manchester, 1997, 247–8.
[118] A. Bassett, *The life of the Rt. Hon. John Edward Ellis, MP,* London, 1914, 22.
[119] The Newark club was formed in 1855: *NG,* November 27 1856, 5, states it was beginning its second season. A club was being mooted at Retford in 1857: *NG,* April 30 1857, 5. The Basford club was active from at least the early 1860s, *NG,* December 11 1863, 5.

which Fraser refers.[120] Nonetheless, after the passing of the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act, supported by Nottingham Tories due to the corruption of the Whig-dominated corporation, the new town council began to see greater representation of the newly wealthy and influential lace manufacturers.[121] The first lace manufacturer to become mayor was William Vickers in 1844, and the majority of those elected to the office in the second half of the nineteenth century were also from the lace industry.

In total, from Thomas Wakefield's first of two year-long stints in 1835 to Edwin Mellor's elevation in 1911, eleven members of the NCC, over twenty per cent of the 54 men who held the mayoralty in this time, were elected to the highest position in local government for a total of eighteen years.[122] Six of these also held office within the NCC, or eight if the 1839 ball committee is taken into consideration, including two presidents and two vice-presidents (Mellor held both positions at different times). In addition to this, a further six NCC members were elected to the town council during the nineteenth century, with at least one more, Job Derbyshire, during the twentieth. With Albert Heymann's election to both the newly created Nottinghamshire County and West Bridgford Urban District Councils in 1893,[123] at least nineteen members of the NCC were elected to public office by popular vote.

The change from oligarchic to more meritocratic urban politics from the late 1830s onwards, even though ultimately the beneficiaries of both systems were drawn from groups of similar social status, presaged the rise to positions of

[120] D. Fraser, *Urban politics in Victorian England: the structure of politics in Victorian cities*, Leicester, 1976, 115.
[121] Church, *Economic and social change,* 181.
[122] Nottingham City Council, 'Previous Lord Mayors and Mayors - from Year 1284 to Present Day', 2016.
[123] C. Wright, *Wright's directory of Nottingham and 12 miles around,* Nottingham, 1893, 612.

influence of what we have already seen to have been a significant proportion of the membership of the NCC.

Six of those who were elected mayor also previously held the office of Sheriff of Nottingham, although by the time Edwin Mellor became Sheriff in 1906 this role was purely ceremonial.[124] Albert Heymann held the Deputy-Lieutenancy of Nottinghamshire in addition to his local council roles,[125] while Derbyshire also became High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire several decades after the NCC foundered, though again this was a ceremonial role by this time.[126] Nine of these councillors were also appointed as borough or county magistrates with a further four members of the chess club being appointed as magistrates during the Victorian era.

It is clear, therefore, that the membership of the NCC was drawn significantly from the strata of society with the opportunity and ambition to seek political power and influence, 'legitimiz[ing] their role as social leaders through political office'.[127] As detailed above, this engagement with the local political sphere lent the NCC some considerable respectability: the regular attendance of mayoral incumbents at the club's annual dinners would have been calculated to mutually enhance their respective reputations. The club itself was a source of pride to the town, hence its advertisement in the local press as the 'champion club of the Midland counties',[128] and thus, perhaps despite the less respectable activities of some of its members, would have been considered a respectable institution.

[124] Nottingham City Council, 'Previous Sheriffs of Nottingham', 2016.
[125] J.P. Briscoe and W.T. Pike (eds), *Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire at the opening of the twentieth century [and] Contemporary biographies,* Brighton, 1901, 18.
[126] *London Gazette,* March 31 1942, 1453.
[127] Fraser, *Urban politics,* 116.
[128] *NG,* October 17 1862, 5.

The political sphere was one area in which the middle classes, and particularly the elite of such, could exert 'economic and cultural authority within the middle class…[and] against and over the working classes.'[129] The other area, as Morris explores, was that of the voluntary societies such as mechanics institutes, trade unions, libraries, charities, 'even chess clubs'![130] This paper will now consider the interaction with these voluntary societies on the part of the members of the NCC; alongside voluntary societies this paper will also consider municipally-backed institutions such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Nottingham and District Tramway company, as these were populated by key members of the political and commercial classes.

Prior to the founding of the chess club in 1829 there existed a variety of such organisations, largely having been founded in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and thus providing more evidence for Morris's observation that there was 'an increase in the formation of voluntary societies from the 1780s onwards.[131] These can be roughly assigned to five categories: religious, such as the Sunday Schools, and Bible and Missionary Societies; charitable institutions, for example several schools and hospitals and the 'various benevolent societies' White referred to in 1832;[132] cultural, under which umbrella fall the various libraries and such bodies as the Nottingham Florist and Horticultural Society; fraternal organisations including the Freemasons, Druids and Odd Fellows; and the political, such as the Trades Union, and the Political Union aimed at Parliamentary reform. There was also a Savings Bank 'for the humbler classes', controlled by the local elite in the

[129] Morris, 'Voluntary societies', 96.
[130] Ibid, 95.
[131] Ibid, 95.
[132] White, *History, Gazetteer and Directory of Nottinghamshire*, 161.

form of the Duke of Newcastle as patron and Sir Robert Clifton, 7th Baronet Clifton, as president.[133]

The chess club had significant commonalities with these existing organisations, and indeed with voluntary societies on a broader basis. As Morris argued, these bodies were usually controlled by 'the higher status members of the society. The president was often a high-status local leader, often a major industrialist, the secretary usually a solicitor, and the treasurer perhaps a local merchant'.[134] This is an almost perfect description of the NCC, with the industrialist mayor Thomas Wakefield its first president, solicitors Samuel Newham and Samuel Shilton its first two secretaries, and lace and silk merchants Sigismund Hamel and Carl Sipman two of the three men found to have taken on the role of treasurer.

Morris asserts that in the period 1780 – 1850 these voluntary societies were 'vital to the distribution and mediation of power within British towns.'[135] In other words, through their membership and control of these organisations, the middle classes, and specifically their elite, were able to extend their influence beyond the political. Beyond this these societies were an opportunity to establish an identity for the new middle class, a 'social expression for their new status'.[136] Clark, however, discounts this view, holding that by focusing on Leeds Morris has ignored the wider picture.[137] Instead, Clark believes that voluntary societies are almost a prerequisite for the development of civil society, enabling social connections 'within and…across broad social

[133] Ibid, 175.
[134] Morris, 'Voluntary societies', 101.
[135] Ibid, 96.
[136] Ibid, 96; Bailey, *Leisure and class,* 89.
[137] Clark, *British clubs and societies,* 446 – Clark is largely referring to Morris's book *Class, sect and party: the making of the British middle class: Leeds 1820–1850,* Manchester, 1990.

alignments'.[138] The middle classes' membership of, and the holding of office in, the NCC perhaps offers more support to Morris's argument than that of Clark, though it must be noted that Clark was referring to the eighteenth century. As has been shown, however, by the later nineteenth century Clark's broad social alignments had started to show themselves within the Nottingham Chess Club.

Despite Clark's negative assessment of Morris, his explanation of the particular circumstances in which voluntary societies in Leeds came to be dominated by the middle class can similarly be applied to Nottingham, where this class was also the 'nascent social and economic power…[eclipsing] the old-style gentlemen merchants'.[139] This paper will therefore look at the extent to which Nottingham voluntary societies also came to be dominated by the middle classes during the mid- to late-nineteenth century and, by uncovering the extent to which members of the chess club were members of or involved in the running of other voluntary societies within Nottingham, it will be shown how similar the NCC was to these institutions. The membership of the NCC has been shown to have been overwhelmingly drawn from this elite of the middle classes, and it will therefore be possible to ascertain how the chess club relates to other voluntary societies of the time in terms of its membership's willingness to engage in the community building inherent in the network of voluntary societies.

The nature of many of the voluntary societies in Nottingham was somewhat transitory, with few records having survived – including member or subscriber

[138] Ibid, vii and 446.
[139] Ibid, 446.

lists – and only a handful of the organisations the NCC members chose to join are still in existence. Therefore, identifying who belonged to which organisations can be troublesome. However, it is those men who controlled the voluntary societies and institutions that are of most interest and such details were often recorded elsewhere, particularly in newspapers and commercial and trade directories and it is from these sources that the following information is largely drawn.

In total, 107 of the 235 discovered members of the NCC, nearly half, have been found to have been associated with at least one other voluntary society in Nottingham. Three institutions in particular were found to have considerable links with the chess club: 53 chess club members subscribed to the Nottingham Subscription Library, the club's first venue; 43 were members of the NMI, possible reasons for which will be examined below; and 32 members belonged to at least one Freemason lodge (Samuel Shilton, long-time secretary of the NCC, was perhaps the foremost Mason in Nottinghamshire, being at various times member of eight lodges, and master of two).[140]

The above organisations were just three of 79 different voluntary societies with which NCC members were associated, and unfortunately comprise three quarters of those for which ordinary members can be identified. Of the remaining 76, in all bar the Literary and Philosophical Society were the members of the chess club occupying positions of responsibility, from the committee to director or president. The greatest proportion of these, over 25 per cent of the total, were what could be classed as social or cultural institutions, including the subscription library, but also bodies such as the

[140] *NG,* December 21 1877, 5.

Literary and Debating Society, Sacred Harmonic Society and the *Deutscher Verein,* or German Club, founded as a social club for Nottingham's sizeable German population, a number of whom were also NCC members.[141] A further fifteen per cent were sports clubs, with five cricket clubs, four bowling greens, a cycling club, and the Nottingham Aquatic Club, likely a rowing club. The remainder consisted largely of medical, political and educational institutions (24 in total) with charitable, financial and business organisations totalling thirteen between them. The nine others comprised three religious organisations, two temperance societies, two municipal-backed transport companies, and two military volunteer units – the Robin Hood Rifles and the South Nottinghamshire Yeomanry Cavalry.

In addition to their hold on political power, therefore, members of the NCC also had a degree of control in a wide variety of social arenas. While certain institutions had a large number of club members associated with them – in addition to those noted above, twenty held positions within the Nottingham Chamber of Commerce, nine in the School of Art, and seven at the People's College, while thirteen were members of the Literary and Philosophical Society – 52 of the 80 voluntary organisations identified above have been found to have had connections with only one individual from the NCC. Similarly, some club members are only linked with one other voluntary society – James Wallis, who was with the NCC during the 1850s and 60s, was an elder of the New Testament Disciples, a church that had split from the Scotch

[141] Judging from names alone, 28 of the 235 NCC members discovered were of Germanic origin; all of those further identified were at some point involved in the lace or silk trades.

Baptists in Nottingham,[142] while Leopold Hamel, brother of NCC president Sigismund, has only been found to have also subscribed to the Nottingham Subscription Library in addition to the chess club.[143]

Perhaps the most significant associations between members of the Nottingham Chess Club and the voluntary societies of the town are those with the Chamber of Commerce, the foremost commercial organisation in Nottingham, and with various educational institutions in the town. As alluded to in the second chapter there were two Chambers of Commerce in Nottingham: the first was formed in 1835 with Thomas Wakefield as president and two other NCC members, Samuel Adams and Thomas Hind, among the fifteen directors. It is unclear when this folded – the centenary history of the second such institution sheds no light on this – but its successor was formed in 1860 out of concern over the effects of French import tariffs on Nottingham's lace industry.[144] Seventeen members of the NCC held positions in this second incarnation, but the number who may have been members could well be higher: by 1867 there were 80 members with an expectation that it would ultimately reach over 200.[145] It is likely that many of Nottingham's prominent industrialists would have sought to join, and therefore that NCC members such as Edwin Mellor, Anderson Brownsword, John and Samuel Froggatt, William and James Gibson, Charles Hill, and John Herbert, all of whom owned textile companies, could well have been among this number.

[142] D. Murray, 'The Scotch Baptists and the birth of the churches of Christ' in D. Bebbington and M. Sutherland (eds), *Interfaces. Baptists and Others,* Milton Keynes, 2013, 51.
[143] N. Priestland, *A Directory of names associated with Bromley House Library, 1816 to 1916,* 2008.
[144] *NG,* April 19 1860, 3.
[145] *NG,* January 18 1867, 3

There is evidently an element of self-interest in these men's involvement in the Chamber of Commerce, with its purpose of safeguarding and promoting Nottingham's commercial interests. Nonetheless, the Chamber was a representation of civic culture, with all the connotations that term evokes – Hill argues it can be an instrument of social control; that by shaping civic culture to their needs and their image, the middle classes reinforced their social and political power.[146] Stobart largely supports this, observing that 'the elite undoubtedly augmented their social standing and their power through involvement' in civil bodies.[147] Thus by not merely joining but also partially controlling an institution such as the Chamber of Commerce, these men were recreating Nottingham society to their own ends. There was a wider picture to this as well, promoting the image and importance of Nottingham beyond the town's boundaries.

This can also be seen with the involvement of a number of NCC members in educational institutions in the town. The Heymanns, Lewis and his sons Albert and Henry, were very prominent in the promotion of education to the working classes in Nottingham – Lewis and Henry were both vice-presidents of the NMI, while Albert was elected a trustee.[148] Albert and Henry also both served on the committee. All three were involved in the running of the Art School, and Lewis and Albert were director and vice-president respectively of the People's College. Henry was later on the board of the University College and was widely believed to be the anonymous donor of £10000 vital to setting up that

[146] K. Hill, '"Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of ancient Greece'': symbolism and space in Victorian civic culture' in A. Kidd and D. Nicholls (eds), *Gender, Civic Culture and Consumerism: Middle Class Identity in Britain 1800–1940,* Manchester, 1999, 99–100.
[147] J. Stobart, 'Building an urban identity. Cultural space and civic boosterism in a 'new' industrial town: Burslem, 1761–1911', *Social History,* 29 (4), November 2004, 491.
[148] Green (ed), *History of the Nottingham Mechanics Institution,* 50.

particular body.[149] This may appear charitable, and indeed all three were noted for their generosity, however Lewis's involvement with the Art School was essentially designed to provide his business with employees of greater technical ability in his design department.[150]

Other members of the club were heavily involved in the education of Nottingham's citizens as well: William Ward had links with the NMI, the Art School and the People's College, while another mayor, John Manning, was on the committees of the Art School and Ragged School. Furthermore, Ward and another club member, John Mallet, were on the town's School Board, and Joseph Bright and Edward Goldschmidt were governors of the High School.

With such entwining demonstrated between what can admittedly only have been a small subset of Victorian Nottingham's voluntary societies, the idea of these organisations having 'unity…as a coherent social development', as Morris suggests, is given further credence.[151] The evidence from the three institutions on which the most data is available, the NMI, Freemasons and Subscription Library, similarly supports Clark's contention that there was a degree of social mixing in these societies. All three were sizeable organisations, however – the NMI's membership reached 1000 by the mid-1860s – and so quite how much mixing there may have been between, for example, vice-presidents and ordinary members is rather open to debate.

What is clear, however, is that the members of the chess club were part of what Stobart calls 'a resident and ambitious elite', extending their social and political power through their involvement with voluntary societies and civil

[149] Mellors, *Men of Nottingham,* 221.
[150] G. Oldfield, *The Heymann Family of West Bridgford,* West Bridgford, 1983, 4.
[151] Morris, 'Voluntary societies', 96.

bodies.[152] Many of these institutions were designed at least partly to promote the image and interests of the town of Nottingham – the impetus for the creation of the Chamber of Commerce was the economic concerns of Nottingham's industrialists while the University College, though having some roots in the NMI, sprang from the University Extension Movement of the 1870s. This promotion was not limited to physical institutions but also the more intangible idea of civic pride. In 1836 the MCC chose Leicester as the venue for a cricket match between sides representing North and South. In his history of Nottinghamshire cricket, Ashley-Cooper states that 'the good men of Nottingham considered that their *amour propre* had been wounded' by this decision, and a public meeting was held at Nottingham's Exchange Rooms to 'consider the best means' for persuading the MCC to switch the venue to Nottingham. Five of the 25 men at the meeting were NCC members, including presidents Newham and Wakefield (the latter of whom chaired the meeting), and vice-president Hind.[153] Physically these bodies were designed to enhance Nottingham as well: the Art School building, now part of one of Nottingham's universities, was built in a classical Venetian style, explicitly linking it and the town with Renaissance Italy. This literal construction of an urban identity, as Stobart argues, further helped to define the middle class elite, extending the control they exerted over the town and projecting both their and the town's status to their urban neighbours.[154]

[152] Stobart, 'Building an urban identity', 491.
[153] Ashley-Cooper, *Nottinghamshire cricket and cricketers,* 62–3. Nottingham was ultimately unsuccessful in their bid and the match was held at Leicester.
[154] Stobart, 'Building an urban identity', 492.

## Chapter 4: Chess and Sport

The civic engagement of the members of the Nottingham Chess Club is clearly not in doubt: nearly two thirds of those members reliably identified have been found to have been involved in other voluntary societies or civic bodies in Nottingham during the Victorian period, many as presidents, directors and trustees of some of the larger or more important institutions. In this chapter, this engagement, as well as the club's social structure, will be analysed against that of other British sports clubs from the Victorian period to determine if the Nottingham Chess Club was unusual or typical in its members' desire to be so heavily involved in the civic institutions of the town. However, although historians have investigated and established the extent to which a wide range of sports were played by the middle classes in the Victorian period, it is unfortunate that, as MacLean noted relatively recently, 'there is little evidence of any body of work' on the life of individual sports clubs, save for 'a narrow range of…high-quality club histories'.[155] Hill has similarly observed that historians' interests tend towards 'commercial provision' rather than 'voluntary association', meaning that amateur sports clubs such as the Nottingham Chess Club have had little scrutiny.[156]

One club that has been subject to such a study is the Stanmore Golf Club; indeed, Holt's article on Stanmore is one of MacLean's high quality club histories. This golf club appears to have been far more exclusive than the NCC, with a five guinea entrance fee and annual subscription, while

[155] The most notable work on sport and the middle classes is perhaps J. Lowerson, *Sport and the English middle classes, 1870–1914,* Manchester, 1993. Quote from MacLean, 'A gap but not an absence', 1687–8.
[156] J. Hill, *Sport in history: an introduction*, Basingstoke, 2011, 49.

prospective members had to have their 'family connection[s], education, occupation and income' vouched for by two existing members.[157] The social structure of the membership, however, is frustratingly absent due to incomplete records, though a list of shareholders in the company that owned the club exists, containing occupational details. Though of a different era – the list is from 1925 – Holt observes that the social composition evident in this document 'seems to have been maintained' across the first half of the twentieth century.[158]. Evidence from the shareholders indicates striking similarities between Stanmore Golf Club and the NCC, with the majority, nearly three quarters, being of the commercial or professional elite, or describing themselves as gentlemen. This is not the limit of similarity: as with the NCC and its regular social events, Holt points to the facilities of the golf club to argue that it was designed as much for 'social[ising] as well as playing'.[159]

Golf clubs are an excellent comparator for the NCC as the members were amateur players, unlike in one of the more common subjects for club histories, the professional football club where the players were employees. Vamplew, in a broad survey of histories of British golf clubs prior to 1914, suggests that they had a 'dominant middle-class presence on [their] membership lists', as did the NCC.[160] More usefully, he has presented a breakdown of the occupational structure of the committees and boards of directors at pre-war golf clubs, comprising almost 900 individuals. Though Vamplew classes 68 of these as of either miscellaneous or unknown occupation, the remaining 830

[157] Holt, 'Golf and the English suburb', 80–1.
[158] Ibid, 81.
[159] Ibid, 80.
[160] Vamplew, 'Sharing space', 361.

are drawn from much the same strata of society as members of the NCC, predominantly from professional, manufacturing or mercantile backgrounds.[161]

In line with Hill's observation on the greater interest among historians in the commercial nature of sport, it is professional clubs that have seen the greatest study. Inevitably, however, in attempting to compare an amateur club involved in a sport unconducive to large-scale spectating with a commercial, professional sports club there are complications. In, for example, a football club, who are the equivalent of the NCC members? While professional football clubs had members, these were supporters of the club rather than players. The players in each club have a different role, in one being employees, and in the other the sole stakeholders. The NCC had no direct equivalent of shareholders in a limited company, as many football clubs were towards the end of the nineteenth century, nor were there 'thousands of supporters…[who had] an almost proprietary view of the club'.[162] The closest comparison that can be made may therefore between members of these clubs and the NCC, and between the directors of a professional club and the officers of the NCC. The largest study to analyse these people is that of Vamplew's investigation of shareholders and directors in major English and Scottish football clubs in the period up to 1915. For comparison he also includes data on a few non-football sports companies such as racecourses and cricket grounds.[163]

Vamplew's figures show that in Scotland, prior to clubs adopting company status, over sixty per cent of football club members were from manual

[161] Ibid, table 1, 363.
[162] C. Korr, *West Ham United: the making of a football club,* London, 1986, 19.
[163] W. Vamplew, *Pay up and play the game: professional sport in Britain, 1875–1914,* Cambridge, 1988, 155–73. See also appendices 1a – 1d, 287–301.

occupations, outnumbering those from clerical, managerial, proprietary, and professional backgrounds by a ratio of greater than three to two. After becoming limited companies, however, shareholders from the latter grouping were in the majority and only 47 per cent being in manual employment. By looking at the distribution of shares, the picture is even more disparate, with those from the professions owning ten per cent of shares, proprietors and employers 52 per cent and manual workers only 24 per cent.[164] The difference between membership and shareholding in these clubs and membership of the NCC is therefore quite stark, the latter club having just six members (four per cent) with working class occupations. In terms of directorships, Vamplew found that around thirty per cent of directors on the boards of Scottish football clubs had manual occupations, again a significantly larger proportion than among the officials of the NCC where only two men have been identified as from working class backgrounds.[165]

In English clubs, by comparison, shareholders from manual occupations only made up slightly over 35 per cent of the total, while nearly 60 per cent were from professional, proprietary or employing, managerial, and clerical backgrounds. Again these numbers diverge when looking at shareholdings, with less than twenty per cent of shares being held by the working classes and more than four times that number by the four other groups.[166] Vamplew incorporates figures from Mason and Tischler in looking at directorships in English football clubs, and while some inconsistencies were introduced through Vamplew's reclassification of occupational types to fit his own model,

[164] Ibid, table 10.1, 156.
[165] Ibid, table 10.5, 167.
[166] Ibid, table 10.2, 160.

the results are, with one exception, broadly similar.[167] All three agree that around ten per cent of directors in these clubs were working class and approximately half were proprietors or employers. The exception to the similarity in figures is that of professionals, who comprised somewhere around twenty per cent – Mason and Vamplew put this figure at sixteen and eighteen per cent respectively, but Tischler's count is nearly 25 per cent. While the figures are therefore somewhat lower than for Scottish clubs, the working class involvement here is significantly higher than in the NCC. It should be borne in mind, however, that, as Mason observed, football was a working class sport, aiding in their formation of a class consciousness.[168] According to Harvey, chess, by comparison, had 'almost no evidence of working-class involvement' by 1850, though clearly this was to change in the second half of the nineteenth century.[169]

On a smaller scale, Garnham and Jackson produced an in-depth study of the socio-economic backgrounds of shareholders in the two Newcastle football clubs, East End and West End, who would later become Newcastle United. Both clubs appeared to have a significantly higher proportion of working class shareholders than Vamplew's aggregate figure of 35 per cent, 40 per cent of East End's and 52 per cent of West End's shareholders coming from working class backgrounds.[170] However, the authors note several instances of shareholders' self-ascribed occupational details giving false impressions as to

[167] Ibid, 166; table 10.6, 168; see also T. Mason, *Association Football & English Society 1863–1915*, Brighton, 1980, 43 and S. Tischler, *Footballers and Businessmen: The Origins of Professional Soccer in England,* New York, 1981, 72–6.
[168] Mason, *Association Football,* 255–6.
[169] Harvey, 'Social participation', 24.
[170] N. Garnham and A. Jackson, 'Who invested in Victorian football clubs? The case of Newcastle-upon-Tyne', *Soccer & Society*, 4 (1), April 2003, table 1, 62.

their actual socio-economic status.[171]Ultimately they conclude that precise figures, unobtainable due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, would largely be in line with Vamplew's.[172]

The above studies highlight similarities and differences in the social characteristics between members of the NCC and those of other sports clubs, there notably being more of the former with golf and the latter with football. However, there is no indication if the engagement demonstrated by our chess players with Nottingham's civic society is typical of the Victorian sports club. To address this, one needs to turn to studies where such investigations have been carried out, yet the only notable example for comparable urban environments is again of professional football clubs. Kennedy's analysis of the directors and shareholders of four Merseyside football clubs at the time of their incorporation as limited companies in 1892 is similar to this paper, not only in that he is interested in demographic data such as occupation, social class and personal wealth, but also in that he questions the extent to which these football clubs' boardrooms 'attracted those prominently involved in other organizations of importance to civic life.'[173] His occupational profiling of individuals is more limited than Vamplew's as he restricts himself to four categories – commercial, professional, skilled manual and skilled non-manual. Nonetheless, the difference in occupational backgrounds among the 34 directors is stark – Kennedy classifies just five as having working class occupations.[174] Even this number may be too high as one of these Kennedy acknowledges owned his own business, while another had donated a

[171] Ibid, 63.
[172] Ibid, 64.
[173] Kennedy, 'Class, ethnicity, and civic governance', 842.
[174] Ibid, 845.

significant sum of money to keep Bootle FC afloat only the year prior to that being studied.[175] While this is a small sample size, it is roughly comparable with that of the officials of the NCC where two of 52 were evidently working class.

While there may be similarities between the directors of the Merseyside clubs and NCC officials, in terms of comparison between shareholders and NCC members, there is significant disparity: of 630 shareholders in Kennedy's study almost 60 per cent are classed as being in working class employment.[176] This overall picture is skewed, however, by Everton's shareholder profile. Due to the club's decision to avoid selling its shares in bulk, not only did Everton have by far the most shareholders (they outnumbered those of the other three clubs by more than two to one), but over two thirds of those who held shares in the club came from skilled manual or non-manual backgrounds. The three other clubs – Liverpool FC, Liverpool Caledonians FC, and Bootle FC – had more homogenous shareholder profiles, with only around a third of shareholders at each club appearing to have working class occupations. Even these figures mark the football clubs as being notably different from the Nottingham Chess Club, however, a society where just four per cent of members for whom occupational data were found were working class.

To partly fulfil his aim of 'provid[ing] a detailed biographical account'[177] of the socio-cultural characteristics of football club directors, Kennedy analyses a range of data pertaining to them, including their personal wealth for which he

[175] Ibid, 846, 854.
[176] Ibid, table 2, 844.
[177] Ibid, 841.

uses estate values on death. With one exception, he notes that none left more than £100,000 in their will, and while the figures involved do indicate significant wealth among the directors as a whole, they are a level below that seen among the members of the NCC, six of whom left estates valued at six figures.[178] For a direct comparison, the most valuable estate of a Merseyside football club director was that of Thomas Taylor Wainwright at £264000 in 1921, equivalent to slightly over £10 million in 2015, around half that of Lewis Heymann's estate in 1869. The tens of thousands of pounds left by several other directors in the 1920s are similar amounts to those left by members of the NCC one or even two generations before and thus equal to only half or even a quarter of the chess players' fortunes. Kennedy supports Mason's contention that the founders of these clubs were not 'men from the city of Liverpool's commercial elite',[179] unlike the respective position of many of the members of the NCC in Nottingham, who were heavily involved not only in the town's chief industry but also in promoting its commercial interests nationally and internationally.

In terms of civic engagement, Kennedy finds significant involvement among his directors with Poor Law Unions and local government, with thirteen being 'actively involved in political organizations' and six helping to run three of the city's Local Boards.[180] However, only four, just over ten per cent, were elected to the councils in Liverpool and Bootle, compared with eleven (slightly more than twenty per cent) of the NCC's officials. Once Kennedy introduces the clubs' shareholders into the analysis, though, the picture becomes far more

[178] Ibid, 846.
[179] Ibid, 846; T. Mason, 'The Blues and the Reds', *Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 134 (1985), 111.
[180] Kennedy, 'Class, ethnicity, and civic governance', 853.

comparable: he observes that 'almost one-in-ten of the combined shareholders' of the four clubs were councillors, against eleven per cent of chess club members.[181] There was also one MP present in each group; interestingly William Watson Rutherford, Liverpool Caledonians director and MP for Liverpool Edge Hill, was one of the strongest players, and twice president, of the Liverpool Chess Club![182]

Kennedy concludes that, much like the officials and ordinary members of the Nottingham Chess Club, 'Merseyside's football club directors were influential in terms of the governance of the local state', and, following Morris, that the clubs were 'locked into a network of civic organizations through which the cohesion of a middle-class urban elite was maintained'.[183] However, there is less likelihood of an ulterior motive on the part of the chess club members – Kennedy, quoting Walvin, notes that attaching oneself to a local football club was an excellent way for potential local politicians to make a name for themselves, and thus becoming director of a football club was a means to an end rather than an end in itself.[184]

From the evidence above, the Nottingham Chess Club seems to have had more in common socially with golf clubs than football clubs in the Victorian period, these being the only sports clubs heretofore analysed to any great extent. Membership of golf clubs was largely restricted to the well-off middle classes, either through cost or 'blackball' systems for prospective members.[185] Similarly, the NCC's entry fee was prohibitively high for nearly half of its

[181] Ibid, 854.
[182] J.S. Edgar, *Liverpool Chess Club: a short sketch of the club from its first meeting, 12th December 1837, to the present time,* Liverpool, 1893, 77.
[183] Kennedy, 'Class, ethnicity, and civic governance', 856.
[184] Ibid, 853.
[185] Vamplew, 'Sharing space', 362.

existence, while there was still some form of proposal and election system for new members after the entrance fee was abolished. Nonetheless there were features of the NCC that are comparable to football clubs of the period, specifically the willingness, whatever the motive, of those who ran the clubs to be involved in other civic institutions. Only with further studies of clubs of various sports can any firm conclusions as to the typicality of this civic engagement be drawn, but initial evidence appears to confirm that it was, at least, not unusual for it to be the case.

## Chapter 5: Conclusions

This work has made it readily apparent that the NCC was a society created for the middle class elite. The social makeup of the club in its formative years was, in line with Morris's observations, exclusively from this section of Nottingham society, reinforced by the high cost of admission and the cost of participation in the club's social functions. As Nottingham – and British – society changed, however, so too did the chess club, becoming something closer to the type of society described by Clark, 'developing linkages inside urban communities'.[186] The extent to which the removal of the entrance fee contributed to the opening up of the club to a wider social audience is unclear, but the NCC saw many more members from the lower middle and even working classes join in the final quarter of the nineteenth century. This may even have led to its ultimate demise – as alluded to in the second chapter above, there was a significant overlap of members between the NCC and the club at the NMI, leading to the possibility of the two clubs merging as was suggested may occur in a pseudonymous letter to the *Nottinghamshire Guardian's* chess column in 1889.[187]

As a result of the club's initial social composition, it can hardly be considered emblematic of the rational recreation movement, instead seemingly representing an attempt at maintaining exclusivity as described by Bailey.[188] Nonetheless, there appears to have been a clear understanding – or, at least, belief – on the part of members of the NCC of the 'improving' potential of chess, as Samuel Newham's reported remarks attest to, even going so far as

[186] Clark, *British clubs and societies,* 446.
[187] *NG,* March 2 1889, 8.
[188] Bailey, *Leisure and class,* 143–4.

to describe the game as a 'rational recreation'.[189] His lectures on the game during the 1840s – particularly at the NMI – also intimate a desire on his part to promote the game as such. Furthermore, Newham's and Sigismund Hamel's presidency of the Mechanics' club can be seen to represent a willingness to foster the playing of the game among the lower classes, although it could similarly be seen to be an attempt at creating a controlled environment for working class leisure.[190] While there was significant coincidence between the members of the two clubs, further research into those of the Mechanics' may allow more insight into the truth of chess as a rational recreation during the nineteenth century.

If the rationality of the NCC was ambiguous, so too was its respectability. Whereas as an institution the club itself had little in common with the rational recreation movement it was almost eminently respectable. For over half of its existence its club nights were held at the Nottingham Subscription Library,[191] an elite, respectable institution in its own right, [192] while the *Nottinghamshire Guardian* referred to it variously as 'the good old club' and 'a credit to the town', claiming it had 'reflected a certain lustre' on Nottingham.[193] In contrast to this, there was a seam of disrespectability running through the membership from Thomas Wakefield's financial dealings to Charles Rosenberg's fraud conviction, via the associatively disrespectable occupations of certain members. Thus, while the environment of the NCC was sharply at odds with

[189] *NG,* November 30 1854, 5.
[190] Bailey, *Leisure and class,* 177.
[191] Minute book II (1816–1831), Bromley House Library; Minute book V (1857–1875), Bromley House Library
[192] J. Fletcher, *Urbanisation and Association: in what manner did the Nottingham Subscription Library at Bromley House represent an elite institution in the period 1815–1853?,* BA dissertation, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, 2003.
[193] *NG,* October 17 1862, 5; November 21 1862, 3; October 20 1865, 5.

that portrayed in George Walker's article on the *Café de la Regence,* the focus of Sharples' work, the latter's interpretation of chess players in the environment of the *Café* as disrespectable is somewhat borne out by the non-chess activities of some members of the NCC. In contrast to this, however, many of the club's members – including those with disreputable connections – held respected positions throughout local government and other institutions,. The evidence put forward here indicates that chess clubs appear to have been respectable, associated as they were with organisations such as banks, libraries and local government, but that chess players were indeed 'a more contested figure than traditionally acknowledged…cross[ing] lines of respectable and disreputable behaviour.'[194]

That so many of the NCC's members were heavily involved in the administration of other voluntary societies and civic bodies within Nottingham, as well as within local government itself, places the chess club within the social networks created by the middle class elites in towns across nineteenth century Britain. It may not have been as fundamental to the economic or educational needs of Nottingham as, for example, the Chamber of Commerce or School of Art, but the chess club was nonetheless part of the gradual assumption of urban control by the middle class elite. Only further research into the chess clubs – and their members – of other towns and cities in Victorian Britain will determine if the NCC was unique in this, or simply part of a larger trend.

Further study will also assist in uncovering the extent to which civic engagement was common among those involved in Victorian sports clubs. If

[194] Sharples, '"I am a chess player"', 298.

these clubs are genuinely part of the network of voluntary societies that Morris describes, it should not be difficult to find copious examples of such linkages. Indeed, a worthwhile focus of future investigation would be the levels of civic engagement in specific towns across clubs of various sports to see which were more heavily integrated within their urban societies. Members of the NCC were certainly well integrated in the various halls of power of Victorian Nottingham; whether this was a peculiarity of chess, or Nottingham, remains to be seen.

Appendix 1a: Presidents of the Nottingham Chess Club

1829-41: Thomas Wakefield

1841-71: Samuel Newham

1871-89: Sigismund Hamel

1889-90: Dr Henry Reginald Hatherly

1890-92: Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1892-94: Hugh Browne

1894-95: Edwin Mellor

1895-96: Fred Hill

1896-97: Carl Sipman

1897-98: unknown

1898-99: Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1899-1900: Thomas Bruges Gerard

1900-?: Edwin Mellor

Appendix 1b: Honorary secretaries of the Nottingham Chess Club

1829(?)-1839: Samuel Newham (presumed from the club's founding)

1844-63: Samuel Richard Parr Shilton (exact dates are unclear, however confirmed dates are 1844, 1848 and 1858–63)

1863-4: Thomas Worth (may have continued beyond 1864)

1868-71(?): Sigismund Hamel (Hamel is likely to have stepped down from this post on becoming president)

1872-74: Alfred Knoth (1872 is the first confirmed year)

1874-76: Hugh Browne

1876-77: James Glendinning

1877-79: unknown – may have been Glendinning, however for the whole period 1876–80 there is very little information in the club's minute book.

1879-80: James Glendinning

1880-83: Arthur Towle Marriott

1883-85: Frederick Freeston Suffolk

1885-89: Thomas Marriott

1888-89: D Adams

1889-90: Edwin John Sander

1890-92: Arthur Abraham Blood

1892-96: George Bailey Kirkland

1896-98: George Leonard Moore

1898-99: Job Nightingale Derbyshire

1899-1901: Frederick John Hingley

1901-02: Dr Henry Blandy

Appendix 1c: Vice-Presidents of the Nottingham Chess Club

1851: Thomas Hind

1861-63, 65-6, 68-9, 72-5: Thomas Worth (confirmed years, possibly in gaps as well)

1875-78: William George Ward

1877-78, 79-80: Hugh Browne (perhaps 78-9 as well)

1880-89: Dr Henry Reginald Hatherly

1883-4: Arthur Towle Marriott (elected for 84-5 season but died November 1884)

1885-87: Carl Sipman

1888-90: Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1889-90: Hugh Browne

1889-90: Thomas W Marriott

1890-91: Dr Henry Reginald Hatherly

1890-93: Thomas Bruges Gerard

1891-92: Hugh Browne

1892-93: Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1893-94: Edwin Mellor

1893-94: Thomas Bruges Gerard

1894-95: Henry Hill

1894-97: Hugh Browne (possibly beyond 1897)

1895-96: Job Nightingale Derbyshire

1896-97: Dr Henry Blandy (possibly beyond 1897)

1897-99: unknown

1899-?: Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1899-?: Dr Henry Blandy

Appendix 1d: Treasurers of the Nottingham Chess Club

1868-9, 1873: Sigismund Hamel (confirmed years, probably also intervening period)

1882-86: Carl Sipman

1886-97: Fred Hill

1900-: Fred Hill

Appendix 1e: Committee members of the Nottingham Chess Club

1837: (Cambridge match committee) Thomas Cheslyn Callow, Captain Mark Huish, Joseph Neuberg, Samuel Newham, Francis Noyes.

1839: (ball committee) Lewis Heymann, J Neuberg, S Newham, John Margaret Becher Pigot, John Watson, Thomas Wakefield.

1840: (ball committee) L Heymann, J Neuberg, S Newham, George Rawson, J Watson, T Wakefield.

1868: John Hewes Herbert, Thomas Hill, Alexander Kilham Sutton

1872: Barber, Edmund Octavius Gilpin, JH Herbert, Edwin Mellor, William George Ward

1873: Hugh Browne, Thomas Daniel Crisp, EO Gilpin, E Mellor, WG Ward

1874: TD Crisp, EO Gilpin, Fred Hill, E Mellor, WG Ward

1880: Edward Goldschmidt

1881: Lewis Johnson, Rev James Alexander Mitchell

1882: Thomas Bruges Gerard, F Hill, L Johnson, Rev JA Mitchell, Edmund Renals

1885: TB Gerard, L Johnson, Rev JA Mitchell, E Renals, Frederick Freeston Suffolk

1886: H Browne, John S Dickins, TB Gerard, L Johnson, Edwin John Sander

1887: H Browne, JS Dickins, H Hill, EJ Sander, Dr Benjamin Whitelegge

1888: H Browne, JS Dickins, H Hill, EJ Sander, Carl Sipman, Dr Whitelegge

1889: JS Dickins, H Hill, William Henry Mellor, Rev JA Mitchell, C Sipman

1890: D Adams, JS Dickins, Thomas Marriott, WH Mellor, EJ Sander, C Sipman, Ralph Albert Wild

1891: H Adams, JS Dickins, Dr Henry Reginald Hatherley, WH Mellor, EJ Sander, C Sipman, RA Wild

1892: D or H Adams, Arthur Abraham Blood, JS Dickins, Dr HR Hatherley, WH Mellor, Samuel Herrick Sands, C Sipman

1893: D Adams, AA Blood, JS Dickins, Arthur Hayes, T Marriott, WH Mellor, EJ Sander, C Sipman

1894: D Adams, Alfred Edward Daniels, JS Dickins, TB Gerard, T Marriott, WH Mellor, EJ Sander, C Sipman

1895: D Adams, AE Daniels, JS Dickins, TB Gerard, T Marriott, WH Mellor, EJ Sander, C Sipman

1896: AE Daniels, JS Dickins, TB Gerard, T Marriott, WH Mellor, EJ Sander

Appendix 1f: Match Captains of the Nottingham Chess Club

1890-92: Thomas Marriott

1893-94: Edwin Marriott

1894-97: Thomas Marriott

1897-99: unknown

1899-1901: Edward Dale

Appendix 2a: Occupations of Nottingham Chess Club members

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lace manufacturer[a] | 49 | Clerk | 5 | Other textile merchant[b] | 2 | Draughtsman | 1 |
| Manager/agent (lace industry)[a] | 13 | Lace merchant[a] | 5 | Pawnbroker/silversmith | 2 | Engineer | 1 |
| Doctor/surgeon | 12 | Accountant | 3 | Stationer | 2 | Gas rate collector | 1 |
| Other textile manufacturer[b] | 11 | Grocer | 3 | Warehouseman | 2 | Journalist | 1 |
| Bookseller/printer (inc. newspaper proprietors) | 11 | Insurance/commission agent | 3 | Artist | 1 | Sharebroker | 1 |
| Solicitor | 8 | Other manufacturer (not textiles) | 3 | Auctioneer | 1 | Tax surveyor | 1 |
| Teacher | 8 | Wine and spirit merchant | 3 | Builder | 1 | Tobacconist | 1 |
| Tailor/draper | 6 | Banker | 2 | Chemist | 1 | Umbrella maker | 1 |
| Clergy | 5 | Cashier | 2 | Dentist | 1 | Upholsterer | 1 |
| [a]Lace industry sub-total | 67 | [ab]Textile industries sub-total | 80 | Total | | 174 | |

Appendix 2b: Occupations of Nottingham Chess Club officials

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lace manufacturer[a] | 13 | Accountant | 1 | Military | 1 |
| Clerk | 4 | Cashier | 1 | Other manufacturer (excl. textiles) | 1 |
| Doctor | 4 | Clergy | 1 | Other textile manufacturer[b] | 1 |
| Managers, textile industries[b] | 3 | Dentist | 1 | Schoolmaster | 1 |
| Solicitor | 3 | Draper | 1 | Sharebroker | 1 |
| Newspaper proprietor | 2 | Insurance agent | 1 | Upholsterer | 1 |
| Silk merchant[b] | 2 | Journalist | 1 | Warehouseman | 1 |
| Wine and spirit merchant | 2 | Lace merchant[a] | 1 | None/unknown | 6 |
| [a]Lace industry sub-total | 14 | [ab]Textile industry sub-total | 20 | Total | 54 |

Appendix 3a: Nottingham Chess Club members elected Mayor of Nottingham

1835: Thomas Wakefield

1840: Dr John Pigot

1842: Thomas Wakefield

1846: William Cripps

1857: Lewis Heymann

1870: John Manning

1871: William George Ward

1875: John Manning

1877: William George Ward (died in office)

1881: Edward Goldschmidt

1883: John Manning

1889: Edward Goldschmidt

1890: Samuel Herrick Sands

1892: Anderson Brownsword

1894: Joseph Bright

1895: Joseph Bright

1904: Joseph Bright

1911: Edwin Mellor

Appendix 3b: Nottingham Chess Club members elected Sheriff of Nottingham

1815: Thomas Wakefield

1858: John Manning

1859: William George Ward

1890: Anderson Brownsword

1893: Joseph Bright

1908: Edwin Mellor

Appendix 3c: Nottingham Chess Club members elected to Nottingham council

Years in brackets are the minimum extent of the individual's period of service as councillor. Where no end year is given, they were still a councillor in 1904.

Joseph Bright (1889)

Hugh Browne (1877–80)

Anderson Brownsword (1889)

William Cripps (1844–47)

John Froggatt (1880–89)

Samuel Froggatt (1892–1901)

Edward Goldschmidt (1871–95)

Edwin Mellor (1900)

Francis Noyes (1839–44)

Dr John Pigot (1839–44)

Samuel Herrick Sands (1888)

Thomas Wakefield (1817–44)

William George Ward (1869–78)

Thomas Worth (1873–88)

Appendix 3d: Nottingham Chess Club members appointed borough magistrates

Years in brackets are the minimum extent of the individual's period of service as magistrate.

William Allen (1897–1900)

Joseph Bright (1900)

Anderson Brownsword (1897–1900)

John Edward Ellis (1885–1900)

William Gibson (1879)

Edward Goldschmidt (1888–1903)

Lewis Heymann (1860–62)

John Manning (1879–97)

Samuel Newham (1853–75)

Dr John Pigot (1844–55)

Samuel Herrick Sands (1888–1900)

Thomas Wakefield (1844–48)

# Bibliography

## Primary Sources

### Manuscripts

Minute book II (1816–1831), Bromley House Library

Minute book V (1857–1875), Bromley House Library

Minute book of the Nottingham Chess Club (established 16 October 1829), DD/703/1, Nottinghamshire Archives.

Records of the Nottingham Chess Club, 1842 – 1900, MS 675, Nottingham University Manuscripts and Special Collections.

The Society's book (proceedings of a Nottingham social club): volume 1, M/358, Nottinghamshire Archives.

### Government Records

Nottingham Assizes, Home Office: Criminal Registers: England and Wales, 1832, 1834, 1856.

National Probate Calendar, 1858–1966.

UK census 1851–1911.

### Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals

*Bell's Life in London*

*Leeds Mercury*

*Lincoln, Rutland and Stamford Mercury*

*London Gazette*

*Nottingham Daily Express*

*Nottingham Review*

*Nottinghamshire Guardian*

*Le Palamède*

## Books

Bassett, A., *The life of the Rt. Hon. John Edward Ellis, MP,* London, 1914.

Edgar, J.S., *Liverpool Chess Club: a short sketch of the club from its first meeting, 12th December 1837, to the present time,* Liverpool, 1893.

Green, J.A.H., (ed.), *History of the Nottingham Mechanics Institution, 1837–1887,* Nottingham, 1887.

Hume, G., and White, A.C., *Changing Fashions,* Stroud, 1925.

Hume, G., and White, A.C., *Valves and Bi-valves,* Stroud, 1930.

Walker, G., *A new treatise on chess,* London, 1833.

## Commercial Directories

Drake, E.S., *Directory of the town and county of the town of Nottingham,* 1860.

Glover, S., *The history and directory of the town and county of the town of Nottingham,* 1844.

Lascelles and Hagar, *Commercial directory of Nottingham,* 1848.

Morris and Co., *Commercial directory and gazetteer of Nottinghamshire,* 1869.

Morris and Co., *Directory and gazetteer of Nottingham and district,* 1877.

Kelly and Co., *Kelly's directory of Nottinghamshire,* 1876–1904.

Kelly and Co., *Kelly's Post Office directory of Nottinghamshire,* 1855

Orange, J., *The Nottingham annual register,* 1840

White, F., *History, gazetteer and directory of the county of Nottingham,* 1844–1864

White, W., *History, gazetteer and directory of Nottinghamshire,* 1832, 1885

Wright, C.N., *Wright's Nottingham and suburban directory,* 1858–1866

Wright, C.N., *Wright's directory of Nottingham and 12 miles around,* 1868–1900

## Secondary sources

### Books

Ashley-Cooper, F.S., *Nottinghamshire Cricket and Cricketers,* Nottingham, 1923

Bailey, P., *Leisure and class in Victorian England: rational recreation and the contest for control, 1830-1885*, London, 1987

Boase, F., *Modern English Biography volume 2, I–Q,* London, 1965

Briscoe, J.P. and Pike, W.T., (eds), *Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire at the opening of the twentieth century [and] Contemporary biographies,* Brighton, 1901

Church, R., *Economic and Social Change in a Midland Town: Victorian Nottingham 1815–1900,* Abingdon, 2006

Clark, P., *British clubs and societies 1580-1800: the origins of an associational world,* Oxford, 2000

Cunningham, H., *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, c.1780-c.1880,* London, 1980

Curry, G. and Dunning, E., *Associational Football: a study in figurational sociology,* Abingdon, 2015

Deane, P. and Cole, W.A., *British economic growth 1688-1959: trends and structure*, Cambridge, 1962

Fraser, D., *Urban politics in Victorian England: the structure of politics in Victorian cities*, Leicester, 1976

Gunn, S., *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: ritual and authority and the English industrial city*, Manchester, 2007

Harding, T., *Correspondence Chess in Britain and Ireland, 1824–1987,* Jefferson, NC, 2010

Harding, T., *Eminent Victorian Chess Players: ten biographies,* Jefferson, NC, 2012

Harding, T., *Joseph Henry Blackburne: a chess biography,* Jefferson, NC, 2015

Hill, J., *Sport in history: an introduction*, Basingstoke, 2011

Holt, R., and Mason, T., *Sport in Britain, 1945–2000*, Oxford, 2000

Korr, C., *West Ham United: the making of a football club,* London, 1986

Lowerson, J., *Sport and the English middle classes, 1870–1914,* Manchester, 1993

Mason, T., *Association Football & English Society 1863–1915*, Brighton, 1980

Mellors, R., *Men of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire,* Nottingham, 1924

Morris, R., *Class, sect and party: the making of the British middle class: Leeds 1820–1850,* Manchester, 1990

Oldfield, G., *The Heymann Family of West Bridgford,* West Bridgford, 1983

Tischler, S., *Footballers and Businessmen: The Origins of Professional Soccer in England,* New York, 1981

Vamplew, W., *Pay up and play the game: professional sport in Britain, 1875–1914,* Cambridge, 1988

Walton, R., *The History of the Nottingham Chamber of Commerce 1860–1960,* Nottingham, 1962

## Essays

Harding, T., 'Policeman on the Case: early chess in Lancashire and the *Preston Guardian* chess column 1879–83' in R. Spalding and A. Brown (eds) *Entertainment, Leisure and Identities,* Newcastle, 2007, 50–65.

Mason, S., 'Lace' in A. Briggs-Goode and D. Dean (eds), *Lace: Here: Now*, London, 2013, 1–26

Huggins, M. and Mangan, J.A., 'Prologue: all mere complexities', in M. Huggins and J.A. Mangan (eds), *Disreputable Pleasures: less virtuous Victorians at play,* Abingdon, 2004, ix–xx.

Beckett, J. and Brand, K., 'Municipal Reform and Parliamentary Enclosure' in J. Beckett (ed), *A Centenary History of Nottingham,* Manchester, 1997, 220–252.

Murray, D., 'The Scotch Baptists and the birth of the churches of Christ' in D. Bebbington and M. Sutherland (eds), *Interfaces. Baptists and Others,* Milton Keynes, 2013, 49–55.

Hill, K., '"Thoroughly imbued with the spirit of ancient Greece": symbolism and space in Victorian civic culture' in A. Kidd and D. Nicholls (eds), *Gender, Civic*

*Culture and Consumerism: Middle Class Identity in Britain 1800–1940,* Manchester, 1999, 99–111.

## Journal Articles

Beckett, J., and Brand, K., 'Enclosure, Improvement, and the Rise of "New Nottingham", 1845–67', in *Transactions of the Thoroton Society,* 98 (1), 1995, 92–111.

Garnham, N., and Jackson, A., 'Who invested in Victorian football clubs? The case of Newcastle-upon-Tyne', *Soccer & Society*, 4 (1), April 2003, 57–70.

Gourvish, T., 'Captain Mark Huish: a pioneer in the development of railway management', *Business History,* 12 (1), 1970, 46–58.

Griffin, A., 'Thomas North: mining entrepreneur extraordinary', *Transactions of the Thoroton Society,* 1972, 56 (1), 53–73.

Harding, T., 'Kings and Queens at Home: a short history of the chess column in nineteenth-century English periodicals', *Victorian Periodicals Review,* Winter 2009, 42 (4), 359–391.

Harvey, A., 'Howard Staunton'*, Kaissiber*, 17, 2001, 55–60

Harvey, A., 'Social participation in the game of chess: a recreation for everyone', *Caissa* 1 (1), April 2016, 18–27

Harvey, A., '"You may say what you like to the professional and dismiss them when you want": the rise and fall of professional chess players in Victorian Britain', *Sport in History,* 30 (3), September 2010, 402–21

Holt, R., 'Golf and the English Suburb: class and gender in a London club, c.1890-c.1960', *The Sports Historian,* 18 (1), May 1998, 76–89

Huggins, M., ‘Direct and indirect influence: J.A. Mangan and the Victorian middle classes: Major revisionist in the history of sport’, *International Journal of the History of Sport,* 20 (4), 2003, 26–44.

Huggins, M., ‘More sinful pleasures? Leisure, respectability and the male middle classes in Victorian England’, *Journal of Social History,* Spring 2000, 33 (3), 585–600.

Kennedy, D., ‘Class, ethnicity and civic governance: a social profile of football club directors on Merseyside in the late-nineteenth century’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 22 (5), September 2005, 840–866

MacLean, M., ‘A Gap but not an Absence: clubs and sports historiography’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport,* 30 (14), 2013, 1687–1698.

Mason, T., ‘The Blues and the Reds: a history of the Liverpool and Everton football clubs’, *Transactions of the Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 134 (1985), 107–128.

Morris, R., ‘Voluntary societies and British urban elites, 1780–1850: an analysis’, *The Historical Journal,* 26 (1), March 1983, 95–118

Sharples, J., ‘“I am a Chess-player”’: Respectability in Literary and Urban Space, 1840–1851, *Sport in History*, 35 (2), May 2015, 296–321.

Stobart, J., ‘Building an urban identity. Cultural space and civic boosterism in a ‘new’ industrial town: Burslem, 1761–1911’, *Social History,* 29 (4), November 2004, 485–498.

Vamplew, W., ‘Sharing Space: inclusion, exclusion and accommodation at the British golf club before 1914’, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* 34 (3), August 2010, 359–375

## Online Sources

Harding, T., 'Which are the oldest chess clubs?', *The Kibitzer,* September 2011, http://web.archive.org/web/20120119163019/http://www.chesscafe.com/text/kibitz184.pdf, [accessed: 24/6/2016]

Measuring Worth, 'Purchasing Power of Pound', 2016, http://www.measuringworth.com/ppoweruk/, [accessed: 27/6/2016]

Nottingham City Council, 'Previous Lord Mayors and Mayors - from Year 1284 to Present Day', 2016, http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/about-the-council/councillors-and-leadership/the-lord-mayor-of-nottingham/previous-lord-mayors-and-mayors-from-year-1284-to-present-day/, [accessed: 9/8/2016]

Nottingham City Council, 'Previous Sheriffs of Nottingham', 2016, http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/about-the-council/councillors-and-leadership/the-sheriff-of-nottingham/previous-sherrifs-of-nottingham/, [accessed: 9/8/2016]

Priestland, N., 'A Directory of names associated with Bromley House Library, 1816 to 1916', 2008, http://www.ashbracken.com/BrHouse-HTML/BrH1816-Index.html, [accessed: 31/08/2016]

University of Glasgow History of Art and HATII, 'Frederick R Fussell', *Mapping the Practice and Profession of Sculpture in Britain and Ireland 1851–1951,* 2011, http://sculpture.gla.ac.uk/view/person.php?id-msib4_1227190329, [accessed: 21/9/2016]

## Unpublished Works

Fletcher, J., *Urbanisation and Association: in what manner did the Nottingham Subscription Library at Bromley House represent an elite institution in the period 1815–1853?,* BA dissertation, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, 2003.