Kevin Waite
University of Pennsylvania
16 December 2013

Beating Napoleon at Eton:
Violence, Sport and Manliness in England's Public Schools, 1783-1815

Abstract: Despite the popular aphorism, 'the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton,' historians have been slow to appreciate the value Georgian elites vested in their public schools and public school sport. In fact, the stereotype of these schools as anarchic and pedagogically insignificant still endures. I argue that the schools of this period came to enjoy a growing popularity precisely because of their rough nature. Contemporaries praised the violence of both the dormitories and the playing fields as productive of vigorous, future leaders, capable of defending Britain in a world at war. Such rhetoric, I argue, anticipated the late Victorian cults of sport and manliness.

As revolution came to a close in the former American colonies, rebellion erupted at Eton College. The cause of the scholastic clash was a typical one in public schools of the period. Protesting Dr Jonathan Davies's refusal to relax discipline, a horde of adolescent malcontents drove their headmaster out of the school. Left in possession of the college, they proceeded to break the school's many windows, including those in the headmaster's chambers, where they also destroyed Davies's papers and vandalized his furniture. In a symbolic gesture of defiance, the boys removed and dismantled the block on which floggings took place, thereby achieving the rebellion's *coup de grace* and marking a victory over that notorious instrument of school discipline.[1] Such wild episodes were hardly unique to Eton, however. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries none of the major English public schools escaped a student uprising of some sort, a number of which left considerable destruction in their wake. The headmaster at Rugby even had to call in a battalion of soldiers after a band of mutinous

pupils made a vast bonfire of his personal library and school furniture in a 1797 rebellion.[2]

These and other chaotic scenes prompted an older generation of historians to brand this period in English public education as a time of incorrigible misrule – what has proved an enduring stereotype. Their histories conventionally present the later Georgian era as anarchic and savage, marked by educational mediocrity and rude conditions. This disorderly stage gradually gives way, in these accounts, to enlightenment, reform and general improvement, with the schools reaching a civilized apotheosis by the late nineteenth century.[3] Although this stereotype is largely the product of older scholarship, more recent works have not gone far enough in challenging these facile characterizations. Even John Chandos's history of the public schools from 1800-1864 – the most complete and even-handed survey of its kind – creates a picture of Georgian-era public schools as jungles of juvenile delinquency and open violence. 'Little short of death seems to have been taken much notice of, and not always that,' he writes.[4] Other more recent work simply reiterates the conclusions of the older generations.[5]

This paper will advance two interrelated arguments. First, it will contest the commonly accepted notion that public schools only became effective intuitions for the development of young male 'character' by the Victorian period. To be sure, the earlier schools were often challenged, understaffed and plagued by violence. However, it was the very roughness of life amongst dozens or hundreds of boys, from under ten to around eighteen years of age, that appealed to the many advocates of the system. The rough-and-tumble life at public school was seen as a sort of dress rehearsal for the cutthroat nature of politics and the trials of military service. In a jab at both private education and

the culture of sensibility, one critic wrote that public schools 'are not calculated to form "men of feeling," bloated with sickly and morbid sensibility – selfish insulated beings, who live in a world of their own creation, and fancy themselves above all the ordinary restraints of morals and of opinion.'[6] Hard times called for hard men. And the harsh systems of rule enforced by the schoolboys themselves, many believed, produced exactly that.

The second argument is that this mission of the public schools – to produce hardy and capable leaders – was tightly bound up with the role of sport. Parents, pupils and educational theorists alike noted that games-playing at these schools encouraged the development of manly qualities: courage, vigour and even moral fortitude. Of course, masculinity during this period encompassed a range of (sometimes conflicting) expressions. The male code of conduct celebrated at the Georgian public schools differed from other elite manifestations of masculinity – polite sociability and especially the culture of sensibility. In vogue during the latter part of the eighteenth century, both politeness and sensibility emphasized more refined and delicate behaviour. Boys at public schools of this era, on the other hand, were expected to be hardened; audacity, physical prowess and resilience were the virtues most celebrated.[7] Thus with a focus on the rhetoric of manliness surrounding school sport, the second part of this essay will unpack the history and ideology behind the Duke of Wellington's famous, though apocryphal, aphorism: 'The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton.' Curiously, for all the scholarship on public school sport during the Victorian period, we know relatively little about games in the Georgian schools. By examining the increasingly sympathetic attitude toward adolescent sport in the Georgian period, I will argue that the Victorian

cult of games and its attendant emphasis on manly character has a much longer history than scholars have recognized. The Georgians had stressed the connection between games-playing, manliness, adolescent development and the nation's health well before the late Victorians turned exercise into a virtual mania.

In short, pre-Victorian public school life was not some sort of *Lord of the Flies* in waistcoats. Rather, as writers at the time argued, public schools – especially the rough codes that guided behaviour within the dormitories and on the playing fields – served an explicit and what many deemed to be an essential purpose: to make vigorous leaders in a time of national need. Beating Napoleon, or whoever might menace Britain, was a task ideally suited to those who passed through England's public schools.

Public over private

The period under review constitutes the beginning of the public school system as a distinct category within British education. Even though no precise or universally accepted definition existed, by the turn of the century the term 'public school' was well-understood to apply to old, established institutions that took on fee-paying boarders.[8] In conjunction with a general shift away from domestic education during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, enrolments at these public schools began to rise. By the 1790s, for example, both Rugby and Harrow were educating more pupils than ever before in school history. A small institution of 52 students in 1778, Rugby expanded its enrolment to 245 pupils by 1794, while Harrow reached a new high of 351 students by the turn of the century.[9] By 1815, the number of spaces at Winchester had become so scarce that its headmaster would warn the parent of a prospective student, 'unless a

nomination is applied for at least 10 years, or even before the Boy is born there is I fear little chance of succeeding.'[10] Although enrolments remained subject to fluctuation throughout this tumultuous period in national history, by Waterloo seven institutions had distinguished themselves as Britain's preeminent public schools. These seven – Eton, Harrow, Westminster, Winchester, Rugby, Charterhouse and Shrewsbury – will be the subjects of this study.

The popularity of these schools was no doubt enhanced by international developments, as continuous warfare and the threat of revolution raised the stakes in the education of the nation's elite. The years between Yorktown and Waterloo placed heavy demands on Britain's leadership, to both erase the shame of defeat in America and to defend the nation from the menace of revolutionary France. In a growing literature on England's schools, educational theorists and casual commentators alike noted that Britain's very future depended on how its youth was trained.[11] To a greater extent than their forebears, British boys of this period were groomed to take their place at the nation's helm from a young age. And it was the public schools, noted a host of satisfied commentators, that were ideally suited to the task. 'If the youth be designed for any active station in publick life; for the bar or the senate; for the practice of medicine, or for the profession of arms,' wrote one prominent advocate of the system, 'he ought to have a publick education.'[12] Such claims were not merely rhetorical. Almost three-fourths of all ministers of state between 1775 and 1800 had attended either Eton or Winchester, while Westminster, under headmaster William Carey from 1803-1814, 'became the great nursery for the army,' reputedly drawing praise from the Duke of Wellington as a school that infallibly produced good officers.[13]

Private education, frequently deemed the cause of effeminacy and weakness in young boys, provided a favourite foil for the advocates of the public schools. That criticism of domestic schooling – beginning in earnest during the late eighteenth century – coincided with a demographic shift in favour of England's public schools should come as no surprise. Vicesimus Knox (1752-1821), master of Tonbridge School and author of the popular and frequently reprinted *Liberal Education*, made a hobbyhorse of this private-public comparison. Indeed, more than any other educator or theorist at the time, Knox solidified the reputation of England's public schools. Michele Cohen has even argued that 'Until Knox, private education's promise of virtue had been inviolable.'[14] Like many public school apologists, Knox stressed the morally enriching effects of rough, boyish society and denigrated the 'effeminate' and 'contemptible' products of 'parental solicitude.'[15] Let boys be boys, Knox argued. He found the demands of 'exertion' made on schoolboys especially wholesome, while cautioning against the aristocratic graces. Instead, he recommended that a boy should mingle in 'the noisy mirth of his school-fellows.'[16] Through this pedagogy highlighting manly vigour, Knox sought not simply to reform public education, but to reformulate the national character. He aimed at nothing less than purging Britain of the 'levity of France' and 'luxury, effeminacy and everything ignoble.'[17] By drawing the parallels between public education and national character, Knox both prefigured a Victorian sensibility in educational theory and added a powerful, gendered dimension to the defence of public schools, ideas that would be affirmed and refined by later advocates, especially by champions of school sport.

Adolescent independence and manly development

Such manly development could only be achieved, many argued, by letting boys struggle

freely amongst themselves. Indeed, independence from oversight came to be seen as one

of the defining features for public school life. When not at their lessons, boys were, more

or less, left to their own devices. '[S]o long as they made no disturbance by fireworks or

other gunpowder amusements threatening the blowing up of the premises,' one Old

Etonian recalled, 'they were allowed to pass their time ... pretty much as they pleased.'[18]

Although such liberties were initially granted out of sheer necessity – a lack of

supervisory personnel coupled with a rapid growth in student intake – with time, the self-

governance of boys would be hailed as a policy of profound educational wisdom.

Increasingly during this period, educational theorists emphasized the importance of

independence both to the schoolboy and to the university student. 'We want not men

who are clipped and espaliered into any form which the whim of the gardener may

dictate, or the narrow limits of his parterre require,' one such theorist, especially

committed to botanical metaphors, wrote in 1810. 'Let our saplings take their full spread,

and send forth their vigorous shoots in all the boldness and variety of nature.'[19] Granting

free rein to boys was thus not only natural; it was productive of growth and strong moral

fibre.

The payoff would eventually redound to Britain itself. Echoing many of Knox's

ideas, William Barrow published his influential defence of public education in 1802 and

again in 1804. Barrow, later Archdeacon at Nottingham, believed that Britain's security

depended, in large part, on its former schoolboys. 'The state of Europe will probably

always require, what it obviously requires at present, a martial spirit in the individuals of

every nation, that wishes to maintain its independence,' he wrote. 'And it may be considered as a maxim, that he, who has not in early youth defeated any of his school-fellows in their contests of personal prowess, will not often in his maturer years defeat the enemies of his country.'[20]

Not all, however, shared such enthusiasm for the purported payoff of adolescent liberty – or anarchy, as certain critics dubbed it. After receiving a 'dismal' report of his son's performance at Winchester in 1813, the bishop of Durham concluded that at least some of the blame must lie with the boy's friends: 'idle thoughtless boys' who scorned 'regularity and diligence'.[21] The bishop's complaint was not an uncommon one. Indeed, dissatisfied parents and commentators alike worried that too little supervision at such a formative age could set the wheels of wrongdoing spinning in a young man's development and thus leave an early and ineradicable imprint of sin on his character. Public schools, according to some critics, could be downright Hogarthian in their scenes of disorder. Under limited surveillance, the temptations of the wicked were omnipresent. As some would argue, one of the great dangers of public school life was that boys learned by imitation of those around them.[22] Exactly what sorts of activity such imitation produced is colourfully captured in Thomas Rowlandson's 'Extra-Scholastic Activity', which equates the liberties of school life to drunken debauchery (below). As Rowlandson makes abundantly clear, moral exemplars were often hard to find in these so-called menageries.

Figure 2: Thomas Rowlandson, 'Extra-Scholastic Activity'[23]

While the wilder side of these adolescent communities should not be disregarded, it is equally important to resist the enduring interpretation of Georgian schools as heavy on misrule and light on educational merit. In fact, there was often a surprising degree of organization, collaboration and regulation to these seemingly anarchic systems of boy rule. And furthermore, it was precisely the roughness of these boyish communities that attracted the praise of contemporaries and encouraged a widespread faith in the public schools as the only institutions capable of adequately training Britain's youth. Under self-rule, boys were expected to gain in manliness and self-reliance, as well as generosity and moral rectitude. And thus, guided by a belief that when it came to social matters, boys were their own best instructors, outnumbered masters readily gave a wide berth to their pupils outside the classroom. Rather than simple negligence – though there was certainly much of that – there was a philosophy behind granting such liberties to their pupils.

Above all, the right to self-governance was jealously guarded by the boys themselves. At school it was deemed ignoble to submit complacently to arbitrary authority; ill-treatment would not be borne in silence. Some students even reported proudly to their parents about school rebellions as episodes of pluck and daring, becoming in a young English gentleman. 'There prevailed an opinion, not only among the boys, but among some parents, that to be mischievous and wicked was a sign of spirit and genius', wrote one former schoolboy. By defying the rod and revelling in high jinks 'the more likely we were thought to become, one day, ministers of state, archbishops, or lord chancellors.'[24] A healthy degree of insubordination was even encouraged – or at least not discouraged – by some school authorities. At Eton, the practice known as 'shirking' permitted boys to avoid punishment for traveling outside of school bounds, so long as they observed the proper protocol. Under the rules of shirking, a boy who had broken school bounds was to duck behind a hedge, an alley or into a nearby shop upon the approach of his master. Even if the master saw the pupil, he was to take no notice. The mere fact that the pupil made the effort to hide satisfied the requirements and granted him immunity.[25]

Sometimes boys took liberty to the extreme and, on several occasions during the period under review, overthrew the governing authorities of their schools. Although some of the school rebellions of the 1790s derived inspiration from the upheaval and political discourse in revolutionary France, these adolescent revolts generally resulted from perceived incursions on the pupils' autonomy, and not from the political radicalism of schoolboys.[26] Periodic rebellion was not only a way of protesting injustices at the school, but of asserting a spirit of independence expected in young boys of that time.

Clearly a past history of insubordination did not hinder the prospects of the eight pupils involved in an 1808 riot at Charterhouse, four of whom went on to illustrious careers in the military and two of whom became colonial administrators.[27]

By this period, the administration of discipline by select senior boys over their juniors – the system known in public schools as 'fagging' – had effectively been enshrined as a sacred rite of school life. The introduction of fagging achieved several ostensible aims: to maintain a degree of discipline amongst the pupils, to protect the younger boys from bullying and to relieve pressure on the outnumbered schoolmasters. The fag performed duties essential to the fagmaster and the fagmaster, in turn, protected the fag – paternalism in miniature. Depending on the nature of this relationship, however, such protection often came at a high price. For instance, a fag in the Long Chamber, Eton's notorious dormitory, was to make his master's bed, wait on him at meals, run errands, and generally respond quickly and obediently to whatever he was told. 'The fag was liable to be fagged at all times, and in all places, and for all purposes,' one Old Etonian recalled.[28] At Westminster, in particular, fagging was a government of the strong, for the strong and by the strong. Fagmasters there ran the school like feudal lords, employing their fags beginning at three or four in the morning and continuing through most of the day. According to an old school saying, there were only three absolute rulers in the world: the Great Mogul, the captain of a man-of-war, and a praefect of hall at Winchester.[29]

Yet rough treatment was not the only order of the day. Lord Monson, at Eton from 1808-1811, could recollect few instances of abject brutality. Rather, there prevailed an unspoken system of boy justice that punished the excessively cruel and rewarded the

dutiful and stalwart. He recalled that when word reached the captain of the school that a particular older boy had whipped his fag with a wet towel, justice was quickly served. The captain marched to the older boy's room, dragged him outside, and horsewhipped him against a nearby elm to the delight of the large gathering, especially the younger boys.[30] Boys did not appeal to masters to right the wrongs of their peers. Instead, they relied on one another and an implicit sense of fair play to regulate behaviour and put a check on disproportionate roughness. Plenty of cruelty, of course, went unpunished, but the presence of strong and upright older boys ensured a surprising degree of order in such large and often unsupervised schools.

Nevertheless, episodes of maltreatment suffered at the hands of other boys were common enough to enflame a discourse over what many believed to be the lamentable state of public education. Notable critics and former schoolboys alike deemed public schools, at best, backward and barbarous, and, at worst, entirely unsuitable for civilized, Christian Englishmen. In William Cowper's estimation – albeit a rather feminized, evangelical one – a public school was little more than a 'mob of boys', a breeding ground of vice that had entirely failed its 'trust'. To send one's child to such a school was tantamount to gross parental negligence.[31] Even old schoolboys – who, as a whole, tended to be loyal to their former institutions – found fault with certain practices. Reflecting on the hardships of fagging, one Old Boy wrote, 'In the age of innocence, I suffered in mind and body more than many adult criminals who are convicted of flagrant violations of the laws of their country.'[32] The celebrated writer and former Winchester pupil Sydney Smith became perhaps the best-known critic of the public schools. Without proper oversight, he argued in an 1810 article, schoolboys' interactions were marked by

'cruelty and caprice' under a system which made every pupil 'alternately tyrant and slave.' Adding a rather violent twist to the common horticultural metaphors for adolescent development, he argued that within public schools, 'the towering oak that remains is admired; the saplings that perish around it are cast into the flames and forgotten.'[33]

Even school apologists conceded that these institutions could be dangerous places for delicate boys. But, as one former Winchester pupil wrote in his unpublished memoirs, 'The case must be very bad to justify a parent in depriving a son of the enormous benefits which the character and the faculties desire from a Public School training.'[34] Indeed, the often defensive critiques from writers like Cowper and Smith underscore a trend they could not arrest: Public schools were becoming increasingly central to the development of Britain's male elite. Parents willingly and gratefully sent their sons off to the daily struggle of public school life – with its attendant fagging, flogging and fighting – under the firm belief that only in the company of other boys could they acquire the preparation needed for a life of distinguished service. And in such a time of national trial, hardiness and determination were more necessary than ever. The link between the schools, manly growth and even national greatness, articulated by writers like Knox and Barrow, had become an article of faith amongst many parents and students alike. Whether within Eton's Long Camber or under Winchester's fagging system, the harsh nature of school life bred a fraternity of fellow survivors, which, according to one school supporter, engendered essential virtues: 'benevolence', 'manliness of feeling' and a 'chivalrous sense of honour'.[35] Many believed that the manly

development of Britain's youth was also on full display beyond the dormitories, namely on public school playing fields.

Making manliness on the playing fields

According to these commenters, school games exemplified some of the very finest features of public education. Yet the value that pre-Victorians placed on sport (like the value they placed on public education in general), has been largely overlooked, or simply dismissed, by historians. Games of this period, writes one such historian, 'were not played to keep fit or to instil "virtues" like team spirit or to occupy and therefore discipline boys or to sublimate sexual energy. They were played purely for pleasure.'[36] Another historian echoes this common refrain: 'In the accounts of sports and games we must note the absence of any strong expression of the moral or character-formation virtues of physical exercise or games.'[37] And another scholar erroneously remarks that, in pre-1850 English public schools, 'organized games were as yet unknown.'[38] Even the rare studies of Georgian public school sport largely ignore the ideological claims made for games-playing during this period.[39] A look into the educational writings of the time, however, will serve to counter such allegations and situate the Victorian cult of games in a wider context. Indeed, synchronous with the rise of the public schools in the late eighteenth century, a new rhetoric of games-playing emerged, celebrating the manliness, hardihood and confidence that sport instilled in British youth.

While Victorians may have elevated sport to a 'national mania', the cult of games was hardly born overnight.[40] It had a forerunner in what can only be called the sporting renaissance of the late Georgian era. During the years between Yorktown and Waterloo,

British sport entered, according to historian Dennis Brailsford, its 'most creative period, more formative than any that followed.'[41] The patronage of the rich and powerful, including the Prince of Wales, infused the nation's sporting pastimes with a new vitality from the 1790s. Before the turn of the century, a number of athletic organizations and traditions had been established: competitive sailing and rowing on the Themes, the Marylebone Cricket Club and the pugilistic championship, to name some of the more prominent. This period also witnessed the development of sport journalism. The long-lived *Sporting Magazine* printed its first issue in October 1792, while more mainstream newspapers, most notably *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, increasingly took on sporting leanings by 1800.[42]

Public school sport experienced a similar period of innovation and expansion, though certain games did not always meet the approval of school authorities. After all, it was not until the 1860s and '70s that masters gave their unqualified endorsement to organized sport, and thus, inter-school contests in the Georgian era took place only sporadically.[43] Generally, masters avoided meddling in the games of boys out of a respect for their long-held liberties, rather than out of any distaste for extra-curricular recreation. Some commentators would argue that school games functioned best in the absence of adult supervision. Thus, masters' lack of control on the playing fields could even be seen as the product of educational wisdom rather than negligence. By and large school authorities in the early nineteenth century came to see sport in a more generous light, as a way of controlling large numbers of schoolboys and expending their excess energy in a productive and healthy manner.[44] Some even contributed to the expansion of playing spaces available to boys. Although largely intended to generate greater profits for local

landowners, the Harrow Enclosure Act of 1803 put part of Roxeth Common under the governors' direct control as a cricket field.[45]   Around the same time, Shrewsbury constructed two ball courts for fives.[46]   And even the woefully inactive and gout-ridden Dr Vincent of Westminster made his contribution to school games, setting aside ten acres as playing space on Tothill fields in 1811.[47]

Yet by and large, support for games, like so much else in the schools of this period, came from the boys themselves – a testament to the robust system of adolescent rule that prevailed at these institutions. Team games, in particular, flourished in the eighteenth century with the influx of boarders.[48]   Under this growing sporting culture, athletic prowess and social prestige were nearly synonymous. Boys did not require the support of their masters to affirm that individual worth was measured by the size of one's leap and the force of one's punch. At Harrow from 1801 to 1805, Lord Byron learned early that fighting, in particular, was the surest stepping-stone to esteem in the rough-and-tumble world of school social politics. One of his old schoolfellows warmly remembered that despite his lameness, Byron 'was a great lover of sports and preferred hockey to Horace, relinquished even Helicon for Duck puddle, and gave up the best poet that ever wrote hard Latin for a game of cricket on the common.' It was, however, in bare-knuckle combat that Byron won his reputation. 'I have seen him fight by the hour like a Trojan, and stand up against the disadvantage of his lameness with all the spirit of an ancient combatant,' his old schoolfellow claimed.[49]

Schoolboys were not alone in recognizing the importance of sport. Yet while educational theorists had, for hundreds of years, found games-playing a healthful and even productive diversion, it was only by the late eighteenth century that observers

condoned, and even celebrated, more violent forms of sport.[50] Not surprisingly,

Vicesimus Knox was in the vanguard of the growing discourse. '[V]iolent exercise is

necessary at their age to promote growth,' he argued. 'They will run risques; but by these

they will gain experience, and a necessary degree of courage.'[51] By Knox's logic, the

presumed anarchy of school life could thus be directed toward productive ends. Like

Knox, Catharine Macaulay Graham feared the insidious influence of luxury on Britain's

moral fibre. She praised the Spartan manner of raising hardy youth, arguing that

'corporal weakness... commonly gives a taint to the morals.' Therefore, the only way to

achieve a conduct 'uniformly virtuous' was to join 'a good head and a sound

constitution.'[52] By the turn of the century, William Barrow had expanded this rhetoric of

vigorous manliness. A boy lacking exercise, in Barrow's eyes, was a wretched sight. At

school, pupils should be encouraged to roam freely and organize their own games.

'Dangerous diversions,' he argued, 'give to the rising generation activity of body and

vigour of mind; the capacity of making manly exertions, and bearing fatigue without

inconvenience; and courage and confidence in themselves and their own powers.' Barrow

added, 'Advantages like these are surely worth some risk in the purchase.'[53] A late

Victorian sport enthusiast could not have said it better himself.

The practice of sport, however, arguably benefited more than the individual

players alone. The nation as a whole could profit from Britain's manly pastimes. Look

no further than ancient Greece to see what inspiring effects sport could have on an entire

people, educator George Chapman suggested. Among other things, he argued, the games

of Greece 'rendered the body more hardy and vigorous,' 'served as a school for military

virtue' and 'diffused a manly, independent, patriotic spirit.'[54] Capitalizing on the growing

market for sporting literature, Joseph Strutt published his weighty history of English sport in 1801, in which he advanced similar claims for the social significance of games. 'In order to form a just estimation of the character of any particular people,' he wrote, 'it is absolutely necessary to investigate the sports and pastimes most generally prevalent among them.'[55] Roughly a decade later, the author of one of the early boxing histories elaborated on the idea of sport as a barometer of societal development. For him 'the different degrees of ... advancement in civilization' was directly proportional to 'the kind and nature of the popular sports and exhibitions of a people.'[56]

By the early nineteenth century such athletic advocacy, especially among educational theorists, was common enough to draw the indignation of Sydney Smith. He complained of the 'ridiculous stress... laid upon the manliness of the exercises customary at public schools', which, despite their appeal to enthusiasts and boys alike, remained 'utterly unimportant' to a gentleman's business in life.[57] Thirty years earlier Smith would have had more supporters; but by the time he made this argument in 1810, the social and physical value of sport was passing into conventional wisdom.

Cricket and football

Cricket, that 'manly' and 'national' game, reigned as the most respectable sport in the eyes of headmasters and as the most popular amongst pupils.[58] Arranged by the players themselves, the first recorded cricket match took place between Eton and Westminster in 1786. After that, schoolboys at Eton, Harrow and Westminster, in particular, ensured that matches between other schools, visiting clubs, or most commonly, different sections of their own school, became fixtures in their sporting calendars. Much was at stake in these

early contests – at least according to the boys. In 1796, one Etonian wrote to his father: 'The Westminster boys are going to play us at cricket; we meet at Hounslow, and then is to be determined the fate of Eton! Or I think rather of Westminster.'[59] Knowing that they would likely be flogged upon their return, Eton's eleven marched off to play, subordinating concern for their own backsides to the prospect of glory and the chance to compete for school pride.

Not all masters, however, frowned upon the organized matches of their pupils. Dr Keate, a formidable cricketer in his schooldays, carried his fondness for the sport into his headmastership of Eton, beginning in 1809. To be sure, Keate never organized games for his pupils. To do so would be to encroach on the cherished liberties of his boys, and to go well beyond the bounds of a master's proscribed duties. But he certainly gave more than just passive support to cricket. According to one old boy, when Eton's star player returned from a match against the Marylebone Club, Keate greeted him 'with language savouring of the greatest delight.'[60] Another remembered that Keate 'took indeed great interest in all the matches; always had questions to ask… and was as vexed as the Captain of the eleven himself if the College were beaten.'[61]

While predominantly a folk pastime in the eighteenth century, football found a receptive audience at virtually all of the major public schools, where boys treated the violence of the game as a test of endurance, hardiness and strength.[62] In a world of rough diversions, football was generally the roughest of them all. Each school had its own variant of the game, though all versions, more or less, resembled a melee with a ball, in which little distinction was drawn between kicking the ball and kicking one's opponent – essentially as close as the playing fields came to actual warfare. School football in the

early nineteenth century, as one Old Etonian remembered, provided the opportunity 'of wreaking a spite on the shin of another, to whom you have no particular favour.'[63]

Although Shrewsbury's headmaster Samuel Butler, among other detractors, denounced football as a game 'only fit for butcher boys,' the pupils themselves saw both recreational and social value in the sport.[64] By outfacing the physical dangers of football, boys proved themselves worthy of their peers' esteem. Wounds earned on the field of play were deemed honourable scars. Looking back on his days at Winchester, one old boy wrote of football: 'Certainly as we played it, it was a great trial of nerve and good temper.'[65] Indeed, hardiness and status went hand-in-hand.

Pugilism

No school sport drew as much commentary as pugilism. Both within the schools and the nation at large, pugilism entered a sort of golden age during this period. The rapid revival of the sport in the late 1780s was due largely to the support of George III's sons, as well as to a diverse crowd of other notables, which would eventually include Lord Byron and William Cobbett.[66] A host of publications – including technical guides, polemical defences, histories and anecdotal accounts – also helped fix boxing in the national limelight, though not without pushback.[67] The *Sporting Magazine* devoted large sections of its first five issues to historical accounts of pugilism.[68] Meanwhile Pierce Egan, one of the period's finest journalists, was hard at work, aggressively promoting the sport. On the heels of Bill Oxberry's popular boxing publication, *Pancratia*, Egan released his magisterial four-volume *Boxiana* between 1812 and 1814. Thanks to the efforts of Egan, the *Sporting Magazine*, and a flood of cheap prints depicting famous

pugilists, boxers became some of Britain's first national sporting heroes. By 1809, one of

the most celebrated of these pugilists, Tom Cribb, 'stirred British emotions more than

Wellington himself,' according to one historian.[69]

A national debate over boxing would spill into the public schools – what were, in

a sense, the nurseries of the pugilistic spirit.[70] While the Eton Society, the school's

debating club and model for the Oxford and Cambridge Unions, rarely deviated from its

programme of weekly historical debates, the issue of pugilism and its effects on the

national character twice interrupted the Society's routine, once in 1812 and again in

1814. To the applause of his fellow members, one boy, during the 1812 debate, defended

boxing as 'a most spirited and noble recreation' and compared the current British practice

to the ancient Olympic games, 'which were instituted to keep up the martial spirit of the

Grecians.' By and large, however, the Society's members contested the prevailing pro-

boxing arguments. One boy in 1814 resolutely denied 'that it can animate or increase

true courage, that it can make our men better soldiers.'[71] Regardless of how these

Etonians ultimately voted in these two debates, that they even took place within the

almost exclusively historical agenda of the Society reinforces the argument: Pre-

Victorian boys and sporting enthusiasts alike were thinking seriously about how games

could shape their individual and national character.

The Eton Society's scepticism aside, boxing remained not only a popular

diversion, but also a defining experience for many public schoolboys. Indeed, violence

had a deep anchorage in the school social fabric, and until the 1840s, fights were an

almost daily occurrence in the close or on the playing fields. Informal and sporadic

battles, of course, broke out frequently between rival boys, but it was the prize fights that

were most celebrated. In imitation of the popular pugilists of the day – who must have ranked as real heroes amongst schoolboys – pupils fought according to the code of the prize ring. Thus, there were no round limits; so long as a boy got to his feet after a knockdown and recovered within sixty seconds, the fight went on.[72] Because these battles constituted prime entertainment for schoolboys, the audience was not often compelled to stop a fight prematurely. One old Etonian fondly remembered a fight lasting three hours before a master finally intervened.[73] Occasionally the results were tragic. In 1784, for instance, a fight between two boys ended in death for one of the combatants.[74] And though not lethal, a two-hour fight at Westminster in 1809 rendered one of the combatants 'unrecognizable'.[75]

Despite the dangerous consequences, most boy pugilists would not have accepted intervention from their schoolmates. After all, it was within the fighting ring that enduring reputations were made. 'Nothing captivates the imaginations of the Eton boys more than personal prowess, and success in feats of arms,' Charles Rowcroft recalled of his schooldays in the early nineteenth century. He happily remembered one victory, which 'had the same favourable result that national wars have sometimes had, – it absolved me from my debts.'[76] A thirst for schoolyard glory swept even the smallest of participants into the fray. Boy pugilists were canonized in school lore, their bare-knuckled feats committed to sagas and passed down through the generations.[77] Putting their school lessons to good use, boys often described their combat in classical terms, endowing them with a sense of the heroic. Thus transformed, combatants were not settling petty, boyish scores; they were imitating the immortals, waging battles 'worthy of Homer's heroes.'[78]

Like the boys themselves, masters were not inclined to interfere with these contests unless they proved truly dangerous. Some school authorities, including William Carey, headmaster of Westminster in the early nineteenth century, even encouraged fights. During his tenure, a fight was considered reason enough for adjourning school.[79] Writing under the name 'Nimrod', the sporting writer Charles James Apperly warmly praised the 'manly character' that prevailed at Rugby in the 1790s. During this time, 'very little notice was taken of bloody noses and black eyes, or any question asked when they were displayed in school.' One master, according to Apperly, 'would often look on when a good fight was proceeding.'[80]

Georgian libertines, Victorian prigs: Re-examining the myth

Those who dismiss the schools of this period as little more than backward and barbaric have failed to see that it was precisely this coarseness that contemporaries celebrated. In fact, many deemed the rough-and-tumble nature of boy society, both within the dormitories and on the playing fields, the *sine qua non* of the public school experience. By the late eighteenth century, more parents than ever before sought this kind of experience for their children. To be sure, they recognized the hazards entailed in placing their sons amongst other impressionable adolescents under limited supervision. But they were willing to run these risks in the hope that the instruction provided in such a social atmosphere would ultimately yield salutary results. Few put it better than William Barrow: 'Some portion even of our national bravery may undoubtedly be ascribed to the hardihood of our education.' Quoting a 'gallant admiral', he added, 'Were it not for the

dormitory at Westminster, and the quarter deck of a man of war, we should soon be a nation of macaronis.'[81]

As the factories of Britain's ruling caste during such a formative moment in the nation's history, the public schools of this period deserve far more careful analysis than they have received thus far. Perhaps part of the problem lies with Thomas Arnold. Headmaster at Rugby from 1828 to 1841, Arnold casts a long shadow that extends backward in time and often discourages close scrutiny of the earlier decades of public school history.[82] With Arnold cloaked in the mantle of saviour, the schools of the preceding period necessarily become marginalized or sometimes even denigrated as mere 'dumping grounds'.[83] Certainly Arnold deserves credit for bringing about dramatic reforms, but he did not find the schools stinking and leave them sweet. By taking into account contemporary Georgian attitudes toward education, this essay has assessed the schools of this period on their own terms, and not by a set of anachronistic expectations. In the early nineteenth century, to interfere in the extracurricular affairs of one's pupils was not only to exceed the duties of master, it was to potentially disrupt the healthy, if occasionally vulgar, interactions of the boys, a hallmark of the public school experience.

More generally, this essay has attempted to deal with the broader problem of periodization; specifically the discrete and often irreconcilable value systems that are frequently attributed to the Georgian and Victorian eras. As John Tosh writes, 'At the level of popular stereotype, no greater contrast could be imagined than that between the uninhibited 'Georgian' libertine and his sober frock-coated 'Victorian' grandson.'[84] These stereotypes have infiltrated studies of English public schools, casting the institutions of the earlier period as nurseries of misrule, while those of the latter period

are portrayed as well-oiled machines for the output of diligent, manly and vigorous English youth. In drawing a bold line under the Georgian past and defining themselves against the values of the preceding generation, however, Victorians often overlooked what they had in common with it.

Part of the problem with drawing a clean line between Georgian and Victorian education is that the Victorian public schools themselves underwent a fundamental shift – what David Newsome has called a 'revolution' – beginning roughly in the 1860s. As Newsome argues, the 'godliness and good learning' of the early Victorian period, epitomized by Thomas Arnold, gradually gave way to an educational ideology that stressed sporting masculinity and muscular Christianity. By promoting militancy, athleticism and Spartan discipline, the late Victorian schoolmasters necessarily downplayed the religious moralism of their predecessors. As Newsome writes, these later schoolmasters championed 'the belief that manliness and high spirits are more becoming qualities in a boy than piety and spiritual zeal' while 'patriotism and doing one's duty to country and Empire became the main sentiments which the new system sought to inculcate.'[85]

Yet as Newsome himself briefly acknowledges, such attitudes were not altogether new.[86] Indeed, we have already seen the major antecedents. By focusing on the role of sport in the Napoleonic-era public schools and on the ideology of education more generally, this study has attempted to bridge the gap that Victorian writers and subsequent historians were often eager to enlarge. Like their late Victorian descendants, Georgian educational theorists, such as Vicesimus Knox and William Barrow, touted the invigorating effects of sport and the public school atmosphere, arguing that rough

exercise combats effeminacy and promotes manly development. Their schools may have been less regulated than those in subsequent generations, yet many of the very qualities celebrated in late Victorian schoolboys – manliness, self-reliance, courage, fortitude, loyalty – were also heralded as virtues in the pupils of the Georgian era. The very nation itself, Georgians and late Victorians alike argued, depended on such qualities in its young ruling elite. As these schoolboys would ensure, England was to be no nation of macaronis.

[1] H.C. Maxwell Lyte, *A History of Eton College, 1440-1898* (3rd edn., London, 1899), p. 359

[2] W.H.D. Rouse, *A History of Rugby School* (New York, 1898), p. 182-186.

[3] See, for example, R.L. Archer, *Secondary Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1921); J. Basil Oldham, *A History of Shrewsbury School, 1552-1952*

(Oxford, 1952); Vivian Ogilvie, *The English Public School* (London, 1957); Rex Warner, *English Public Schools* (London, 1945).

[4] John Chandos, *Boys Together: English Public Schools, 1800-1864* (London, 1984), pp. 12, 66-70.

[5] H.S. Ndee, 'Public Schools in Britain in the Nineteenth Century: The Emergence of Team Games and the Development of the Educational Ideology of Athleticism', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 27 (April 2010), pp. 845-846.

[6] 'A Reply to the Most Popular Objections to Public Schools, with Particular Reference to the Tyrocinium of Cowper; from the Pamphleteer', in *Public Education* (London, 1817), p. 124. For the eighteenth-century cult of sensibility, see G.J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago, 1996)**.**

[7] On masculinity, see Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500-1950," *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (April 2005), pp. 274-280; the essays of John Tosh, in his collection, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family and Empire* (Harlow, England, 2005); essays in *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*, edited by Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen (London: Longman, 1999); Michele Cohen, '"Manners" Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830', *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (April 2005). On politeness, see Lawrence Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1994); Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (Harlow, England, 2001).

[8] Tony Money, *Manly and Muscular Diversions: Public Schools and the Nineteenth-Century Sporting Revival* (London, 1997), pp. 29-31; Ogilvie, *The English Public School*, pp. 98-100; T.W. Bamford, *Rise of the Public Schools: A Study of Boys' Public Boarding Schools in England and Wales from 1837 to the Present Day* (London, 1967), pp. x-xii.

[9] Ogilvie, *The English Public School*, pp. 104-106; and Christopher Tyerman, *A History of Harrow School, 1324-1991* (Oxford, 2000), p. 144. For a brief discussion of the decline of private education, see Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (London, 1987), p. 235.

[10] John Stratchan to Lieu Bridges, 29 July 1815, Winchester, Winchester College Archives (WCA), G29/8.

[11] See, for example, Catharine Macaulay Graham, *Letters on Education. With Observations on Religious and Metaphysical Subjects* (London, 1790), p. iii; Vicesimus Knox, *Liberal Education: Or, a Practical Treatise on the Methods of Acquiring Useful and Polite Learning* (2 vols., 10th edn., London, 1789), I, p. 8; William Cowper, 'Tirocinium; or, A Review of Schools', in *The Poetical Works of William Cowper* (London, 1845), pp. 314; II, 403.

[12] William Barrow, *An Essay on Education; in which are Particularly Considered the Merits and the Defects of the Discipline and Instruction in our Academies*, (2 vols., 2nd edn., London, 1804), I, p. 89. Schoolboys themselves frequently echoed these expectations of future eminence; see Eton's journal, the *Microcosm*, first published in 1786. Gregory Griffen, ed. *The Microcosm; A Periodical Work*, No. 1, (5th edn., London, 1825), p. 5-6; and [Robert Southey, et. al.], *The Flagellant*, 1 (London, 1792), p. 7.

[13] M.V. Wallbank, 'Eighteenth-Century Public Schools and the Education of the Governing Elite,' *History of Education* 8 (1979), p. 1. The proportion of aristocratic and genteel enrolments at the schools increased through the century, until by 1800 public education had become 'an accepted pattern of life for the upper classes of society.' T.W. Bamford, 'Public Schools and Social Class, 1801-1850', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 12 (Sep. 1961), p. 224. On Westminster, see [William Lucas Collins], *The Public Schools: Winchester, Westminster, Shrewsbury, Harrow, Rugby; Notes of their History and Traditions* (Edinburgh, 1867), p. 135.

[14] Michele Cohen, 'Gender and the Private/Public Debate on Education in the Long Eighteenth Century', in Richard Aldrich, ed., *Public or Private Education? Lessons from History* (London, 2004), p. 17.

[15] Vicesimus Knox, *Liberal Education*, I, pp. 370-371.

[16] Vicesimus Knox, 'Classical Learning Vindicated', *Essays, Moral and Literary*, in *The Works of Vicesimus Knox*, (London, 1824), I, p. 15.

[17] See Knox, *Liberal Education,* 'Conclusion'; also Cohen, 'Gender and the Private/Public Debate', pp. 18-19.

[18] Charles Rowcroft, *Confessions of an Etonian*, (3 vols., London, 1852), I, p. 38; see also [William Hill Tucker], *Eton of Old; or Eighty Years since 1811-1822* (London, 1892), p. 40.

[19] Quoted in Sheldon Rothblatt, 'The Student Sub-culture and the Examination System in Early 19th Century Oxbridge', in Lawrence Stone, ed., *The University in Society: Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the Early 19th Century*, (2 vols., London, 1975), I, pp. 276-277.

[20] Barrow, *Essay on Education*, II, p. 136.

[21] Edward Maltby to Henry Gabell, 10 Feb 1813, WCA, D17/7/8.

[22] See Maria Edgeworth and Richard Lovell Edgeworth, *Practical Education,* (London, 1798), II, p. 503. Also, Jenny Holt, *Public School Literature, Civic Education and the Politics of Male Adolescence* (Surrey, 2008), p. 49.

[23] Printed in Ogilvie, *The English Public School*, p. 111.

[24] [Anon.], 'On the Manners Prevalent at Some Public Schools', in Vicesimus Knox, *Winter Evenings; or Lucubrations on Life and Letters*, in *The Works of Vicesimus Knox*, III, p. 144. See Rowcroft, *Confessions of an Etonian*, p. 87 for the fiercely independent voice of schoolboys.

[25] See Tucker, *Eton of Old,* pp. 38-39, 173; also Chandos, *Boys Together*, p. 212; and Edward C. Mack, *Public Schools and British Opinion 1780 to 1860: An Examination of the Relationship Between Contemporary Ideas and the Evolution of an English Institution* (London, 1938), p. 38.

[26] John R. Gillis, *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations, 1770-Present* (New York, 1981), p. 37; Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, *The Public School Phenomenon, 597-1977* (London, 1977), p. 56.

[27] R.L. Arrowsmith, *A Charterhouse Miscellany* (London, 1982), p. 57.

[28] Rowcroft, *Confessions of an Etonian*, p. 117. See also, Tucker, *Eton of Old*, p. 44

[29] Chandos, *Boys Together,* pp. 88-91.

[30] Lord Monson, 'Reminiscences of Eton, 1808-1811', *Etoniana*, 29, (Nov. 1921), pp. 455-456. See also, [Charles James Apperly], a.k.a. 'Nimrod', *My Life and Times* (London, 1927), ch. XIII.

[31] William Cowper, 'Tirocinium', pp. 296-299, 313.

[32] 'On the Manners Prevalent at Some Public Schools', p. 142.

[33] [Sydney Smith], 'Public Schools, &c.', in *Public Education*, pp. 3-4, 17.

[34] Unpublished memoirs of H.S. Tremenheere, Life at Midhurst and Winchester (1816-1818), WCA, G171/1.

[35] 'Reply to the Most Popular Objections to Public Schools', p. 114.

[36] Gathorne-Hardy, *Public School Phenomenon*, p. 53

[37] Rothblatt, 'Student Sub-culture,' p. 259.

[38] Ndee, 'Public Schools', p. 846.

[39] See Timothy J.L. Chandler, 'Emergent Athleticism: Games in Two English Public Schools, 1800-1860', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 5 (1988), pp. 312-330.

[40] There are a number of important works on the Victorian sporting craze. See Bruce Haley, *The Healthy Body and Victorian Culture* (Cambridge, Mass. 1978); J.A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (Cambridge, 1981); and Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930* (Oxford, 1991). A recent appraisal of the Victorian sport literature is found in Mike Huggins, 'Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School (Review Essay)', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 18 (2001), pp. 149-155. For a classic Victorian emphasis on the connection between sport and morality, see *Cassell's Book of Sports and Pastimes* (London, 1886), p. iii.

[41] Dennis Brailsford, *A Taste for Diversions: Sport in Georgian England* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 7.

[42] Brailsford, *Taste for Diversions*, pp. 7-11.

[43] For schoolmasters' uneasy relationship with games, see Tucker, *Eton of Old*, p. 220; David Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning: Four Studies on a Victorian Ideal* (London, 1961), pp. 80-81; Chandler, 'Emergent Athleticism', pp. 314-317.

[44] Money, *Manly and Muscular Diversions,* p. 55

[45] Tyerman, *History of Harrow School*, p. 142.

[46] Oldham, *History of Shrewsbury School*, p. 245.

[47] William Vincent's Book of Events during his Time as Dean, 1802-1818, London, Westminster Library and Muniment Room.

[48] Money, *Manly and Muscular Diversions*, p. 49.

[49] Quoted in John Timbs, *School-Days of Eminent Men* (London, 1860), p. 293.

[50] For earlier commentary on adolescent sport, see John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (London, 1693), p. 147; and Issac Watts, *The Improvement of the Mind. To which is Added a Discourse on the Education of Children and Youth* (London, 1825), p. 364-365. Watts cautioned against violent activities as the 'the play of dogs or horses' rather 'than of children.'

[51] Knox, *Liberal Education,* I, p. 370.

[52] Graham, *Letters on Education*, p. 24.

[53] Barrow, *Essay on Education,* II, pp. 132-133.

[54] George Chapman, *A Treatise on Education in Two Parts with the Author's Method of Instructions, while he Taught the School of Dunfries; and a View of Other Books on Education* (4th edn., London, 1790), p. 14.

[55] Joseph Strutt, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England* (2nd edn., London, 1810), p. i.

[56] [Bill Oxberry], *Pancratia, or a History of Pugilism* (London, 1812), p. 3-9.

[57] 'Public Schools, &c.', in *Public Education,* p. 6.

[58] *Letters from a Nobleman to his Son, during the Period of his Education at Eton and Oxford* (London, 1810), p. 64. For a brief commentary on the popularity of cricket, see Strutt, *Sports and Pastimes*, p. 98 and David Underdown, *Start of Play: Cricket and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*, (2000).

[59] Quoted in F.S. Ashley-Cooper, *Eton v. Harrow at the Wicket* (London, 1922), p. 17.

[60] Blake, *Reminiscences of Eton,* pp. 48-52.

[61] Tucker, *Eton of Old ,* p. 190.

[62] Malcolmson, *Popular Recreations in English Society*, pp. 40-41.

[63] Blake, *Reminiscences of Eton*, p. 43.

[64] Butler quoted in Oldham, *A History of Shrewsbury School*, p. 232.

[65] Unpublished memoirs of H.S. Tremenheere, Life at Midhurst and Winchester (1816-1818), WCA, G171/1.

[66] George IV used a corps of pugilists as ushers at his coronation. Dennis Brailsford, *Bareknuckles: A Social History of Prize-Fighting* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 19-26; and John Ford, *Prizefighting: The Age of Regency Boximania* (Devon, 1971), pp. 9-10

[67] *The Art of Manual Defence; or, System of Boxing: Perspicuously Explained in a Series of Lessons, and Illustrated by Plates* (3rd. edn., London, 1799) is an especially interesting glimpse into the growing popularity of boxing.

[68] *The Sporting Magazine; or Monthly Calendar of the Transactions of the Turf, the Chase, and every other Diversion Interesting to the Man of Pleasure and Enterprise*, vols. 1 and 2 (London, October 1792-April 1793).

[69] Derek Birley, *Sport and the Making of Britain* (Manchester, 1993), p. 165.

[70] For spirited defenses of boxing as a promoter of honour, manliness, strength and equity, see Pierce Egan, *Boxiana; or, Sketches of Modern Pugilism, during the Championship of Cribb to Spring's Challenge to all England* (3 vols., London, 1821), pp. 5-6; Oxberry, *Pancratia*, pp. 25-28; William Cobbett, 'Boxing', in *Cobbett's Political Register*, VIII.6 (Aug., 1805), pp. 193-202.

[71] Minutes from the Eton Society Journal, 1812, Windsor, Eton College Library, p. 200, 265.

[72] Chandos, *Boys Together*, pp. 138-142.

[73] Blake, *Reminiscences of Eton*, p. 46.

[74] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven, 1995), p. 308.

[75] G.F. Russell Barker and Alan H. Stenning, *The Record of Old Westminsters: A Biographical List of All Those Who are Known to Have Been Educated at Westminster School from the Earliest Times to 1927* (2 vols., London, 1928), I, p. 958.

[76] Rowcroft, *Confessions of an Etonian,* I, p. 165.

[77] Chandos, *Boys Together*, p. 140.

[78] Rowcroft, *Confessions of an Etonian*, 165. For another classical allusion employed to describe a fight, see Blake, *Reminiscences of Eton*, p. 45.

[79] John Sargeaunt, *Annals of Westminster School* (London, 1898), p. 215. For masters' affinity for fights, see Mack, *Public Schools and British Opinion*, p. 184.

[80] Apperly, *Life and Times*, ch.13.

[81] Barrow, *Essay on Education,* II, p. 136

[82] Panegyrical accounts, both fictional and biographical, have firmly rooted Arnold in the pantheon of public school masters, most famously, Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown's School Days*, (Cambridge, 1857), as well as former pupil Arthur Penryn Stanley's biography, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D.*, (2 vols., London, 1844).

[83] See Gillis, *Youth and History*, pp. 70-71; Warren, *English Public Schools*, pp. 8-9, 16-17.

[84] Tosh, 'The Old Adam and the New Man: Emerging Themes in the History of English Masculinities, 1750-1850', in *Manliness and Masculinities*, p. 62.

[85] Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning,* pp. 202, 25-26.

[86] Newsome, *Godliness and Good Learning,* p. 203