

Sport and the Upper Classes: Introduction

Mike Huggins (2008) *Sport in History*, 28:3, 351-363, DOI: 10.1080/17460260802315462

This collection addresses two key questions. What was the place of sport in British upper-class life? How far have the upper classes contributed to sport in British society more generally? To begin to address such questions is important, not least because in a century far less conducive to aristocratic life, the sporting lives of the monarchy, aristocracy, gentry and other upper-class groups have been unappreciated and largely neglected. So we need to constantly remind ourselves that they were the aboriginal sporting group in Britain, at least in terms of having most time to devote to sport, and made a significant contribution to British sporting culture. Not only did sports play a key role in their own social and cultural worlds, but the male upper classes, their gentlemanly sons and (less often) their wives and daughters were deeply implicated in the shaping of British sporting leisure, and its dominant cultural images, up to and beyond the inter-war years. Their sporting interests have helped to shape the British sporting calendar, the rural landscape, sporting culture and the high status of particular events and organizations.

Britain is still a class-based society, and the aristocracy are still much with us, even if largely not in the House of Lords. While class analysis has merged with cultural insights, and the exploration of a wider mix of people's identities, such as gender, generation, race and ethnicity, the current reworking and defences of its utility still demonstrate class's continued importance. [1] Reassessments of the position of social history also make frequent reference to the need to revive social class as a corrective to the quirkiness of the linguistic and cultural turns, though in a context which recognizes structure, agency and perception. [2] So it seems timely to readdress, in more revisionist form, the contribution of the upper class, and place them once again firmly within the historiography of sport.

Notions of the 'upper class' are cultural constructs, but as a self-defined social group with a keen sense of their class identity, they were well able to identify like others. This was partly through the trappings of the formal social hierarchy, monarchy, peerage and gentry, along with land, wealth and property, which have always been key status indicators. Over the past centuries the upper classes have had a highly important social, cultural and political role. Their sports simultaneously demonstrated their claims to be guardians and arbiters of British culture, and contributed to and shaped their mental horizons. Their wealth, vices and landownership have never gone unchallenged. Despite their powerful ruling structures, dominant ideologies and apparent cultural hegemony, there was always a width and depth of bitterness and disaffection towards landed rule, and consistent opposition by radical reformers to landlordism and aristocratic entitlements, vices and extravagance, though such stereotypical attacks applied only to a section of the upper classes and cannot be accepted at face value. The course of British sporting history can thus be conceptualized

in terms of cultural diffusion, appropriation and exchange, and struggles for ascendancy between value systems that variously competed, coexisted, negotiated or cooperated.

Such issues, understandings and potential debates make it the more surprising that many (though not all) aspects of the sporting life of the upper classes have been substantially ignored within sports history, as Martin Johnes has recently pointed out. [3] The lack of a coherent body of work on their sports is a major limitation in sport's historiography. In mainstream social history, Martin Hewitt has argued that the upper classes were still 'the least studied of all the classes', partly because of the problems of definition, while Antony Taylor has asserted that their history is 'neglected and under-researched'. [4] Such neglect is the more surprising, given that their lifestyle placed demand at the centre of leisure and thus potentially offered a contrasting model of sports development to the undogmatic Marxism formerly a 'presiding influence' in sports history, which has often emphasized provision for the proletariat, partially dictated through middle-class hegemonic controls. [5] Recent interest in the analysis of working-class masculinity, voluntary association and the roles that sports such as pigeon racing played in local identity and various overlapping working-class cultures, as they coped with the material constraints of working-class life, still tacitly implies a working-class culture of consolation among groups looking upwards towards those who were more rich and powerful. [6] There has been an increased focus in the distinctive contribution of the middle classes to British sport in recent decades, as J.A. Mangan's recent collection, *A sport-loving society: Victorian and Edwardian middle-class England at play* (Abingdon, 2006) exemplified. Unlike the middle classes, the nobility and gentry, with a few important exceptions, played only a small part in industrialization, urbanization and the modernization of sport. [7] But - and this is an important point - the middle classes, in subsequently taking power, had to come to terms with pre-existing upper-class sports, outlooks and manners, variously adopting, adapting, resisting and reconstructing them in the process.

Who were the upper classes?

'What is a gentleman without his recreations' asked a character in George Powell's *Cornish Comedy* (c. 1689), naming 'horses, hounds, setting-dogs and cocks'. [8] Powell's audience would have recognized, as we should, that for 'a gentleman', his sports acted as symbols of his position and wealth, and bonded him to his peers and forms of pleasure. But what was a 'gentleman'? Terms such as 'elite' and 'gentleman', or phrases such as 'gentlemen amateurs', are still often utilized as a tool of social description, but often imprecisely and sometimes interchangeably, applied to social groups that could either be middle- or upper-class in origin, thereby implying a binary 'them' and 'us' model. Such over-simplistic class representation has been one of the three common perceptions of the British class system for several centuries. [9] Powell's audience had a more precise definition in mind.

Yet this definition of what it was that 'made' a 'gentleman' relied in part on social ascription, behaviour and appearance, so it was applied inconsistently, not least since there were subtle differences between the Scottish, Irish, Welsh and English upper classes which cannot be explored here for reasons of space. Upper-class lineages sometimes went back generations, allowing them to enjoy the endless veneration of posterity, ensuring that people believed they had power and influence. Historians of leisure have recognized their importance too. To Peter Laslett, writing about pre-industrial Britain, they were the 'only class', a leading group 'capable of concerted action' in society, emphasizing display and using sports to demonstrate their position. [10] In Victorian times, they were a 'elite' group, a 'dominant class' concentrating wealth, status and power in few hands, and so able to spend substantial money on leisure. Hugh Cunningham thus saw them very much as a 'leisure class', a group who could choose how much work they did or did not do, and who enjoyed conspicuous, continuous and expensive consumption of sporting leisure. [11] Their power was greatest in London, in Parliament, in county towns and on their country estates, but they were found in a range of contexts: court and parliament, public schools and universities, armed forces and in imperial administration, and were rich in social capital. To Ross McKibbin, writing about the period between 1918 and 1951, the upper class was 'a class that defined itself, and was defined by others, by its public display'. [12]

There was not thus one 'upper class', but a number of different representations of the upper classes, both in the past and in terms of modern historians' perceptions and definitions. There is, for example no disagreement about the monarchy and peerage forming part of the upper class, but whether, for example, wealthy industrialists, successful professional men and senior armed services officers might also be members is a more a matter for debate. One indicator might be the extent to which they possessed the powerful cultural capital that generated deference and social power, not least since this has always had implications for class participation in British sport. Contributors to this volume have been allowed some limited leeway in their interpretation.

Even though the upper classes may have had some sense of overall class identity, most felt that membership was stratified internally. At the apex of the upper class stood the monarchy, linked to the next level by marriage and culture. Below them came the peerage, a constitutionally defined, growing group. In 1776 there were 119 peers sitting in the House of Lords; in 1830, 358. By 1880, there were 580 peers, of whom 431 were hereditary members of the House of Lords. Thereafter there was steady but spectacular growth in numbers. In 1919 the House of Lords numbered 692. By 1950 it numbered 840. In 1980, if life peerages were included, the peerage totalled 1,206. Few if any of these more recently created peerages were landed. Politicians, judges and self-made men were the main groups entering the peerage.

Below the peerage were a wider group, the remaining aristocracy,

bearing titles but without parliamentary rights. Linked to them were ambitious wealthy businessmen, industrialists and merchants who wanted to join the elite. There was always a small group of the super-wealthy that bought sizeable landed estates and made provisions for founding a landed family, ensuring nouveau riche money was acceptable after a generation had passed.

To an extent the upper classes were a caste rather than a class, and to belong to the upper classes without being a member of a titled family depended on ascription. Cultural assumptions lay at the heart of most people's definitions, though a subtle mixture of breeding, land, status, wealth, power and education was vital. Numbers varied depending on which factors were seen as most central. Most members were wealthy. In 1867 for example, 4,500 families (0.07 per cent of the population) owned 16.2 per cent of the national income of England and Wales. If we take a more generous definition, a further 25,200 families (0.41 per cent of the population) had a further 10.1 per cent. [13]

Critical factors substantially overlapped. If we take c.1880 as one example, in terms of status there were then 580 peers – dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts or lords, of whom 90 per cent held land and 75 per cent over 2,000 acres. [14] This group largely had political power, with 431 being members of the House of Lords, along with seven peeresses, 101 Irish and forty-one Scottish peers. To a very large extent the peerage was also wealthy, which in turn was often but not always associated with landownership. There were some 250 wealthy magnates with over £30,000 income per annum, and three-quarters of these were peers. Below the peerage in 1880 were some 850 baronets, hereditary knights, of whom two-thirds owned land and half over 2,000 acres. These groups were publicly defined in a series of great directories, such as Debrett's Peerage of England, Scotland and Ireland, published irregularly from 1802, and later Sir Bernard Burke's Genealogy and Heraldry, History of the Peerage and Baronetage of the United Kingdom, published from 1836. In 1880 there were 750 families of middling landowners holding over 10,000 acres, generally earning over £10,000 per annum, and this landowning group overlapped with the peerage and barons. The House of Commons was then still essentially landholding too, largely patrician, with a substantial minority from landed families. In sum, all four factors were concentrated in relatively few hands.

The landed gentry were defined largely through the acreage of their property, lineage, the right to bear arms, social prestige and connections with other families in the upper classes. Less is known of them, despite a recent attempt to use national census data to explore their families. [15] Their sporting life has also been less explored too. [16] Membership was via informal ascription: one belonged to the landed gentry if other members accepted that one did so. Of the 4,500 untitled landed gentry noted in Burke's landed gentry in the 1880s, 90 per cent had a country 'seat' and estate. Initially Burke's landed gentry limited itself to 'stately' domains of more than 500 acres, though it began, in the twentieth century, to include 'old' families who had ceased to own their ancestral

lands but still held their stately home, and by 1951 it lowered the property qualification to 200 acres for all British families whose pedigrees had been 'notable' for three generations. Almost half the c.5,000 families more recently listed are there because their forefathers were: they themselves have no land left.

Land, wealth, power and status

Landownership and land acquisition was as important to the upper classes as it was to their public schools. In both it acted as cordon sanitaire, a source of income generation, visual beauty and sporting potential, and demonstrated importance, wealth and commitment to sport. Land had mythic meaning in upper-class discourse. Its ownership brought potential and actual revenues, from agriculture and rural rents, mining rights for coal or iron, wayleaves for railways over land, the development of ports, iron-producing towns and seaside resorts and urban rents. It brought political influence, social importance, the pleasures of improving an estate and power over tenants and rentals. Although figures are unreliable, with much discrepancy between sources of doubtful accuracy, it would appear that even at the end of the eighteenth century, some 4,000 families owned three-quarters of British land. The 1872-1873 Return of the owners of land showed that 710 individuals owned one-quarter of all land in English and Wales. [17] In 1882, forty-four persons in Great Britain and Ireland held 100,000 acres and upwards, and in total 2,500 persons owned over 3,000 acres, and a total of 4,217 owners held 54 per cent of English and Welsh land. In terms of income, fifty-one individuals had over £100,000 per annum, and 2,500 people had £3,000 or more. [18]

Social standing and political power were also important in making a gentleman. As well as having Parliamentary power, men of the landed classes were also Justices of the Peace, licensing pubs, operating the poor law or acting as aldermen or county councillors. The slow decline of their power has been extensively studied in mainstream historiography. [19] In the seventeenth century there were largely separate numbers of nobility and gentry in the four British countries enjoying wealth, power and status. But according to Linda Colley, a 'British' ruling class converged in the decades of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, adopting generally similar lifestyles and patterns of expenditure, while their dominant discourses laid claim to their guardianship of national culture, and many provided dutiful and relatively disinterested state service. [20] The 1790s saw challenges to the nature, meaning and role of 'aristocracy', but radical anti-aristocratic sentiment was quickly repressed. [21] As population increased, and grain prices and rentals rose rapidly in the first decades of the nineteenth century, the upper classes increasingly extended their patronage across Britain, and leisure slowly shifted from 'town' life in London, the assize towns and 'leisure towns' such as Brighton to country estates. This shift intensified when the 1832 Reform Act led some towns to reject upper-class domination, but despite this, as novelist Bulwer-Lytton stressed in 1833, the aristocracy still shaped and formed 'popular opinion' in leisure and fashion. [22]

For much of the nineteenth century England was still an aristocracy-led country, but one faced by the growing economic power of the middle classes. Land had declining economic importance as foreign canning and meat and grain importation increased, the price of wheat dropped and land rents collapsed. The democratic changes of the late nineteenth century, such as the secret ballot in 1872 (which deprived landlords of influence over the electorate), the 1885 Reform Act (which replaced the historic county and borough boundaries) and the virtual abolition of the Lords' power of veto in 1911, likewise contributed to a slow weakening of the landed interest. But through and beyond the nineteenth century the increasingly integrated upper classes still played a key role in the economic, social and political life of Britain. [23] New members were recruited via the traditional routes: wealth, political clout and state service. When traditional families found fortunes threatened, some turned to the Empire or the New World, others married dowry-bringing foreign heiresses. The agricultural depression of the 1870s had a negative effect on rents and on agricultural land as a primary source of wealth. By 1896, 167 noblemen, a quarter of the peerage, were directors of companies. The 'fast set' surrounding the Prince of Wales attracted negative publicity. Even so, Angela Lambert has argued that in Britain they enjoyed an 'Indian summer' in the period from 1880 to the First World War. [24]

Death duties taxing inherited wealth had impacted by 1914, and the Liberals, supported by the Labour Party, introduced land reforms. But the Great War had a more dramatic effect, from requisitions of land and houses for military and hospital use to loss of sons. Aristocratic families suffered disproportionate losses. From 600 upper-class families investigated in detail, 275 young men died violent deaths. [25] There was an increased break-up of estates as substantial land was sold off between 1910 and 1922 to meet death duties and maintain lifestyles; there was an erosion of local control in county government; and far fewer patrician professionals were found in the civil service, Church, law, the armed forces and the diplomatic service. The upper classes continued to be bound by complex networks of kinship, privilege, connection, close alignment of land and some commercial and financial activity, but new titles and honours opened the upper classes increasingly to new money between the two world wars, creating a more cosmopolitan plutocracy. The peerage was, however, still open to the two traditional routes of politics and the law. [26] In Ireland, land purchase acts from 1885 to 1909 began the disappearance of Irish grandees and gentry, a trend rapidly accelerated by the Irish Free State government in the inter-war years. [27] In Britain, rural deference was in retreat, and the Church was less supportive too. The impact of new capitalist forms of economic activity was becoming felt in the countryside, with profound long-term effects on social relations and leisure pursuits. The landlord-tenant relationship was becoming viewed negatively, though rents were rarely high and evictions rare. There was increased challenge to upper-class claims of land custodianship and tradition, and their defence of rural sports. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was still reluctant to support the abolition of hunting, but the League Against Cruel Sports,

founded in 1924, was far more radical in its opposition to 'blood sports' and the establishment. In response the British Field Sports Society, founded in 1930, almost 'a private gentleman's club' initially, soon became an effective spokesman for hunting views, with the Duke of Beaufort as chairman. [28] The peerage continued to be well represented in non-Labour cabinets, but by the 1950s the landed gentry families had largely disappeared as they sold off their estates. The newly wealthy made their money from commerce and manufacturing, not land.

Such changes impacted on sporting land management. In England and Wales the numbers of gamekeepers, which had their highest numbers per 1,000 acres in the eastern and south-eastern counties of England, peaked at 17,148 in 1911 but had dropped to 9,365 in 1921, a reduction of 45 per cent. By 1951 there were less than 4,000. By contrast the wealthier members of the peerage, determined to retain their birth-right and breeding, have been both resilient and adaptable, and largely retained their ancestral homes, and in some aspects of British public life, patrician values and traditional forms still survived. [29]

At the end of the twentieth century, much of upper-class ideological and cultural power had gone. The variously termed 'ruling class', 'landed' classes, social 'elite', 'patricians', 'high society', 'gentlemen' or 'upper classes' had become terms for some to sneer at, as in Jonathan O'Farrell's recent book, *An utterly impartial history of Britain: 2000 years of upper-class idiots in charge* (2007). Their determination to cling on to their estates, or to any notions of honour and tradition, are sometimes seen as outmoded. [30] The success of the 2004 Hunting with Dogs Act and the passions it generated partly stemmed from class spite and antagonism, especially from Labour MPs, as well as negative attitudes to cruelty to animals. [31]

Taking such changes in status, wealth and cultural power into account, it is all the more important to engage with the place of upper-class sport in upper-class life and in British society. The articles and essays included in this issue all engage with a selected aspect of the theme, beginning with an overview of current historiography. Mike Huggins's opening contribution explores in a short compass some key themes, including the overall patterns of sporting interests in relation to key upper-class sports, gender and sport, and upper-class contributions to rule-making, sports patronage and global sport. He shows how their sports impacted on rural landscape and country-house architecture, and reflects on the extent to which the monarchy offered an upper-class role model and on how far upper-class attitudes had a complex impact on amateurism.

The following essays move from such general overviews to provide a variety of tighter and more focused perspectives, themes and subjects. James Williams offers a perceptive analysis of the English upper classes and their sports during the relatively neglected early modern period, astutely setting them in the wider context of the period, and identifying key changes over time, especially in terms of moral, economic and other attitudes to sport and its place in the world of the imagination. He

exploits a range of sources to show how their sports demonstrated conspicuous consumption and picked up on Renaissance ideals of health, education, exercise and training while playing a complex variety of social, cultural and political roles in elite society in Britain and abroad.

The next section explores three upper-class sports, each occupying a different place along the classification continuum of 'traditional' to 'modern'. Horse racing has been an elite sport for many centuries, even before the introduction of the thoroughbred, and John Pinfold explores the changing role of the landowning classes in relation to nineteenth-century horse racing. They promoted it, sat on race committees and as stewards, owned and bred racehorses, and sometimes rode as 'gentlemen riders'. They used racing to enhance social status and prestige, but some found the associated gambling only too attractive and lost their wealth in backing horses.

Alastair Durie's article analyses game shooting, a sport that only became widely popular among the upper classes in the nineteenth century. Possession of a good pheasant shoot, partridge manor or grouse moor conferred social status, and for the newly rich it offered potential social mobility, associational opportunities and access into the elite. In the fifty years leading up to the First World War records were set, for individual 'big shots' and teams of guns, that have never been reached since. Durie examines how such large bags were achieved pre-1914; reviews the impact of the First World War and the economic, political and environmental factors that reshaped game shooting in the inter-war years; and then reflects on the situation post-1945, when the very existence of the sport came under pressure.

Jack Williams's final essay in this section chooses to explore a twentieth-century sport less commonly associated with the upper-classes, and one very much associated with modernity rather than tradition. Aeroplane sport was a reminder that not all the upper classes were followers of field sports. He shows that aeroplane sport had a strong upper-class presence between the wars, but was different to most other elite sports. Races offered cash prizes, while supporters advocated not the private market but state financing of aeroplane sport. They were also less concerned to keep flying socially exclusive.

The next section moves from contrasting studies of sports to three very different biographical studies of upper-class sportsmen across the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. The three exemplars chosen range from Tory to Communist in their political affiliations. They came from Scotland, Ireland and England respectively, and occupied different positions within the upper classes, from being a leading member of the peerage to being the younger son of a newly wealthy and titled Jewish family. The three studies aim to help readers understand the central importance of sport in some upper-class lives, the high extent of their commitment and expenditure of time, money and effort, and the sacrifices they made in their lives to maintain their involvement.

John Tolson reviews the career of the thirteenth Earl of Eglinton (1812-1861), a Scottish peer, estate owner and lifelong Tory, who played an important yet complex role in both sport and politics in Ayrshire, Scotland and the rest of the British Isles. Tolson reveals the impressive breadth of his sporting interests and achievements and his social leadership, which provided organizational support and patronage to sports in places where he enjoyed political and social influence. In part his approach harked back to the past, but he also exploited developing technology, such as railways and the electric telegraph, to facilitate the spread and enjoyment of sport in Scotland.

Jonathan Magee explores the central role hare coursing played in the life of Charles Brownlow, the second Lord Lurgan (1831-1882), a northern Irish Protestant landowner and Whig peer, who organized, entered and provided prize money for the Brownlow Cup at the Lurgan coursing meeting from 1858 to 1877. He hosted leading visitors at his country house nearby, and was steward at other Irish meetings. He was also a member of the exclusive Altcar Club near Liverpool and won the Waterloo Cup there three times. His love of coursing and high spending to maintain his involvement contributed to financial problems, finally forcing the sale of his estate.

Jim Riordan provides a fascinating account of the life of the Hon. Ivor Montagu (1904-1984), youngest son of Lord Swaythling, the Jewish financier and Liberal peer. Montagu enjoyed a conventional upper-class education at public school and Cambridge, but rebelled against his background from an early age through left-wing politics and choice of career. He was a keen soccer fan, but from the 1920s he also played a key role in popularizing the new sport of table tennis, playing, refereeing and getting involved in its organization and administration. He was the founding chairman of the English Table Tennis Association in 1923, wrote and published its rules, and was the first chairman and then president of the International Table Tennis Association from 1927 to 1931, and again from 1958 to 1966.

The sheer variety of the chosen case studies is both revealing and suggestive about the complex nature of the upper-class contribution to British sporting life. It suggests that if we are committed to balance, impartiality and rigour, it is time to begin a revisionist reassessment of the contributions of the relatively neglected, unloved and unappreciated upper classes to the development of British sport, through their work, patronage, institutions, cultural manifestations, sporting ideologies and values. The cultural meanings they transmitted and embodied, and the way power relations were structured, represented and challenged in sporting terms, all need much further exploration. Historians need to develop the work of synthesis and unpack the complex processes of diffusion, appropriation and cultural hegemony taking place. One of the challenges for the historian is that British sporting cultures overlapped, so that aspirant middle-class groups were able to participate in much of upper-class sporting life, and this mixing and overlapping needs far more consideration and explication.

Certainly, as Catriona Parratt remarked in 1989, 'traditional field sports [have] continued to hold an unassailable position in the programme of country pursuits' among the upper classes, but this collection is a reminder that their contribution was much wider than that. [32] Before a cultural and social history of their broader involvement in Britain's sporting history can be written much remains to be done. Some years ago, I wrote: 'Historians need to move away from what is currently relatively narrow, crude and coarse-grained analysis and begin to open up . . . middle-class sport to a far wider base of historical and cultural investigation.' [33] The same comments apply even more so to upper-class sport. We need to provide a far better historical perspective of their changing sporting interests and priorities than currently and take them as seriously as some took themselves.

Notes

- [1] E.g. Neville Kirk, 'Decline and fall, resilience and regeneration: A review essay on social class', *International labor and working-class history* 57 (2000), pp. 88-102.
- [2] See, for example, the fall 2003 issue of the *Journal of Social History*.
- [3] Martin Johnes, 'Historiography of sport in England and Wales', in Steve Pope and John Nauright (eds), *The Routledge companion to sports history* (forthcoming).
- [4] Martin Hewitt, 'Class and the classes', in C. Williams, ed., *A companion to nineteenth century Britain* (London, 2004), pp. 305-20; Antony Taylor, *Lords of misrule: Hostility to aristocracy in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain* (Houndsmill, 2004), p. 4.
- [5] Richard Holt, 'Sport and history: the state of the subject in Britain', *Twentieth Century British History* 7 (2) (1996), p. 233.
- [6] Martin Johnes, 'Pigeon racing and working-class culture in Britain c.1870-1950', *Cultural and Social History*, 4 (3) (2007), pp. 361-83.
- [7] See C. F. Foster, *Class and innovation: How Britain became the first industrial nation* (Northwich, 2004).
- [8] Quoted in Peter Borsay, *A history of leisure* (Basingstoke, 2006), p. 81.
- [9] David Cannadine, *The rise and fall of class in Britain* (New York, 1999).
- [10] Peter Laslett, *The world we have lost* (London, 1968), p. 22.
- [11] Hugh Cunningham, 'Leisure and culture', in F.M.L. Thompson, ed., *The Cambridge social history of Britain 1750-1950*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1990).
- [12] Ross McKibbin, *Classes and cultures: England 1918-1951* (Oxford, 1998), p. 2.
- [13] Dudley Baxter, *The national income* (London, 1868), p. 15.
- [14] The following section draws in David Cannadine, *The decline and fall of the British aristocracy* (New Haven, CT, 1990), pp. 1-20; J.F.C. Harrison, *Early Victorian Britain 1832-51* (Glasgow, 1988), pp. 92-7; W.L. Burn, *The age of equipoise* (London, 1964), pp. 302-9.
- [15] Mark Rothery, 'Constructing the scaffolding: the national census and the English landed gentry in the Victorian period', *Family and Community History* 9 (2) (2006), pp. 91-102.
- [16] See Roger Longrigg, *The English squire and his sport* (London, 1977) for a rare attempt at analysis.
- [17] 'Return of the owners of land in England and Wales 1872-3', *Parliamentary*

Papers 1074 (C1097) LXXII, parts 1 and 2.

[18] John Bateman, *The great landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (Leicester, 1971; orig. pub. 1883), Tables I and V.

[19] G.E. Mingay, *English landed society in the eighteenth century* (London, 1963); F.M.L. Thompson, *English landed society in the nineteenth century* (London, 1963); Marion Yass, *The English aristocracy* (London, 1974); George Mingay, *The gentry: The rise and fall of a ruling class* (Basingstoke, 1994); Cannadine, 362 M. Huggins

The decline and fall of the British aristocracy, George E. Mingay, *Land and society in England, 1750-1980* (London and New York, 1994); J.V. Beckett, *The aristocracy in England, 1660-1914* (Oxford, 1986); David Cannadine, *Aspects of aristocracy: Grandeur and decline in modern Britain* (London, 1994);

D. Cannadine, *Lords and landlords: The aristocracy and the towns, 1774-1967* (London, 1980); D. Cannadine, ed., *Patricians, power and politics in nineteenth-century towns* (London, 1982); Pamela Horn, *High society: The English social elite, 1880-1914* (London, 1992).

[20] Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the nation 1707-1837* (New Haven, CT, 1994).

[21] Amanda Goodrich, *Debating England's aristocracy: Pamphlets, polemics and political Ideas* (London, 2005).

[22] E.G. Bulwer-Lytton, *England and the English* (New York, 1833), vol. I, p. 37.

[23] See E.A. Smith, *The House of Lords in British politics and society* (London, 1992).

[24] Angela Lambert, *Unquiet souls: the Indian summer of the British aristocracy 1880-1918* (London, 1984); Nigel Agar, *Behind the plough: Agrarian society in nineteenth century Hertfordshire* (Hereford, 2005) comes to similar conclusions.

[25] Gerald Gliddon, *The autocracy and the Great War* (London, 2002).

[26] McKibbin, *Classes and cultures*, pp. 18-19.

[27] Mark Bence-Jones, *Twilight of the ascendancy* (London, 1989); Terence Dooley, *The decline of the big house in Ireland 1860-1960* (Dublin, 2001).

[28] Callum McKenzie, 'The origins of the British Field Sports Society', *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 13 (2) (1996), pp. 177-91; Emma Griffin, *Blood sport: Hunting in Britain since 1066* (New Haven, ct, 2007), pp. 180-1.

[29] F.M.L. Thompson, 'English landed society in the twentieth century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5 (40) (1990), and 6 (1) (1991).

[30] John Scott, *The upper classes: Property and privilege in Britain* (London, 1982); Jamie Douglas Home, *Stately passions: The scandals of Britain's great houses* (London 2007); Janet Gleeson, *A passionate affair* (London, 2006); Geoffrey Beard, *The compleat gentleman: Five centuries of aristocratic life* (London, 1993).

[31] Griffin, *Blood sport*, pp. 219-34.

[32] C.M. Parratt, 'Athletic womanhood: Exploring sources for female sport in Victorian and Edwardian England', *Journal of Sport History* 16 (2) (1989), pp. 140-57.

[33] Mike Huggins, 'Second-class citizens? English middle-class culture and sport 1850-1914: A reconsideration', *International Journal of the History of Sport* 17 (1) (2000), p. 30.